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Abstract

This PhD examines the development of the listed narrative form, its uses, versatility and the reasons for its popularity. The principle focus is on Hellenistic *Kollektivgedichte*, including Callimachus’ *Aetia*, but their Hesiodic background is given due attention.

Section one looks at the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and its predecessor, the *Theogony*. The *Theogony* provides an essential context for the study of the *Catalogue of Women*, and yet at the same time reveals differences that point to the development of the catalogue form. Although dominated by lists, the poem is highly complex in structure and tightly subordinated to a teleological end. The structure of the *Catalogue* is more complex, and shows a greater degree of engagement with contemporary culture. The use of genealogy gives prominence to figures from the margins of myth, by setting the ‘canonical’ Greek heroes in the context of their mothers and sisters, and their courtship stories. The poem makes frequent reference to four central clusters of Greek myths - Heracles, the Argonautica, the Theban cycle and the Trojan War – in a way that separates them from their usual context and presents different episodes as side lights on characters’ lives. While still closely bound up in the genealogical frame, the narratives point the way forward to the development of *Kollektivgedichte*.

Section two looks at the range of sub-genres within Hellenistic *Kollektivgedichte* - curse poetry, erotic catalogues and metamorphosis poetry – as well as considering the form of works sometimes linked with *Kollektivgedichte*. Issues of generic play and the negotiation with the Hesiodic predecessor are considered. Poets considered include Phanocles, Hermesianax, Euphorion, Nicander, Boios and Sostratus.

Section three is devoted to Callimachus’ *Aetia*, which has a privileged position because of the number of fragments we possess and the poem’s prestige. It is of especial interest because the two halves of the poem were different in format, showing two different conceptions of the structure and nature of catalogue narrative poems. The first half, framed by the dialogue with the Muses, is shown to have a complex interplay of themes, while the poet’s enquiring nature is prominently on display. It the second half the structure of the poem pushes at the boundaries of *Kollektivgedichte* by to an increasing extent removing unifying features. This challenging of the poem’s own form and genre is important to an understanding of how the listed narrative form was conceived of by Callimachus.

Generic play and self-reflexive experimentation are shown to be the chief characteristics of *Kollektivgedichte*. Although many of the poets in question are neglected by scholars, they are seen here to have been innovative and to exemplify many of the traits of Hellenistic poetry.
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INTRODUCTION

*Kollektivgedichte* is a rather general term, embracing a heterogeneous collection of works: ‘Hesiodic-style catalogue poetry’, curse poetry, metamorphosis poetry, and even Callimachus’ *Aetia*. None of the works has survived in full. Most remains of Callimachus’ *Aetia*, but this may have diverged from the form of the other poems. A number of them are only known by name, such as Sostratus’ *Ehoioi* and Antigonos’ *Alloioseis*; it is even doubtful whether some of them, such as Philetas’ *Bittis*, ever existed. With the exception of the *Aetia*, *Kollektivgedichte* are often neglected and frequently disparaged. The form appears nonetheless to have been prevalent in Hellenistic poetry. The subject matter of the narratives, too, seems to have been characteristic of the period: it is frequently erotic, often bizarre, and tends to feature obscure incidents and figures from the margins of myth. Aetiology appears to have been a particular concern of certain poets, in particular Nicander and Phanocles. The poems participated in the Hellenistic experimentation with genre. While they share the same outline form, each individual poem draws on features from a range of generic subsets.

This play with genre in the majority of the works, and the differences of metre and topic among them, mean that ‘*Kollektivgedichte*’ is to a certain extent a term of convenience. No formal definition of it exists, but on the basis of the poems’ shared characteristics I will restrict it to works that contain an extended sequence of narrative segments lacking interconnection through plot or characters, that are not subordinated to an overall narrative structure displaying a developed plot or dominant teleological thrust, and that are self-standing in that they do not require further information for
their stories to be comprehensible. For instance, the *Aetia* and Euphorion’s curse poetry placed their narratives in an outline context, respectively the dialogue with the Muses and the condemnation of the recipient to suffer the mythical fates narrated, but the primary purpose of these frames is to present and lend coherence to the narrative segments. One could compare by way of contrast the relationship of the Lemnian (1.609-639) or Aristaeus (2.500-527) narratives to the epic plot of Apollonius’ *Argonautica*. The former is a narrative that could be self-standing, but is extended to end with the women’s reaction to the sight of the *Argo*. It is a digression subordinated to the main plot, explaining the situation that the Argonauts will encounter, and it participates in the epic’s motifs, particularly the theme of murderous women, and the relationship between father and daughter. The Aristaeus narrative is an aetiological digression on the Etesian winds; it explains the delay in the Argonauts’ journey, and provides a pause in the poem’s action that mirrors this delay. In a *Kollektivgedicht* both could have formed self-standing segments, but in the *Argonautica* they are bound up in a specific context.

*Kollektivgedichte* differ from catalogues of forces in epic, and catalogues of exempla, for a similar reason; such catalogues are always bound up in the imperatives of the larger work’s plot, themes or argument. In addition, narratives that could be self-standing in such catalogues tend to be exceptions; more normally segments are brief and allusive, or simply descriptive. *Kollektivgedichte* must also be distinguished from lists in shorter works sometimes referred to as ‘catalogue poems’, such as Vergil’s *Eclogue* 6. There, the majority of the stories are one or two verses long; even the longer narratives, such as that of Pasiphae, are brief snapshots of a single moment in the tale that require the reader to know the whole story in advance. Poetic
collections, on the other hand, also differ from *Kollettivgedichte* in that the latter link the narrative segments either syntactically (through the use of connective formulae), or through unifying elements below the level of plot, such as the poet’s persona, whereas in a collection there may be an overall theme, but the individual pieces are presented as wholly separate poems.

The nearest parallel for the segmented narratives in Hellenistic *Kollettivgedichte* is the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. A number of poems express their affiliation to it through their title (for example, Sostratus’ *Ehoioi* and Nicaenetus’ *Catalogue of Women*) or through the use of repeated formulae at the beginning of every segment in a manner recalling the *Ehoiai* in the *Catalogue*. In the Hesiodic poem, however, the narratives, while independent of one another, did have a wider function within the poem as a whole. They functioned symbiotically within the genealogy, explaining its shape and adding to individuals’ identities while being set in an entire mythical and cultural context by it. This complex interdependence of narrative and frame means that the *Catalogue* is not itself a *Kollettivgedicht*. It is important, however, for the precedent it provided. Its differences from the *Theogony* also show the development of the listed narrative form. Consideration of the *Theogony* shows its high degree of logical subordination, and thus the extent to which narratives and genealogy in the *Catalogue* enjoy a far freer relationship. The *Catalogue* also seems likely to have appealed to the Hellenistic poets through its subject matter; it differs from heroic epic in the attention paid to women and to bizarre incidents from Greek myth. The major epic cycles are subjected to fragmentation, with incidents handled in separate segments. This readjustment in emphasis, marginalising the heroic, has clear parallels in Hellenistic poetics.
Callimachus’ *Aetia* displays the furthest stage in the development of *Kollektivgedichte*, not in diachronic terms, but in that it shows the greatest degree of development of the listed narrative form. The form of the poem changes as it progresses: in the first half the frame of the dialogue with the Muses helps relate the segments to one another and draw parallels and contrasts; in the second half, however, this frame is missing and the relationship between the segments is weakened by the use of strongly differing contexts and generic affiliations, so that eventually the poem appears to push at the boundaries of *Kollektivgedichte* and then to step beyond them. Callimachus’ relationship with *Kollektivgedichte* is obscured by his supposed hostility to the form. This question is closely linked to the disputed interpretation of the *Prologue* and to Callimachus’ known dislike of the *Lyd*e, but it is far from certain that his remarks should be understood as a condemnation of *Kollektivgedichte* as a whole.

Between these two extremes in the history of *Kollektivgedichte* lie a number of subcategories of poem: erotic narratives by Phanocles and Hermesianax, linked to the Hesiodic *Catalogue* by the use of repeated introductory formulae; curse poems, containing sequences of myths of punishment or misfortune which the recipient is cursed to experience; and metamorphosis poetry, containing narratives that may, although this is by no means certain, have been set in a didactic frame. Although not all poems displayed all these features, the main elements of the listed narrative form that made it attractive to the Hellenistic poets appear to have been its association with the process of enquiry, its tendency to compile paradigms, its preference for marginal figures, and its ability to reflect the cultural situation.

With the exception of work on the *Aetia* and, to a far lesser extent, Euphorion, *Kollektivgedichte* have been neglected by modern scholarship. Commentaries have
been published on individual poets, some of them limited to technical aspects, and there have been some excellent isolated articles, but it is an area still passed over by scholars taking a broader view of Hellenistic literature. Hutchinson’s *Hellenistic Poetry* is divided into chapters on Callimachus, Apollonius, Theocritus and ‘Other Poets’ - Aratus, Herodas, Lycophron and Asclepiades. Phanocles and Hermesianax appear in a footnote; Euphorion does not appear in the index.¹ In *Tradition and Innovation* Fantuzzi and Hunter cover a slightly broader range, with chapters on epyllion, epigram, hymns and encomia and drama as well as Callimachus, Apollonius and Theocritus. *Kollektivgedichte* make a brief appearance in two paragraphs.² At the 7th Groningen Workshop on Hellenistic Poetry, *Beyond the Canon*, dedicated to the less studied Hellenistic poems, there were papers on Euphorion, Hermesianax and Alexander Aetolus, but out of the twenty papers there were four on Herodas, and two each on Lycophron, Moschos, and Aratus. Thus even when ‘minor’ poets are the major topic, half the attention is paid to the best-known authors. The only modern extensive treatment of *Kollektivgedichte* as a whole is the hostile and tendentious chapters in Cameron’s *Callimachus and his Critics*.³ Other authors, such as Lightfoot, summarise *Kollektivgedichte* briefly in work on other texts.⁴

Where *Kollektivgedichte* do receive a mention, one of the principal defects in their treatment is the failure to distinguish the different styles and poetic attitudes among the authors involved. This thesis aims to draw out the range of styles and subgenres within *Kollektivgedichte*, identifying how Hesiodic poetry laid a foundation for the listed narrative form, and how Callimachus tested the form’s limits. It has three

¹ Hutchinson (1988).
2.1 Introduction

A study of the evolution of Hellenistic Kollektivgedichte as a poetic form must take into account the different influences upon Callimachus, Nicander, Euphorion, Phanocles, Hermesianax and others. While these influences include Antimachus, Mimnermus and contemporary epigram, it is Hesiodic catalogue poetry that must take pride of place. Like Hellenistic Kollektivgedichte, the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women contrives to join disparate narratives together in a form similar to that of a catalogue. This, and its use of formulae, were plainly seen by the Hellenistic poets as its most distinguishing features. The alternative names given to the poem bear witness to this - ἡ οἶαι or κατάλογος γυναικῶν. Modern scholarship acknowledges this influence on later poetry:

"However crude and artificial the phrase [Ehoie] may be as a unifying device for a series of stories, the Alexandrians immediately saw the potential of the Ehoiai as a model for their own derivative of catalogue poetry, the poetic book." Krevans (1984) 170.

"There is no evidence that the Lyde’s stories were treated as separate poems. The various episodes were presumably linked by transitions, like the Ehoiai, making the Lyde a continuous narrative.” ibid 201.

Such a view of the Catalogue, however, is one-sided, ignoring the poem’s links to the Theogony and thus failing to recognise an important part of its structure. Indeed, the poem viewed by scholars from the standpoint of the Theogony seems a different work from that viewed from Kollektivgedichte.

"It was natural to join these two poems [the Theogony and Catalogue of Women]. In combination, they related human to divine history, and thus told the story of the entire world from the origin of the physical universe and of the first gods down through the Trojan War, by way of marriages among the gods, the unions of goddesses with mortal men (Theog. 965-1020), and the unions of gods with mortal women (the Catalogue of Women).” Thalmann (1984) 75.
This latter opinion, however, is no more accurate than the former. While the view of Krevans and others ignores the role of genealogy in the poem’s structure and dynamics, Thalmann’s view fails to acknowledge the diversity of theme and structure in the *Catalogue*. The existence of two such different attitudes to the poem is an effectual marker of its pivotal place in the evolution of catalogue poetry. It marks a distinct development from the *Theogony*, and was developed in turn by the Hellenistic poets.¹

Even from the fragments, it is plain that the *Catalogue* differed considerably from the *Theogony* in its form and nature. In the latter, not only is there a far sharper divide between the stemmata and the passages of continuous narrative, but there is also a strong teleological thread which appears in part to be chronologically independent of the genealogy. The *Theogony*’s handling of genealogy and narrative must nonetheless be thoroughly understood as a context for the *Catalogue*, so that how the *Catalogue* differed from its model and how those differences were expanded upon by the Hellenistic poets becomes clear. This is the more so because genealogy has a considerable impact upon how and to what end narratives may be introduced and ordered, and the development of themes, juxtapositions and teleological narratives is thus placed under considerable pressure. Chronology and its implications are also massively affected by the genealogical form. All these factors influenced the composition of the *Theogony*, so that the text which preceded the *Catalogue* was the product of a particular set of circumstances.

¹ While it may be the case that the poem in fact synthesised an earlier form, Rutherford’s (2000) hypothesised ‘Ehoie poetry’, with genealogy, it seems to have been the Hesiodic *Catalogue* that first drew attention to the scope and potential of this type of poetry.
2.2 Genealogical Catalogue Technique

Both the *Theogony* and *Catalogue* shared in the problem of expressing the two-dimensional form of a genealogy in the linear form of poetry. A genealogy displays an ever increasing number of synchronous lines: brothers and sisters marry and reproduce, and their offspring, all contemporaries of each other, do likewise. Thus this third generation in a chronological sense is all on the same level, but, should the genealogy be rendered through the linear form of a spoken or written text, they cannot all be mentioned at the same time. Nor, for clarity’s sake, can individuals be mentioned without their parents, and frequently their grandparents, being named, because without them figures would lose their identity in the stemmata. Thus the genealogical text must either continuously recapitulate, or follow an individual stemma for a certain number of generations before returning to where it began to pick up a sibling’s line. The text must constantly transform synchronic laterals, for instance, series of siblings, into diachronic vertical structures as these siblings are all each dealt with in turn. From the vertical thrusts sprout further laterals, which themselves may become developed vertically. In addition, the component parts of each lateral must be arranged, and the list of siblings given initially may be shuffled to grant prominence to the most important figure of each generation.\(^2\)

In this thesis I will call the order in which a text arranges the contents of the stemmata the *linear sequence*. In conventional epic this sequence normally corresponds to the diachronic narration of events; *prolepseis* may anticipate certain events (as with prophecies, for example), and *analepseis* - flashbacks - may tell us of what has passed before the narrated time.\(^3\) It is nonetheless understood that such

passages are digressions only, and at their close the forward movement of the text will reflect the forward movement of time in the narrative. Because, however, in a genealogical text, contemporaneous stemmata have to be located one after another in the linear sequence, the linear sequence cannot consistently reflect diachronic time. Diachronic passages may become mingled with synchronous ones: a hero’s line may be described down to his great grandson - the linear sequence here would correspond to diachronic movement - but when his brother’s line is similarly described afterwards this is neither analepsis nor prolepsis, for the narrative need not return to the hero at the end, but it is rather a diachronic description that is synchronous to what has gone before. This inevitably leads to ambiguities that the poet may exploit to his own ends, and, as I will show, this is particularly the case with the Theogony. Although the genealogy of the Catalogue of Women is far more complex, with a greater number of initially unrelated stemmata and the presence of numerous intermarriages, there is far less evidence for such a dominant teleology as appears in the Theogony. In that text the linear sequence and its customary association with diachronic time is tightly controlled and exploited to achieve the particular end of the justification and glorification of Zeus’ reign.

The potential for ambiguity is increased by the fact that the stemmata are never left wholly unadorned. Short narrative or descriptive passages occur naturally within genealogies, each with the potential to vary its own diachronic movement with prolepsis or analepsis. These passages originate as part of the process of identifying a character. While identity is closely tied to genealogy, especially for women, who may at times be famous only for their male relatives, a further part of a character’s

---

identity is his or her most famous exploit, characteristic possession, or other such attribute. Thus Mestra is known for her shape-changing, and Iphimede for the fact that she was sacrificed; both give rise to narratives that are followed by barely signalled leaps back in time to the stemmata.\textsuperscript{6} Confusion between linear sequence and diachronic time is something exploited above all by the \textit{Theogony}. It is this, along with the selective use of elaborations within stemmata, that was the work’s chief characteristic.

\subsection*{2.3 The \textit{Theogony}}

The \textit{Theogony} compounds the problems of expressing genealogy through a linear sequence with the use of multiple forms of genealogical logic. As has been shown in detail by a number of scholars, Greek thought employs genealogical terminology to express conceptual relationships.\textsuperscript{7} The most prominent of such relationships in the \textit{Theogony} is that of the offspring whose characters specify a particular aspect of their parents’ nature. Gaia bore Ouranos, Hills, and Pontos - that is, she produced within herself, to dwell upon herself, all the features of the physical world, including the earth’s atmosphere. From Pontos come aspects of the sea:

\begin{quote}
\begin{small}
Νηρέα δ’ ἀψευδέα καὶ ἀληθέα γείνατο Πόντος,
πρεσβύτατου παίδων αὐτάρ καλέουσι γέρουντα,
οὕνεκα νημερτής τε καὶ ἤπιος, οὐδὲ θειότων
λήβεται, ἀλλὰ δίκαια καὶ ἤπια δήνεα οἰδέν
αὕτις δ’ αὖ Θαύμαντα μέγαν καὶ ἀγίννορα Φόρκυν
Γαίη μισγόμενος καὶ Κητῶ καλλιτάρην
Εὐρυβίην τ’ ἀδάμαντος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸν ἔχουσαν.
\end{small}
\end{quote}

\textit{Theog.} 233-239.

\textsuperscript{6} 3\textsuperscript{7} \textsuperscript{H.}.23\textsuperscript{a}M.-W.1-69; 15\textsuperscript{H.}.23\textsuperscript{a}M.-W.15-27.
\textsuperscript{7} See esp. Philippson (1936); West (1966); Miller (1977).
Nereus, “The advice-giving, generous old man of the sea”, Thaumas, “Die göttliche Verkörperung des Unbegreiflich-Wunderbaren und des Staunens über dieses Wunderbare”, 8 Phorkys and Ceto, monsters of the deep, Eurybie, the broad power of the sea. 9 From Nereus come the nymphs:

\[\text{Πρωτός τ' Εὐκράντη τε Σαώ τ' Ἀμφιρήτη τε Εὐδώρη τε Θέτις τε Γαλήνη τε Γλαύκη τε, Κυμοθόν Σπειό τε Θοῆ θ' Ἀλή τ' ἔρωσσα . . . (Theog. 243-245)}\]

Among these names are those of the nymphs given most characterisation and most prominence in poetry - Thetis and Amphitrite - but also aspects of the sea - Γαλήνη indicates calm, Εὐκράντη fair weather, Γλαύκη the sea’s grey-green colour; Κυμοθόν could be translated as “wave-swift”, 10 Εὐδώρη as “giver of good”, 11 Σαώ reflects the fact that “one of a marine god’s functions is to brings ships safely home”. 12 Σπειό (grotto) and θ’ Ἀλή (salt sea) stand for the physical characteristics of the coast. 13 From this it is evident that these siblings are not uniform; some are characteristics of the sea, some are cult figures, some are aspects to be prayed for. But in addition it should be noted that all these things come out of the idea of the sea, just as Nereus, Thaumas and their siblings did. Pontos is not that part of the sea that is not monstrous, wonderful, wide-ruling, or productive of calm, the sea’s colour, and the speed of the waves. Pontos is the sum of the aspects that all his descendants express, and more.

Philippson describes the genos as an integration both of ancestors with living and future generations and of all the living parts in the present, so that they form a

---

9 Thalmann (1984) 1: Nereus and Phorkys set in opposition the positive and negative aspects of the sea.
11 Frazer (1983) 42.
12 West (1966) 238 ad loc.
2.3 Hesiodic Catalogue Poetry: The *Theogony*

unity. This unity makes it a condition that the first ancestor lives on in all successors; as such the original being is timeless, not expiring with the death of the ancestor but continuing in its successors in ever-renewed modifications. The genealogy is thus a likeness of the cosmos. Through this, Hesiod makes the character of the gods plain not only through name and epithet, but also through descendants.

The earlier “divine, begetting powers” stand in the genealogy, the greater the wealth of characteristics they gain. This understanding is fundamental to a consideration of the *Theogony*. As the branches of the stemmata progress, there is a movement towards increasing individuation. That is, the figures take on more and more specific characteristics, and in some cases are assigned a greater degree of personality.

Once figures have developed personalities, or perform actions rather than merely existing as cosmic components, the synthesising of different forms of conceptual relationship into the same genealogical bond at times creates seeming incongruities. Scholars have drawn attention, for instance, to the apparent contradiction in the idea that all the Titans rebelled against Zeus - Τιτηνές τε θεοί καὶ ὅσοι Κρόνου ἔξεγένυτο (630) - since this implies that Themis and Mnemosyne were involved in both the battle and the subsequent imprisonment in Tartarus. Not only would this be contrary to Themis’ own nature, but Zeus later marries both figures. West saw the heterogeneity of the list of Titans as an example of its lack of traditional foundation. It is indubitable that throughout the *Theogony*

---

14 Philippson (1936) 1.
15 Philippson (1936) 9.
16 In the earliest stages, however, other forms of specification do exist, in particular that of antithesis. This is most evident in the relationship of Aither and Day to their parents Night and Erebos (123-5); bright and gloomy are contrasted - Day against Night, Upper Air against Underworld - and in addition there is a division between temporal abstracts - Day and Night - and physical but intangible substances - Erebos and Aither. See esp. Miller (1977).
18 West (1966) 36.
different versions of events and divergent traditions are combined: this is not, however, solely for the sake of completeness, or in order to compose a kind of compendium. As we shall see, in particular in the case of the narratives of Zeus' rise to power, the various components are put together in a way that is strictly governed by the teleological drive of the poem. Lauriola divides the list of Titans into three groups - physical entities, anthropomorphic figures, and moral entities - which are each dealt with in turn in the poem, but the sequence in which this occurs is significant for the picture created of the coming to be of the cosmos and Zeus' rule.¹⁹

The changing rhythms of the Theogony divide the text, after the proem, into four major phases, which, indeed, correspond to the major epochs of the narrative. First (116-210) is the initial cosmogony, the birth of the Titans, the castration of Cronos, and the arrival of Aphrodite; second (211-411) come the long lists of many of the figures who come together to make a picture of the cosmos, which is complete in preparation for the arrival of Zeus. The 'Hymn to Hecate' intervenes between the second and third sections (415-452): it arises from a genealogical entry in the manner of the other elaborations in the second phase, but swells far beyond them, until the genealogical entry appears merely a peg for the hymn. Where the stemma resumes, the rhythm is predominantly that of narrative rather than genealogy. This third epoch (453-885) is concerned with Zeus' rise to power, and includes the deposition of Cronos, the Prometheia, the Titanomachy and the attack by Typhoeus. The fourth phase of the text (886-960) is the account of the offspring of the Olympians. It is uncertain at what point it should end, for the text is surely subject to interpolations at this point: it is clear, however, that the unions display Zeus strengthening and stabilising his power.

The first phase puts in place all the figures necessary for the growth of the cosmos. The creation of the universe and its most basic shaping are dealt with: the first four beings - Earth, Chaos, Hell and Love - the growth from Chaos of Night and Underworld, and their antitheses Day and Upper Air. Through the birth of the Titans from Earth and Heaven it also contains the first elements of the divine, allowing for the initial stage of the succession myth. The requirements of cosmic growth and the succession myth strongly dictate the order of figures in this section. It is necessary, for instance, for the Titans to be born before Ouranos can be cut off from Gaia. The Cyclopes and Hundred-handers had a traditional part to play in the Titanomachy, and thus, by association of ideas at least, belong to this period. But in addition it should be noted that they have an air of being a primeval, ungoverned stage of creation. As monsters they belong, from the standpoint of the teleological narrative, far from the period of Zeus’ rule. Something similar could be said of the Giants and Erinyes, born from Ouranos’ blood.

The long genealogical second phase falls into three parts: the stemma from Night (211-231), that from Pontos (232-336), and the unions of the first four pairs of Titans (337-413). There is no further development of the succession myth within this phase, but the basis is laid for its progression. The progeny of Night are placed first, not simply because Chaos, from whom they are descended, was the first being, but because these abstractions, of all the components of the cosmos in this section, are the darkest. They provide a bridge as they look back to the violence of the castration of Ouranos, but this juxtaposition, by association of ideas, places them in the time before Zeus’ rule. The placing of these abstract figures so far back also allows for a greater concentration on physical features throughout the remainder of the section, lending

coherence to the cosmogonic narrative. The impression created by their placing exploits the customary association of linear sequence and diachronic order. The genealogical chronology suggests that the brood of Eris, grandchildren of Night, are synchronous with Zeus and his siblings; genealogical logic suggests that the negative abstract forces have always existed within their ancestors, and continue to exist, as if within a timeless vôv, as Philippson has suggested. For the teleological narrative, however, the time that must elapse between the audience hearing of these figures and hearing of Zeus is important, because of the implicit distancing effect that this has.

Among the physical features, Pontos is the oldest and the one to be characterised first. Nereus, his son, is the first figure (perhaps with the exception of Gaia and Ouranos) to be given a personal character, rather than merely standing as a personification. As such he is a landmark in the text, marking the emergence of a theogony from the cosmogony. This development also paves the way for the introduction of the monsters. Nereus was both an aspect of the sea and a person in his own right. The monsters are almost all characters rather than personifications. No monstrous births are mentioned beyond this point in the poem, as if the birth of such creatures is to be seen as an early phase in the narrative of creation, and consequently before the time of Zeus’ rule. At the same time, the mention of their deaths at the hands of heroes reminds us that this is not in fact the case. According to the genealogical chronology there is no anachronism in this, but the linear sequence has collapsed the time-frame of the teleological narrative by placing these figures so far

21 Philippson (1936) 18-19.
22 That this shift from personification to individual should occur so early on in the linear sequence and then be followed by further personifications when the Titan branch is taken up is typical of the genealogical narrative.
23 Clay (1993) 115-6: "Moreover, by situating the monsters early in the Theogony, he suggests that they belong to a primitive but passing, although perhaps necessary, phase of cosmic evolution. All the surviving members of the clan are integrated into Zeus’ regime or rendered harmless at the ends of the earth, literally marginalized." Cf. Stoddard (2004) 148.
from their contemporaries. As the monsters have interaction with mortals and their characters are highly specific, they are marked out as being ‘later’ than the Cyclopes and the Hundred-handers.

The third part of the section is occupied by the Titan marriages. The order of these is dictated by the need (in terms of the requirements of the teleological narrative) for the cosmos to be fully developed by the time of the arrival of Zeus. Oceanus, a boundary figure, encircling the earth, almost naturally has to take first place. Theia and Hyperion, Eurybia and Crios, Phoebe and Coios form a group unified by intermarriage. Astraeus and Perses, sons of Crios, marry Eos, child of Hyperion, and Asteria, daughter of Phoebe. In addition, all three families have associations with astronomical phenomena: Hyperion fathers Sun, Moon and Dawn; Astraeus, along with Eos, will give birth to three of the winds, Eosphorus and the stars.

The Oceanid Styx, however, wife of Crios’ third son Pallas, along with Leto and Hecate, signals a gradual divergence in this group from astronomical phenomena to individuals and Olympians. With Styx comes the first significant interruption of the genealogy since the castration of Ouranos. The story of Zeus’ grant of honours to her not only looks forward to his rise to power, but also justifies and explains it. His grant of *timai* to figures from the old order as well as the new was a guarantee of stability, while also, because it secured the allegiance of Styx’ children Zelos, Nike, Cratos and Bie, giving him the power to retain control.

Στύξ δ’ έτεκ’ ήκέανοι θυγάτηρ Πάλλαντι μιγείσα
Ζήλον καὶ Νίκην καλλίσφυρον ἐν μεγάροισι
καὶ Κράτος ἤθε Βήνη ἀριστείκετα γείνατο τέκνα.

25 For the importance of the *dasmos* see Philipson (1936) 21-3; Solmsen (1949) 51-3; Boedeker (1983) 89; Zanker (1988) 71.
26 Boedeker (1983) 89.
The passage on Styx is followed soon after by the ‘Hymn to Hecate’. Like the Styx excursus, it gives a preview of the dasmos under Zeus, but it grows into an expression of the goddess’ near universal honour. If one discounts the dubious final 140 lines or so of the poem, the piece stands at the approximate centre of the Theogony: a climax to the initial cosmogony and the time of the old gods, and a prelude to the establishment of the Olympian order. Its main themes are the honour due to a goddess and the aid that may be given in return. Mentions of land, sea and sky express the universality of her honour, and the details that follow create a picture of a broad range of human activity.

The hymn establishes a paradigm for what is to come once all the events narrated in the poem are over. It signals the telos of a created world inhabited by mortals who give due honour to the gods, and is a promise of ‘correct’ interaction to be remembered when Prometheus’ deceitful sacrifice at Mecone is described.

The third epoch begins conventionally enough: Rhea bears children for Cronos:

It is only after all her children have been listed that we are told that Cronos swallowed them, even though, if the linear sequence corresponded to the chronology, that would mean that Zeus was born before Cronos did this. The list of offspring in fact shows the baseline, sets out what is at stake, before the narrative concerning these births actually begins. Cronos’ motivation itself is explained through an *analepsis*: a prophecy that he was to be overcome by the contrivance of Zeus (464-5). In spite of this, Zeus’ active role in this coup appears to be limited: Rhea was advised by Ouranos and Gaia about her plan, and the precise means by which Cronos was vanquished remains uncertain:

This episode of the succession myth over, genealogy seems to reappear with the Iapetids. Once again, the four offspring are listed before the elaborations describing their fates occur: Epimetheus caused trouble for mankind by accepting his wife from Zeus; Menoitios was struck by lightning for *hybris*; Atlas was condemned to hold the world on his shoulders; and Prometheus was chained down for an eagle to eat his liver until Heracles killed it. As with the stories in the catalogue of monsters, these elaborations stand as a supplement to the genealogy, providing further information about the characters and their fates. It has been suggested that the positioning of the *Prometheia* at this point is also a result of this practice, that to have...
told of Prometheus' trick at a distance from the mention of his birth would have entailed considerable awkwardness.29 The poet manages, however, to reintroduce the Cyclopes and Hundred-handers when the time comes for them to aid Zeus. From the temporal outlook of the description of Prometheus, the narrative is an *analepsis*, explaining why he was punished.

\[
καὶ γὰρ ὅτε ἐκρίνοντο θεοὶ θυητοὶ τ’ ἄνθρωποι
Μηκώνην, τὸτε ἔπειτα μέγαν βοῶν πρόφρονι θυμῷ
δασσάμενος προύθηκε, Δίος νόον ἔξαπαφίκοι(535-7)
\]

The text does not, however, return to genealogy afterwards. In fact, the *Prometheia* appears as it were a prelude, or maybe a transition, to the cosmic battle scenes of the Titanomachy and the Typhoeus episode.

The location of the *Prometheia* at this point in the poem has been subject to a good deal of debate. The episode presupposes the existence of mankind and the establishment of a religion in which Zeus was to be honoured with sacrifices. This was foreshadowed in the ‘Hymn to Hecate’, but the linear sequence has given no indication that it has come to fulfilment. The description of the making of Pandora involves the active participation of Athena and Hephaestus (571, 573), neither of whom have yet had their births described. In sum, the time of action appears to be a point after the Typhoeus episode.30 These points, however, may be explained by understanding that, from the point of view of the linear sequence and the genealogical chronology, the passage is a *prolepsis*, looking forward to what will occur and figures who will be born.

In addition to these relatively straightforward points, certain scholars claim that the *Prometheia* takes place before the birth of Zeus.

---

"Likewise, the Prometheus story is chronologically out of place: the birth of Zeus has not yet taken place, nor that of Athena and Hephaestus, all of whom are essential to the story."


"Hesiod frequently collapses chronology, most blatantly perhaps in the Prometheus story, where Zeus plays a central role, although his birth has not yet taken place."


The reasoning behind these statements is not supplied for the reader to consider. In West's text, as in all major editions, Zeus' birth is described in verses 453-500, and the story of Prometheus begins at verse 507. The line of thought must be that Cronos was the youngest of the Titans, and so one might expect his offspring to be described last. One presumes that therefore because the birth of Zeus 'should not' have been described yet, the passage may be treated as if it had not been. In contesting this mindset Lauriola points out that it is not only in the case of Cronos and Iapetus that the initial order of the list of Titans at Theog. 133-8 is not followed. "Oceanus comes first on both occasions, but none of the female Titans are mentioned in the same order, and the order Coios, Crios, Hyperion is inverted. In fact, the order in which the Titans' offspring are described depends principally on their nature as physical, anthropomorphic, or moral entities. "It is the telos of the exaltation of Zeus, however, which affects the order in which the unions of Crios, Coios, Cronos and Iapetus are mentioned. The Styx and Hecate passages are advance affirmations of Zeus' rule as the cosmos comes to completion; he is then born and first manifests his power in deposing Cronos, and then the Prometheus section provides an affirmation of his exercise of power - θνητοίοι και αθανάτοιοιν ἀνάσσει (506)." In addition, the significance of telling the whole Prometheus story at this point in the poem is that

nothing in the linear sequence will then detract from Zeus’ sovereignty after Typhoeus’ defeat.

By inserting the Prometheia early in the narrative of Zeus’ reign, the poet assimilates it into a climactic series of struggles. Zeus was aided by his mother when he took power from Cronos; Prometheus he defeats and punishes on his own in a battle of wits; the Titanomacy is a far greater challenge, and to aid him Zeus recruits the Hundred-handers. The struggle has been compared to the epic aristeiai by which heroes prove themselves through a display of kratos. The Titans are cast into Tartarus and the Hundred-handers are made warders there (713-735), and thus their monstrosity is restricted to the boundaries of the cosmos. The authenticity of the Typhoeus passage which follows is much disputed, but it does not detract from the progression that has been observed. Zeus defeats him unaided, by a cast of his thunderbolt. The progression from being a baby saved by his mother to being the dominant god, capable of dealing with aggressors without help, is thus complete.

According to the linear sequence, Typhoeus is Zeus’ last challenger; the potential threat of Metis’ son is forestalled. The winds that result from Typhoeus are troublesome to men, but their description is followed by that of the Olympians settling down at peace, so that they are almost dismissed, as if of no significance.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ἰα τόνον μάκαρες θεοί ἐξετέλεσαν, 
Τιτήρεσσι δὲ τιμῶν κρίναντο βίης, 
δὴ ἰὰ τῷ’ ὠτρυνον βασιλεύέμεν ἢδὲ ἀνάσειν 
Γαίης φραδμούσην Τ'Ολύμπιον εὐρύστεα Ζῆν 
ἀθανάτων ὦ δὲ τοῖσιν εὖ διεδάσσατο τιμᾶς. (881-885)

34 Solmsen (1949) 17. 
35 Cf. Lamberton (1988) 88 “They are specifically and explicitly distanced from our world, which becomes by implication more tolerable for their absence [...] its [Tartarus’] description contributes as well to the increasing orderliness of this nascent cosmos and to its moral coherence.” See also Thalmann (1984) 39; Johnson (1999). 
These lines form in many ways the climax to the teleological narrative. They assert and legitimise, in an oddly democratic fashion, Zeus' rule; they announce a settled peace - τὸν ζῆσθαι ... ἔξετελεσσαν - and the establishment of a new order through the division of honours - διεδάσσατο τιμᾶς. We do not in effect see the results of this new order portrayed after this passage; the positive ones must be inferred from the Styx and Hecate digressions, the negative ones through the monsters and the Prometheia. What follows in the fourth phase of the poem is not an extended description of life for the cosmos once the telos of Zeus' rule has been reached, but a further consolidation. Zeus marries Themis and Eurynome and these matches give rise to the offspring Eunomia, Dike and Eirene, the Moirae, and the Graces, all positive abstracts that are to legitimise the regime he has established. Marriages to Demeter, Mnemosyne, Leto and Hera result in Persephone, the Muses, Apollo and Artemis, and Hebe, Ares and Eileithyia, while Athena emerges from Zeus's head. With the exception of Ares these figures are distinguished by having power over their associated concerns rather than being personifications of them. This final narrative is thus that of the establishment of order over the separate parts of the cosmos, rather than of the emergence of those separate parts.

It has been suggested that the plural explanations and narratives in evidence in the poem are indicative of a certain 'non-systematising' mode of thought. Rowe, who cites and brings together ideas from Perry and Fränkel, describes this as "a thing's being described or explained in more than one way in the same context, where the descriptions and explanations are not brought into connection with each other, and

where they may appear to be [...] mutually inconsistent." 39 This view has been applied to the ‘‘explanations’’ for Zeus’ victory: the allegiance of the children of Styx, the thunderbolt, the support of the Hundred-handers. 40 Each provides an explanation for how Zeus came to rule that is independent of the others. Similarly, in the Titanomachy Zeus and the Hundred-handers are described attacking in separate but parallel passages: 664-686 - the Hundred-handers prepare to attack; 687-712 - Zeus attacks; 713-720 - the Hundred-handers vanquish the Titans and cast them into Tartarus. Saïd terms them “de double développement d’une même action”. 41

As we have already seen, this mindset is applied to genealogical thought as well as narrative development. It may moreover be the case that such a mode of thought underlies the treatment of chronology in the poem as a whole. As I have shown, the linear sequence is exploited in the teleological narrative as if it represented a diachronic time-scale, even though this led to considerable tension with the chronology suggested by the genealogy. The Theogony is inevitably paratactic as a result of its material, for contemporary stemmata have to be arranged one after the other. 42 This use of parataxis, however, avoids the necessity of subordinating too tightly the teleological and genealogical strands, 43 for by enabling the conceptual linkages within the teleological narrative to remain unexpressed it allows the genealogical form to retain its independence. The order in which the episodes of the genealogy occur is crucial to the sense of the teleological narrative, 44 and it is one of

39 Rowe (1983) 127; cf. Perry (1937) and Fränkel (1975) 105 “The archaic mode of thought does not deal with an object once and for all, thereafter simply discarding it; rather, its habit is to circle around its object, in order to inspect it ever afresh from changing viewpoints.”
41 Said (1977) 196.
42 For parataxis in the Theogony see Thalmann (1984) lff.
the poem’s most notable features that chronology seems to be presented from two independent but coexistent view-points, teleological and genealogical.

The distinguishing characteristics of the body of the *Theogony* are thus the dominance of teleological order and the carefully managed tension between the linear sequence of events and the genealogical chronology. The role played by these factors renders it difficult to class the text as a ‘catalogue-narrative poem’. Although much of the work is dominated by lists, the narratives themselves are not disassociated: while there is a return to genealogy after each narrative, the narratives themselves form one coherent sequence. In this the poem differs from the works that followed it, the *Catalogue of Women* and Hellenistic *Kollektivgedichte*. At the same time, however, the fact that it could present the narratives in such a non-continuous fashion points the way forward to those works.

### 2.4 The End of the *Theogony* and the Beginning of the *Catalogue of Women*

The last hundred or so lines of the *Theogony* form a tailpiece that has been subject to some controversy. Among the features attracting scholarly attention is the fact that the last two lines of the poem are the same as the first two lines of the *Catalogue* proem:

```
Νῦν δὲ γυναικῶν ἕνεκοι ἀείσατε, ἡδυέτειαι
Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγόχοιο. (1021-2 / 1.1-2)
```

Such a potential connection between the poems is plainly worthy of consideration. The verses do not occur in all manuscripts of the *Theogony*: in some they are added in
a later hand, and in some, as well as in PSI 1191, they are absent altogether.\textsuperscript{45} A range of reasons have been suggested for this: it has been proposed that the lines are a fossil of an old form of the Hesiodic corpus, in which the \textit{Theogony} was transmitted alongside the \textit{Catalogue of Women},\textsuperscript{46} or they could have been added at the end of the roll to enable the reader to identify which roll he was to read next, and such a scholion could have been incorporated into the text.\textsuperscript{47} Another response, however, is to accept that the \textit{Catalogue} formed a direct continuation of the \textit{Theogony}, and this opinion is one that has the potential to reveal a great deal about both catalogue poetry and attitudes to it. Thalmann qualifies his opinion when he states that the fact that the \textit{Theogony} and \textit{Catalogue of Women} could be joined at all is suggestive, because it reminds us that although the \textit{Theogony} is coherent in its design, it is only one part of the world’s history and thus could be continued;\textsuperscript{48} Lamberton, however, makes the more sweeping claim that the \textit{Theogony} as a whole is in fact accumulative and characterised by parataxis.\textsuperscript{49} Solmsen, too, states:

\begin{quote}
This is the beginning of the \textit{Ehoiae}. Originally a continuation of the \textit{Theogony} they were soon too bulky to remain an appendix. Having become an epic in their own right they continued to sprout. (1982) 25.
\end{quote}

What these opinions have in common is the view that a genealogical catalogue poem might be expanded for as long as there were figures to be accounted for; that they can admit any number of new segments, and are capable of wandering between topics. Thalmann’s own rider, however, points to the falsity of this view where the \textit{Theogony} is concerned: the body of that work, as I have shown, is far too coherent and tightly subordinated to the teleological narrative to be the product of a mere accumulation of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{45} See Treu (1957) 169; Arrighetti (1961) 276-7; West (1966) 437. \\
\textsuperscript{46} Arrighetti (1961) 276-7. \\
\textsuperscript{47} Schwartz (1960) 435; West (1966) 437. \\
\textsuperscript{48} Thalmann (1984) 75. \\
\textsuperscript{49} Lamberton (1988) 50, 52-3.
\end{flushright}
material. The poem’s tail, however, is different in nature, and this may help to explain these attitudes towards the work’s structure.

The tail is split in two by an invocation at 963-8. The first part consists of an orderly catalogue of Zeus’ consorts and offspring (886-929), and a further, more varied list of gods, their loves and descendants (930-962). The invocation requests the Muses to sing of goddesses who slept with mortal men, and the list of these fills the second portion of the tail. An apparent progression thus emerges: unions of gods and goddesses, unions of goddesses and mortal men, and then, in the Catalogue, unions of gods and mortal women. West sees a marked change in the style of the text after v.900, and Kirk finds the poem’s form ‘chaotic’ after v.885, suspecting the catalogue of Zeus’ wives after 923, and suggesting that beyond it was once an ending describing the division of powers among the Olympians. Down as far as 929 the passage can, as I have indicated, be regarded as the final stages of an account of Zeus’ rise to power, for it includes the final stage of the cycle of succession (the story of Metis), and the birth of the positive abstracts and younger gods. The list as a whole is ordered through the measured enumeration of Zeus’ consorts - Metis is called his πρώτην ἄλοχον (886); Themis is his δεύτερον (901); Hera is introduced by the phrase λοισθοτάτην δ’ Ἡρην θαλερήν ποιήσατ’ ἀκοιτίν (921). This apparent finality makes the lines that follow still more doubtful. The contents of this next section are as follows:

| 930-933a | Aphrodite & Poseidon → Triton |
| 933b-937 | Aphrodite & Ares → Panic, Fear, Harmonia, who married Cadmus |
| 938-939 | Maia & Zeus → Hermes |
| 940-942 | Semele & Zeus → Dionysus |
| 943-944 | Alcmene & Zeus → Heracles |

50 West (1985a) 127.
51 Kirk (1962) 73, 76, 87-8.
2.4 Hesiodic Catalogue Poetry: The end of the Theogony and the beginning of the Catalogue

945-946  Aглаia & Hephaistos
947-949  Dionysos & Ariadne
950-955  Heracles & Hebe
956-962  Perseis & Helios → Circe, Aetes, who married Idyia, who bore Medea.

West suggests that the unions with Maia, Semele and Alcmene were not to be regarded as regular marriages, and so were left out of the earlier catalogue.\(^52\) Northrup was willing to approve 938-955, because "the power and popularity of these younger gods redounded ultimately to Zeus' own greater glory", but he asserts that no such justification exists for 930-37 and 952-962 as those passages have nothing to do with Zeus.\(^53\)

In truth, one factor in deciding where the Theogony should end is the question of what the poem's true subject is. As I have indicated, all parts of the poem up to the disputed section seem to be tightly subordinated to the teleological narrative of Zeus' rise to power. Many other scholars take the same view; for Leclerc the Theogony is above all a myth of sovereignty, while Solmsen is firm that the subject of the poem is not heroes but gods.\(^54\) A different conception of the poem and its telos, however, is expressed by Clay and Stoddard, who are willing to see a greater emphasis on mankind in the text. Clay argues that the Meliai of v.182 are in fact human, and sees the poem as contrasting divine evolution with human decline.\(^55\) Nonetheless, I cannot see that mankind is granted such a privileged status in the text: whereas the dominant emphasis is on Zeus, mankind's situation is restricted to prolepsis and digressions.

The most obvious place to seek the Theogony's subject is the proem. This, however, contains three potential summaries of the poem's contents. The first, the

\(^52\) West (1966) 411.
\(^53\) Northrup (1983) 8.
\(^55\) Clay (2003) 127. Cf. Stoddard (2004) 189 "He has structured the Theogony so as to emphasize what he perceived as the fundamental reality that shaped the development of the cosmos: the division of the universe between the sundered poles of mortal and immortal."
song the Muses are described singing before their encounter with Hesiod (10-21), lists Zeus, Hera, Athene, Apollo, Poseidon, Themis, Aphrodite, Hebe, Dione, Leto, Iapetus, Cronos, Eos, Helios, Selene, Gaia, Ouranos and Night. It has been noted that this is a partial reversal of the figures in the body of the text, with Olympians at the beginning, Titans in the middle and Gaia, Oceanus and Night at the end. This is not however consistent: Hebe and Aphrodite appear in the middle, for example, whereas in the stemmata they stand at opposite ends, while Dione does not appear elsewhere in the poem at all. After the description of their encounter with Hesiod the Muses sing again (36-74): this time their song has a more obvious structure and order. It begins with the race of gods from the beginning, whom Gaia and Ouranos bore, and their offspring (44-46), then comes praise of Zeus, ‘father of gods and men, supreme in power’ (47-49), and finally the race of men and giants (50). This last item, along with the absence of Night, is the principal difference between this song and that requested of the Muses by Hesiod. His invocation calls for a song about the gods born of Gaia, Ouranos, Night, and Pontos; how the first gods came to be, and the rivers, sea, stars and heavens; the division of τώμαι, and the occupation of Olympus (105-113). This clearly corresponds to the body of the Theogony. The omission of men and giants and the addition of the descendants of Night could mark the poet figure’s selective refinement of what he hears the Muses sing. The emphasis on the division of τώμαι and occupation of Olympus, in particular, means that what is envisaged is a narrative that has a defined telos, in contrast to the Muses’ song, which was one of general praise.

A new request, for a song about goddesses and mortal men, occurs at 965-8.

58 Cf. van Groningen (1960) 263.
While this could potentially correspond to the interest in mortals in the proem, that a wholly new direction should be indicated so very late in the poem must be suspect.

Clay defends the catalogue down to at least v. 1010:

In presenting a telescopic version of the heroic age and hinting at the causes for its demise, Hesiod’s final catalogue manages to provide a meaningful and satisfactory end to the Theogony. (2003) 164.

The jumble of figures in the catalogue of goddesses, however, contrasts with the far more coherent presentation of mankind in the ‘Hymn to Hecate’. It is in fact a heterogeneous list: Demeter, by the hero Iasion, gives birth to the god Ploutos (969-974) and the nymph Callirrhoe unites with Chrysaor (981-983), who, as someone sprung from Medusa’s severed head, is not human in any normal sense of the word, and has moreover been dealt with appropriately in the catalogue of monsters (287-292). The other unions listed fit the subject matter better, but awkwardnesses still remain. The pairings represent the major mythic cycles - Harmonia bears Cadmus, Ino, Semele, Agave, Autonoe and Polydorus (975-8), although her union with Cadmus had already been described (937), and Semele, too, had already made an appearance and been named as the daughter of Cadmus (940). Eos bears to Tithonos Memnon and Emathion (984-5), but to Cephalus she bears Phaethon (986) - two wholly separate myths have been juxtaposed. The Argonautic myth is represented by Medea and Jason (992-1003), and the Trojan war by the births of Aeneas and Achilles, although the birth of Achilles was preceded by that of Phokos, who plays no especial part in myth, and of whom little is said here (1004-5). There is no especial sense of unity within the
catalogue, and certainly nothing approaching the tight teleological subordination of the body of the *Theogony*.

Van Groningen terms 963-4 "un embryon d’ épilogue", comparing them to the concluding lines of a number of the Homeric Hymns. Many such endings promise further song, as with the *Hymn to Hermes*.

Καὶ οὖ μὲν οὕτω χαίρε, Διὸς καὶ Μαίαδος υἱέ· αὐτὰρ ἐγώ καὶ σείο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσου’ ἀοιδῆς. (HH 4.579-580)

One possibility is that line 965 replaced such a generalised promise with its specific demand for further song. Merkelbach, however, suggests that originally the invocation may have formed a transition into the *Catalogue of Women* and have read:

'Υμεῖς μὲν υὖν χαίρετ' ὶλυμπια δέωματ' ἤχοντές, 963
νῇοι τ’ ἥπειροι τε καὶ ἀλμυρὸν ἔνδοθι πόντος. 964
υὖν δὲ γυναικῶν φύλον ἀείσατε, ἡδυοπειαί 1021
Μούσαι ὶλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο. 1022

A considerable number of scholars have found the catalogue of goddesses problematic, and probably dispensable, but retain the idea that the *Catalogue of Women* could have been linked to the *Theogony*. A similarity between the catalogue of marriages between gods and goddesses and the proem of the *Catalogue* has been perceived. The *Catalogue* proem presents a detailed request for a song that appears to end in a list of gods.

υὖν δὲ γυναικῶν ἰφύλον ἀείσατε, ἡδυοπειαί
Μούσαι ὶλυμπιάδεις, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.
αἱ τὸτ’ ἀρισταί ἔσαν[
μῆρας τ’ ἀλλύσαντο, [
μισογόμεναι θεοί[
ἐναι γάρ τότε δαίτες ἔσαν ἐναι δὲ θῶκοι
ἄβανάτοις τε θεοί[ι καταθητοί τ’ ἀνθρώποις
οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἱσαῖνας οἶμι]

---

59 van Groningen (1960) 266.
The sequence Zeus - Poseidon - Ares does indeed appear at 886-937, but Heracles and Hermes appear in 938-944 as infants rather than sexual partners. The comparison is also deceptive in another sense. When first published, this list in the proem misled Treu into believing that the poem would be structured according to those gods - first women who slept with Zeus, then those who slept with Poseidon, and so on - and he used the form of the corresponding *Theogony* passage to support his analysis. As we shall see, however, this is very far from being the case. The *Catalogue of Women* is based upon genealogy, and is by no means a mere accumulation of sexual encounters between gods and women.

The bare and abrupt list in the tail of the *Theogony* in fact seems even more dubious when compared to the coherent texture of the *Catalogue*. While the correspondence with the list of gods in the proem forges a superficial link, the passage otherwise fails as a would-be transition from the *Theogony* to the *Catalogue*. It matches the style and structure of neither work, and does nothing to ease or explain the change from a work on the cosmos to one concerned with local identity in Greece. It is probably best regarded as a later attempt to join the two poems together. The point in time at which this occurred can be conjectural only. West ascribes it to the

poet of the *Catalogue* himself, and Cohen draws a comparison with the cyclic works designed to begin where the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* left off, such as the *Aethiopis*, which adapted the final line of the *Iliad*. There is nothing, however, to say that the join was not made by a later redactor. One thing that is plain is that the *Theogony*'s tail presents a view of catalogue poetry that fails to appreciate, or at least to reproduce, the subtleties of the larger works.

### 2.5 The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*

One of the greatest differences between the *Catalogue of Women* and the *Theogony* is that of scale. The *Theogony* is the length of a single poetic book: five books are attested for the *Catalogue*. There is no evidence that the *Catalogue* included immense uninterrupted lists of names, such as the *Theogony*'s catalogue of Nereids (*Theog.* 243-262). The genealogies of the *Catalogue*, too, seem to have been more diverse; while the *Theogony*'s two main stemmata derived from just four first beings, in the *Catalogue* there were at least five different stemmata, which only became intertwined in their later stages: the descendants of Deucalion, Inachus, Atlas, Asopus and the Arcadians. Once intermarriage does occur, the interconnection is far more complex than that in the *Theogony*.

---

64 West (1966) 399.
66 West (1985a) also posits an Athenian line on the basis of ps.-Apollodorus, but the evidence for this is less certain. Objections in Hirschberger (2004) 33 n.95.
Identifying and arranging the fragments of the Hesiodic Catalogue is a matter of considerable difficulty and one that is not a subject of this thesis. Although West's reconstruction on the hypothesis that pseudo-Apollodorus was following the order of the Hesiodic Catalogue has not gone unchallenged, it seems to me to be supported by the current papyrological evidence, and I will use it as a working basis for my arguments. At times I will have to deploy material that has been assigned to the Megalai Ehoiai, or that cannot be assigned securely to either poem, in order to draw out information about the author's attitudes: this is not a sign that I consider the Catalogue and Megalai Ehoiai to be identical. Scholarship and evidence about the question has been summarised by Schwartz and again from a different angle by Hirschberger. In essence, ancient authors use three names, the Ehoiai, the Gynaikon Katalogos, and the Megalai Ehoiai. A scholion to Apollonius 2.181 contrasts the Gynaikon Katalogos and Megalai Ehoiai, and Pausanias (4.2.1) contrasts the Megalai Ehoiai and Ehoiai. On this basis the majority opinion is that the Gynaikon Katalogos and Ehoiai were alternative titles for the same poem, and Megalai Ehoiai was the title of a different work.

The ways in which the Megalai Ehoiai may have differed from the Catalogue (Gynaikon Katalogos) remain unclear, apart from minor details of content. So little is securely attributed to the former that we can have no idea of its structure: we do not know, for instance, whether it was dominated by Ehoiai and had less genealogy, or

69 For alternative opinions see Cohen (1986), who believes all three titles belong to the same work; Marckscheffel (1840) 106-119, who suggested that the two poems were merged into a five-book work by the grammarians, and Schwartz (1960) 23-6, Casanova (1979) 237 and Rutherford (2000) 88, who argue that the titles Megalai Ehoiai and Gynaikon Katalogos represent Pergamene and Alexandrian editions of the same original text.
what dictated the order of figures within it. Nor can we know its geographical or temporal scope.

The nature of the presentation of material in the Catalogue points to the difference in its aims from those of the Theogony. As I said earlier, it is standard in catalogues for names to be accompanied by brief descriptions that display certain key aspects of their identity. In the Theogony these descriptions on the whole were limited, except where they were expanded to form essential components of the narrative sequence. In the Hesiodic Catalogue, however, a different situation may be observed. The frequency with which narrative passages occurred was still highly variable, but the themes involved in them were more numerous, and less dictated by a teleological programme. In fragment 5H./10aM.-W., for instance, the first eighty verses are dominated by genealogy, but there then appears to have been a fifteen line narrative about Ceyx and Alcyone before the genealogy resumed. The chief topics of this narrative seem likely to have been hybris and metamorphosis: Ceyx and Alcyone loved each other so much that they called each other Zeus and Hera, angering Zeus, who turned them both into birds.71 At the other end of the scale, the Mestra fragment (37H./43aM.-W.) may have covered 110 verses, in which the genealogical material was bound up in a tale of deceit and adultery. The last words of the fragment, however, ἂ τέκε, show that the stemma was eventually resumed.

The frequency and role of the Ehoiai formulae is something for which the evidence is somewhat contradictory, and something, too, for which the Theogony provides no parallel at all. Ancient references to the work, along with its Hellenistic reception, show them to have been regarded as the poem’s distinguishing feature. There must thus have been far more instances than can now be found, but it is plain

that they did not introduce every substantial narrative. The relationship between the
formulae and the genealogical structure is hard to understand. According to West, the
formulae were not merely paragraph marks, but signalled points at which the
genealogy jumped back to an earlier part of the stemma after completing a collateral
branch.\(^{72}\) They may also have applied to women who were mated by gods.\(^{73}\) It seems,
however, that they were not used to introduce every such instance. In fragment
79H./177.5M.-W. Electra’s union with Zeus marks a switch of several generations
back up the Atlantid stemma after the descendants of Taygete and Zeus had been set
out. No *Ehoie* occurs, although this neglect can hardly be owing to any lack of
importance, for the Trojan line descended from Electra. The small number of *Ehoiai*
attested (Hirschberger’s edition has 6 for the *Catalogue*, 2 for the *Megalai Ehoiai* and
2 ἐξ ἀθηλῶν ἐπών\(^{74}\)) make precise deductions difficult. It is apparent that the
formula could introduce either narrative or genealogy, and that within genealogies a
host of other, different formulae asserted order and provided signposts, such as
λέχος εἰσαναβᾶσα, ποιήσατ’ ἄκοινυ, ορ ἰ传染病.\(^{75}\)

The syntactical implications of the formula, however, appear to point to a
comparative function. ἰ’ οὗη means ‘or such as’, and there must logically have been
an initial οὗη (Rutherford suggests Pyrrha) to whom all the others were compared.\(^{76}\)
According to Steinrück, this is prepared for by questions in the prologue:\(^{77}\)

\[
adι τοτ’ ἄρισται έσαν
\]
\[
tάων ἐσπετε Μ[ούσαι]
\]


\(^{73}\) West (1985a) 63-4.

\(^{74}\) *Catalogue*: Thesteids 15H./23aM.-W.; Porthaonids 17H./26M.-W.; Coronis 70/59; Antiope 87/181;
F14H./253M.-W. ἐξ ἀθηλῶν ἐπών Atalante *1H./71AM.-W.; Ioë*14H.

\(^{75}\) Cf. Heilinger (1983) 22.


\(^{77}\) Steinrück (1996) 25.
This seems to point to the use of particular women as exemplars, \(^78\) what, precisely, they exemplified that set them apart from others is nonetheless a debatable point. The Alcme~e Ehoie stands out as a highly laudatory portrait of a blameless wife, \(^79\) but if the other women were ἄρισται, it was not for their moral κλέος, or for that of their families. Murderous wives were a feature of the Thesteid stemma; the Porthaonids left their parental home to roam the mountains with the nymphs, most indecorously; Coronis married another man while pregnant with Apollo’s child; Asterodeia’s sons fought in her womb. Some of these women, it is true, were mothers of culture heroes - Asclepios, Amphion and Zethus, Heracles, Aristaeus - but this is not uniform, and while women may have gained additional fame through their offspring, they were not known for them alone. The purpose of the comparison, above all, remains a mystery. Indeed, since this singling out of particular women seems incompatible with the genealogical logic, some scholars have posited that originally ‘Ehoie poetry’ may have existed as a separate genre. \(^80\) Nevertheless, as I will show, the existence of segments and segmented narratives within a unified structure is one of the poem’s distinguishing features.

---

2.6 The Catalogue and its Cultural Context

The Catalogue, then, could be said to have a dual structure: the formulae and genealogy each suggest their own logic and function. To this duality must be added that of the role played by the mythology. In the upper reaches of the stemmata mythology and toponyms are influenced by issues of culture and ethnicity; in the lower reaches, the mythology concerns more three-dimensional figures,\(^81\) and the myths, while still often employed to geo-political ends, are less tied to a single place.

While in the Theogony the genealogy had the function of expressing the relationships and nature of the constituent parts of the cosmos, in the Catalogue the genealogy presents a cultural and ethnic map of archaic Greece. Similarly, while the upper, cosmogonic reaches of the Theogony's stemmata prepared for the narrative of the rise of Zeus, the toponymic parts of the Catalogue map and explain power relationships and ideas of kinship on a broad scale, and provide a cultural landscape for the dynastic heroes of the lower stages,\(^82\) which were influenced more by local and aristocratic assertions of status.\(^83\) In archaic Greece, genealogy was a popular form, a means of expressing relationships between states and defining cultural identity.\(^84\) The Hesiodic Catalogue may have been unusual in that it united regional genealogies from all over Greece, so that the myths, charters for local identity, were placed in a panhellenic context.\(^85\)

Greek genealogy was a fluid form, manipulated by local politics for the sake of propaganda and open to debate and criticism.\(^86\) In the Hesiodic Catalogue, for

\(^{81}\) Cf. Hall (1997) 77, 87.
\(^{83}\) Hall (1997) 41, 77-8.
instance, Sicyon was the son of Erechtheus (224M.-W.), whereas in Ibycus Sicyon was the son of Pelops (Paus. 2.6.5): one version views Sicyon as subject to Athenian influence, the other version as subject to Peloponnesian. In mapping out regional ethnicity genealogies could also express hierarchies. One key example of this is the traditions concerning Hellen and his offspring. Hecataeus presents Ion as descended from Orestheus, Hellen’s uncle - the Ionians are thus excluded from the Hellenes (FGrH 1F15). In the Hesiodic Catalogue, on the other hand, Hellen’s sons are Xouthos, Aeolus and Doros, the version also found in Hellanicus (FGrH 4F125; 4H./9M.-W.). The Hesiodic author makes Ion and Achaeus Xouthos’ sons (5H./10a.64-5M.-W.) and Calydon and Pleuron Aeolus’ great-great-grandsons through Aetolus. Ion is thus made Hellenic, and more so than Aetolus, Calydon and Pleuron, for he is more closely related to Hellen.

Fowler has suggested that this derives from the specific context of the formation of the Thessalian-dominated Amphictyony after the first Sacred War: the boundaries to which the term ‘Hellas’ was applied correspond to those of the Amphictyony. Phocis, moreover, which was on the losing side, is made non-Hellenic in the Catalogue: Phocus’ father Aiakos is made an Asopid, and located on Aegina, even though myths about him seem to have been Thessalian in origin.

In addition, individual figures and myths could be turned to political ends at a local or dynastic level. The story of the enmity of Phocus’ sons, Crisos and Panopeus, who fought while still in their mother’s womb, is also thought to reflect the events of

---

89 For the complications and significance of these different constructions of the Hellenic genealogy see Nilsson (1951) 66-8; West (1985a) 52-3; 57-60; Fowler (1995); Hall (1997).
the first Sacred War (ME9H/58M.-W.). Direct extrapolation from myth to history is a risky proceeding, but myths can show popular perceptions and attitudes, if not actual events. The history of the first Sacred War is shadowy, but the defeat and destruction of the Phocaean city of Crissa was a feature, and perhaps a prominent one. The extent and nature of Panopean involvement is unclear: in the Iliad Panopeus appears as the home town of one of the Phocian commanders, and it may thus stand for Phocis as a whole or a block within Phocis. The idea of hatred between twins would express this sense of internecine struggle.

Political manipulation of mythology is perhaps best typified by the appropriation of Heracles. Although cults of Heracles and Alcmene centred on Thebes and were not common in the Argolid, myths present Heracles as the rightful heir of Tiryns, or, as Argive supremacy grew, Argos. This enabled the Dorians, under the guise of ‘Heracleidai’, to claim legitimacy as heirs, through a complex set of myths, to the land due to Heracles by birth (the Argolid) or conquest (Messene, Sparta). Successive rulers also claimed Heracles as ancestor, including Pheidon the tyrant of Argos, and the Spartan kings.

Myth and genealogy were interdependent, each influencing the other and each granting the other additional layers of meaning. Indeed, this was also a feature of cult at local level. For instance, the *deme* Melite was named for Heracles’ eponymous mistress, and Heracles was worshipped in Melite as Heracles Alexikakos, but Melite’s

91 Fowler (1995) 14 & n.32.
92 See Càssola (1980). The historical reality of the war has been questioned by Robertson (1978), but see Lehmann (1980), who asserts that it was part of Greek national consciousness before the time of the propaganda surrounding the Third Sacred War.
96 The bibliography on Heracles and his descendants is extensive: see e.g. Tomlinson (1972) 58-63; Demand (1982) 49-52; West (1985a) 9; Dowden (1992) 70-3; Hall (1997) 56-65, 76-78, 87-98.
grandfather Melanippus also had a shrine there, and her father Myrmex was commemorated in the name of a nearby track, the Myrmekos atrapos.\textsuperscript{97} The family group appeared in the Catalogue (225M.-W.), although we do not know to what extent the poet told Melite’s story. That at a local cult level she should appear in the context of her family, however, shows that genealogy was not merely a tag, or a mechanism by which a minor figure could be inserted into the work as a whole, but an integral part of Melite’s identity.

Myth and genealogy existed symbiotically, and served as mutually supportive aetiologies; the myths, that is, explained the how and why of the unions plotted in the genealogy, or the extinction of certain lines. The genealogy, for its part, ‘explained’ interconnections between groups of myths, along with alliances and antipathies based on family ties or feuds. In cultural terms, both myth and genealogy tended to be back-formations reflecting the contemporary situation.\textsuperscript{98} This could lead to considerable complexity, as myths were combined or partially supplanted, and genealogy had to be manipulated to absorb such changes, or, alternatively, the insertion of new eponyms into a genealogy might require adjustments to the myths.

The most complex example of this is perhaps that of the Argolid, which was peopled with a tangle of Proitids, Pelopids and Perseids (see figure 1). Abas, the son of Lyceus and Hypermestra, had two sons, Acrisios and Proitos, who quarrelled; the ‘kingdom’ was divided between them, the first of many such divisions.\textsuperscript{99} Proitos fathered three daughters and a son, Megapenthes. When the daughters were driven mad, they were cured by the seer Melampous in return for a share in the kingdom for

\textsuperscript{99} Dowden (1989) 72 points to the fact that ‘Argos’ is a slippery term, capable of referring to the city itself, some portion of the entire region, or even heroic Greece in general, with additional confusion caused by the fact that several legends may originally have referred to Phthiotic Argos. See also Wathelet (1992).
Figure 1: Perseids, Proetids, Pelopids
him and a further one for his brother Bias. These brothers originally had no connection to the Argolid, having instead family links to Messene and Thessaly. Meanwhile, or perhaps a little later, Danae (who belongs to the same generation as the Proitides) had an illegitimate son and was sent to sea in a larnax. When Perseus returned and was reconciled with his grandfather Acrisios, he accidentally killed him with a discus, and in atonement he exchanged halves of the kingdom with the Proitid side of the family. Some authors were content to ignore the genealogical difficulty of this occurring before the arrival of Melampous and Bias and the subsequent division of territory. Others inserted extra generations into the Proitid stemma - Pausanias had the daughters of Anaxagoras, son of Argas, son of Megapenthes suffer from madness. The occurrence of ‘Argos’ here, a toponym among three-dimensional figures, points to his makeshift nature.

Perseus’ three sons married three daughters of Pelops - Alkaios married Astydameia and fathered Amphitryon, Sthenelos married Nikippe and fathered Eurystheus, and Elektryon married Lysidike and fathered Alcmene. With the exception of Elektryon, all three sets of parents are colourless and history-less. When we find that Eurystheus gives his kingdom to his mother’s brother Atreus before going to fight the Heracleidai, thus making the Pelopids rulers of the Argolid, the sense that these marriages are a legitimising makeshift is strengthened. Like Melampous and Bias, the Pelopids seem out of place in the Argolid. Menelaus and Orestes both moved to Sparta on their marriage, and there are signs that Agamemnon also originated there. The Perseid Elektryon, too, is firmly bound up with the Echinades Islands,

100 Their uncles were Pheres and Aison, Bias married Neleus’ daughter Pero. See also Jost (1992) 173-184; Hall (1997) 96.
103 For instance, the towns he offers Achilles are Spartan (Il. 9.149-53). See Hall (1997) 91-2.
off the coast of Calydon. There is also a chronological problem, for Eurystheus and Heracles would thus be contemporaries of the Atreids, even though Heracles’ sack of Troy was supposed to have occurred a generation earlier. In the Hesiodic Catalogue, the stemma appears to have been expanded: Pleisthenes intervenes between Atreus and Agamemnon (194M.-W.).\textsuperscript{104} Hall has suggested that the lines from Acrisios and Proitos were competing variants, pointing to considerable similarities in the stories attached to both lines in some versions.\textsuperscript{105} Should this be the case, then the Heraclid claim to the entire region would reflect it, and the story of the divided kingdom would show merely an attempt to accommodate what had originally been variants of the same tale.

Divisions and complications continued to be a feature of the Proitid and Melampid stemmata. Megapenthes and his son are relatively colourless figures, seeming to do little more than occupy space until Megapenthes’ granddaughter Periboia marries Oineus and gives birth to Tydeus; her brother is Capaneus. Bias’ son Talaos, however, fathered Adrastus, who in the Theban cycle is always king of Argos. Amphiaraus, the great-grandson of Melampus, appears to have the next nearest claim to the throne. At any rate, there was a tradition that Adrastus was forced into exile in Sicyon following stasis between the Talaiids and Melampids.\textsuperscript{106} The two parties were reconciled when Adrastus’ sister Eriphyle was given in marriage to Amphiaraus. There seems to have been no suggestion in any of the accounts that Capaneus might have had a strong claim. Diomedes, Tydeus’ son, gains his portion of the Argolis as Adrastus’ grandson (through Argeia), and not as a descendant of Proitos. As an

\textsuperscript{104} See Kakridis (1978b); Hall (1997) 90-91.
\textsuperscript{105} Hall (1997) 94.
\textsuperscript{106} Pindar Nem. 9.30 and Scholia. See Hubbard (1992) and Stoneman (1981).
additional complication, it has been suggested that the whole story of stasis and Adrastus' stay in Sicyon is a sixth-century dynastic invention.\textsuperscript{107}

Even this brief outline of Argive mythology, then, shows the combination of myths and genealogy to be subject to political pressures, and to conflation and expansion and, inevitably, to confusion. Each altered mythical connection between stemmata might require the genealogy to be extended or compressed if synchronism was desired. These adjustments and adaptations have in turn to be absorbed by the poem's overall structure.

\textit{2.7 Structure, Narratives and Segmentation}

While structure and genealogy are thus to some extent dictated by each other, there are nonetheless opportunities for the poet to make decisions about the ordering of material. He seems, for example, to prefer to list offspring in their mother's stemma rather than that of their father. This is not a firm rule, but appears to be an influencing factor when such decisions have to be taken. It is visible in particular in the Aeolid stemma. Perimede's descendants, for instance, are traced down to her great-grandson Oineus and his son Tydeus, but mention of Oineus' sons by his other wife, Althaia, is delayed until her line is treated. The case of Porthaon is more complicated (see figure 2). He first appeared as husband of Eureite and father of Oineus and his brothers when they occurred in the line of Perimede, and at that point he was identified as the grandson of Pleuron (5H./10aM.-W.60-68). Porthaon's sons are thus described primarily in the context of their mother's family. Porthaon's daughters, however, were mentioned wholly separately, with their own \textit{Ehoie} (17H./26M.-W.). Their mother

\textsuperscript{107} Stoneman (1981) 45.
Figure 2: Porthaonids and Thesteids
Laothoe (Porthaon’s second wife) appears to have no history of her own. The descendants of Stratonike were described along with a narrative telling of how she came to be married, and a narrative of her sister Eurythemiste being wooed by Thestios appears to have followed.

Thestios’ daughters themselves, however, Leda, Althaia and Hypermestra, had their own *Ehoie* shortly before this, probably after the union of Thestios’ mother Demodike with Ares was described (14H./22M.-W.). Thus while Porthaon’s daughters are given special treatment by being separated from their brothers and getting an *Ehoie*, the most famous of their own children were mentioned separately. This may be because the poet gave preference to Demodike, Porthaon’s sister. In addition, however, there are thematic considerations involved. This is in fact the case in all the examples. While this is undoubtedly a poem that pays special attention to women and their progeny, neither this fact, nor the structure and genealogy, precludes a careful deployment of motifs and thematic dynamics by the poet.108

Demodike was greatly desired and lavishly courted, but was unwilling to marry.

In this last respect, she seems a suitable aunt for the mountain-roaming Porthaonids, so that it might seem a surprise that the two passages are not more closely juxtaposed. Both the number of suitors and Demodike’s eventual union with Ares, however, are directly relevant to her Thesteid descendants. They look forward to Helen’s catalogue of suitors and the element of violence associated with the families of all three women.

This violence is of course most evident in the case of Clytemnestra:

Iphimede is sacrificed by the Achaeans. Clytemnestra is killed by her own son, in revenge for the killing of his father. The poet’s choice to tell Clytemnestra’s story in the context of her mother’s family rather than the house of Atreus, while displaying his preference for attaching tales to the woman’s line, severs it from its normal context. The history of bloodshed in Agamemnon’s family is ignored, so that all the emphasis falls upon a woman committing violence and dying at the hands of her own son. When not long afterwards Deianeira’s killing of Heracles is described, it comes to be seen in a new light: murder seems to run in the family; the genealogy ‘explains’ the action. It has also brought together two otherwise unrelated myths. Certainly, in chronological terms, they can hardly belong together. Nor has the Heracles myth any connection to the House of Atreus cycle.

\[\text{τοὺς δ᾿ ἄλλους Οἰνηί [τέκ'] Ἀλβάην κυά[ν][ώ][π]ὶς} \]
March has argued that Deianeira in this version was aware of what she was doing, and that she was presented originally as an Amazon-like figure. The etymological meaning of her name is ‘husband-slayer’. Much would seem to depend upon the supplement in verse 17. Lobel read ἐπὶ φ[ρ]ονα - ‘foolish’, but March suggests δύσ[φρ]ονα - ‘ill-intentioned’, or ύπτέρ[φρ]ονα - ‘arrogant’. Whichever is correct - the misguided or the vengeful character, as a complement or a contrast to Clytemnestra - she is placed deliberately in the context of women who kill. Notably, no sort of motive is indicated. This is in fact delayed until the Porthaonid stemma, in which Iole appears as Stratonike’s granddaughter.

There is space here for no more than Heracles’ attack on Oichalia. A problem is that Iole’s tale may have been told in more detail a little further on in her own Ehoie. March suggests this on the basis of a vase showing a youth with a book roll bearing the letters HOIHA/ MEPAK/ VEEI/ IOVEO. Depending upon whether this is
written entirely in the Attic alphabet, or in a mixture of Attic and Ionic, this reads either οἱ ἰῶτα Ἡρακλέει ἱόλεως [.] or ἦ οἱ ἰῶτα ἰόλεως ἱόλεως οἱ. The former would refer to Heracles’ charioteer Iolaos, but the latter would suggest Iole was granted a more extensive treatment of her own, perhaps giving an account of the sack of Oichalia, the events at Trachis, and Iole’s own offspring. Be that as it may, what is clear is that the two sides of the story - Deianeira’s jealousy and the involvement of Iole - are connected to the two women involved and separated from each other. This is something not dictated by the genealogy: the poet was free to include the whole story with Deianeira, Iole, or Heracles as he wished, but he chose instead to bring about this division.

In the Hesiodic Catalogue, the major Greek sagas - Heracles, the Theban cycle, the Trojan war, the Argonautica - tend to be mentioned piecemeal. As Haubold in particular has noted, Heracles’ life (at least as it appears from the extant fragments in the currently accepted arrangement) is told backwards, beginning with his death. Elements of these stories are in effect detached from their natural context and placed in a new one, so that they are now integrated on the basis of a certain person, rather than a narrative plot. This marks a significant step on the way towards Hellenistic Kollektivgedichte. Treating stories as if separable from their normal mythic cycle may be seen as a first stage in the process of gathering unrelated tales. In the Catalogue, moreover, once separated out the shorter tales are attached to characters who at times have a secondary role to play in them. The stories of Mestra and Bellerophon, for instance, arise out of the genealogy of Glaucus (37H./43aM.-W.); the protagonist in the story of Pero and Bias is undoubtedly Melampous, who undertakes the task and

uses his gift of prophecy, but the tale comes out of Pero’s genealogy (27H./37M.-W.); the story of the Taphian pirates appears as part of the shadowy Lysidike’s genealogy, rather than that of Elektryon (90H./193M.-W.). The tales, it is true, still gain a great deal from their genealogical context. The *Catalogue* is not a list of narratives. But the tales do gain from juxtaposition as well, and this points forward to the Hellenistic adaptations.

The Trojan war first appears in the fragments we possess in the description of the sacrifice of Iphimede (15H./23aM.-W.17-26); Sarpedon’s death at Troy is mentioned at 56H./141M.-W. and that of Telephus at 72/165. A fragment apparently prophesying Achilles’ death at the Skaian gates has been assigned to the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (99H./212bM.-W.),113 and there also appears to have been another prophecy, perhaps in the mouth of the seer Theoclymenos, although Hirschberger is uncertain about the assignment of this fragment to the *Catalogue* (*6H./136M.-W.*).114 The war was almost certainly also mentioned along with other key (or indeed minor) figures associated with it, such as Agamemnon and Menelaus, Ajax, and Nestor. The most prominent foreshadowing of the war, of course, is the catalogue of suitors (see below). The war was mentioned throughout the poem for the impact (principally fatal) which it had on characters’ lives. Thus only the episodes associated with those figures are likely to have been mentioned at any one time, inevitably segmenting the overall myth into a number of disparate episodes. Such a process places more emphasis on individuals and their stories, rather than epic events on a grand scale.

We have less evidence for the Argonautica and the Theban cycle.115 An isolated couplet describes Iason’s birth and his education by Cheiron (28H./40M.-W.),

---

113 March (1987) 16.
115 On the under-representation of the Theban cycle in the fragments see now Cingano (2005) 123-4.
but we do not know what other information may have been given. Athamas was mentioned in the Aeolid stemma, and it seems reasonable to assume that Phrixos and Helle and their fates were also included,\textsuperscript{116} especially as a mention of the golden ram is attested for the Hesiodic corpus (68M.-W.).\textsuperscript{117} The only substantial fragment is the so-called \textit{Periodos Ges} - a list of places flown over by the Boreads in their pursuit of the Harpies (60H./150M.-W.), which briefly mentions a whole string of barbarian tribes, including the Pygmies, horse-milking Scythians, Hyperboreans and Laestrygonians. The races are ordered according to the gods who fathered them: Zeus, Poseidon and Hermes,\textsuperscript{118} a pattern which, as we have seen, appears at the end of the \textit{Theogony}, and appeared to be predicted by the \textit{Catalogue}'s proem. Its presence here may reflect the association of certain gods with certain geographical regions, or it may be owing to the inherently hierarchical nature of catalogues. The catalogue was apparently introduced in connection with Phineus rather than with the Boreads (Strabo 7.3.9/151M.-W.). It has been suggested that the piece was in fact a way to round off the entire Inachid stemma. Io's stemma, of which Phineus was part, was international, including the eponyms of Phoenicia, Europe, Cyrene, and Arabos.\textsuperscript{119} The \textit{Catalogue}, which shows its greatest chronological expansion in numbers of generations at this point, would then also be displaying its greatest geographical extent.

Before the papyrus fragment was discovered, the citation of Hesiod's \(\Gamma\eta\epsilon\varsigma\;\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma\) by Strabo (7.3.9) led to confusion as to whether this was a separate lost work by the poet.\textsuperscript{120} It was recognised, however, that Strabo's phrasing - \(\epsilon\nu\;\tau\iota\;\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\eta\;\Gamma\eta\epsilon\varsigma\;\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma\) - was a sign that it was part of a larger work.\textsuperscript{121} This

\textsuperscript{117} Cardini (1921) 90 speculates that a catalogue of Argonauts may also have been included.
\textsuperscript{118} Cf. Schwartz (1960) 386; West (1985a) 84.
\textsuperscript{119} West (1985a) 84.
\textsuperscript{120} Schwartz (1960) 91, 385-8, 572-7 shows the residue of this.
\textsuperscript{121} Nilsson (1905) 179; Gissinger (1928) 321.
scope for confusion in fact points to an attitude among the poem’s ancient readers that
distinctive sections of the work could be referred to as if separable. This is hardly something unique to the *Catalogue* - it is also in evidence, for instance, in ancient references to the *Dios Apate* or the *Doloneia* - but this mindset, dividing larger *epe* into episodes, may be thought significant for the development of catalogued narrative poems by the Hellenistic authors.

The sequence of Heracles episodes as the text stands at present is as follows:

Deianeira, Iole, Periclymenos, Cos and Troy, Auge and Telephus, and the Alcmene *Ehoie*, which includes an account of Zeus’ plan regarding Heracles.

\[
\pi\alpha\tau\iota\rho\varepsilon '\ \alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega\nu\ \tau\varepsilon \ \theta\varepsilon\omega\nu\ \tau\varepsilon
\alpha\llambdav\mu\mu\tau\iota\nu\ \vphi\alpha\iota\nu\varepsilon\ \mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\ \phi\rho\varepsilon\omega\iota\nu, \\bar{o}\varsigma\ \bar{\rho}\varsigma\ \theta\varepsilon\theta\omicron\iota\nu
\alpha\nu\delta\rho\alpha\omicron\ \tau'\ \alpha\lambda\phi\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\theta\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu\ \acute{\alpha}r\acute{\iota}\acute{s}\ \acute{\alpha}l\acute{k}t\iota\nu\acute{\alpha} \phi\omicron\tau\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\iota. \quad (\text{Scut. 27-9})
\]

In his analysis of the Heracles episodes, Haubold suggests that they show a gradual change in the presentation of his character. That is, his death shows him in an entirely passive light, and the events at Pylos, Cos and Troy show him as violently destructive, whereas in the description of his birth Zeus plans him as a benefit to mankind.\(^{122}\) Such an interpretation, however, risks ignoring the context of these passages and their focalisation in this poem. Heracles’ appearances occur at points where those related to him or associated with him are treated in the genealogy. Thus it is that many of his ‘tasks’ (already legendary if not yet given canonical number and order) cannot be scattered throughout the work. The Nemean lion does not have a place in the genealogies of the *Catalogue* as it did in the *Theogony*. Since the tasks are a feature pertaining to Heracles rather than anyone else, it seems likely that mention of them would be restricted to his own ‘biography’, the description accompanying his birth. Furthermore, an argument from silence is especially risky with a text of this nature.

\(^{122}\) Haubold (2005) 86-95.
The Heracles episodes are frequently focalised through those whom he meets: thus in the Auge passage it is his role in fathering Telephus and his activities about that time that are mentioned; in the Periclymenos passage he appears in his role as a destroyer. The passivity Haubold saw in his death at the hands of Deianeira may also be explained in this way. Since the passage is focalised through the woman, Heracles’ deeds and motivations must take second place. Indeed, in so short a description there seems room for little else.

The audience’s likely response to such a presentation of a common myth must also be taken into account. Haubold would argue that in the mentions of Heracles’ sacking of Troy and Cos, the justification for these events is not given, so that it would appear that he is a destructive force rather than a benefit to mankind.

Haubold points to the fact that the fight at Cos begins εἰς ἀρχῆς ὁλίγης and that Laomedon’s guilt is left unmentioned: these factors leave Heracles looking the aggressor. But to my mind the fact that in both cases the information is given merely as an explanation of Heracles’ presence indicates that these are no more than allusions to stories known to the audience.

Although their wider context may be alluded to, when Heracles' exploits are
told at length they appear self-standing. The Pericylenos section may be a good
example of this.

The passage begins as a description elaborating the genealogy - Pericylenos' distinguishing feature was his ability to change shape at will. The story of his battle

---

124 Kakridis (1978a).
Although their wider context may be alluded to, when Heracles' exploits are told at length they appear self-standing. The Periclemenos section may be a good example of this.

The passage begins as a description elaborating the genealogy - Periclemenos' distinguishing feature was his ability to change shape at will. The story of his battle...
with Heracles arises out of this: his ability deceived him, by the will of Athena. Already, the story is taking on the shape of a moral fable - a story of overconfidence followed by nemesis. Athena’s anger seems to be aroused by his success in battle rather than his shape-changing ability, but it is undoubtedly this ability and its attendant rashness that are used to bring about his destruction. As the narrative runs, Periclymenos was slaughtering many in battle around his father’s city, but when Athena grew angry she put an end to his aristeia. Grief seized Heracles at this course of events. Periclymenos sat on the yoke before Heracles’ eyes, intending to do great things (it seems that we are expected to know that he had by now transformed into an insect - one presumes that his aristeia had been carried out in the form of a man). Whatever shape he may have been, however, this was a clear piece of bravado, accompanied by the boast that he would stop Heracles’ power. “The fool! He did not fear the long-suffering son of Zeus and the famous bow which Phoebus Apollo had borne. But he came in the way of strong Heracles . . .” Tantalisingly, the text becomes scrappy at this point. Athena hands Heracles his bow; an arrow is shot. At that point the fragment ends. In the next fragment Periclymenos is dead and this enables Heracles to sack Pylos at last, killing all the Neleids apart from Nestor.

As a moral fable, the piece is self-contained. Periclymenos puts too much trust in his ability, with the result that he challenges a much stronger hero.125 His attitude ends in tragedy for his entire family: by overreaching himself he deprives the city of his protection. The role of Heracles here seems that of divine agent. This is not his story, but that of the house of Neleus. Haubold saw his massacre of the Neleids as a contravention of Zeus’ purpose for Heracles, killing the Νηλήνος ταλασσιφόνος

125 Kakridis (1978a) 174.
viéas ἐσθλοῦς rather than monsters. To him, the language used seems to indicate that sympathy lies on the side of the Neleids. In heroic epos, however, acknowledgement of a dead warrior’s worth by no means necessarily implies condemnation of the man who killed him. It is acknowledged that these things happen in war. νήπιος (v.28) is an adjective that when used of adults in Homeric poetry indicates a lack of knowledge of the future that is often ironic, because it causes men to embark on courses of events that lead to death - there is frequently implicit condemnation in its use. Men act in such a witless way often because they have forgotten or ignored advice, or because they do not respect their opponent’s strength. Thus the language makes Periclymenos responsible for his fate, while there is no epithet such as ‘pitiless’ or ‘man-slaughtering’ to condemn Heracles.

It is in fact hard to say here if it is a matter of a section of the Heracles myth being turned into a discrete episode with a focalisation that draws attention away from the hero, or whether this is a part of a lost Pylian saga, similarly lifted as a segment. The background presupposed by the narrative is a war against Pylos. Nestor mentions Heracles’ attack in the Iliad, and it is plain from what he says that it was one of a number of such raids and conflicts.

126 Davies’ (1992) 103 suggestion that in killing Periclymenos Heracles is killing a monster is a misapprehension. Periclymenos’ ability may make him a monstrum in that he is abnormal, but Heracles’ remit is the monsters that plague mankind; Periclymenos is no more of a bane than any other hero. 127 Haubold (2005) 91. 128 See Edmunds (1990). The instances of its use against adults are listed on pages 60-3. 129 Eg. ll. 16.684-7 Πάτροκλος δ’ ἵπποι καὶ Αὐτομεδόντι κελεύσας Τρώας καὶ Λυκίους μετεκλάθε, καὶ μέγ’ ἀδάθη νήπιος: εἰ δὲ ἐποι Πηληπάδας φυλάξειν, ἢ τ’ ἄν ὑπέκρυψε Κηρὰ κακὴν μέλανος θανάτοιο. Cf. ll. 12.110-117, 12.124-128, 16.830-6, 17.233-6, 20.262-7, 20.408-412, 21.410-411. 130 For the possibility of a Pylian cycle see Bölte (1934); Hainsworth (1993) 296-8.
In all, the other Pylian episodes which Nestor mentions are as follows: his killing in single combat of the giant Arcadian champion Ereuthalion (7.132-7), a Pylian cattle raid against the Epeians (11.650-761) and the funeral games of the Epeian Ammaryneus, in which he won the boxing, wrestling and foot race, but the Moliones deprived him of first place in the chariot race (23.626-642). The second of these tales is a set of events that perhaps suggests a larger version. The Pylian raid was in revenge for the Epeian treatment of Pylos after Heracles had sacked the city, behaviour which had included Augeias' unlawful seizure of a Pylian chariot team at Elis. Nestor killed Itymoneus in the initial raid, but when the Epeians counterattacked three days later, Neleus would not allow Nestor to go out, but hid his chariot. Nestor went out nonetheless and killed Moulios, son in law of Augeias, capturing his chariot. At the sight of this the Epeians were routed. Nestor went after the twin Moliones and would have killed them if Poseidon had not hidden them in mist.

Together, these passages suggest a substantial body of tales about the Pylian wars. A scholion on Il. 11.690 seems to indicate knowledge of matter not in Homer, for it names Periclymenos' ὑπερήφανία as the first cause of the hostility between him and Heracles. This is not something that could have been gleaned from the text of the Iliad, and it suggests that Periclymenos' presentation in the Catalogue is a part of his traditional portrayal. In the Iliad these passages occur as hortatory exempla, paradeigmata. They serve as narratives complete in themselves, although hinting at a much larger story in the background, but gain resonance and further implications through their parallels with the outer text. It is the fact that they are inserted for a

readily visible end, and as part of the narrative plot of the entire work, that distinguishes them from the narratives in the *Catalogue*. A further difference is that in the *Iliad* the surrounding text is another, larger narrative, rather than the contrasting form of genealogy. This is not to say, however, that the *Catalogue*’s Periclomenos narrative is less bound up in its context than its Iliadic counterparts. It participates in the mechanics of genealogical epos in its own ways: it situates Periclomenos and his brothers in the context of the larger groups of myths, it explains the shape of the genealogy by showing why the Neleid line does not expand greatly, and it exemplifies one of the mind-sets (rashness in battle) that influence the processes of birth, death and marriage that are integral to the genealogy.

Narratives that appear as self-standing segments in the *Catalogue* are not restricted to tales from the major *epe*. The treatment of Tyro, for example, displays this - the story of her resistance to her father’s hybris, rescue by Zeus, residence with Cretheus and rape by Poseidon form a coherent narrative that needs no other material to render it comprehensible. It could easily be removed from its genealogical context and presented as self-standing. Like things could be said of the Atalanta fragments, but this is nonetheless not the general rule in the *Catalogue*. Condensed segments that require a knowledge of the larger myth are more common.

The process of segmentation can also be witnessed within tales about single figures. The Mestra fragment (37H./43aM.-W.) centres on Glaucus, the son of Sisyphos, and his search for a bride and an heir. It contains at least three stages, each of which has the potential to become a story in itself, but which still need a little further information: Aithon and his ‘selling’ of Mestra to afford food; Heracles on Cos; and Poseidon’s seduction of Eurynome, resulting in Bellerophon and his killing
of the Chimaera. The links between these sections are superficial. Other versions of the Cos story do not name Mestra as Eurypylus' mother, for instance, and nothing links Cos and Bellerophon.

The fragment begins with the characterisation of Erysichthon through his burning hunger:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\[I\nu \text{ Τριςπίδαυ} } \\
\text{Χαρίτων \[άμαρύματ \[έχουσα} \\
\text{ἐπὶ\[ων\[μι\[ν\[ν \[έις\[κα λι\[μού} \\
\text{\[θυντ\[ων \[άνθρ\[ώτων} \\
\text{\[αθόλυνα \[δο λι\[μόν \[άπαντες} \\
\text{\[θυντο[\[ύς \[άνθρ\[ώτωις} \\
\text{πτκινά [φ]\[ρεὺς \[μή\[ς \[ίδι[νι} \\
\text{\[θεа . . . [.] \[δ γε\[περν[} \\
\text{γυ\[μακ\[κων} \[37H./43aM.-W.3-11\]
\end{align*}\]
\]

A question raised about the story of Erysichthon’s hunger here presents a further view of the passage as a self-standing segment. It has been disputed whether Hesiod gave the familiar story of Erysichthon’s offence against Demeter as the cause,\textsuperscript{133} and Fehling claims that the episode formed a self-standing story without any need for an explanation of his hunger:

Motivkern ist also die Ernährung des hungrigen Vaters durch die verwandlungsfähige Tochter. Das ist ein reiner Schwank und absolut vollständig, ohne daß eine Ursache des Hungers berichtet wird. Fehling (1972) 176

This view of the passage as a self-standing farce, while not inaccurate in the sense that it does not require anything more for comprehension, need not preclude the existence of any background information: as I have sought to show above, narratives in the Catalogue arise from the genealogy rather than being grafted on to it. While it is possible that there was an emphasis here on Mestra’s care to provide for her father,\textsuperscript{134} there is also scope for at least a brief allusion to how this situation came about. The

\textsuperscript{133} Fehling (1972) 176-8; Casanova (1977) 21.
\textsuperscript{134} Cf. Brillante (1983) 29.
Callimachean story of the goddess pleading in person with Erysichthon for her sacred grove may not have been there, but it seems likely that the hunger was punishment for *hybris* of some kind.\(^{135}\)

The first part of the Mestra fragment is unified above all by the central irony of the trickster Sisyphus being deceived.\(^{136}\)

\[\text{He provided rich bride goods, only for the bride to escape; he won the lawsuit, only for the bride to be abducted. When Mestra is removed to Cos and we hear of her descendants there, this bond becomes broken. The events on Cos, while linked genealogically through Mestra, centre on the figure of Heracles; although the passage is too allusive to be called self-standing, it appears divided off from the previous story.}

An even sharper division occurs when Mestra returns to Athens, and the narrative focus changes abruptly to Glaucus’ second bride, thought to be Eurynome. The story looks back to the original Mestra and Glaucus tale: the idea that Sisyphus did not understand the will of Zeus, which was that Glaucus should have no descendants, is repeated in both sections (52–4, 76–80).

\[\text{The final episode in the fragment marks a change of subject matter once more.}

Bellerophon receives the swiftest horse, Pegasus, goes against the fire-breathing Chimaera, and marries a king’s daughter.}


\(^{136}\) Cf. Casanova (1977) 22.
The compression of these heroic events in comparison with the transactions involving Mestra is notable. It may also be thought to confirm a preference in the Catalogue for non-epic and lower-register stories. Wars are reduced so that they are paid no more attention than wooing.

The segmentation of larger *epe* in the Catalogue is a process that acknowledges the episodic nature of many of the major myths (as witnessed by the epic cycle), and yet seeks to place these episodes in contexts that give them new resonance, and to approach them from new angles. It is this stance that was followed by the Hellenistic poets. The influence of the *Theogony* on the Catalogue here is more complex. The *Theogony* is a text on the whole concerned with canon formation: it sets out and places in a hierarchy the Greek deities, thus differing considerably from the focus on minor figures encouraged by this segmentation of myths. In the *Theogony*, too, as I have shown, the relationship between narrative and teleology is very close. The teleological emphasis of the Catalogue is harder to estimate, in part owing to the condition of the poem, but the range of themes arising out of the narratives suggests a far more diffuse attitude. In particular, the element of cultural definition does not seem subordinated to the poem’s finale. The catalogue of suitors and *Dios boule*, indeed, bring the poem and the heroic age to a close, but there may not be a sense that the entire work is tending single-mindedly towards this end. But although the *Theogony*’s
narratives do all have a clear function within the poem’s teleology, they nonetheless arise separately from one another. Thus the *dasmos* is mentioned in connection with Styx, the picture of the cosmos under Zeus’ rule is attached to Hecate, and the *Prometheia* and Typhoeus episodes are attached to Prometheus and Typhoeus respectively. Only the Titanomachy is not attached to a genealogical peg. Ostensibly, then, the order of these episodes is owing merely to the dictates of the genealogy; although all are part of the same narrative of Zeus’ rise to power, they are introduced as if separable, and the chronological disjunction is a part of this.

2.8 Genealogical Processes and the Question of Teleology

The range of concerns, and the motifs reflecting these, is far greater in the *Catalogue* than in the *Theogony*. Questions of ethnic and cultural identity, as I have shown, played a considerable role. So too does the question of heroic identity, and with this are bound up both allusions to the major myths and, above all, the genealogical processes that shape the tales’ presentation. As a poem about heroes’ identities, the most distinctive exploit of these figures might be mentioned, but it is noticeable that the exploits are most often (although hardly exclusively) presented in the context of their birth, death, marriage, or, in the case of women, childbearing, or in the case of men, manslaying. Meleager, for instance, is introduced by a laudatory description measuring his prowess, that is, his status and through it his identity as a hero, against both his siblings and all the other heroes, Heracles apart.

\[
\text{δὲς μὲγὶ ἄριστος ἐνυ}
\text{ἔγχει μάρνασθαι}
\text{πλὴγὺ γ’ Ἡρακλῆος} \quad (16H./25M.-W.1-3)
\]

The passage goes on, however, to describe his death at the hands of the Couretes.
A considerable range of possible causes of death are displayed in the course of the catalogue: although war and murder predominate, the scenarios vary. The murders committed by Orestes, Alcmaion and Deianaeira, for instance, were motivated by a desire for revenge. Deianaeira's thirst for revenge rose out of sexual jealousy: so too did Apollo's killing of Coronis and Acastus' attempted murder of Peleus. Orestes and Alcmaion, on the other hand, were motivated by family treachery. Murders of family members in the catalogue are also committed, for a variety of motivations, by Clytemnestra, Tydeus, Polyneices and Athamas. Athamas was driven by madness, Polyneices by hatred. Hatred between twins, as we have already seen, is evident too in the story of Crisos and Panopeus. Deaths in war include the casualties of sacked cities as well as those who fall in battle (Cos, the Echinades, Pylos). Another cause of death is divine justice, as seen most plainly in our fragments in the death of Salmoneus, but also apparently operating with the Niobids, Coronis and Eetion. Death, the end of the genealogical process, is thus displayed in considerable variety. In a few instances, too, lives are ended through metamorphosis. It has been noticed, however, that no deaths by natural causes seem to occur, and that deaths of women are underrepresented. This last may seem unusual, because it was normally the death of a heroine that was the focus of her cult, but it has been observed that there is a certain distance between literary treatments of heroines and their presentation in cult-focused

139 Clytemnestra: 15H./23aM.-W. 29; Tydeus: 5/10a.55-58; Polyneices 90/193; Athamas 29/69 - 31/70 (see Casanova (1968) 173-4).
142 See Rutherford (2000) 86, 88. His claim, however, that the only real female death in the Catalogue is that of Clytemnestra must be mistaken; Coronis, for instance, was killed but not immortalised, and so too was Salmoneus' wife (20H./30M.-W. 18-22).
myths.\footnote{Larson (1995) 20.} A more important factor may be the heroic world view: the woman’s story is to be one of marriage, intercourse and childbirth; the man’s is to be one of battle.\footnote{Cf. Steinrück (1996) 34-6 - women are praised for bearing children according to the same pattern by which men are praised for killing.} In the \textit{Catalogue}, however, the genealogy gives prominence to women and their children. The eventual fates of these children, grown up to die in battle, are of lesser importance.

Just as the \textit{Catalogue} displays a range of possible deaths - the end-point of the genealogical process - so too it displays a wide variety of scenarios for courtship, marriage and birth. While chaste wives are not wholly absent from the \textit{Catalogue}, the women whose tales gain most attention are those whose behaviour or stories are aberrant in some way. The theme embraces abduction, rape, unwillingness to marry, adultery and tasks imposed upon suitors. Mestra’s story (37H./43aM.-W.) demonstrated a combination of deceit, wooing with bride gifts, and abduction. Glaucus’ second wife committed adultery, but passed off the child, Bellerophon, as Glaucus’ own. Mestra’s unwillingness to marry has parallels in the stories of the Porthaonids, Demodike and Thetis. In Thetis’ story, like that of Mestra, metamorphosis was used as a means of escape, but this time unsuccessfully.\footnote{98-100H./211-212bM.-W.; See March (1987) 11-12; Ormond (2004) 313-326.} Peleus’ struggle with Thetis may be seen as a courtship task comparable to those undertaken by Melampous, or the suitors of Atalante, and possibly those of Alkestis.\footnote{Melampous: 27H./37M.-W.; Atalante: *2-4H./73-76M.-W.; Alkestis [Apoll.] Bib. 1.1.15, Hyginus \textit{Fab}. 50, 51, Paus. 3.18.16; see Gantz (1993) 195.} The penalties for unauthorised sexual activity and situations in which it is suspected or discovered also vary. Peleus was falsely accused by Acastus’ wife and left unarmed on a mountain full of wild beasts; Deianeira killed Heracles because she feared Iole would supplant her; Apollo killed Coronis for marrying a mortal while pregnant with
his son. Excessive devotion also brings punishment, however: Ceyx and Alcyone were turned into birds because they compared their love to that of Zeus and Hera.

The two staples of genealogy, death and sex, are thus constantly viewed from fresh angles, creating a diffuse and diverse backdrop to the stemmata. It is unlikely, therefore, that every narrative in the Catalogue was subordinated to a strong teleological thread in the way that those of the Theogony were. The Theogony reached its culmination in Zeus' rule. The climax of the Catalogue seems to have been the catalogue of Helen's suitors and the Dios Boule, both looking ahead to the Trojan war. While wooing and war, the two central motifs of this finale, have been present throughout the poem, there does not appear to have been any noticeable development in their portrayal. Unlike Zeus' rule in the Theogony, the conditions in which they could occur did not slowly come into being. The moral and heroic situation by the time of Helen's courtship has not noticeably deteriorated since the situation portrayed in the proem. Murder and hybris, for instance, were features at an early stage of both the linear sequence and the genealogical chronology. By combining these themes and applying them to the myth of the end of the heroic age, the catalogue of suitors and Dios Boule bring the poem to a satisfactory conclusion, but they do not require all that has gone before to be subordinate to them.

The most prominent internal theme of the catalogue of suitors is the offering of bride gifts. Odysseus, for example, offers little because he knows that Menelaus can offer the most; Menestheus has access to spectacular ancestral treasure; Aias has cattle won in battle. The bride price was a feature of narratives throughout the Catalogue, such as the courtships of Demodike, Eurythemiste and Mestra. In each case it is a sign

---

148 Tydeus, Ceyx and Alcyone.
149 Salmoneus, Athamas.
of the bride's high status and desirability, but in all the extant examples the exchange is compromised in some way. Demodike, for instance, was lavishly courted, but unwilling to marry any man. Molione received gifts of ὀλυμ τε καὶ σίγων (11H./17aM.-W.8) but slept with Poseidon as well as her new husband Actor, so that the Siamese twins Kteatos and Eurytos were born. For Mestra and Erysichthon it was the bride price and not the marriage that was important, and the bride price probably receives its apparently extensive description for that reason (37H./43aM.-W.21-25).151

It has been observed that Erysichthon severely compromises his heroic status by violating the ideal of reciprocity, through attempting to retain both the bride gifts and his daughter.152 The tension of prestigious weddings accompanied, as happens in Helen's case, by adultery, embodies in a way two salient features of the proem: it was a golden age of feasts between gods and men, but also an age of sexual relationships between gods and women.

The most notable feature of the catalogue of suitors, however, is the way in which it looks forward to the Iliadic catalogue of ships. Scholars have remarked that the relationship between the two pieces is something more than that of model and successor.153 Both catalogues may have been drawn by the poets from one common tradition.154 Moreover, the way in which the catalogue of suitors is framed casts it as the cause of the catalogue of ships. The oath described at the end of the catalogue (110H./204M.-W.40-47) is the one that will compel the suitors to sail against Troy.

---

151 Robertson (1984) 384 etymologises Μῆδορα as 'she who is wooed', describing her as "a perpetual bride whose successive husbands offer rich bride goods".
152 Levaniouk (2000) 44.
The emphasis on Achilles looks forward to his central role in the story of the Trojan war.

\[
\text{Χείρων δ’ ἐν Πηλίων ὑλήντι}
\]
\[
\text{Πηλείδην ἐκόμιζε πόδας ταχύν ἔρχον ἀνδρῶν}
\]
\[
\text{παιδ’ ἐτ’ ἐν’[τ’] ὑ’ γὰρ μὲν ἀρησίλος Μενέλαος}
\]
\[
\text{νῖκη’ οὐδὲ τὶς ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων}
\]
\[
\text{μηστεύων Ἐλένην εἰ μὲν κίχε παρθένον οὐσαν}
\]
\[
\text{oίκαδε νοστήσας ἐκ Πηλίου ὦκύς Ἀχιλλεύς.}
\]
\[49-54\]

No catalogue of future participants in the Trojan war would be complete without him, but also, and perhaps more importantly, the catalogue presents an implicit ranking according to wealth, skill in war, and so on. The desire of the Dioscouroi to have Agamemnon as a brother-in-law is described in drastic terms:

\[
\text{καὶ υ’ κε ἰὴ Ἰάστωρ τε καὶ ὁ κρατερὸς Πολυδεύκης}
\]
\[
\text{γαμβρόν ποιήσαντο κατὰ κράτος ἄλλ’ Ἀγαμέμνων}
\]
\[
\text{γαμβρός εὼν ἐμίνατο κασιγνήτωι Μενελάωι}
\]
\[105H./197M.-W.3-5\]

That Achilles’ desirability should be ranked even higher is a sign of the tensions of power and superiority that dominate the Iliad.

That this look forward to the Trojan war is cast in the form of a catalogue of suitors is of a piece with the treatment of the major epe in the Catalogue. War, a man’s affair, belonging to the highest register of poetry, is set is the context of the lighter world of courtship. The men are in a way subordinate to a woman at this moment, for although Helen’s brothers and father are the ones who will decide on the match, it is only through marriage with Helen that the heroes will gain the additional status they seek. The Trojan war, the conclusion of the genealogical processes of the heroic age, is approached through marriage.

---

The Trojan war is clearly presented in the *Dios Boule* as a means of destroying the race of heroes.

The details of Zeus’ plan have been extensively discussed by scholars:¹⁵⁷ the identity of the ἡμίθεοι and the precise nature of Zeus’ πρόφασις, as well as the relationship which the passage bears to the other Hesiodic pictures of the ages of heroes, have all come under scrutiny. It is plain, however, that the story of the *Dios Boule* was a very old tradition drawn on and adapted by poets. Awareness of this should make us less ready to map the passage here onto the *Cypria* prologue or the hints in the *Iliad*. All three texts may be interpreting the tradition in their own way.¹⁵⁸ What is clear above all is that this is to be a defining moment, and that the individuals of the stemmata are to be swept away. The Trojan War, although singled out in this way, is not the only large-scale destruction. At Pylos, for example, all but one of the Neleids were wiped out; on the Echinades Alcmene was the only survivor of her family after a raid by the Taphians. These events show the vulnerability of the race of heroes, but only Zeus’ hostility can lead to its final downfall. The presence of these earlier mass killings does however vitiate what Mayer has argued, that war in general and all other evils came to

---


be through Helen.\textsuperscript{159} While the Helen story may at the birth of the tradition have been parallel to that of Pandora, this is not to say that the poet of the \textit{Catalogue} was aware of, still less made use of, such a facet. War, trouble, death and sorrow are already present in the \textit{Catalogue}.\textsuperscript{160} Zeues’ plan concerns the specific aim of separating men from gods; the general affliction of mankind, suggested by the imagery that follows, is a side effect, and not the plan itself.

\begin{verbatim}
πιολλά δ' ἀπὸ γλωθρῶν δευδρέων ἀμύοντα χαμάζε
χειμέω καλὰ πέτηλα ρέεσκε δὲ καρπὸς ἔραζε
πιεύοντος Βορέα περιζαμενὲς Δίὸς αἰσθή
οἴδεοκεν δὲ θάλασσα τρόμεσκε δὲ πάντ' ἀπὸ τοῖον
τρύχεοκεν δὲ μένως βρότεον μινύθεοκε δὲ καρπὸς
ὀρήν ἐν εἰςαρινῇ ὡτε τ' ἀτριχὸς οὐρεῖς τίκτει
γαλαίης ἐν κευθύων τρίτωι ἐτεὶ τρία τέκνα

ioctl δὲ ὁρὸς καὶ ἀνὰ δρυμὰ πυκνὰ καὶ ὕλην

τὸ στεφαίζον καὶ ἀπ[ε]χθαίρων πάτον ἀνθρῶν

γάγκας καὶ κυμίων κατα[

χειμῶνος δ' ἐπιόντος ὑπὸ .]

κεῖται πόλλ' ἐπισσαμενὸς ε[ι]

δεῖνος ὅφη κατὰ νότα δα[φοινὸς]

ἀλλά μιν ὕβρισθη τε καὶ [

κῆλα Δίὸς δαυνάι φη . . . [

ψυχή τοῦ [ . ] οἴη καταλείπε[ται]

ἡ δ' ἄμφ' αὐτόχυτον ταλαμί[ην]

ἡβαιῆν

(110H./204M.-W.86-103)
\end{verbatim}

As Davies has remarked, there is nothing quite like this in the rest of Hesiodic poetry.\textsuperscript{161} No especially convincing application of the serpent image to the themes of the \textit{Catalogue} has yet been reached. The snake is typically a symbol of revival or regeneration, but it is unclear whether this should refer to the immediate destruction caused by the storm, to mankind after the Trojan war, or to an envisaged return of the heroic age.\textsuperscript{162}

\bibitem{159} Mayer (1996) 8-13.
\bibitem{160} Similarly, West’s argument that Helen led to the building of ships for the first time (1961) 133 flies in the face of the references to seafaring elsewhere in the \textit{Catalogue}, including the Argonautica.
\bibitem{161} Davies (1992) 145.
Interpretation of the storm image depends heavily on how the heroic age in the *Catalogue* is to be viewed. For those who see the poem as set in the 'Golden Age', this storm is the first ever autumn:¹⁶³ after a period of eternal spring, man will now have to endure hardships of foul weather and ruined crops. Identifying the situation outlined in the proem with any of the precise situations described in the Hesiodic corpus is risky, however. The idea of shared feasts and intercourse between gods and men presupposes that the *Theogony*'s division at Mecone has not yet occurred.¹⁶⁴ In the myth of races in the *Works and Days*, a situation in which men and gods share meals only fits the first, golden age, but the ages of silver and bronze intervene before the age of heroes, with each race being removed from the earth before the next begins (109 - 173).¹⁶⁵ The heroic age of the *Catalogue* cannot be intended to fit with either of these pictures. It is better to assume once more that all versions were drawing on far older traditions about some race of men who had intercourse with the gods, but who were finally and irrevocably removed.¹⁶⁶ The storm seems above all a metaphor for an all-encompassing disaster: the Trojan War, in fact, translated into the natural world. The world suggested by the narrative of the *Catalogue* appears to be one in which disease, hunger and awareness of mortality already exist:¹⁶⁷ the Proitides appear to suffer from a skin disease;¹⁶⁸ Erysichthon suffers famine, and the fact that Endymion should be granted the right to determine the time of his own death suggests that fear of dying already existed, contrary to the sleep-like end of golden-age men in the *Works and Days* (v.116).¹⁶⁹

Davies' analysis of the Catalogue claimed that there was a move in the poem's themes from the state of affairs described in the poem to man's condition by the time of the Dios Boule, a gradual shift from the world view of the Theogony to that of the Homeric poems.\(^{170}\) The fact that immortalisations, heroes with special powers and gods interacting with mortals to arrange marriages occur predominantly in the first half of the poem was used to support this view. Such an argument, however, fails to take into account that the largest number of substantial fragments belong to the first part of the poem, to the Deucalionic stemma.\(^{171}\) To argue that features observable there do not appear in the later stages of the poem is an argument from silence on dubious grounds. This analysis of the poem is further flawed by certain over-generalisations. It is claimed, for instance, that figures connected with the Trojan war are clustered in the second half of the poem, looking forward to the Iliad, whereas references to Heracles grouped in the first half look back to the Theogony.\(^{172}\) As we have seen, however, the spread of references to such figures is far more even. The Trojan war is referred to early on through the sacrifice of Iphimede (15H./23aM.-W.17-26), and Heracles' birth occurred in the Pelopid stemma, well over half way through the poem (91H./195M.-W.). Davies also asserts:

By the Catalogue of Suitors, only mortal men sleep with mortal women, and Zeus decides this will be the rule for all future relationships. The only exceptions are immortal nymphs and witches, such as Thetis, Calypso and Circe. (1992) 117-8


\(^{171}\) If as 'substantial fragments' we count for the sake of argument pieces that have either 4 or more complete lines or at least 10 fragmentary lines in which complete words can be read, then (in Hirschberger's edition) the Deucalionic stemma has 13 such fragments, the Inachid 4, the Arcadian 3, the Pleiad and Pelopid 8 and the Asopid 7. If furthermore we count the number of verses within those fragments, the predominance of the Deucalionic stemma in what is left of the poem becomes still more apparent. The substantial fragments for the Deucalionic stemma total 523 verses, for the Inachid 109, for the Arcadian 35, for the Pleiad and Pelopid 178 and for the Asopid 86.

\(^{172}\) Davies (1992) 105. Haubold (2005) 94-6 gives a more nuanced view of Heracles as a figure poised between the worlds of the Theogony and the Trojan War.
This caveat is a rather large one, however. The marriage of Peleus and Thetis, apparently narrated shortly before the catalogue of suitors and the *Dios Boule*, may well have presented a substantial mingling of gods and men.\(^{173}\) That Thetis is a nymph rather than a goddess must seem a technicality beside this major example of the 'shared feasts' motif.

The linear sequence of episodes in the poem does not, then, in itself display a progressive adaptation of the world-view preparing for the *Dios Boule*. Indeed, the plan would lose much of its impact if it merely ratified an existing state of affairs. That every theme and narrative was not teleologically subordinated to a climax does not imply, however, that the poem was merely accumulative in its organisation of material. The fact itself that the tales are so closely linked to the stemmata argues against this; so too does the fact that the tales are given a distinct application to the genealogical process. As we have seen, the segmentation of the main mythic cycles allowed them to be placed in new contexts and approached from new, sometimes non-heroic angles: the pressure exerted by a strong teleological thread would have worked against such a multi-faceted approach to the material.

2.9 Epilogue

The *Ehoiai* themselves may serve to demonstrate both the characteristic segmentation of the *Catalogue* and one of its unifying features. The formula appears to have picked out particular women, highlighted throughout the work, to create a structure secondary to the genealogy. In part, this would have led to a unifying effect:

\(^{173}\) See March (1987) 7-20.
figures belonging to different mythic cycles and different stemmata would all be placed on the same comparative level. Equally and contrarily, this compartmentalising of certain figures within a stemma would increase the sense of segmentation already created by, for instance, the treatment of the epic tales. We have already seen how this segmentation allowed for new juxtapositions, as, for example, when Clytemnestra and Deinaneira are brought together. The *Ehoiai*, likewise, through calling attention to certain women in such a way, suggest approaches to and contexts for particular stories beyond those that are normally taken for granted.

The *Catalogue of Women* has been compared to the Odysseian Catalogue of Heroines, in part because many of the women are the same. When considering how that passage interacts with the rest of the *Odyssey*, scholars discuss how it presents Odysseus, and the audience, with an array of paradigms for female conduct in general, and for the specific conduct of Penelope. Will Penelope be suicidal, treacherous, faithful? In the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, however, there is no question of catalogue and frame. All the women, whether granted an *Ehoie* or not, are potential comparanda, not just for each other, but for the women known to the audience as well. Thus the genealogy sets both the audience and the characters in the specific contexts of culture and behavioural traits, while the exemplary nature of the *Ehoiai* likewise has a double application. This coexistence of structural principles, in fact, is as much a hallmark of the Hesiodic style as the presence of lists.
3.1 **Introduction**

The poems referred to as *Kollektivgedichte* form a highly heterogeneous collection; the works for which we know more than simply the title and author are as follows: Antimachus' *Lyde*, Phanocles' *Erotes E Kaloi*, Hermesianax' *Leontion*, Sostratus' *Teiresias* (SH.733), Nicander's *Heteroioumena*, Boios' *Ornithogonia*, Euphorion's *Thrax*, *Chiliades* and *Arae*, Moero's *Arae* and the anonymous *Tattoo Elegy* (P.Brux.Inv. E.8934 & P.Sorb.Inv. 2254).¹ A number of other works are mentioned in connection with these: Minnemus' *Nanno* is frequently named as Antimachus' model,² and Philetas' *Bittis* tends to be referred to as similar to the *Lyde* and *Leontion*.³ Alexander Aetolus' *Apollo* is also mentioned as a possible catalogue elegy. Some papyrus elegies have also been linked to the form (P.Oxy. 2884 fr.2, 2885 fr.1, 3723).⁴ Antigonos of Carystus wrote a collection of metamorphoses entitled *Alloioseis*; *Metamorphoses* were written by Didymarchus, Theodorus, Dorotheus and Parthenius, although it is disputed whether this latter was verse or prose.⁵ No ancient term referred to these works as a single group, and it is perhaps questionable whether they should be treated as a single genre. Nagy has proposed that the idea of genres arose to compensate for the loss of a specific *occasion* (that is, performance context) for poetry.⁶ This is a view that has gained considerable acceptance.⁷ Much work has been done on how for archaic poetry what we regard as genre was the result of

---

⁴ See Parsons (1988); Morelli (1994); Hose (1994); Butrica (1996).
⁵ See Lightfoot (1999) 38.
⁷ See esp. contributors to Depew and Obbink (2000); Fantuzzi & Hunter (2004).
interplay between audience expectation and the poetic endeavour to innovate while retaining a recognisable form. But the fifth century is considered to have seen the end of this type of development, and what followed was the attempt to formulate in writing rules based on these expectations. Genres soon seem to have been viewed in terms of outline forms and characteristics, codifying what had their origins in the genres' earlier occasions.

The imagined performance contexts motivating different poems among Kollektivgedichte vary, and the question of their genre is never unproblematic. The poems closest in some outline characteristics to the Catalogue of Women appear to have abandoned some of the features of the poem most bound up in its original performance context, such as genealogy. The origin of curse poetry would appear at first to be non-literary defixiones, but, while they may have gained their inspiration there, they differ greatly from them in content and form. Within this group, too, were differences in metre: unlike the Tattoo Elegy, Euphorion's works were hexametric. The relationship between metre and genre seems indeed to have been complex. In some forms, such as iambics, the two were closely linked. Hexameter had a number of uses besides epic, but, by the Hellenistic period at least, heroic poetry was unlikely to be written in anything but hexameters. Forms that had been rendered in hexameters in the archaic period might be deemed more suited to the lighter elegiacs: some at least of the poems drawing on the Catalogue of Women were written in elegiacs. Didactic poetry was still hexametric, but Callimachus' Aetia was elegiac. The frames of didactic poetry are also problematic. The imagined performance context of Hesiodic didactic was one in which the poet instructed his audience. Extant Hellenistic didactic

---

poems, such as the *Phaenomena* and *Theriaca*, however little practical use the latter in particular may have been, maintain this fiction of instruction. To what extent, however, the stories in the *Heteroioumena* and *Ornithogonia* were cast is a similar way might, as I will discuss, be questioned. The performative backgrounds for the models of the different types of *Kollektivgedichte* thus varied, but in all instances they appear to have moved away from those origins, and tend to share instead in each other’s themes and structures.

Among the main charges levied against the poems are those of monotony and a mechanical approach to the catalogue style, motivated by scholarly habits and a desire to follow Hesiod.

With Hermesianax, the structure was monotonous and the mechanisms all too obvious. [...] The crudely Hesiodic oTos is repeated five times in 15 stories. Then second-person apostrophes, presumably, (as Rhode saw) to Leontion. There was personal potential here, but Hermesianax handles them all in the same mechanical way, merely as variations on the oTos formula. [...] Hermesianax’s third device was to use the third person, though in no less impersonal and mechanical a way. [...] In his vocabulary, too, Hermesianax drew heavily and mechanically on Homer and Hesiod. Cameron (1995) 383.

On the other hand, there is a great deal to indicate that Callimachus and the didactic writers of ‘Hesiodic’ epic were not remotely concerned with either a chronological scheme or any sort of narrative unity [...] It is also difficult to imagine that such works as Nicander’s *Heteroioumena* (Transformations) or Parthenius’ *Metamorphoses* were essentially different from extant didactic or ‘collective’ poems: the former seems to have been rather bald didactic (with the metamorphoses geographically arranged) and the latter a kind of *Aetia* specialising in *metamorphosis* Otis (1970) 48.

The truth, however, is that for many of the subgroups within *Kollektivgedichte* information about the poem’s structures is defective or entirely lacking. Most of the fragments we possess are various mythological tales ascribed to certain works, and so any information about how these tales were linked is lacking. Where we do have data about how segments were joined, as with the *Thrax* and the *Leontion’s* catalogue of lovers (F.7P.), this is closely bound up with the particular scenarios of these poems. To extrapolate information about one poem and map it onto another is a dubious
proceeding. The *Aetia* is evidence of this: the two halves of the poem had different frames and structures, neither of which could have been deduced from the other. This has been one of the failings of criticism of *Kollektivgedichte*, even now that it is gaining in appreciation. Assessments made on the basis of outline style obscure the different attitudes, traditions, and approaches that may have influenced the poets. Hermesianax and Antimachus, for instance, seem not to have made much use of aetiology, unlike Phanocles, and have had posited, on however tenuous grounds, a personal basis for their erotic narratives.

The more one considers any one poem, the more it becomes clear that the poem’s traits are part of its own individuality. In the absence of clear indications about the poems’ structures, one means of confronting the question of monotony will be to consider the range of themes attested for a work, and the scope for their constructive manipulation and development. Indications of a poem’s affiliations with better known genres, too, will be important to an understanding of the varied development of Hellenistic *Kollektivgedichte*. Inevitably, though, since so much of the context and contents are lost, I will have to group *Kollektivgedichte* according to outline form.

### 3.2 Phanocles and ‘Hesiodic’ Catalogues

Two entirely lost Hellenistic poems expressed a clear generic allegiance to the *Catalogue of Women* through their titles: Nicaenetus’ *Catalogue of Women* and Sostratus’ ‘H’ οἶοι. While unfortunately we know nothing about their structure or contents, we do possess fragments of three poems that apparently used connective formulae in a manner harking back to the Hesiodic ἤ’ οἶη: Hermesianax’ *Leontion*, Phanocles’ *Erotes* and the anonymous *Tattoo Elegy*. The *Tattoo Elegy* will receive
fuller treatment below. It was a curse poem that threatened to tattoo the imagined recipient with different mythological scenes on different parts of his body. Each segment had the word στίξω in its opening verse. For Phanocles we have one substantial fragment and two further couplets, along with three other narratives that are ascribed to the poem. The poem as a whole was a catalogue of homosexual affairs, and this fact alone, since it lacks a progenitive element, seems to preclude the existence of any genealogical framework for the narratives. The introductory formula used - ἔως - seems to refer to an action or course of events rather than a person: ‘Or as Orpheus loved . . .’, ‘Or as mountain-roaming Dionysus seized Adonis. . .’ Here, then, we appear to have the simplest outline conception of the Hesiodic Catalogue: a narrative attached to a repeated formula. Yet the adaptation of the formula, and, in the case of the Tattoo Elegy, its application to a wholly different context, must show that the borrowing is more than simply ‘mechanical’.

Impressions gained from fragments may also be deceptive, perhaps no more so than in the case of Hermesianax. Eight fragments are attributed to the Leontion, providing evidence for six different narratives as well as a monstrous catalogue of poets and philosophers in love (F.7P.). It is this fragment that has aroused the most scholarly scorn, and I will discuss its contents in full when I consider the evidence for a ‘subjective’ element in Kollektivgedichte. The love affairs presented in the catalogue are, in various ways, deliberately preposterous, while the style of the catalogue is ponderous. Hermesianax’ explicit ‘understanding’ of the Catalogue of Women and its structure is expressed thus:

Φημὶ δὲ καὶ Βοιωτῶν ἀποπρολιτῶντα μέλαθρον Ἡσιόδου πάσης ἡρανον ἱστορίης ᾿Ασκραίων ἑπεύθαι ἐρώθη ᾿Ελικώνιδα κόμην ἐνθὲν ὁ γὰρ ᾿Ηοῦν μιμώμενος ᾿Ασκραίην
Some earlier commentators did indeed understand this to imply that Hermesianax’ knowledge and comprehension of the *Ehoiae* was so poor that he believed it to be a work written about ‘Ehoie’, Hesiod’s beloved. Quite apart from the fact that no pupil or friend of Philetas is likely to have made such an error, his own catalogue shows a clear understanding of the formula’s meaning and comparative function.

This is the transition from the catalogue of poets to that of philosophers. and the crucial adaptation in v. 84 of the Hesiodic ἐν η ν ὤη demonstrates what has been hypothesised for the *Catalogue of Women*, that all the formulae must point to an initial ὤη, and that ἐν, ‘or’, must refer to someone at the beginning of the catalogue. This shows plainly how in Hermesianax’s eyes the syntax of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* operated: a description of the group was followed by examples of individuals, serving as paradigms.  

Other formulae in the catalogue show a wider variety than elsewhere. Hermesianax introduces an address to a second person: Λέοβιος Ὁ Ἀλκαῖος δὲ . . .

γιγνώσκεις (47, 9), "Ανδρα δὲ τὸν Κυθέρηθεν . . . γιγνώσκεις (69, 73), οἶθα

11 Ellenberger (1907) 26 confessed that at first he was misled into thinking that Hermesianax had understood Hesiod’s formula, but then came to realise that he had read it as an exclamation: “Ehoie! Madness about Theano bound fast Samian Pythagoras . . .” (!)
Thus either the poet, or an inset speaker, is far more actively involved in the process of cataloguing, and assumes that his audience (internal or external) is likewise involved. The stress is a good deal more on the performance of the list. The formulae do not have a merely syntactic or comparative role, but are given extra life as attempts to direct the audience's attention. This, then, is no mechanical lifting of a Hesiodic device, but a redeployment of it in such a way as to give it fresh energy. While the *Leontion* fragment is highly condensed and probably parodic in form, it displays constructive engagement with its model.

The apparent simplification and flattening of the structure of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* into a mere sequence of segments and formulae nonetheless calls for explanation. The myths of the *Catalogue of Women*, as we have seen, gain an immense cultural and thematic context through their genealogical setting. They are not isolated, introduced abruptly through a formula, given internal coherence and closure, and then abandoned, but rather share in and contribute to the ethos of the poem. In this they differ conspicuously from the tales in *Kollektivgedichte*. The aspects of the poem most connected with its performative context have been abandoned, and its purely formal characteristics have been retained. This divorcing of genre from its original context is something that must be remembered when poems apparently from other generic backgrounds are seen to adopt the 'Hesiodic' catalogue form.

The abandonment of genealogy is something of a puzzle, in particular because it retained its validity as an instrument of cultural identity into Hellenistic times. Curty's analysis of the epigraphical evidence provides an ample demonstration of
δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄνθρωπῶν (75), along with his own emphatic assertions: ἃλλα δὲ καὶ (21, 62). Thus either the poet, or an inset speaker, is far more actively involved in the process of cataloguing, and assumes that his audience (internal or external) is likewise involved. The stress is a good deal more on the performance of the list. The formulae do not have a merely syntactic or comparative role, but are given extra life as attempts to direct the audience’s attention. This, then, is no mechanical lifting of a Hesiodic device, but a redeployment of it in such a way as to give it fresh energy. While the Leontion fragment is highly condensed and probably parodic in form, it displays constructive engagement with its model.

The apparent simplification and flattening of the structure of the Hesiodic Catalogue into a mere sequence of segments and formulae nonetheless calls for explanation. The myths of the Catalogue of Women, as we have seen, gain an immense cultural and thematic context through their genealogical setting. They are not isolated, introduced abruptly through a formula, given internal coherence and closure, and then abandoned, but rather share in and contribute to the ethos of the poem. In this they differ conspicuously from the tales in Kollektivgedichte. The aspects of the poem most connected with its performative context have been abandoned, and its purely formal characteristics have been retained. This divorcing of genre from its original context is something that must be remembered when poems apparently from other generic backgrounds are seen to adopt the ‘Hesiodic’ catalogue form.

The abandonment of genealogy is something of a puzzle, in particular because it retained its validity as an instrument of cultural identity into Hellenistic times. Curty’s analysis of the epigraphical evidence provides an ample demonstration of
this.\textsuperscript{14} Not only were variations upon the formula φιλοι καὶ συγγενεῖς (friends and kinsmen) frequently used in order to establish one state’s claim to the support of another on the basis of kinship, but at times there is also evidence of negotiations with myth to underwrite these claims. Inscriptions concerning Xanthus (75C) and Argos (4&5C) contain detailed mythical expositions as proof of common ancestry.\textsuperscript{15}

Genealogy must thus have been subject to continuing evolution in order to meet political requirements, especially as the Hesiodic tradition takes little notice of the islands and Ionia. At the same time, however, genealogy does not seem to have been used in poetry on a large scale. To a certain extent, \textit{ktisis} poetry would have taken on some of its former functions, expounding local and regional identitites. A certain change of attitude may also have been the underlying cause of its abandonment. While for politicians genealogy remained negotiable, for poets and scholars the process of canon formation may have altered the situation.\textsuperscript{16} Once the Hesiodic poem had been granted a special status in the eyes of the Hellenistic poets, the idea of continued reworking of long genealogical poetry may have come to be viewed in the same light as cyclic epic. That is, such poetry might be written, but might not meet with ready approval. Thus Callimachus and Aratus in their appropriation of other Hesiodic poems seek not to replicate the works but to recreate them in a form that suited their contemporary world. Some of the same sources that bear witness to the ongoing popularity of genealogy reveal that it was considered to be a species of ‘easy reading’. Polybius saw it as a genre preferred by those who were not enquiring or interested in antiquity.\textsuperscript{17} As such, it would seem to have been a form lacking in appeal

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] For the formation of ‘canons’ in the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries see Pfeiffer (1968) 204-7.
\end{footnotes}
to Alexandrian poets, who sought innovation in the commemoration of the past and present cultures.

At the same time, however, the implicit use of the mythical past to explain and contextualise the present found in the Hesiodic Catalogue would have been attractive to the Hellenistic poets. There, as I discussed above, in their role as charters of local identity myths were used to explain present realities. It is possible that it was viewed as one of the first aetiological poems: the combination of aetiology with brief, often erotic, tales and the marginalisation of epic themes finds a clear parallel with Hellenistic practice. Phanocles at least, in addition to using Hesiodic-style formulae, shows such an attitude in the Erotes. Traditional figures seem to have been placed in un-heroic situations. One segment told of Agamemnon’s love for Argynnos, and how Agamemnon founded the temple of Aphrodite Argynnos in his memory (F.5P.). A cult action linked the mythic tale to the present day, and this, along with the tragic love story, is likely to have been the main focus of attention. Agamemnon’s epic, martial background, if it appeared at all, would only have played a marginal role. Similarly, another segment gave a homoerotic reason for a war between Greece and Troy. Tantalus raped Ganymede, perhaps acting as a pimp for Zeus and ‘grooming’ the boy for his service (F.4P.). Unfortunately, any action has been lost, but we can note that here is a homosexual variant on the old theme of rape and counter rape as a cause of wars between East and West. It seems likely, too, that the erotic part of the narrative gained more attention than the martial aspect. Another fragment possibly preserves a further cult action: Adonis is abducted by Dionysus (F.3P.) - the passage of Plutarch that preserves the fragment mentions that Dionysus and Adonis were identified, and this may have been the focus of this segment.
The role of aetia in Phanocles seems not, however, to have been uniform: the Cycnus segment, for instance, appears to have ended in metamorphosis. The Orpheus segment ended in a double action: the reason why the people of Lesbos are so musical, and the reason why the Thracians tattoo their women. Neither of these seems to have much kinship with the cult aetia. The poem did not rely on the aetia for unity, and while Morelli assumes that all the tales took the form of aetia, it is perhaps unwise to read Phanocles through Callimachus to that extent.18 This is not to say that the poem was merely accumulative, assembling a melange of tales of homosexual love.19 It appears from the change in the initial formulae, from ἱ' οἴηι to ἱ' ὀς, that Phanocles had adapted the focus of the Hesiodic poem, so that rather than being about a type of person and the results of their mating for future generations, the Erotes was about a type of relationship and its results. It is impossible now to tell what particular focus the repeated ἱ' ὀς ... ἱ' ὀς ... ἱ' ὀς may have been given. There could have been a justification of pederastic love affairs, whether on personal grounds, addressed to a friend,20 or in general, or perhaps, more likely given the unhappy outcome of the stories, a warning against any deep involvement in such affairs. The tone of the Orpheus segment, however, seems detached and slightly impersonal: this may be seen to argue against any especially personal element in the frame. Alternatively, the nature of Phanocles' adaptation of the Hesiodic Catalogue has the potential for some passage inviting a contrast between this new, up-to-date view of the past, and the Hesiodic original:

"Hesiod has sung of how maidens were mated with gods, and how from such unions came the race of heroes, from whom all the tribes of Greece are descended

18 Morelli (1950) 1.
19 Pace Couat (1931) 107.
20 E.g. as Theocritus addresses his Cyclops to Nicias.
and from whom many of our cities gained their names. But I sing of the loves of gods or heroes and mortal lads; such affairs had no human issue, yet nonetheless wrought changes that persist to this very day. Such as the way that X ~ ~ ~, or as Thracian Orpheus, son of Oiagrios, loved Boread Calais from the depth of his heart.”

The style of the Orpheus segment blends Hellenistic elements, such as its pastoral overtones, with features such as the genealogical information about Orpheus and his beloved in the first distich:

"Η ὡς Οιάγροιο πάις Ὡρηκίος 'Ορφεὺς
ἐκ θυμοῦ Κάλαιν στέρξε Βορηιάδην (F.1P.1-2)

The authorial voice is repressed, as in traditional narrative poetry and in contrast to Callimachus’ more engaged style. The piece is fully unified internally, but, as at times in the Catalogue of Women, there is a sense that a wider background is assumed: here, the Argonautic connection between Orpheus and Calais. The first section of six lines, describing Orpheus’ love for Calais, ends with Κάλαιν, looking back to the Κάλαιν that announced to object of Orpheus’ love in v.2. Within the passage marked off in this way, there is a continual emphasis on Orpheus’ unquiet mind, and almost no information about Calais. We see him, as Orpheus does, from far off.

πολλάκι δὲ σκιεροίσιν ἐν ἀλατησιν ἔξετ’ αείδων
δὲν πόδον, οὐδ’ ἦν οἱ θυμὸς ἐν ηοχῇ,
ἀλλ’ αεί μὲν ἄγρυπνοι ύπὸ ψυχῇ μελεδῶναι ἔτρυχον, θαλερὸν δερκομένου Κάλαιν. (F.1P.3-6)

Apollonius may have been recalling this sense of unattainable love when he alludes to Phanocles’ opening verse in his description of the Argonauts’ encounter with the Sirens.²¹

οἱ δ’ ἀπὸ νηὸς

²¹ The priority of Phanocles over Apollonius cannot be proven, but I think it likely in this case, for the presentation of a genealogy is more important to Phanocles’ passage that it is in its Apollonian context. Cf. Scherer (2002) 176 n.4.
The one Argonaut who does jump overboard, Butes, cannot reach the Sirens any more than Orpheus can reach the winged Calais.\(^{22}\)

Orpheus is presented as the *protos heuretes* of homosexuality, and Calais’ name is comparable to *kalos*, so that he appears as the archetypal ‘pretty boy’.\(^{23}\) One would think that this aspect - a poet figure, inventor of homosexuality in a poem about homosexual relationships - would be highlighted. In fact, however, these features remain implicit only, appearing through the motive given for Orpheus’ murder.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{τὸν μὲν Βιστονὶδες κακομήχανοι ἄμφωποθείσαι} \\
\text{ἐκτανοῦ, εὐθῆς φάγονα θηξάμενοι} \\
\text{οὔνεκα πρῶτος ἐδείξεν ἐνὶ Ὃρηκεσιν ἐρωτας} \\
\text{ἄρρενας, οὐδὲ πόθους ἦνεσε θηλυτέρων}.
\end{align*}\] (F.1P.7-10)

This decision not to capitalise upon what appears to be an essential aspect of the poem as a whole should perhaps warn us against assuming that the most obvious aetia in the tales attributed to Phanocles were always the segments’ principal focus. All the conventional aspects of the myth are subordinated to the tale of love and punishment.\(^{24}\) Orpheus’ love for Calais is thought to be Phanocles’ own invention,\(^{25}\) and this particular aetion for tattooing appears nowhere else.\(^{26}\) The expected elements of Orpheus’ underworld journey and his power to charm rocks are at best hinted at in

\(^{22}\) For Calais’ inaccessibility see Stern (1979) 136.
\(^{24}\) West (1983) 4 and Graf (1987) 80 list what might be seen as the recurrent elements of the Orpheus myth.
a description to his lyre’s power after its burial with him, while the Orpheus cult on Lesbos is implied merely by the epithet ‘holy’.  

τὰς δ’ ἵερῃ Λέσβῳ πολιῇ ἐπέκελεθε θάλασσα:  

τὴν δ’ ὡς λιγυρῆς πόντου ἐπέσχες λύρης,  

νῆσος τ’ αἰγιαλοῦς β’ ἀλιμυρέας, ἐνθά λίγειαν ἀνέρες Ὀρφείνι ἐκτέρισαν κεφαλῆς,  

ἐν δὲ χέλνι τύμβῳ λιγυρῆν θέσαν, ἢ καὶ ἀναύδους πέτρας καὶ Фόρκου στυγνόν ἐπεθεὶν ὑδώρ.  

ἐκ κείνου μολπαί τε καὶ ιμερὴ κηραιστύς νῆσον ἔχει, πασέων δ’ ἐστίν ἀοιδοτάτη: (F.Π.15-22)

The aetiological couplet has a rather decisive finality. It seems the natural conclusion to the piece, and in fact it explains more than it claims to, for the Lesbian poets were known specifically for erotic poetry. Rather than using this to achieve closure, however, Phanocles then returns to the Thracians.

Όρηκες δ’ ὡς ἐδάπασαν ἀρήμοι ἔργα γυναικῶν ἄγρια, καὶ πάντας δεινοὺς ἐσῆλθεν ἄχος,  

ὡς ἀλόχους ἔστιζον, ἵν’ ἐν χρόνι σήμιται ἔχουσαι κυάνεα στυγεροῦ μή λελάθοιντο φόνου·  

ποινάς δ’ Ὀρφήτι κταμένῳ τίνους γυναῖκες εἰσέτι νῦν κείνης ἐῖσεκαν ἀμπλακεῖς. (F.Π.23-28)

This, to judge from its size and position, is to be the true climax of the segment. Once again, the passage is unified by the repetition of a key word, this time that of γυναικῶν... γυναῖκες (vv.23&27). Aural jingles help to emphasise the women’s guilt - ἔργα... ἄγρια, ἄχος... ἀλόχους. It is, in fact, the emotional consequences of the women’s action, and not the musical or poetic ones, that seem to be the focus of the segment. In the Hesiodic Catalogue, too, it was the people’s stories that mattered more than the cultural background that gave rise to them.

While the segmentation of the Erotes was given a Hesiodic precedent through the use of initial formula, a summary of an elegy on Teiresias by ‘Sostratus’ shows

---

the apparent segmentation of a narrative concerning a single figure (SH 733). The summary occurs as one of a number of versions of the Teiresias myth given by Eustathius, and there is no reason to suppose that it records more than the poem’s most salient points. Even from the outline, however, we can tell that the piece was a witty and unusual version of the myth, telling of Teiresias’ six sex changes and eventual metamorphosis into a mouse. Each episode appears to draw on the traditions underlying a different myth - only one of which was originally to do with Teiresias.

\[\text{...Teiresias...}\]

The mountain-roaming maiden, whether huntress, bacchante, or friend of the nymphs, is a familiar motif of Greek myth, and a familiar target for rape or abductions. It has been seen as an expression of the liminal state of a girl reaching sexual maturity. They may have viewed things differently in the ancient world,\(^28\) but seven still seems a little young. It is, however, also the number of times she is transformed, as well as being in other versions the number of lifetimes granted to him by Zeus, and the number of years he lived as a woman (Ovid \textit{Met.} 3.326-27).\(^29\) The story of the broken bargain is in essence that of Cassandra (Aesch. \textit{Ag.} 1202-13), who promised marriage to Apollo after a situation of near rape, but then changed her mind.\(^30\) Teiresias’ story thus draws on that of another seer, but with the essential differences of the nature of the bargain and the punishment. As the text stands, Apollo taught Teiresias μουσική, rather than the expected μαντική. Emendation has been proposed, on the grounds

\(^{28}\) O’Hara \(1996\) 183 n.14.
\(^{29}\) See Wagner \((1892)\) 133; O’Hara \((1996)\) 183.
that Eustathius is not always accurate: shortly before this he attributes to Callimachus a story in which Teiresias was blinded after seeing Artemis, not Athena, in her bath.\footnote{31}{Wagner (1892) 134; Brisson (1976) 85; O'Hara (1996) 184.}

That mistake, however, was due to the association of ideas with the Actaeon myth. But in this context μουσική is not the word that comes most naturally to mind; while Apollo as a teacher of music is unremarkable, both the topic of Teiresias and the parallel with Cassandra make teaching prophecy more likely. It has been remarked that while we hear of her gift of prophecy being revoked after her trial for the killing of Glyphios, we do not hear of the initial grant. It is possible, however, that it occurred in the original poem, perhaps after the judgement between Zeus and Hera,\footnote{32}{See Wagner (1892) 134.} but was not mentioned in the summary. Above all, the essential nature of the piece is the unexpected reworking of motifs. For Apollo to teach music rather than prophecy would be a part of this.

The punishment imposed by Apollo looks forward to the established element of Teiresias' career, the judgement about sexual pleasure, and that episode assumes that she did have sexual encounters as a man, but none of these appear in the summary. The punishment demands that Teiresias' 'experience of love' should be the frustrated passion that she had inflicted upon Apollo - an erotic lex talionis. The curse does not, however, seem from the summary to be fulfilled. As a woman she is from then on able to ward off unwelcome advances, and when she herself falls in love the affairs appear to be consummated without difficulty. Aphrodite's attempt to make her look unlovable is also foiled by the intervention of Beauty.\footnote{33}{Cf. Brisson (1976) 90.}

The next section told of the judgement about sexual pleasure in the quarrel between Zeus and Hera.
The first part of this, the best known part of the story, is condensed in the summary; one must assume that it was Hera who turned her (him) into a woman as a punishment, but as a punishment it seems weak - after all, she was born a woman. It has been observed that the traditional punishment of blinding is deflected on to her son, who is born with deformed vision. As with the penalty imposed by Apollo, the punishment is milder than in the mythical parallel. In fact, throughout the piece the gods are shown to be vengeful but ineffective, and working against each other’s wishes.

The next segment shows Teiresias made a man again, this time an ugly one, ‘monkey man’.

The insult to the goddess’s statue is again a motif borrowed from another myth, that of the Proetides who laughed at Hera’s statue and were sent mad and/or afflicted with a skin disease and hair loss. Once more, Teiresias has strayed into a myth where he does not belong, and once more, he escapes more lightly than the myth’s original protagonists.

Zeus turns him back into a women - a fourth sex-change. Wagner points to the irony that Zeus’ merciful action in transforming her into a desirable lady had disastrous consequences. In the fifth segment her neighbour, a lad called Glyphios,
tries to rape her at her bath, but is overpowered and throttled. Poseidon, whose 
erastes Glyphios was, sent the matter for trial by the Moerae, who turned her into 'Teiresias' and took away his/her power of prophecy.

Here in particular the normal mythic roles are reversed. In Callimachus it was Teiresias who unwittingly surprised Athena in her bath - here she is surprised in her own. Glyphios, Poseidon’s passive sexual partner, tries to take on an active role.\textsuperscript{37}
The odd 'made her Teiresias' may contain a further irony. It is thought to imply she assumed the traditional character of the venerable and distinguished old man,\textsuperscript{38} but an essential part of his character, the part that inspired most awe, was his power as a prophet. To be ‘Teiresias’ without prophecy is a paradox, although notably, in the summary at least, we never see her/him exercising this faculty.

While in the form of the older man Teiresias is described fulfilling the roles of youths in myth - becoming a pupil of Cheiron, like Jason, Achilles, and others,\textsuperscript{39} and playing the part of Paris in the judgement of beauty.

\[\textit{\textbf{O’Hara remarks that Cheiron’s teaching of prophecy instead of medicine can be compared to Apollo’s teaching music instead of prophecy.}}\textsuperscript{40}\]
expectations are defeated. The judgement of beauty adjusts the participants and outcome of the original myth in a way that must add to Aphrodite’s frustration. Normally Love wins because she can offer a good sex-life as a bribe. Here, however, as Wagner notes, she is placed in the hopeless position of having to contend in beauty with Beauty personified. And if the punishments so far have been weaker than in the original myths, here the consequence is comically bathetic. Paris’ judgement of beauty led to the Trojan War because of Hera’s anger. Teiresias’ judgement results in his brief transformation into an unattractive old woman.

The play with tradition is complemented by a ‘learned’ re-reading of Homer’s text. The Grace who is Hephaestus’ consort in the Iliad has the epithet καλή: Sostratus turns this from a beautiful Grace into a Grace named ‘Beauty’.

\[ \text{τίν \ δὲ \ ἵδε \ προμολούσσα \ Χάρις \ λιπαροκρήδημος} \\
\text{καλή, \ τίν \ ὃπιυε \ περικλυτός \ ἀμφιγυηείς} \]  
\( \text{I.I. 18.382-3} \)

Pasithea, another of Sostratus’ Graces, is in the Iliad the nymph promised to Sleep as a bribe by Hera (I.I. 14.267ff.). This allusion recalls the promise of Helen as a bribe to Paris. Aphrodite thus has to contend with Beauty, a bribe similar to the one she would normally offer, and Euphrosyne, ‘Wisdom’, who perhaps takes the role of Athena in the original contest. The role of Hera is all that is left for Aphrodite.

Once again, it is an attempt to ameliorate another god’s spite that leads to disastrous consequences. The beauty given to Teiresias by Beauty makes Arachnus fall in love with her, and then boast that he had slept with Aphrodite. They are changed into a mouse and a weasel, eternal enemies.

\[ \text{τίν \ δὲ \ Καλὴν \ χάριτις \ αὐτῇ \ ἀγαθὰς \ νεῖμαι \ καὶ \ εἰς \ Κρήτην} \]
This too is a familiar motif: similar offences were committed by Ceyx and Alcyone, and Aedon and Polytechnus (A.L.11), both of whom compared their love to that of Zeus and Hera. Ceyx and Alcyone were transformed into birds; Aedon and Polytechnus had their love transformed into enmity. Both motifs occur here. It is Arachnus’ eventual form that is the surprise. The obvious etymological creature for him to be transformed into is the spider. Expectations are defeated once again.

The metamorphosis action seems, in comparison to the general run of such passages, to require too much extra information.

In general, the aetia in metamorphosis stories draw on events and traits shown in the story before the transformation: thus in Nicander the Meleagrides mourn every year as birds, because they were mourning before they were transformed (A.L.2); Boios tells how Boulis became a heron that eats the eyes of fish and birds, because she had tried to put out her son’s eyes (A.L.5), and the cannibal Agrios was turned into a flesh-eating vulture (A.L.21). The first part of the Teiresias action, why the mouse eats little, seems bathetic, and the mouse as a weather prophet was not apparently foreshadowed by anything that went before. While there may have been episodes of prophecy not mentioned by the summary, weather lore seems unlikely to have been among them. Teiresias’ gift, moreover, never seems to have saved him/her

---

44 Some metamorphoses are more general, with characters turned into ill-omened birds for committing ill-omened acts.
misfortune. That Teiresias’ powers should only receive this tiny memorial is of a piece with the deliberate inconcinnity of the work as a whole.

From the summary it thus appears that the elegy offered a mythological game of consequences: motifs from different tales are lifted from their contexts and juxtaposed. Teiresias experiences most of the stages in life of men and women - girl, man, mother, ugly man, nubile woman, old man and old woman - as well as committing a range of offences against the god - a broken promise, unwitting offences (the two judgements), blasphemy (insulting Hera’s statue), killing a god’s favourite, and being involved in a partner’s blasphemy. Rather than the catalogue form assembling different narratives showing these motifs, as in other Kollektivgedichte, they are all forced into the story of a single figure. A segmented effect must have been created by the number of changes and different types of narrative. Each leads into the next with a comically contrived feel: the normal tragic conclusions to the stories of those who offend the gods are transmuted into sex-changes that pave the way for still more offences, until Aphrodite has her revenge at last. The catalogue form and rhythm would have contributed to the comic effect, emphasising the number of changes in Teiresias’ hyperbolically bizarre career. In all, this represents a clever variation of the types of segmentation observed in the Hesiodic Catalogue, where major sagas were mentioned piecemeal and focalised through different figures. Here, a single figure is used to focalise motifs from different myths.

The identity of the Sostratus said to have written the piece has been questioned. O’Hara details five potential solutions, and expresses his preference for the first century BC author Sostratus of Nysa,\(^45\) who could be identified with the

\(^{45}\) O’Hara (1996) 198-212.
Sostratus (or Sosicrates) of Phanegoria said to have written the *Ehoioi*.\(^{46}\) Opinion as to whether the *Teiresias* was originally part of the *Ehoioi* is divided. Cameron judges that the material of the *Teiresias* would fit nicely with that of the *Ehoioi*, but Lightfoot expresses due caution, because the piece has its own separate title.\(^{47}\) If it did belong to the *Ehoioi* and the whole work were composed of similar myths, it must have risked being rather unwieldy, with such catalogues branching in all directions from the stem of the poem. If, on the other hand, the *Teiresias* was a virtuoso piece, perhaps a final flourish to the poem, its form, a list of transformations, might reflect on that of the whole work.

### 3.3 Curse Poetry

Of all *Kollektivgedichte*, curse poetry is the form with the least outward connection to Hesiod in general, and the *Catalogue of Women* in particular. Curses had a varied background, being part of certain public rituals, as well as appearing on tombs to ward off grave robbers, and taking the form of *defixiones*.\(^{48}\) From an early stage they also occurred in literature: a number of brief examples occur in Homeric poetry, such as the curse made against anyone who should break the truce in *Iliad* 3.\(^{49}\)

Curses survive in a number of archaic texts, including the ‘Strasbourg Epode’, and also in tragedy, such as Ajax’ curses in Sophocles’ eponymous play (835ff., 1175ff., 1389-92).\(^{50}\) They were, then, common literary topics that had a parallel in everyday

---


\(^{49}\) Ζεύ κύδιστε μέγιστε, καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι,

ōπτότεροι πρότεροι ὑπὲρ δρίκαι πτιμήσαν,

οὸδὲ οὐ’ ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδες ῥέοι ὡς ὡδὲ ὠνόσ,

αὐτῶν καὶ τεκέων, ἄλοχοι ὃ’ ἄλλοι δαμεῖν.” (3.298-301)

\(^{50}\) Cf. Watson (1991) 54-79.
life. Some, non-literary ones in particular, seem to have been quite all-embracing, denying the recipient a place on land or sea, offspring of his own, livelihood or use of his property, proper burial, and so forth. There is little evidence, however, for the presence of mythological paradigmata in such pieces, let alone substantial lists of them.

When analysing the Hellenistic curse poems, Watson points to the contemporary trend of developing forms already present in poetry into poetic subjects in their own right, such as metamorphosis and aetiology, and he also suggests that the apparent interest in versifying popular forms, as witnessed by Herodas’ development of the mime, may be relevant. Either attitude, or both, could indeed account for the Hellenistic expansion of the form. In addition, Watson attributes the use of the catalogue form to the Hellenistic fondness for the style, as it was a means of loosely associating a considerable amount of material while avoiding regularity of construction. This latter point is something of a commonplace when Kollektivgedichte is discussed: Hellenistic poets wrote catalogue poems because they were fond of writing catalogue poems. It is, however, both possible and desirable to be a little more specific. While for Phanocles the reasons why the catalogue form and the Hesiodic style were chosen may have been owing to the appeal exerted by the themes and nature of the narratives in the Catalogue of Women, in the Teiresias the catalogue form seems likely to have been used to increase the sense of hyperbole and to emphasise the discontinuity of the different myths applied to the protagonist. In Hermesianax F.7P., on the other hand, the form was given fresh energy by involving the audience in the process of cataloguing. In curse poetry, too, the poet’s voice (or

---

that of an inset speaker) is prominent. The myths are given a clear application, and their accumulation is in part a way of demonstrating the poet's (simulated) rage.

The anonymous *Tattoo Elegy* has the longest legible fragment of the surviving Hellenistic curse poems. Its form combines repeated 'Hesiodic' formulae with Homeric diction and an opening that may allude to epic catalogues.\(^{53}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{1. π. [. .]. μνήσομαι άοίδαι} \\
\text{1. [. .]. ές τε πυρί φλέγομαι} \\
\text{μνώτον στίζω μέγαν Εὐρυτίων}
\end{align*}
\]

'Αμφίτρωων νά σανίμον ὑπὸ χερσίν. (1.3-7 Huys)

μνήσομ' άοίδης is a formula that ends many of the *Homeric Hymns*, promising a further song.\(^{54}\) It is recalled twice by Apollonius at the beginning of the *Argonautica* - 'Αρχόμενος σέο, Φοίβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτών / μνήσομαι (1.1-2) in his brief invocation, and πρώτα νυν 'Ορφήος μνησόμεθα (1.23) at the beginning of his catalogue of Argonauts.\(^{55}\) In the *Tattoo Elegy*, the promise of future song is retained, but the formula is adapted so that other, apparently unspecified bards are to recall something. It is not easy, however, to tell how the phrase fits with the catalogue that follows: it cannot directly introduce the mythological scenes, for those are heralded by the poet himself.\(^{56}\) It could, perhaps, promise that his treatment of the offender will be so drastic as to be worthy of epic song. The epic connotations give the act of cursing, as well as the subject matter of the curses themselves, both epic dimensions and a sense that they will be worthy of traditional remembrance. All this implies the seriousness of the recipient's fault and the author's intention to punish him, but this is immediately undercut. In general, curse poems consist of a recital of


\(^{54}\) *HH* 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 19, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33.

\(^{55}\) Apollonius may also have been reflecting part of the invocation before the *Catalogue of Ships* - μνησαίαθ' ὑπὸ Ἶλιον Ἴλαβον (II. 2.492).

\(^{56}\) E.g. στίζω δ' ἐν κοιρήτι (II.4)
mythological disasters in which the recipient is to replace the traditional victim;\textsuperscript{57} here, however, such instances of divine reprisal are merely to be tattooed on the recipient’s body. The recipient is to be treated as if he were a slave:\textsuperscript{58} he isn’t worth the gods’ attention; but as the gods punish sinners, he is to be sure he’ll be punished too. The scenes are thus both a warning to him, and, through their being tattooed onto him, a punishment in themselves.

Interpretation of ως τε πυρὶ φλέγομαι (I.2) is complicated by the fact that when the phrase πυρὶ φλέγομαι appears elsewhere in this sedes (AP 5.139.6, 12.89.4) the context is an erotic one,\textsuperscript{59} and Hutchinson suggests that love may be the cause of the poet’s anger.\textsuperscript{60} There is no way of knowing, however, what the recipient’s supposed offence was: II. 12-3 seems to imply that a definite crime was committed rather than the curse being the result of generalised hatred or sexual jealousy. φλέγομαι does occur in contexts of passionate anger as well as love (Soph. OC. 1695; Ar. Nub. 992) and this sense may be more suitable here.

In the scenes described the crimes and punishments vary. In the first, the centaur Eurytion is in the process of being punished for attempted rape. Heracles is depicted in the act of smashing his skull into splinters, while Athena assists. What seems thus to have been a gruesome description was followed by three more measured lines describing Dike:

\begin{verbatim}
μειδησεν [δ]ε Δίκη παρθένος ἀθάνατος,
ητ’ ἀναπτιταμενοις ἀτενές βλέπετι ὁφθαλμοῖσιν,
ἐν δὲ Διὸς Κρ[ο] νιδεω στήθεσιν ἐθριὰ[ε]ι
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{(II.1-3)}

\textsuperscript{57} See Watson (1991) 84-88
\textsuperscript{58} Watson (1991) 120.
\textsuperscript{60} Hutchinson (1992) 484.
The picture is an allegory of Zeus’ ability to dispense justice, and yet the conception of Dike is a curious one: she is described looking and smiling, which suggests that she is viewed as an anthropomorphic goddess in her own right, yet that she is described sitting in the heart of Zeus suggests she is also seen as one of his personal attributes.

In the next segment the scene is not that of a single, violent punishment, but of an ongoing situation. Tantalus’ penalty is above all fear of further harm, as an immense stone hangs above his head. The scene is a threat of punishment, and the punishment itself is a threat. The crime this time was tattling about the gods’ affairs. Tantalus’ fall from a privileged status to disgrace gives point to the poet’s threats of inescapable justice:

```
ήεν καί Ζηνός παῖς νεφεληγερέος,
kai πλοῦτωι καί παισὶ μέγας καί τίμιος αὕτως,
άλλ’ οὐδ’ ὡς γλώσσῃ δοὺς χάριν ἀξινέτως
ποινὴν ἔξηλυζέ· σὺ δ’ ἐλπεῖα ἐκφευξέσθαι,
μήτη πούτο θεοίς ἀνδάνοι ἀθανάτοι[5] (II.9-13)
```

The third vignette seems to give pride of place to the Calydonian boar itself - σύταρ υπέρ ο’ ὀρφύων στίξω σὺν ἀφιόδοντα, (II.14). If this is the threat, however, it seems to be one that has been overcome, for Meleager has killed the boar. Nor does the material seem likely to give rise to a moralising conclusion in the way that the previous segments did, for the catalogue of hunters with which the fragment ends has little to do with either the punishment or the original fault. Huys considers it likely that the segment ended along with the fragment, and that the Dioscuri were the last hunters to be named.61 Column III, however, has 17 lines before a paragraphos and the word στίξω, giving ample space for a few more verses to

---

conclude the Calydonian section before the start of a new segment. The catalogue could thus have been extended to include Aethra's brothers, giving rise to a comment on their killing and Meleager's fate. This would look back to the message of II.9-13. Meleager thought he had ended the punishment, but worse was awaiting him.

As it stands, the piece is thus varied in the degree and nature of the action portrayed, while being unified through the theme of divine vengeance, and the consistent tone of traditional epic, supported by the many Homeric phrases. What above all gives the poem coherence is the presence of the poet - he intervenes to apply the vignettes to the recipient, he points morals and invites the readers to reflect upon the scenes as demonstrations of punishment. In this, curse poetry may be contrasted with the structure of other Kollektivgedichte. The fragments of Phanocles' work suggest no place for authorial intervention of this kind. If the poet was present in the Lyde and Leontion, he could have served to point the links between the narratives, but the energy of curse poetry would have been lacking; the myths in the Heteroioumena and the Ornithogonia may have been told towards a particular end, but the demonstrations of whatever the quasi-scientific argument may have been would have depended upon the response to the intricacies of the different situations presented in the tales and their significance. In the Tattoo Elegy, the myths are simpler, and their application relies upon ruthlessness rather than subtle interconnections.

The 'Hesiodic' formulae - the repeated στίξο - are thus extraneous to the poem's structure. The same, of course, could be said of the Ehoiae in the Catalogue of Women itself. The formulae help to mark boundaries while the listing of body parts may have provided an illusory sense of direction. Their presence may also be seen as

---

62 The early part of col. III is so damaged that any paragraphos after the Calydonian section must be lost.
a generic marker. While we cannot be sure how representative these pieces are, the presence of repeated initial formulae in Phanocles, Hermesianax and this elegy, along with their likely use in Sostratus’ *Ehoioi*, is indicative. Although these texts have different generic ancestries in many ways, the shared use of this form suggests that within *Kollektivgedichte* to a certain extent generic self-fashioning, at least on the level of outline form, may have taken place.

The most prolific author of curse poetry appears to have been Euphorion of Chalcis, who wrote at least three such works: the *Thrax, Chiliades*, and *Arai E Poteriokleptes*. Of these, we have the most evidence for the *Thrax*, while the surviving fragments of the *Chiliades* are pitifully scanty, especially when one considers Suidas’ notice:

Χιλιάδες ἔχει δὲ ὑπόθεσιν εἰς τοὺς ἀποστερήσαντας αὐτὸν χρήματα ἀ παρέθετο, ὡς δικήν δοιέν κἂν εἰς μακράν· εἶτα συνάγει διὰ χιλίων ἑτῶν χρημοὺς ἀποτελεοθέντας· εἰσὶ δὲ βιβλία ε’, ἐπιγράφεται δὲ ἡ πέμπτη χιλίας περὶ χρημῶν.

Van Groningen’s edition assigns six fragments to the *Chiliades*, three of them citations of single verses. A substantial fragment given to the poem in *SH* (418) is given by van Groningen and others to the *Dionysos* or the *Mopsopia* (see below).63

This is a poor haul for a five book work, and it has been suggested that the poem must have contained pieces known under different titles, in particular the *Arai* (over 20 titles of Euphorion are known), just as the *Coma Berenices* has its own title but was part of the *Aetia*.64 While not impossible, this may not be necessary: the survival of Hellenistic poetry is very much a matter of chance, and among the many unassigned fragments of Euphorion are a number that could have been used in a curse poem.65

---

64 Van Groningen (1977) 3-6.
The poem's hypothesis is noteworthy, in particular because it gives the ostensible reason for the curse (the only other Hellenistic example is the self-explanatory *Poteriokleptes*, 'Cup-thief'). The information that the poem contained prophecies fulfilled over a thousand years has caused puzzlement, but a plausible suggestion is that Euphorion, perhaps influenced by Pythagorean thought, considered the period from the beginning of myth to his own day to be a thousand years, and drew on myths throughout that period. An alternative interpretation points to the story of the Locrian maidens, sent as tribute to Troy for a thousand years in accordance with an oracle. The work appears to have been about oracles, rather than narratives told through oracles (as the *Alexandra* and *Apollo* were), but the combination of oracles and curses is a striking example of innovation within the genre. Magnelli suggests that Euphorion may have developed the marginal form of curse poetry so that it might gain a more solid literary status, and invokes the concept of *Kreuzung der Gattungen*. Within *Kollektivgedichte*, however, almost every poem differs from the others and seems to draw on techniques and motifs from other genres. As a non-canonical form, its boundaries were fluid. This explains in part why such a range of works are referred to by the same modern term: they shared and swapped structures in the course of their development along different routes.

It appears to have been a feature of curse poetry that the level of vehemence and types of punishment described were out of proportion to the alleged offence. This is also the case in the *Arai E Poteriokleptes*. If F.9P./11v.G. is rightly assigned to the poem, the curses drew on a wide variety of myths.

The recipient is cursed to suffer as Herse did, as Sciron’s victims did, to be shot by Artemis, aider in childbirth (a humiliating way for a man to die?), to bear Ascalaphus’ heavy stone in Hades. The brevity of the scenes contrasts with those of the Tattoo Elegy; the segments of the Chiliades may to the contrary have been quite long: it has been argued that the size of the work militates against the sort of cursory treatments found here. As in the Tattoo Elegy, the myths are examples of suffering, rather than of a specific type of offence or penalty. The target of the curses seems to be referred to in the third person - “May whoever stole my silver cup suffer as much as . . .” - rather than the more vivid direct address to the culprit found in the Thrax and Tattoo Elegy. Sciron’s punishment, however, is introduced not as one of the list of curses but as a quasi-spontaneous after-thought: “Or <may he be shattered> as much as travellers were shattered where Sciron plotted the shameful bath for his feet - it didn’t last long - caught by Aithra’s son he fed the tortoise.” A curse to suffer an unpleasant fate gives rise to an exemplum of punishment. This spontaneity may perhaps suggest the poet’s simulated rage. It is impossible to judge from such a small fragment whether the poem comprised such brief segments throughout, or whether longer passages were included.

The *Thrax* fragments seem to suggest that mythological narratives and direct addresses to the poem's target could vary considerably within a single piece, unlike the practice of Ovid's *Ibis* on the one hand and the *Tattoo Elegy* on the other. Isolated fragments mention Amphiaraus being carried away from battle by his horses, Cerberus being led up to earth, and a tomb by the crags of Myconos. We also possess three substantial fragments from the same papyrus. The first, A (*SH* 413), tells, possibly at some length, the story of Harpalyce and Clymenos, a tale of incest, slaughter, cannibalism and metamorphosis. Fragment B (*SH* 414) mentioned the Peliades, Tereus, and some women with a sharp sickle; in its left hand margin was a scholion referring to Crisos and Panopeus, so that tale either occurred after the Clymenos story, or fragment B preceded A and Crisos and Panopeus appeared in a column that is wholly lost. The final fragment, C (*SH* 415), first mentioned disastrous marriages in quick succession, including those of Leipephile and Semiramis, before telling the story of Apriate and Trambelos at greater length. The next segment contained the story of a shipwreck, almost wholly lost. When the final column begins, we have left the narratives, and the poet speaks of Pandora, bringer of troubles to men, Themis, and Dike. As an example of the workings of Dike the story of events on the Echinades Islands is introduced: Comaetho's betrayal of her father, which would not have occurred if the Teleboeans had not forcibly taken the Islands. The poem ends abruptly, bidding farewell to a murdered man(?) in no more than five lines.

It has been noted that a number of these myths involve murder within the family. This has suggested that the myths were chosen to fit the situation supposed by the finale. Such a use of material would contrast that of the other curse poems seen so
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far. It seems unlikely, however, to have been uniform throughout the poem: it is at any rate hard to see how Amphaiarus, Cerberus, and the shipwreck would fit into this pattern. Fragments A and B, if ordered one after the other, appear to show a situation in which a myth given substantial treatment (Harpalyce and Clymenos) was followed by briefer allusions to better known myths on a similar theme (Crisos and Panopeus, the Peliades, Tereus). Verse 10 appears to contain a second person address, and the preceding verse could be supplemented so as to constitute a threat to the poem’s target:

ως ἄν μὴ ληθοῖς
tώι σε παρακλ inh (SH 414.9-10)

It is possible that something similar occurs in fr.C.I: brief examples of fatal marriages are followed by the more detailed story of Apriate and Trambelos. The marriage theme appears to commence at, or have already begun by, the beginning of the fragment. άφυσόσμενος and οδωρ in 2-3 have been linked to the nuptial bath,

and the first discernible phrase - κενεν' μ[ε]τά λέκτρον' ἱκοι - is an obvious curse addressed to a second person. Lines 6-14 are clearer.

ά]λλα 혹 γ' ακ[ ] δι[ ]ων δαίσα[ις γάμον ἡεφ[ ]...].ρος
η Ἱρωκείδας δαϊρασας ἱολάου
"Ακταρ Λειτεφίλην θ[α]λ[ε]ρ[η]ν μυήσαιο τύγατρα,
καὶ δὲ σ´ ἔρασιμο[ν] άνδρα Σεμιέραμισ ἀγκάσαιτο
δ' φρα [οι] εὐόδιμοι [π]αρὰ πρόδομον θα[λάμοι]ο
παρθενίωι [χλαρικτα ποδι κροτέωι [ ]...].ε[]
η υύ τ[ο]ι Ἀπριάτης [ ] λεύξω γάμον ὦκ[ ]...].α[ ]...]
εἰς ἀλα δειμήμασα κατ´ [α]γιλίπος θόρε πέτρης (SH 415 1.6-14)

The whole passage up to verse 12 is a curse in direct speech, telling the recipient to go after an empty marriage bed, woo Leipephile and be embraced as a “dear” husband by Semiramis; but in verse 12 a first person is introduced, and the meaning of the

72 Barigazzi (1947) 58.
word in question depends upon the initial letter to be supplied (⌜]ευξω). It is commonly given as [τ]ευξω - I will prepare the marriage bed of Apriate for you,\textsuperscript{73} or left as ευξω - "pour sûr, tu as souhaité un mariage avec Apriaté comme Trambélos, qui en a subi les tristes conséquences."\textsuperscript{74} All the supplements involve a rather abrupt change of tone, a heightening of emotion as the speaker’s own feelings are emphasised. ευξω could just pass as being Euphorion’s exclamation to his addressee, but [τ]ευξω has been understood as a quotation of Apriate’s words before she jumps. Some commentators have been led as a result to consider that the whole of the previous speech is to be placed in Apriate’s mouth,\textsuperscript{75} although it has been pointed out the verse 12 could stand by itself as Apriate’s speech and create a dramatic beginning to the telling of her story.\textsuperscript{76}

The manner in which curses are inserted into the poem thus varies. It has been remarked that the target of verses 6-11 is not simply told to marry ‘some Leipephile’ or ‘a new Semiramis’, but, with greater vehemence and immediacy, is told to marry Leipephile and Semiramis themselves.\textsuperscript{77} Such brief, directly applied curses, contrast the more developed narratives elsewhere. The pace of the poem would thus vary, and, if the verses are not an inset speech, curses desiring the recipient to suffer a certain mythological fate would be varied by direct orders for him to play a part in the paradigmatic myths themselves. In the Apriate section, however, which should then be supposed to be the culmination of the series, the woman does not attack her man, and it is rather Trambelos who is the aggressor; Apriate kills herself in desperation

\textsuperscript{73} Vitelli & Norsa (1935) 9; Lobel (1935a) 67; Page (1941) 494. Latte (1935) 141 has also suggested [q]ευξω.
\textsuperscript{74} van Gröningen (1977) 76.
\textsuperscript{75} Latte (1935) 138; Page (1941) 494.
\textsuperscript{76} Bartoletti (1957) 38.
\textsuperscript{77} Watson (1991) 86.
and Trambelos’ death is the result of her curse. The section is thus a poor fit if it is to be the climax of the previous tales.

However it is read, the passage demonstrates the fusion of two different modes of curse poetry, or two different densities of catalogue. The short catalogue could be seen as the condensation of the normal form into a style that is explicit about what the longer narratives in the sequence leave implicit - the piling up of disasters as a threat. It is noticeable, however, that references to Dike are absent from the little catalogue. The addressee is commanded to serve as the victim in the tales of evil wives, rather than to serve as a character who is justly punished, or who suffers as the result of a curse. This is perhaps an argument in favour of placing the passage in Apriate’s mouth - the powerless woman is wishing her male aggressor were in a situation in which their roles were reversed, and he himself were helpless before a member of the opposite sex.

\(\xi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\sigma^{o}v\epsilon\) (v.I.19) could be read in three possible ways. The families of Achilles and Trambelos were in a kind of guest-friend relationship, so that while Achilles was not literally Trambelos’ guest, the word could still apply to him; it could refer to whatever scenario was involved in the next section; or it could be Euphorion’s address to the poem’s recipient. Its emphatic position in the verse perhaps rules out its being applied to Achilles, who was not truly or deliberately guilty. If it is addressed to the poem’s recipient, it would indicate that, as in the Tattoo Elegy, the segments were united by the poet’s scorn, anger, or desire for vengeance. Just as the Tattoo Elegy related its myths to the personification of Dike, so too the Thrax concludes with such a passage, apparently a feature of curse poetry,
which makes the omission of any sense of justice in the little catalogue the more striking.

This passage also demonstrates further ways in which myths were inserted into the poem. The tale is presented as an example of the workings of Dike, rather than as something which the recipient is cursed to suffer. The Comaetho story - a paradigm of a serious crime and its punishment - is itself presented as a punishment for an earlier fault, the attack by the Teleboans.

The poem concludes with an apostrophe to the supposed recipient’s victim.

The change from the last myth to this sepulchral style is rather abrupt, and this perhaps suggests that throughout the poem the connections between segments worked through an inferred logic rather than through obvious directions by the poet. The brevity and obscurity of these lines have caused some commentators to suggest that the victim was a pet dog, and the presence of the Hippokoon tale (29v.G.) has been mentioned in support of this. It is not impossible that the piece was a hyperbolic reaction to a relatively trivial fault, but these two reasons should be received with caution. As we do not have the introduction to the Thrax, we are unable to tell to what

---

extent Euphorion dwelt on the motivation for the curse. The story of the killing of Hippocoon's dog, provoking violent revenge, while it could be a reflection of the reason for the curse, need not be any more so than the tales of Harpalyce or Apriate.

The different techniques used in joining the narratives in the *Thrax* show that the poem had a more sophisticated structure than is generally assumed for *Kollektivgedichte*. While the little catalogues suggest an alignment with catalogue elegy, the concluding piece in particular demonstrates that the poem did not have a simple catalogue structure throughout - there is a clear thread of thought running through the Dike allegory, the Teleboan segment, and the epitaph. It is noticeable that the poem has little relationship to the 'Hesiodic', segmented style of much of the rest of *Kollektivgedichte*. It might be questioned whether in the *Thrax* the curse poem form has diversified away from a 'Hesiodic' origin, or whether in the *Tattoo Elegy* a separate curse poem form was 'crossed' with the model of Hellenistic catalogue elegy. In the *Arai E Poteriokeptes* certain phrases might be seen as 'Hesiodic style formulae': ἕ σοσον (v.6) . . . ἕ καί (v.10). These do not however provide conclusive evidence. They do not introduce every curse, and might be seen rather as focusing pointers by the poet (even the use of such pointers, though, must to a certain extent recall the Hesiodic *Catalogue*). In truth, as will become increasingly clear, *Kollektivgedichte* as a whole are marked by a certain degree of generic indeterminacy. *Kreuzung der Gattungen* comes close to being a canonical feature of much Hellenistic poetry; these works, standing as they do outside the canon, draw on the forms of existing genres without having a well-defined character of their own to modify.
3.4 Metamorphosis Poetry

From the number of titles that are preserved, it appears that metamorphosis poetry must have been a sub-genre in its own right, but, apart from Ovid’s Metamorphoses, almost none survives. We have the most evidence for Nicander’s Heteroioumena and Boios’ (or Boio’s) Ornithogonia, which was apparently translated by Aemilius Macer,79 but in addition Antigonus of Carystus wrote an Alloioseis,80 and Metamorphoses are attributed to Dorotheus, Didymarchus, Theodoros, Callisthenes of Olynthus, and Nestor of Laranda, although the identity and indeed existence of these authors and works remains obscure.81 Parthenius is also said to have written a Metamorphoses, but it is uncertain whether this was in verse or prose.82 Finally, there is a newly published papyrus elegy (P.Oxy. 4711): this appears to have told a number of stories of metamorphosis (Adonis, Asterie, Hylos). The papyrus is very late (sixth century AD) and the editor has suggested that the poet may be Parthenius, as the work of lesser poets is unlikely to have survived.83 One must remember, however, that we know next to nothing about many of the authors of metamorphosis poetry, and there may well have been others who have now disappeared from view.

The bulk of what we know about the Heteroioumena and Ornithogonia, and thus about metamorphosis poetry in general, derives from Antoninus Liberalis’ Metamorphoseon Synagoge. The nature of this source and its annotations requires

79 Ov. Trist 4.10.43f.; Quintilian 10.1.58.
80 For the confusion over the identity of Antigonus see Wilamowitz (1881) 169-173; Dorandi (1999) xiff.
81 Callisthenes is mentioned in [Plut.] Par. Min. 5 and Dorotheus in [Plut] Par. Min 25, existence questioned by Lafayette (1904) 27; Nestor mentioned by Suidas on Parthenius, see Lightfoot (1999) 164-5. Theodorus ([Plut.] Par. Min. 22; Prob. in Verg. Georg. 1.399; Pollux 4.53; Athen. 14.618c) and Antigonus (Athen. 3.82a-b) may date from the republican or early imperial eras - Lafayette (1904) 36f. Didymarchus mentioned only by manchette to Antoninus 23.
82 Crump (1931) 106; Lightfoot (1999) 38, 164, 248.
83 Henry (2005) 47
consideration. It was transmitted along with Parthenius’ *Erotika Pathemata*, which itself is an important source for a number of *Kollektivgedichte*. The works were preserved together in a single manuscript, the margins of which contain notes of the sources for the majority of tales. The similar form of the two works means that they are usually considered together. The *Erotika Pathemata*, however, dates to the first century BC, while Antoninus’ date is uncertain, but is probably second century AD. The different eras, attitudes and abilities of the authors should indicate a need to differentiate their handling of their sources. There are, however, some factors common to both, most notably the question of the manchettes. It is held to be unlikely that these derive from the authors themselves, but where it is possible to check them, it has been found that the works cited tell the story in question, but not necessarily exactly the same version as that in Antoninus or Parthenius. The word used in the citations - ἴστορεῖ - need imply no more than that the story in question has a parallel in the work mentioned. In addition, it has been queried whether by the time the manchettes were added the texts cited would have survived in full, or merely have been known through epitomes and handbooks. Identification of sources may thus have been difficult for even a diligent annotator, since the nuances between variants could have been obliterated in the process of summarisation.

The sources cited for both texts are Hellenistic with only a few exceptions. They are drawn from works on metamorphosis and ethnography, but also prose treatises and elegies. The pre-Hellenistic sources that do occur - Hesiod, Sophocles, Pherecydes and Aristotle - are each cited only once. The contrast with the papyrus dictionary of metamorphoses published by Renner calls attention to the limited nature

84 Lightfoot (1999) 249.
85 Lightfoot (1999) 249. Copies of obscure works could however have persisted in the great libraries even when there is no evidence that the works were in general circulation or widely read.
of this range of sources, for there the sources are mainly Hesiodic, occasionally Aeschylean. It is noticeable, moreover, that Ovid never makes an appearance in the scholia to Antoninus, and nor indeed, so far as we can tell, do Antoninus’ versions of the myths appear to have been affected by him. Other notable absences are Callimachus and Lycophron. The former’s absence is especially surprising as Antoninus’ first story, that of Ctesylla, is a variant of Callimachus’ Acontius and Cydippe story, and is explicitly presented as such in the text. The manchette names instead the third book of Nicander’s Heteroioumena. So much is common ground, but the range of sources differs between the two collections. Parthenius drew broadly on ethnographical writing, whether verse or prose, and rarely used the same work more than once or twice. Antoninus Liberalis, by contrast, drew on far fewer authors, and the manchettes are dominated by references to Nicander’s Heteroioumena and Boios’ Ornithogonia.

Parthenius’ Erotika Pathemata began with a preface to Gallus that included a statement about the purpose and nature of the tales:

Μάλιστα σοι δοκῶν ἁρμόττειν, Κορνῆλιε Γάλλε, τὴν ἄθροισιν τῶν ἔρωτικῶν παθημάτων, ἀναλεξάμενος ὡς οὕτι μάλιστα ἐν βραχυτάτοις ἀπέσταλκα. τὰ γὰρ παρὰ τις τῶν ποιητῶν κείμενα τούτων, μή αὐτοτελῶς λελεγμένα, κατανοήσεις ἐκ τῶν δὲ τὰ πλέοντα, αὐτῷ τε σοὶ παρέσται εἰς ἔπη καὶ ἔλεγχας ἀνάγειν τὰ μάλιστα ἐς αὐτῶν ἁρμοδία. (μηδὲ) διὰ τὸ μὴ παρεῖναι τὸ περίττον αὐτῶς, δὴ ὅπερ μετέχη, χείρον περὶ αὐτῶν ἐννοήσης. οἶονε γὰρ ὑπομονήματος τρόπων αὐτά συνελεξάμεθα, καὶ σοὶ νυνὶ τὴν χρῆσολ όμοιαν, ὡς ἑοίκε, παρέξεται.

The details here should urge caution in projecting the summarised tales back onto the sources. Parthenius makes it plain that the stories he gives were not treated as tales in their own right by his sources. He is providing a source-book of material for poetry, a

---

86 Renner (1978) 278-293.
87 Η μὲν οὖν Κητήουλα ἀπέρριψε τὸ μῆλον αἰδεσθείσα καὶ χαλεπῶς ἤνεγκεν, ὡσπερ ὅτε Κυδίττην Ἀκόντιος ἔξηπάτησε. (Met. 1)
collection of useful variants, and not an epitome of existing works. It has been suggested, for instance, that as Gallus might be expected to be familiar with Euphorion in the original, Parthenius would have recorded expanded versions of tales touched upon by his source, as a commentary upon them.  

Parthenius' use of sources is far more self-conscious than that of Antoninus. At times he quotes extensively from other Hellenistic versions, he mentions the different variants of the myths, and he also responds to the myths by composing verses of his own on their themes. On the occasions, therefore, when the manchettes seem to contradict the sources which Parthenius himself cites, they could perhaps be seen as presenting supplementary information. The scholiast does not seem unaware of the difference between the sources he mentions and the text in front of him. For Parthenius' Herippe tale the manchette records that Aristodemus' version used different names for the characters.  

For the story of Antheus (E.P. 14), the manchette cites Aristotle and Milesian writers, whereas after recording the fact that there are variants Parthenius quotes from Alexander Aetolus' Apollo at such length that its presence could not have been overlooked by the annotator. For whatever reason, he chose to mention the earlier treatments instead, perhaps, but by no means necessarily, to signal what he thought to be the original source for the tale.  

The treatment of sources implied by the preface can be demonstrated by the tale of Apriate, for on this occasion we have the source cited by the annotator preserved on papyrus (E.P. 26 (ιστορεῖ Εὐφορίων Θραίκη) = SH 415). Parthenius gives two versions: in the first Trambelos murders Apriate on being repulsed by her, "others however" he goes on "say that being chased, she threw herself in". The

89 'Ιστορεῖ Αριστόδημος ὁ Νουσαῖς ἐν α' Ιστοριῶν περὶ τούτων, πλὴν ὃτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑπαλλάττει ἀντὶ Ὑρίππης καλῶν Εὐθυμίαν, τὸν δὲ βάρβαρον Καυάραν. (E.P. 8)
manchette might be expected to refer to the first and apparently main version, but instead it is the suicide version which corresponds to that in Euphorion's *Thrax*. Parthenius' version is far more expanded than that of Euphorion. It sets the scene to a greater extent, and there is a greater amount of detail concerning Trambelos' presence on the island and his death at the hands of Achilles. The extent to which we have the narratives out of context by receiving them through a summary becomes clear. In Parthenius' version the story of Apriate appears as a tragic romance, and while the idea is present, there is less emphasis on the death of Trambelos as retribution for the woman's death.

Parthenius' sources might have been thoroughly appropriated into their new context, but the same relationship between source and summary should not be assumed for Antoninus. Unlike Parthenius, Antoninus never provides variant accounts or quotes verse, and he seems to have imposed a technique and theme upon his sources without adjusting their individual emphases. For at least the first three-quarters of the collection, there is a consistent emphasis on the correct behaviour towards the gods and the punishment of any transgressors, while the narratives tend to begin with rather specific information about the place in which the story is set and the characters' lineage. At the same time, differences between the stories attributed to Boios and to Nicander recur: those of Nicander feature as deities nymphs and the lesser Olympians, and in addition the metamorphoses tend to end with an aetion (often cult or ritual) that is given in a fair amount of detail. Those of Boios, on the other hand, principally feature the major divinities, and show an interest in the sensational, frequently featuring unnatural love such as incest and necrophilia.

cannibalism, and monsters such as man-eating donkeys and horses,\(^91\) details of transformations into birds were given at length. The tale of Arceophon (39), attributed to Hermesianax, shows itself to be different in nature to the summaries of Nicander and Boios. Although it begins, like the others, with fairly full biographical details, the erotic aspects of the myth receive considerably more attention, and the role of the gods is greatly reduced. The details of courtship are typical of an elegiac lover: Arceophon serenades Arsinoe’s house, promises gifts, and tries to bribe the nurse, before letting himself pine away. Unusually for the collection, no action appears at the end of the story - we are simply told that the princess turned to stone - and yet we know from other sources that this myth explained a temple of ‘Aphrodite who Peeps Out’, and may also have been connected to sacred prostitution on Cyprus.\(^{92}\) Antoninus’ summaries, therefore, may be said to show something of the nature of their sources.

According to Suidas, Nicander’s *Heteroioumena* was in five books: this may be an error, for we have several stories attributed to each of books one to four, but no reference to book five at all. The tales in each book were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book 1</th>
<th>Book 3</th>
<th>Book Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cragaleus</td>
<td><em>Met.</em> 7.363ff.</td>
<td>1 Ctesylla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cerambus</td>
<td><em>Met.</em> 7.351ff.</td>
<td>2 Meleagrides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Batrus</td>
<td><em>Met.</em> 2.676ff.</td>
<td>12 Cyncus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Dryope</td>
<td><em>Met.</em> 9.329ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Wolf</td>
<td><em>Met.</em> 11.217ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Messapians</td>
<td><em>Met.</em> 14.512ff.</td>
<td>27 Iphigenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Typhon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Books 1 and 4 seem to display some geographical unity: stories in book 1 concern Thessaly, those in book 4 Boeotia and Attica. A thematic unity might also be detected: all the transformations into stone are in book 1, although this also has other types of transformation; book 3 has only transformations into birds, but for that we only have summaries of three tales.

The only verse fragment of more than a single line (fr.62) shows Nicander's style to have been rather dry and uninspiring. Assessments of the form and structure of the entire poem have not been complimentary:

It seems well that Nicandre n'avait fait aucun effort pour enchainer entre elles les diverses parties de la composition; le sujet presentait par lui-meme un grave defaut; le poete avait a rassambler un grand nombre de fables etrangeres les unes aux autres. (Lafaye (1904) 28.)

It is also difficult to imagine that such works as Nicander's Heteroioumena (Transformations) or Parthenius' Metamorphoses were essentially different from extant didactic or "collective" poems: the former seem to have been rather bald didactic (with the metamorphoses geographically arranged) and the latter a kind of Aitia specialising in *metamorphosis*. As for Boius' *Ornithogonia* (Origin of Birds) which Ovid's friend Macer put into Latin, it was quite clearly didactic of the narrowest sort (with the birds arranged by genera and species). Otis (1970) 48.

In truth, however, it is impossible to divine the structure of a poem for which we have only dismantled segments. We might discern some thematic play in book 1: the stories of Cragaleus (4) and Dryope (32) are both cult aetia, and the characters appear to have the same father; but Cragaleus is turned to stone, while the Dryope story contains a number of different transformations - Apollo into a tortoise, and then into a snake, Dryope into a nymph, and some girls into trees. The other stone metamorphoses in book 1 are that of Battus (23), which has an erotic pastoral setting in total contrast to the divine power struggle of Cragaleus' story, and that of the wolf in the Peleus legend (38). Nymphs, and girls changed into trees, recur in the tale of

93 Cf. Lafaye (1904) 28; Martini (1927) 171; Loehr (1996) 51.
Cerambus (22), but there the nymphs change him into a beetle for suggesting that Poseidon had changed them into trees so that he could have intercourse with their sister. Themes appear to have been brought together, separated, and reused. The geographical element could have been part of this, or it could have been part of a narrative vehicle that tied the tales together. Book 2 has two tragic erotic tales that end in cult actia (13: Aspalis & 26: Hylas), a story of a pious woman’s plea for her daughter’s sex-change (17: Leucippus), but also a tale of impiety and incest (30: Byblis), situated, like the former, in Crete, and in addition a tale of impiety that has no apparent sexual overtones (31: The Messapians). Book 4 similarly has a number of tales of impiety, contrasted by the pious self-sacrifice of Metoiche and Menippe (25) and Iphigenia (27).  

How one views the form and nature of the *Heteroioumena* has to depend upon whether one looks at the Ovidian reworking or at Nicander’s other texts. In *Heteroioumena* 4 a cluster of stories occur which in Ovid are linked together: the Emathides (9 = Pierides in Ovid *Met. 5.294ff.*) and their singing contest with the Muses, Ascalabus (24 = Stellio in *Met. 5.533-50*), changed into a lizard for calling Demeter greedy, and the metamorphosis of the gods into different animals before Typhon (28 = *Met. 5.318-58*). Ovid assigned the flight of the gods before Typhon to the song of the Pierides, while the Stellio story occurs as one of the many inset stories in the Muses’ response, the story of Persephone. In Antoninus these stories are widely separated, and the Emathides are juxtaposed instead with the Minyades (10), another group of young women who transgress in their behaviour towards the gods and are changed into birds. Another cluster of Nicandrean stories occurs in *Metamorphoses* 7, during Medea’s travelogue: it could be that the text is providing a periplous over the

---

95 *Pace* Schneider (1856) 44-5 who denied any sort of thematic connection between the tales.
metamorphic landscape of an earlier text. Martini posited that Nicander’s tales occurred within one another, and all within the story of the Pierides. It is perhaps unwise to attribute Ovid’s interweaving of stories to Nicander, although it is equally unhelpful to suppose that since, if Ovid’s complex of inset narratives were to be untangled, it would be artistically ruined, so the stories that Nicander told could not have been arranged in a satisfying way. The Leucippus story (17) may show that at least one of Nicander’s narratives did have inset tales: when Galatea prays for her daughter’s sex-change she gives four examples - Caeneus, Teiresias, Hypermestra and Siproites, and even in the summary there is sufficient detail to suggest that they were not merely alluded to. Whether Nicander regularly included such insets, however, let alone structured his whole poem through them, is unknowable.

Nicander’s two extant didactic works are both very simple in form. The *Alexipharmaca* is an encyclopaedia of the symptoms of poisons followed by lists of alternative remedies. The *Theriaca* falls into five parts - a subdivided section on the prevention of bites, an encyclopaedia of snakes, an encyclopaedia of herbal remedies for snake bites, an encyclopaedia of spiders, scorpions and other biting creatures, and an encyclopaedia of cures for their bites. In part, however, this form is imposed by the material in question. The majority of didactic poems include some lists as a means of setting out data effectively, but in these works there is no broader didactic argument underlying the lists as for the weather signals in the *Works and Days*, but they exist as self-standing teachings. The subject matter of the *Heteroioumena*, however, differs substantially. The *Alexipharmaca* and *Theriaca* maintained at least the fiction of practical usefulness. The metamorphosis stories in the *Heteroioumena* are

---

96 Martini (1927) 171; cf. Galinsky (1975) 103.  
97 Thus Schneider (1856) 45.
aetiological, with no practical applications. Moreover, it is often the metamorphosis that is important in the tales, and the action appears as an added motif with greatly varying degrees of emphasis. The didactic works did contain occasional ornamental passages, such as the description of the effect of drinking wine for the first time on the Silens (Alex. 30-34), or the metamorphosis of a boy into a gecko (Theriaca 483-487), but these are only very occasional interruptions. The combination of metamorphosis and cult aetia requires explanatory tales in a way which the snakes and herbal remedies did not, and the details in the stories are told for their own sake, rather than having worth only as part of an action. The description, for instance, of Dryope putting a tortoise down her dress only for it to turn into an amorous snake is not strictly necessary to an explanation of why women were barred from being present at a foot-race dedicated to the nymphs (32). Similarly, the three tasks that Cycnus demanded of Phyllius are described at a level of detail intended to be entertaining rather than to explain the metamorphosis (12).

The relationship between metamorphosis poetry and didactic thus appears problematic. If we did not know Nicander primarily as a didactic poet, it seems unlikely that we would associate what we know of the Heteroioumena with that genre. In content, for instance, it appears to stand far closer to paradoxographical writing.\textsuperscript{98} In her book on didactic poetry, Volk put forward four essential characteristics of the genre: indications of explicit didactic intent, a clear ‘teacher-student constellation’, ‘poetic self-consciousness’ and ‘poetic simultaneity’.\textsuperscript{99} All four, notably, depend upon the poet’s own generic self-positioning for the definition of the work as didactic. Nicander’s extant works in fact fell short of some of these

\textsuperscript{98} Cf. Fraser (1972) I.778; Zanker (1987) 118.
criteria, as he does not lay great stress on his own poetic activity. His prefaces are brief, recommending the utility of the information offered to the poem’s recipient. For the *Heteroioumena* we have no such prefatory material, but the subject matter is such that Nicander cannot have made the same statements about it. Whether the tales were assembled to entertain, or to expound some paradoxographical map of Greece, the information was not for immediate practical application. Nor do we know if any particular recipient was addressed and cast in the role of a student, perhaps the most definitive marker of a didactic poem.

Boios, on the other hand, does appear to have included some manner of statement of intent within his *Ornithogonia*, for according to Athenaeus he claimed every bird had once been a man. His material was not, however, marshalled into a taxonomic arrangement. Otis claimed that it was organised by species and genera, but in fact related birds occur in different books and tales: vultures, woodpeckers and owls of various kinds occur in both books. Divisions on the basis of good or bad omens, types of crimes, situations leading to metamorphosis or geography seem to have been similarly lacking. The tales are scattered around Thessaly, Asia Minor, mainland Greece, Crete, Ethiopia, Mesopotamia and elsewhere. This difficulty in finding how the work was structured at once places it in a closer relationship to *Kollektivgedichte* and divorces it from didactic.

The story of Eumelus and his children (A.L. 15), for instance, results in Meropis being turned into a γλασός (little owl), Byssa being turned into what appears to have been a βύας (eagle owl), and Eumelus being turned into a

---

103 See Thompson (1936) 67 s.v. BY'ZA.
νυκτικόραξ (long eared owl), but Agron is turned into a χαραδρός (plover), not because he had offended against the gods less than the others, or in a different way, but because when his siblings were metamorphosed he rushed out of the house armed with a spit. Meropis’ transformation is owing to the fact that she had abused Athena to her face, and the little owl was Athena’s bird, so that the woman is made to suffer the humiliation of being transformed into the symbol of what she had despised.104 Eumelus had abused Hermes for changing his son and so was transformed into a particularly ill-omened owl. Other transformations into owls occur in two unrelated stories, which are in the other book, and there again the metamorphoses are accompanied by transformations into other kinds of bird as well (19, 21). Polyphonte (21) mated with a bear and her sons grew up to be cannibal robbers. One was changed into a flesh-eating vulture and she and the other were turned into ill-omened owls. Their servant, however, prayed not to be transformed into an evil bird, and so was turned into a woodpecker, a good omen for those going hunting or to feasts. Thus good and bad omens could be explained through a single story. Nor do impious acts always lead to ill-omened birds: the thieves who violated the cave where Zeus was born (19) were transformed into well-omened birds - woodpeckers, rock thrushes, kerberoi, and aigolion owls. This last shows that not all members of the same species were uniformly propitious or otherwise. The arrangement of the metamorphoses is thus clearly uninfluenced by the requirements of either ‘scientific’ classification or of moral didactic.

Many of the stories show a taste for the bizarre or the gruesome: Periphas is transformed into an eagle while in the act of making love to his wife (6). Aegypius (5) is tricked into committing incest with his mother by his mistress’ son, and when his

104 See Thompson (1936) 76-80 on the little owl.
mother discovered what had happened she tried to put out his eyes; Aegypius prayed that they should all vanish, and they were turned into birds. Here, metamorphosis is a release, but in other stories it seems an unjust punishment. Hierax, the distinguished king of the Mariandyni, sent grain to the Teurians during a famine that had been inflicted on them by Poseidon (3). The god transformed him into a hawk, hateful to birds, even though he had saved many men from death. It may still be possible to trace some slight groupings among the stories: in book 1, 3, 5 and 6 concern inadvertent faults, while 15 is a foil to these. In book 2, 18 and 20 both showed a father’s sacrifices being interrupted by his impious offspring. Against their lurid background, however, the traces of these patterns are too few and too slight for anything to be made of them.

As with the Heteroioumena, the generic identity of the Ornithogonia seems indeterminate: the arrangement of material argues against its being a moral or scientific didactic. It has been suggested that Boios drew on the older form of Ornithomanteia and combined it with Kollektivgedichte.\textsuperscript{105} The process, however, of combining Ornithomanteia, didactic, or paradoxography with Kollektivgedichte appears to have removed the majority of the outward or structural characteristics of those forms. Only their content appears to be left. Kollektivgedichte in many ways seems to have placed itself outside the boundaries of genre, enabling the poetry of explanations to move away from the globalising argument or practical application of didactic. In the Aetia, for instance, rather than displaying Volk’s ‘teacher-student constellation’, Callimachus shows himself as the student in the process of acquiring information from the Muses. Loehr has drawn attention to the number of different types of aetia that Nicander includes within tales of metamorphosis: cults, rituals,

\textsuperscript{105} Forbes Irving (1990) 25.
topographical names, natural phenomena and the nature or behaviour of animals.\textsuperscript{106} His poem, like other \textit{Kollektivgedichte}, thus takes features that are marginal in the canonical genres and grants them fuller attention.

3.5 \textit{The Question of ‘Subjective’ Erotic Poems}

An additional complicating factor in the interpretation of \textit{Kollektivgedichte} is the possibility of a ‘subjective’ erotic element. That is, the question of whether the erotic poems expressed what were presented as the poet’s own emotions. The two main strands of evidence about this question are provided by Hermesianax and some papyrus fragments. Of these Hermesianax is worthy of the most attention for the sake of his highly skewed presentation of his predecessors. The idea of a subjective erotic context for Hellenistic \textit{Kollektivgedichte} seems a chimaera, but one that perhaps is worth tracking back to its origins. I have already described the ways in which Hermesianax appears to be engaging with the characteristics of the Hesiodic \textit{Catalogue}. While his use in particular of the initial formulae signals this generic alignment, the title he chose suggests an allegiance to the \textit{Lyde} and \textit{Nanno}, poems which supposedly had a personal element. The evidence for such an element, however, rests in part upon the comments of Hermesianax himself.

The sources for the \textit{Leontion} divide in two: tales attributed to it by Parthenius, Antoninus Liberalis, and others, and the 98 line catalogue. The latter tells its stories very tersely, in a manner that avoids variety and reduces many of the tales to a set formula. With the exception of Musaeus, Mimmermus and Philetas, for instance, all the poets are described as going on a journey, even though in Sophocles’ case this means that the move from suburban Colonus into Athens proper is represented as a

\textsuperscript{106} Loehr (1996) 56-7.
major change. The organisation of the catalogue is pedestrian: poets appear in pairs according to genre and chronology; types of opening and laudatory phrases proliferate, echo each other, and merge.

Stories attributed to the rest of the poem show a far greater scope and variety. To book 1 is given a line apparently describing Polyphemus gazing out over the waves with his single eye (F.1P.), and references to the story of Daphnis’ love for Menalcas, and Menalcas’ suicide from love of Euphe (F.2&3P.). Both would seem to indicate tales set in a pastoral world. The descriptive nature of the Cyclops verse may show that the narrative was far less terse than those of Hermesianax’ Catalogue: Δερκόμενος πρὸς κύμα, μόνη δὲ οἳ ἐφλέγετο γλήν. Hermesianax’ version of the Daphnis story may have been an invention or an obscure variant. The world of the other tales, assigned to Leontion 2, is that of the eastern Mediterranean and Oriental romance tales: one is the story of Arceophon and Anaxarete (F.4P./A.L.39), mentioned above, and the other is the tale of Leucippus (F.5P./E.P.5). The events of this latter seem to differ in almost all respects from the other tales, involving as it does incest, the accidental killing of a daughter and accidental parricide, a chain of events which gives rise to a ktisis story. In Parthenius’ summary this had the tale of Leucophrye attached to it as a kind of pendant, a story of love and betrayal after the pattern of Scylla or Comaetho, but it is unclear whether this was included in Hermesianax’ version. The best evidence for the style and presentation of these tales is the summary of Arceophon and Anaxarete, for, as we have seen, Antoninus’ summaries display something of their models’ characteristics. The amount of detail in this passage could certainly not have been compressed into a segment of six verses.

107 Cf. Gutzwiller (1983) 173 n.11. There may have been a tradition of Daphnis poetry: Aelian (VH 10.18) claimed that it went back to Stesichorus, while Diodorus (4.84), probably drawing on Timaeus, claimed that Daphnis was the inventor of bucolic verse; see Zimmerman (1994) 27-8.
The catalogue itself creates in various ways spurious subjective elements for the poetry of all the non-mythological poets. One group of these are the poets whose works never had any such dimension, like Hesiod, Homer, Sophocles and Euripides. These passages may be read as a reflection on the tendency of biographers to read poets' output autobiographically. The entertainment value of a parody depends upon the degree of distortion employed. Complete fabrications may be absurd, but they are not nearly so effective as the misapplication and distortion of known facts. Thus Homer is shown as being in love with the lonely, sympathetically portrayed woman of his poetry, whose husband is far from home. Hesiod does not mention amatory affairs in the personal parts of his poetry, and in the Catalogue of Women the heroines are too many, and too integrated into a partnership with a spouse or a match with a god, to be suitable candidates for the poet's love; besides, repeating the tactic used with Homer would hardly be witty. Instead, 'Ehoie' is plucked out. Hesiod is in love with 'Or another woman such as' - Anne Other. This cannot be the result of ignorance on Hermesianax' part: as several scholars have observed, he was a pupil of the learned Philetas, and is highly unlikely to have made such a remark in error. The superimposition of this 'love story' upon Hesiod's dislike of Ascra even turns the economic and agricultural basis for the misery there into erotic suffering.

The genuinely erotic poets Sappho, Anacreon and Alcaeus are subjected to a different treatment: the targets of their affection are wilfully distorted (7.47-56). Attempts to create tales of love affairs between these poets seem to have been

notorious, and Bing has raised the likelihood of their misrepresentation here being a satire upon the biographer Chamaeleon. Philoxenos’ Cyclops (7.69-74) similarly was a work subject to allegorical readings, and Bing suggests that Hermesianax’ treatment of it is again satirical. Here, however, is a case of a poem that may have genuinely been a court allegory, although not all the stories about the circumstances of its composition are likely to be true. According to the testimonia ‘Galateia’ was mistress to Dionysius of Syracuse, and Philoxenos fell into disfavour for being too close to her. In his dithyramb the Cyclops was supposed to be identified with Dionysius, ‘Galateia’ with his mistress, and Odysseus with the poet. Hermesianax now instead casts Philoxenos as the Cyclops, spurned by Galateia. As the Cyclops’ song is typically naïve and rather grotesque, this transference of characteristics appears a mocking disparagement of Philoxenos’ poetry.

For those segments at least it seems clear that Hermesianax was writing tongue-in-cheek. The catalogue may have had a preface that made its parodic nature plain, or it may have been placed in the mouth of an inset character: it could perhaps be the speech of a comically ignorant pedant trying to woo his woman through a display of learning, a parody of a catalogue poem. It does not seem likely that it bore a close resemblance to the rest of the Leontion any more than the speech of Pythagoras does to Ovid’s Metamorphoses. No scholar would use it as evidence for the nature of Homer’s Odyssey. For Philetas, Antimachus and Mimnermus, however, a number of critics treat the piece as if it provided sound evidence. It is these poets,

115 Athenaeus 1.6e-7a; Aelian V.H. 12.44; Schl. Ven. on Aristophanes’ Plutus 290ff.
117 Day (1938) 10 “On the authority of Hermesianax it is known that Antimachus was deeply enamoured of a woman of Lydia, by name Lyde.” Cf. Cairns (1979) 217 “It is undeniable that
too, that provide the main thread of evidence for ‘subjective’, non-Hesiodic, catalogue poetry.
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The fragments that are attributed to Mimnermus’ *Nanno* are very similar to those that are not in subject matter and tone. They include subjective, historical and mythological material: fragments on the capture of Smyrna (9) and the foundation of Colophon (10); Jason (11), Niobe (12), Ismene and Tydeus (21) and Tithonus (4); laments about old age (1, 2, 5) and a call for truth in a relationship (8). Only the latter could be both personal and erotic; ‘Nanno’ never appears. It is not impossible that all the fragments were sympotic in origin. The details of Hermesianax’ portrait which create a symposiastic picture - girl - λωτός - κώμωi with Examyas - feuds - might arouse suspicion that they were culled from sympotic poetry in the first place. How else could the names of Mimnermus’ supposed friends and enemies have survived the lapse of time? Pseudo-facts may here have been plucked from a variety of pieces and subjected to an unquantifiable amount of distortion. There may well have been some erotic material in Mimnermus’ work, but it is impossible to tell how dominant a role it played. There is also no evidence that the *Nanno* bore much resemblance at all to Hellenistic *Kollektivgedichte*.

Of all *Kollektivgedichte*, the *Lyde* is the poem most often claimed to be subjective. The fact that Antimachus is paired with Mimnermus both by Hermesianax

---

Hermesianax believed Mimnermus had loved a girl called Nanno, and had written verses against his enemies Hermobius and Pherecles."

(who breaches his chronology to do so) and by Poseidippus has led scholars to suggest that Antimachus presented the Lyde as a successor to the Nanno, stressing Mimnermus’ Colophonian origin and perhaps remodelling his work to make it appear more like his own.\textsuperscript{120} What is known of the Lyde’s subject matter, however, seems to bear little resemblance to the Nanno. It is therefore perhaps noteworthy that in Poseidippus’ epigram it is Mimnermus who is φιλεράστης, whereas Antimachus is desired for his self-control, something that might indicate that his work contained more learned information concerning affairs than personal erotic material.

\begin{quote}
Ναννοὺς καὶ Λύδης ἔπιχει δύο καὶ φιλεράστου
Μιμνέρμου καὶ τοῦ σώφρονος Ἀντιμάχου.

(140 A.B./AP XII 168.1-2)
\end{quote}

Pseudo-Plutarch appears to have been strongly influenced by Hermesianax:

\begin{quote}
ἀποθανοῦσθι γὰρ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτῶι Λύδης, πρὸς ἦν
φιλοστοργὸς εἰς, παραμύθιον τῆς λύπης αὐτῶι ἐποίησε τὴν
ἐλεγέλαι τὴν καλουμένην Λύδην, ἔξαρμημεῖσεν τὰς ἠρωκὰς
συμφορὰς, τοῖς ἄλλοτρίοις κακοῖς ἐλάττω τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ποιῶν λύπην.

([Plut.] Cons. ad Ap. 106b)
\end{quote}

The Lyde’s structure and the degree of compression in its narratives are unknowable, beyond the evidence for a substantial Argonautica (55-65Wyss). All the tales attributed to the poem are heroic: tales of Oedipus (70), Bellerophon (68-9) and Adonis (102), along with others less certainly ascribed. For any joke in Hermesianax’ comments to work, there must nonetheless have been some material in the Lyde that

could have been twisted into books of consolatory groans. It is possible that this was an introductory epigram or frame, but then Hermesianax would have strayed rather close to the truth. There could alternatively have been a story involving the disastrous love of a Lydian woman, taken out of its context and deliberately misapplied to Antimachus himself. One further possibility is suggested by the verse Πακτωλοῦ χρυσόιοιν ἐπ’ ἀνδήρωι θάσσους (SH 79/Schl. Lyc.1353). This line has been attributed to both Callimachus and Antimachus: those who assign it to the latter tend to suggest that it belonged to the Lyde’s putative subjective frame. Both the case for the existence of such a frame and that for the authorship of the fragment depend upon the Hermesianax passage, and the argument risks circularity; Hermesianax may instead have inserted Antimachus into one of his own stories.

Hermesianax’ lines on Philetas, the last of his poets, are the hardest to interpret.

οἶθα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἄοιδόν, ὅν Εὐρυπύλου πολιτηταί
Κώδιοι χάλκειοι θῆκαν ὑπὸ πλατάνωι
Βίττίδα μολπάζοντα βοήν, περὶ πάντα Φιλίταν
ῥήματα καὶ πᾶσαν τρυόμενον λαλὴν (7.75-8)

And also you know the bard, whom the Coan citizens of Eurypyllos set in bronze beneath a plane tree, singing of flighty Bittis; Philetas, who wore himself out about all manner of words, and all manner of glosses.

OR
And also you know that the bard whom the Coan citizens of Eurypyllos set in bronze beneath a plane tree sang about flighty Bittis, Philetas, who wore himself out over every word and every sort of babbling.

Hermesianax’ wording allows for a statue depicting Philetas singing, or one that depicted Philetas, who used to sing about ‘Bittis’, or who sang the Bittis. It is not

---

121 See Matthews (1996) 258. For the line as a verbal allusion by Hermesianax see Hollis (1996) 58.
123 For this ambiguity see Latacz (1985) 86-8; see also Hardie (1997) 24-5. Most scholars reject the idea that Philetas was portrayed as singing (e.g. Hardie (1997) 24-5; Spanoudakis (2002) 35). A Poseidippus epigram is evidence that a statue of Philetas existed (63 A.B.), but this need not be the one described by Hermesianax; cf. Hardie (2003). Hardie (1997) 25-6 questions how Hermesianax’ addressee would know that Philetas was singing / or the one who sang of Bittis, and answers this by supposing an inscription or statue epigram. But if the existence of ‘Bittis’ is no more than a joke,
even certain whether the word refers to a woman, or a poem, or both.\footnote{124} Kuchenmüller questioned the existence of ‘Bittis’, pointing to the potential wordplay of \textupsmall{βαττίς} (stutterer) as equivalent to the \textupsmall{γλωσσαί} (obscure words) - already dubbed \textupsmall{λαλία} (speech / babbling) - that Philetas studied.\footnote{125} Such a pun would indeed be very characteristic of Hermesianax. The scholar’s prose output - two books of Homeric glosses - is transformed into the mistress of erotic elegy. An alternative allusive play has been seen by Gallavotti, who points to the similarity of a Philetas fragment preserved by Athenaeus to Hermesianax' description: \textupsmall{θρήσσοθαὶ πλατάνωι γαίῃ ὕπο} (Athen. 5.192e/F.14P.).\footnote{126} Should this be an allusion by Hermesianax to the text of the \textbf{Bittis}, then in a manner that might be parallel to his possible treatment of Antimachus, he would be making the statue appear to portray an incident from Philetas' own poetry. The passages in which Ovid mentions the woman fail to elucidate matters.

\begin{center}
\textit{Nec tantum Clario est Lyde dilecta poetae,}
\textit{nec tantum Coo Battis amata suo est,}
\textit{pectoribus quantum tu nostris, uxor, inhaeres,}
\textit{digna minus misero, non meliore, viro.} (Ov. Trist. 1.6.1-4)
\end{center}

2. Bittis Merkel; \textit{battis} F Ott.; \textit{batis} M; \textit{bactis} D. \textit{baccis} GT. (André)

\begin{center}
\textit{nec te nesciri patitur mea pagina, qua non inferius Coa Battide nomen habes} (Ov. Ex Pont. 3.1. 57-8).
\end{center}

2. \textit{Bittide B\textsuperscript{1}; biti de A; batide B\textsuperscript{2}; bachide D; pilhyde C.} (André)

\footnote{Hermesianax' οἶθα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀοιδὸν ... \textit{βιττίδα μολπάειντα} need reflect the addressee's knowledge no more than does Λέοβιος ’Αλκαίος δὲ ... γιγνώσκεις.}
\footnote{Cf. Latacz (1985) 85; Kuchenmüller (1928) 26-7.}
\footnote{Kuchenmüller (1928) 26-7.}
\footnote{Gallavotti (1932) 235-6. Spanoudakis (2002) 155-8 believes that the lines describe a cult on Cos; Cameron (1995) 316 for his part is in no doubt that this is the very plane tree under which Hermesianax depicted Philetas singing. Cf. also Alfonsi (1943) 426; Hollis (1996) 58; Hardie (1997) 32 on Hermesianax' mode of allusion.}
In all these cases it should be noted first of all that the reference is to a woman rather than a work. The two are not mutually exclusive, but this fact does mean that there is no explicit testimony for the existence of a poem entitled the *Bittis*. The context however of the Hermesianax passage does in its perverse way mean that if Philetas is described as singing of a woman, he may have mentioned that woman in his poetry (as Homer did Penelope, and Philoxenos Galateia). If ‘Bittis’ did appear, however, she may have been mentioned in epigrams or Philetas’ *παίγνια*; these would indeed have been sufficient for Hermesianax’ claims.

In sum, the extent to which Hermesianax indulges in allusive play makes it very difficult to use him as firm evidence for the content or subjectivity of any poem. There seems, however, to be little in favour of the existence of a body of personal, non-Hesiodic, *Kollektivgedichte*. The other evidence that has been put forward comprises four fragmentary papyri dating from the second century AD. Butrica attempts to assign these to the Hellenistic period, although Morelli in particular has put forward arguments for the later date based on metrical usage, verbal formations, and motifs shared with imperial epigram.

The fragments are as follows:

P.Oxy. 3723

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>col. I</th>
<th>col. II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἴς ζεύς ἓ ἐν πῦρ</td>
<td>ἤδε Κιθαιρώνος δρυμοχόρου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

127 Cf. Latacz (1985) 85, Müller (1998) 37. It has been suggested that the poetry of Antimachus and Philetas was hard to obtain by the time of the principate, and that Ovid was influenced by Hermesianax’ comments. Del Corno (1962) 73-5; Boucher (1965) 207; Serrao (1979) 92; Puelma (1982) 225; Hose (1994) 81; Matthews (1996) 65; Hinds (1999) 136; Spanoudakis (2002) 34.


129 Alfonsi (1943) 425 suggests that for such a pun to have point a real woman must have existed.

130 P.Oxy. 2884 fr.2, 2885 fr.1 ed. Lobel (1972); P.Oxy. 3723 ed. Parsons and Bremmer (1987). Parsons (1988); Hose (1994); Morelli (1994); and Butrica (1996) all study the papyri and reach what are at times considerably varying opinions; the latter three were unable to take into account each other’s work.

This second piece was followed by a blank line, and then what appears to be a new poem in a far more fragmentary state. Forms of θεύγω (I flee) appear three times close to the beginning (22, 26, 32) and χρύσεος appears twice in a short space (33, 37). There is reference to Scythia (27), an unusual bird (πίφγγγες 28), a Trojan woman (38) and a descendant of Aecus (43). The most coherent verse seems to be subjective erotic - ἱμείρω πάν ἡμαρ ἀμοιβαδὸν (I long everyday in turn). P.Oxy. 2884 fr.2 provides one final fragment of 18 verses. Sense can only be traced in a few lines:

ήμματος ἐτί θρασέος λεπί
Ἰ.σω τέκμαρ ἐπηλυοίής [I.
α γυναικών Λητώιήν
Ι. εἱ σεῖο θαλακρός ἔρως
ἴσης τὴν παρθένον οὐ γάρ ἐοικ[ε
]. ζεινε . εμετην ὄλιγην

See Morelli (1994) 393.
See Morelli (1994) 400-401.
2885 appears to have been an anthology of some kind: the two elegiac pieces were followed by an epode.\textsuperscript{135} 3723, on the other hand, was from an extremely small (8 cm) roll, apparently cut from a much larger one, and the handwriting is sloppy. Parsons has suggested that it was an amateur production, perhaps the autograph of the poet himself.\textsuperscript{136}

3723 and 2885 both use a series of mythological exempla followed by some kind of personal address. 3723 appears a clear presentation of the \textit{servitium amoris} motif:\textsuperscript{137} Apollo places something at Hyacinth’s feet, perhaps after relinquishing his tripod, temple and oracle; Bacchus gave his thyrsus to the ‘Indian boy’; and Heracles took on love as his thirteenth task. The poet then breaks off: \textquote{If you are \textit{heated} by reckless love ... indeed you smoulder ... more worthy of reproach.} It would thus appear to be a priamel: Medea, Scylla and the others acted rashly and wrongly from love, but the recipient is still more worthy of reproach.

The parallels between these pieces and the poems of Propertius and Tibullus are plain, but Latin poetry is supposed not to have been widely read in second century Egypt.\textsuperscript{139} As, however, to a certain extent the Latin elegists were influenced by

\textsuperscript{139} Parsons \& Bremmer (1987) 59; Parsons (1988) 75.
Hellenistic epigram, one might thus deduce a dual evolution, with the Hellenistic and Latin elegies developing on similar lines. Hose has sought to show that the genesis of subjective erotic Latin elegy is the product of the tensions existing in the Late Republic, such as those between the duty of civil and military life involvement, and the private life.\textsuperscript{140} Such political and social strains, although they give Latin elegy its distinctive character, are not, however, necessary for a poet to address his beloved, draw mythological examples to illustrate his plight, or apostrophise his soul. Cairns' assertion that it is unlikely that while archaic elegy and Hellenistic epigram could be subjective erotic, there could not be such a thing as Hellenistic subjective erotic elegy on its own, seems well founded.\textsuperscript{141}

Whether this demonstrates that \textit{Kollektivgedichte} was similarly subjective is more doubtful. Alexander Aetolus' \textit{Apollo} has been suggested as an instance of myth used as a warning, as a parallel to 2885 fr.1.\textsuperscript{142} The amount of explanation, however, that the form of the myth - a prophecy - would require would surely rule this out. The deliberate obscurity of the segment's form means that it can hardly stand alone as an exemplum. When it is compared to the exempla segments in curse poetry, this defect becomes particularly clear. Butrica has also suggested that the use of myth in the elegies could parallel that by Phanocles,\textsuperscript{143} but the immense difference of scale must make this unlikely. The Orpheus segment has too great a degree of closure, and it develops themes in a way not at all similar to the use of myth in strings of exempla. As I have said, if the frame did cast the tales as a warning, whether to the poet or a third party, against, for instance, deep involvement in homosexual affairs, or, if it cast

\textsuperscript{140} Hose (1994) 71-3.
\textsuperscript{141} Cairns (1979) 216-219.
\textsuperscript{142} Butrica (1996) 321 n.58.
\textsuperscript{143} Butrica (1996) 297, 306.
the tales as a justification for homosexuality, the likely proportion of frame to narrative means that the most obvious Hellenistic parallel is not the papyrus fragments, but poems such as Theocritus’ *Cyclops* (*Id.* 11) in which the Cyclops’ song is used to demonstrate to Nicias that poetry is the only cure for love.

### 3.6 Varia et Dubia

Among the fragments of Hellenistic poetry there are a number of works assigned to *Kollektivgedichte* on a tentative basis: the subject matter or form of such pieces is thought to make it possible that they could have consisted of listed narratives, but there is often a lack of hard data to support such a designation. These include Euphorion’s *Mopsopia* and *Dionysus*, Philetas’ *Hermes*, and Alexander Aetolus’ *Apollo*.

The *Suidas* entry for Euphorion mentions only three works:

> βιβλία δὲ αὐτοῦ ἔποικα ταῦτα: Ἡθοδος, Μοψοπία ἢ Ἀτακτα, ἔχει γὰρ συμμιγείς ἱστορίας: Μοψοπία δὲ, ἢ Ἀττικὴ τὸ πρὶν Μοψοπία ἐκαλεῖτο ἀπὸ τῆς ὁκεᾶνοι θυγατρὸς Μοψοπίας, καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ ποιήματος ἀποτείνεται εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν Χιλιάδες κτλ.

I have already mentioned that there were attempts to fit some of Euphorion’s other known titles into the *Chiliades*. This is still more the case with the *Mopsopia E Atakta*. The title would fit either a collection of poems or a *Kollektivgedicht*. The *Suidas* entry is chiasic, first glossing *Atakta* - ‘for it contained συμμιγείς ἱστορίας’ - before explaining the title *Mopsopia*. συμμιγείς has been taken as equivalent to συλλογή: elsewhere in *Suidas*, however, it is not used of poems, being applied instead to matters such as the mixing of wine, and the noises in

---

144 Cf. Cessi (1915) 282-3.
echoes. It thus seems to be better understood not as synonymous with *sylloge*, but as meaning 'a mixture' rather than a simple 'collection'. The *Atakta* need not, therefore, as it is often understood, merely have been a collection of Euphorion's poems. The problem, however, of relating the 'mixed stories' to the apparently well-defined contents suggested by *Mopsopia* remains. The two halves of the title do not seem to fit well together for either a collection or a *Kollektivgedicht*. Some scholars assume therefore that the *Mopsopia* was the largest or most notable part of a collection that also contained unrelated pieces. If thus taken by itself, without the additional complication of the second half of the title, the *Mopsopia* would appear to be an ethnographical or a *ktisis* poem. Thus Hollis suggests that it was a history of Attica from its earliest days. We have lines, possibly from close to the beginning of the poem, that would seem to bear this out.

\["Ακτής δὲ παροιτέρα φωνηθείςἐνετοποιοί καὶ Ασίδα κικλήσκεθαι,οἱ δὲ Ποσειδάωνος ἐπώνυμον αὐδηθῆναι\]

Different and obscure names for Attica are presented in turn, emphasised by the parallel structure of the clauses, and probably part of reflection upon the unusual explanation of 'Mopsopia' used by Euphorion.

The other fragments ascribed to the *Mopsopia*, however, open up a further problem concerning form and content. There were lines on perfect numbers, possibly connected in some way to Dionysus through Pythagoreanism (36v.G.), and a passage on the three incarnations of Dionysus (39v.G.). In addition, a papyrus fragment (*SH*)

---

146 Suidas K334 sv. κατηλικός; K2368 sv. κρέκο.
147 Cf. Wilamowitz (1907) 65.
148 Cf. Cessi (1915) 283-5; Clua (2000). Barigazzi (1948) 45 believes that the name *Atakta* may be the result of a misunderstanding by a grammarian.
151 Other sources seem to derive the name from Mopsos the seer, or a Mopsos who was king of Attica (Strab. 9.1.18/397 & 9.5.22/443; Schl. Lyc. 733) de Cuenca (1976) 133; van Groningen (1977) 103.
418/19v.G.) contains references to both Attica and Dionysus, and might thus belong to either Euphorion's *Dionysus* or his *Mopsopia*. Responses to such data are that either the *Dionysus* was in some way part of the *Mopsopia*, or that the two poems were wholly separate, and Euphorion duplicated his material. The first of these views would appear to fit the idea that the majority of titles ascribed to Euphorion were subheadings within the *Atakta*. Problems, however, arise from the details of the text. A rather corrupt fragment normally assigned to the *Dionysus* describes Bacchus thrown into the fire by the Titans (14v.G.): this would seem to conflict with the details of the version ascribed to the *Mopsopia*, which has Dionysus dismembered but not cooked.

The Hellenistic poets had no objection to reworking and using different variants of myths. Callimachus, for instance, provides different accounts of the Hyperborean maidens in the *Aetia* (186Pf./97M.) and the *Hymn to Delos* (4.280-299), as well as juxtaposing variant myths, for instance his two accounts of Heracles *Bouthoines* (see below). It is possible that something similar occurred here. Indeed, according to Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, the stories of Dionysus and Perseus must have been told at least twice by Euphorion, for they recur in *SH* 430.1-6, which have proved impossible to marry with 418. If the *Dionysus* and *Mopsopia* were separate poems, however, interpretative problems still remain. Chief among these are to which poem *SH* 418 should belong, and how the seemingly extensive focus on Dionysus in a poem about Attica should be understood. Van Groningen explains a reference to Attica that is assigned to the *Dionysus* - "Ακτιος Αἰγεώς (17v.G.) - by remarking that

---

152 Fragment 10 of the same papyrus (P.Oxy. 2220) belonged to the *Chiliades*, but there is ample scope among the papyrus scraps for one poem to end and another begin.
154 Van Groningen (1977) 44-5.
155 Wilamowitz (1907) 65.
156 Cf. Wilamowitz (1898) 521; van Groningen (1976) 102.
Euphorion was keen on mentioning subjects that had nothing to do with the general course of a poem.\textsuperscript{157} The same explanation would seem to hold good for inconsequential pieces of erudition throughout Hellenistic literature. Greater specificity is desirable, but hard to achieve. The main festivals of Dionysus in Attica were the Anthesteria and the Rural and City Dionysia, neither of which appears to have been connected to his chthonic aspects or to the myth of dismemberment, which was mainly linked to Crete and Delphi.\textsuperscript{158} It is hardly impossible, however, that Euphorion should choose to mention in brief the more complex version of Dionysus' life while giving less prominence to the god's better known links to Athens.

Fragment 418 \emph{SH} tends to be understood as a description of Dionysus' conquering progress down through Greece.\textsuperscript{159} It is true that a range of places are mentioned, but if the fragment is removed from the context of the others assigned to the \emph{Dionysus}, then such an interpretation is by no means obvious. The one reference to Dionysus in the papyrus links him to the Attic Apatouria (v.26). Other possible Attic themes in the fragment are a mention of Erechtheus (v.13), which van Groningen has suggested could be a reference to Boreas' rape of Oreithyia, and Aphidna (v.15), where in some accounts Theseus hid Helen after he abducted her. If van Groningen's interpretation of vv.9-14 is correct, there would be room for no more than an allusion to that story here, but it is possible that the tale received fuller treatment elsewhere in the \emph{Mopsopia}. Another fragment of Euphorion told a variant of the Iphigenia story in which she was the daughter of Helen by Theseus and was

\textsuperscript{157} Van Groningen (1976) 43-4 "Mais il ne faut jamais oublier qu'Euphorion raffole de mentions toutes passagères qui n'ont rien à faire avec le cours général du récit." Cf. ibid 103.
\textsuperscript{158} Diod. Sic. 5.74.
\textsuperscript{159} Barigazzi (1963); van Groningen (1976) 58; Clua (1991).
sacrificed at Brauron rather than Aulis. Hollis suggests that this may have been part of
the *Mopsopia*.¹⁶⁰

ἀγχίαλον θραυρώνα κενήριον ἱφιγενείης
> οὐνέκα δὴ μιν
Ἰφί βησσαμένῳ Ἕλενη ὑπεγείνατο Θησεὶ (94&93v.G.)

Other narratives in *SH* 418, however, appear to have been the Nemean lion and the
birth of Perseus, equally hard to link to either Attica or Dionysus.

Problems in interpreting this fragment to fit either the *Mopsopia* or the
*Dionysus* are thus indeed considerable, but on a purely hypothetical level the piece
might be used to demonstrate how the *Mopsopia* could be both about Attica and
‘mingled stories’. The dismemberment of Dionysus, the Apatouria, Theseus and
Helen, the rape of Oreithyia all belong to unrelated groups of myths. Indeed, one
feature of Attic myth is that the king list appears almost hopelessly fragmented, with
vain attempts to squeeze Theseus, Erechtheus, Pandion, Cecrops and Codrus into the
same family tree leading to doublets and anachronisms. An ethnographical poem
could try to synthesise the various mythic cycles, or it could call attention to those
differences. οἰμιγεῖς ἱστορίος suggests an approach lacking the systematic nature
of an ethnographical exposition of Attic legends, but which would suit a
*Kollektivgedicht* more loosely juxtaposing the contrasting tales.

The *Dionysus*, at least, does appear to have been about the god in question.
The same cannot be said about the extant fragments of Alexander Aetolus’ *Apollo*
and Philetas’ *Hermes*, both thought by some to be *Kollektivgedichte*. The sole
fragment of the *Apollo* is a self-contained narrative of Antheus and Cleoboea, 34
verses long, quoted by Parthenius. The *Hermes* has fared little better: one of the

¹⁶⁰ Hollis (1992) 10-11: the joining of the 2 fragments is his proposal.
stories in Parthenius is said to come from it (*E.P.2*), and two brief verse citations are securely given to the poem (6&8P.), with two more customarily added (7&9P.).

The story from the *Apollo* quoted by Parthenius is couched entirely in the future tense. It tells how the wife of Phobios, who remains unnamed throughout but according to Parthenius was called Cleoboea, fell in love with Antheus, a young hostage from Assosos, who was staying at her house in Miletus. When she failed to seduce him, she asked him to climb down a well to retrieve a golden pitcher, and then threw down a millstone on top of him, later hanging herself (*F.4P./14 E.P.*). The piece begins with a genealogy of Phobios that occupies the entire verse, in a manner reminiscent of the opening of Phanocles' Orpheus segment.

παίς Ἰπποκλῆς Φοβίος Νειληκάδο

The need to explain the title *Apollo*, and the use of the future tense, has led to the reasonable conclusion that the passage was a prophecy by the god. \(^{161}\) The resemblance to the opening of the Phanocles segment has suggested a catalogue poem, \(^{162}\) but there is a complete lack of firm evidence on this point. For the passage to be an epyllion inset some sort of relationship between outer and inner narrative might be expected, but it is not impossible that Alexander contrived such an effect. Knox suggested that it could rather have been a narrative hymn. \(^{163}\) If it were a *Kollektivgedicht*, the subject matter, combining oracles and obscure local myths as well as an erotic element, might show the potential and versatility of the form.

Philetas' *Hermes* has given rise to a greater number of conjectures. Parthenius (*E.P. 2*) summarises a story in which Odysseus arrives at the court of Aeolus and tells of his travels, seducing Polymele, one of Aeolus' daughters. When Odysseus left

\(^{161}\) Cameron (1995) 52, 171-2; Magnelli (1999a) 15-16.

\(^{162}\) Couat (1931) 111; Cameron (1995) 384; Ricci (1997) 127; Magnelli (1999a) 15-19.

\(^{163}\) Knox (1993b) 70.
Polymele was found weeping and clinging to the spoils from Troy. Aeolus cursed Odysseus and would have killed Polymele, but her brother Diores obtained pardon for her and married her. Again, therefore, this is a story that appears unrelated to the poem’s title. A number of scholars have sought to analyse Philetas’ adaptation of the Homeric *Odyssey* on the basis of this summary, and frs. 6 and 8 P. have been interpreted as part of Odysseus’ account of his *nekyia*. As we have seen, however, Parthenius’ summaries by no means uniformly reflect the treatment of their supposed sources. Extensive theorising about the details of the *Hermes* on the basis of that text thus appears unwise, and, in particular, Parthenius cannot be used as evidence for the length or amount of detail in his source.

A number of different ways of linking the Odysseus myth to the title have been suggested, including Hermes as psychopompus, and the facts that Hermes was a god favourable to Odysseus, and was his grandfather. These hypotheses tend in turn to influence opinions about the poem’s form. Crump denied that the poem could have been an epyllion on the rather vague grounds that its title didn’t suggest such a work, and proposed a hymn or catalogue poem instead. Spanoudakis saw it as a potential *Kollektivgedicht*, with tales united by the theme of Hermes as escort, or adventures involving the children and grandchildren of Hermes. Sbardella, on the other hand, considers that the poem could have contained various adventures from Odysseus’ *nostos*, but views the form of the poem as an experiment in inserting the myths of heroic epic into the structure and dimensions of a hymn.

---

165 Challenged however by Knox (1993b) 65, who puts them in Hermes’ mouth.
167 Crump (1931) 26-8. Latacz (1999) has no such reservations and takes it to be an epyllion. Knox (1993b) 65 suggests it might have been a hymn.
3.7 Epilogue

The working definition of Kollektivgedichte has been a work in which narratives are strung together within a continuous poem, but might feasibly be detached and told as if self-contained, for they are not part of one overarching plot. The means by which such works are to be distinguished from poetic books that are collections of individual short works requires some attention. Butrica, when considering the papyrus erotic elegies, claimed that 2885 fr.1 could have been part of the Leontion, making the following statement:

\[\text{That the three books of the Leontion were comprised of multiple individual elegies seems sufficiently established by the evidence of the testimonia that it contained more than three stories.} \]

(1996) 318 n.24

The same argument could indeed be used of the Hesiodic Catalogue and Ovid's Metamorphoses, and the assertion fails to explain why there could not be more than three stories in one continuous poem. In Kollektivgedichte there must always be some unifying element, although not at the level of plot, that nonetheless joins the segments together into a continuous poem. This was most obvious in curse poetry, but the syntactical links created but the initial formulae in Phanocles would have served a similar purpose. The interface between Kollektivgedichte and the poetic collections is tested most, as we shall see, in Callimachus' Aetia, where the second half of the poem seems devoid of either a frame or syntactical links between segments. Uniformity of subject matter, or of the end to which a narrative is told, or of repeated themes within narratives, could all lend coherence without explicit connectives between segments. Also of considerable importance is whether each segment appears to have been composed for a particular occasion, or is given its own particular tone. All these factors together, in different proportions at different times, provide indications about whether a work is a Kollektivgedicht or a collection of poems.
As a group, *Kollektivgedichte* are unified by this segmented form, but, as we have seen, they also prominently display the process of *Kreuzung der Gattungen*. On every occasion when there was sufficient information to judge such matters, each poem was seen to draw on the conventions of its own set of predecessors. The Hesiodic *Catalogue* was prominent among them, and its use of segmented, explanatory, narratives must be seen as an important model even when introductory formulae may have been absent. In the *Tattoo Elegy*, where other generic models might easily have been granted greater prominence, repeated initial formulae were used to signal an affiliation with other catalogue elegies. This play with genre is something that will become still more prominent in the *Aetia*. 
The Aetia and its Structural Dynamics: Introduction

4.1 Introduction

Callimachus' prestige and the number of fragments we possess grant the Aetia a privileged position in Kollektivgedichte. The existence of the Diegesis means that for roughly half the work we may be sure of the order of the episodes, even if we know little else about them. In addition, we know of the separate frames for the first and second halves of the work, and possess the proem. All these are factors that should shed light on issues of cohesion and structure within firstly the Aetia, and secondly Kollektivgedichte as a whole. For none of the other poems do we have introductory material, and such passages are often crucial in informing the reader of the context the poet envisages for his tales, and the end to which he tells them.

While shedding light on Kollektivgedichte in those areas, the remains of the Aetia also sound a note of caution: tales with similar themes were not always juxtaposed, although sometimes they were; sequences of narratives sometimes develop, but more often are broken off or interrupted. The two halves of the poem present a problem fundamental to any consideration of the Aetia's structure. Each has its own very different dynamics. The first two books are granted coherence by the frame of the dialogue with the Muses, but this is no mechanical structure, rather an implicit narrative created by the tension between the different attempts of Callimachus and the Muses to assume overall direction of the poem. The frame also points up certain thematic links between segments. The second half lacks this frame, and the presence of certain segments with close ties to other genres helps create a discontinuous effect. These books appear to have pushed at the limits of
Kollektivgedichte, becoming closer to a poetic collection, and thus call into question our understanding of the poem as a whole along with its genre. In the course of the poem there is a perceptible adjustment and development of the poet’s attitude towards both aetiology and the listed narrative form. A development of ideas about aetiology is also present. Book 3 increases in scope to consider different types of commemoration and their aetiological results; in book 4, furthermore, the action of a number of segments is unknown. While the state of the evidence means that all conclusions must remain hypothetical, it may be that by book 4 Callimachus’ ongoing modification of the poem’s genre, structure and theme had been extended to aetiology itself.

4.2 The Aetia Prologue and Kollektivgedichte

The Aetia’s introductory material serves to set the poem within its poetic context in a twofold manner. The abuse of the ‘Telchines’ defines the characteristics of the work by contrasting them with their opposites and then holding up particular (elegiac) works as the approved tradition within which the Aetia is to be situated. The Somnium, with the advice given by Apollo, asserts a specifically Hesiodic model for Callimachus and at the same time proclaims his intention of originality. What follows is to be a new development, a new Theogony for his modern century.1 How the Aetia is to be related to other Hellenistic Kollektivgedichte, however, is less clear. There is no true consensus about which poems were criticised, and indeed the only approved work that can be identified is Philetas’ Demeter. Opinion varies as to whether Callimachus praised or rejected the ‘collective’ poems of Mimnermus and Philetas, while Antimachus and his Lyde are frequently mentioned as probable targets for abuse, and sometimes used to condemn all Kollektivgedichte

This beginning presents the ‘Telchines’ as Callimachus would have us see them. The most frequent report about the mythical creatures is that they would destroy crops and ruin fertile land by sprinkling them with water from the Styx. As a metaphor for those who seek to blight others’ labour this seems readily transferable to literary carpers. It is less easy, however, to interpret to which poetic Callimachus alleges they wish him to conform.  

μύθος δ’ ἐστὶν ἐς οὐκ ὀσπερ τινὲς οἴονται ἕαν περὶ ἕνα ἕ’ πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἀπειρὰ τὸ ἐνὶ συμβαίνει, ἐξ ὧν ἐνὶ ὀϋδὲν ἐστὶν ἐν ὀὕτως δὲ καὶ πράξεις ἕνός πολλαὶ εἰσίν, ἐξ ὧν μία οὐδεμία γίνεται πράξεις. (Aristotle. Poet. 7.12-8.1)

This complex polyptoton plays on the potential for a poet to confuse the oneness of a unified plot with the life or adventures of one man. Callimachus’ ἐν stands very much
as if it were an allusion to Aristotle's technical term. Indeed, Hunter has seen in it Callimachus' placing scholastic language in the mouths of the Telchines.7

Although the criticism is attributed to the Telchines, who 'are no friends of the Muses, Callimachus goes on to respond as if their measurement of his poetry against the Poetics were technically correct, but pedantic, ill-focused, and rather irrelevant to his own work. D'Alessio and Massimilla understand this to imply Callimachus' rejection of the established Aristotelian prescription for poetry and his establishment of a new point of view.8 The Peripatetic Praxiphanes, who wrote on poetics in the manner of Aristotle, is, after all, named by the scholiast as one of the Telchines.9 It should not, however, be taken for granted that the Telchines' opinions truly coincided with those of Aristotle. The range of meanings for δηνεκές in LSJ include 'continuous', 'unbroken', 'perpetual', and, as an adverb, 'without ceasing', 'from beginning to end'. The combination of such a term with the Aristotelian ἐν presents, as Hunter has suggested, a contradiction in terms.10 It implies just the confusion that Aristotle has warned against - Callimachus' specific charge of the Telchines judging a work by its length makes this clear: rather than looking for oneness, presented in sufficient length to handle a plot with a twist or two, they have looked for a single figure or subject. δηνεκές is a sarcastic presentation of the Telchines' point of view - they are mistaken in their reading of Aristotle.

This presentation of the Telchines implies, within its more specific polemic, Callimachus' rejection of single plots or themes, of unvarying narrative style, and of

---

8 D'Alessio (1996) 367-8; Massimilla (1996) 203: I Telchini rinfacciano a C. la sua incapacità di comporre un carme unitario e continuo, che risponda ai criteri stabiliti - per la tragedia e l'epos - da Aristotele nella Poetica. [...] C. impiega la parola δησικέα per designare l'epos. [...] e l'elegia di tipo tradizionale."
9 Cf. Brink (1946) on Callimachus' stance towards Aristotle and his successors.
inept attempts to live up to the literary values of past centuries. The wording allows space for an acceptable unified poem, if it is not never-ending, or even a long poem, if its length is not its sole recommendation. The fact that the *Aetia* does at times focus on kings and wars shows that to some extent at least the Telchines’ remarks do not in effect constitute a list of features that will in no way be the characteristics of the poem.\textsuperscript{11} It would be helpful if we knew whether Callimachus’ Telchines desired epic, elegy, or simply substantial poetry, irrespective of metre. Cameron’s claim that there was no epic poetry written in the period surely overstates the case, and it seems unwise to assume that hexameter works never formed part of the literary debate.\textsuperscript{12} *Kollektivgedichte* seems unlikely to have matched up to the Telchines’ standard: as we have seen, it is characterised by its multiple discrete segments, marginal characters, and obscure narratives. Its generic play, too, is far from the Telchines’ implied traditionalism.

The Telchines as presented by the Florentine Scholiast, however, seem to bear little resemblance to the Callimachean picture.

\begin{quote}
\begin{alltt}
. . . . . \(1\) μοι Τελχίνες ἐπιτρύψουσιν ἀοιδὴ

\texttt{[ΤΕΙ. δε . . .]} . . .

\texttt{1. Διονυσίοις δυ[σ]ί τῶ ελ}

\texttt{ινὶ κ(α)ὶ τῶ ιλειον κ(α)ὶ Ἀσκλη-

πίαδη τῶ Σικελίδη κ(α)ὶ Ποσειδίππῳ τῶ ονό}

\texttt{1. ὑρίππῳ ρήτορι κ(α)ὶ Ἀνα

\texttt{βεω κ(α)ὶ Πραξιφάνῃ τῷ Μίπω-

ληναίῳ, τοὺς μείμους ὑπὸ τὸ κάτισ-

χὸν τῶν ποιημάτων κ(α)ὶ δι’ ὑπὸ μηκὸς ηπα

\end{alltt}
\end{quote}

Nothing is known of the Dionysii,\textsuperscript{13} but Asclepiades and Poseidippus were epigrammatists of some prominence, while Praxiphanes, as has been said, was a peripatetic philosopher and literary theorist. While grounds of disagreement can be

\textsuperscript{11} Acosta-Hughes & Stephens (2002) suggest that the *Aetia* presents kings and heroes ἐν τῶν τυχέων.


\textsuperscript{13} See Lehnus (1993) for an attempt at identification.
traced between these figures and Callimachus, their poetic views in no way match those attributed to the Telchines. The fact that the list does not include any epic poets has been employed to support the argument that Callimachus’ remarks refer to long elegy alone. The poet’s remarks are thus brought into line with the scholium, but the match is still far from perfect. The epigrams of Asclepiades and Poseidippus are not a form that could be called ἐν ἄειομα διημεκές, and there is nothing to suggest that they wrote longer elegies. All assessments of Asclepiades’ work show him to have had qualities which Callimachus admired and adopted himself. His use of Homer was highly subtle, avoiding clichés and employing rarities with considerable allusive force.

The most telling piece of information about Asclepiades’ poetics, however, comes from Theocritus, who names him along with Philetas as a poet whom it would be unwise to attempt to rival, and within a few lines of this condemns both excessive length and epic literary pretensions.

(Sim.) Καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ Μοισάν κατυρίδον στόμα κημε λέγοντι πάντες ἄοιδόν ἄριστων ἑγὼ δὲ τις οὐ ταχυπειθής, οὐ Δάνο νόμω πῶ κατ’ ἑμὸν νόμον οὔτε τὸν ἔσθλον Σικελίδαν νίκημι τὸν ἐκ Σάμω οὔτε Φιλήταν ἄειδων, βάτραχος δὲ ποτ’ ἀκριδας ὡς τὶς ἐρίσδω.

(Lyc.) ὡς μοι καὶ τέκτων μέγ’ ἀπέχθεται, ἃτις ἐρευνή ἴσον ὁρευνῳ κορυφῇ τελέσαι δόμου Ῥωμεῖδουτος, καὶ Μοισάν ὀρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χίου ἄοιδόν ἀντία κοκκύζουντες ἐτῶσια μοιχίζουντι.

(Theoc. Id. 7.37-41, 45-48.)

16 See e.g. Fraser (1972) 1.562-3; Cameron (1995) 302 “Posidippus and Asclepiades were best known for precisely the sort of sophisticated miniature work that was Callimachus’ speciality. Indeed, Callimachus clearly admired and certainly imitated Asclepiades’ epigrams.”
17 For this see Sens (2002).
This seems unlikely to have been written in the knowledge of the supposed disagreement between Callimachus and Asclepiades, and stands as a reminder that there were no firm distinctions of poetic skill and ideals between Callimachus and his ‘critics’.\textsuperscript{18} The comparisons made by Lycidas seem to rebuke attempts to rival Asclepiades and Philetas in the manner more normally used to dissuade rivalry of Homer. They are thus placed on the highest level, and the implication is that elegy in their hands has reached the same state of perfection as Homeric epic. The image, moreover, of the architect who tries to build a house as high as a mountain may easily be translated as a warning against size that strives against what is natural for the work in hand.\textsuperscript{19}

It is thus very hard to relate Asclepiades’ likely abilities to the failings implied by ἐν άεισμα διηνεκές.\textsuperscript{20} The one major area of disagreement between the figures named by the scholiast and Callimachus appears to have been Antimachus’ \textit{Lyde}. Callimachus’ judgement of the poem was Λύδη καὶ παχῦ γράμμα καὶ οὔ τορόν (398Pf.). Asclepiades, on the other hand, wrote an epigram in its praise:

\begin{quote}
Λύδη καὶ γένος εἰμὶ καὶ οὔνομα: τὸν δ’ ἀπὸ Κόδρου
σεμνοτέρη πασῶν εἰμὶ δι’ Ἀντιμάχου.
τίς γὰρ ἐξ’ οὐκ ἤεισε: τίς οὐκ ἀνελέξατο Λύδην,
τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου;
\end{quote}

(Asclep. \textit{A.P.} 9.63/XXXII G-P)\textsuperscript{21}

Antipater, too, advises readers who have an ear for poetry that is τορός to praise Antimachus’ work, apparently in direct contradiction of Callimachus’ opinions.\textsuperscript{22} His

\textsuperscript{18} See Gow (1950) 2.144; Hunter (1999) 162.
\textsuperscript{19} For this passage see esp. Gutzwiller (1991) 166ff.
\textsuperscript{20} In particular, lines of thought such as that of Brink (1946) 16, who reasons that as Asclepiades and Poseidippus did not share Callimachus’ views on Antimachus, \textit{therefore} they did not share them about cyclic epic, are surely mistaken.
\textsuperscript{21} Poseidippus was also positive: Ναυνοὺς καὶ Λύδης ἐπίχει δύο καὶ φιλεράστου
Μνημέρου καὶ τοῦ όφρονος 'Ἀντιμάχου' (\textit{AP.} 12.168/140 A.B.)
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{AP} 7.409/Ant. Sid. LXVI G-P.
epigram in addition employs the Callimachean imagery of the unbeaten track ‘with malice’ according to Gow and Page, who, however, assign Antipater’s comments solely to the *Thebaid.* Cameron, on the other hand, applies the epigram to the *Lyde,* pointing to the similarity of his language to that of the *Aetia* prologue.

Interpretation of Callimachus’ opinion of the *Lyde* does indeed seem to be almost inextricably linked to ideas about the prologue, and tends to be projected onto his opinion of *Kollektivgedichte.* There are three main areas to be addressed here: what does Callimachus’ language about the *Lyde* imply, should Callimachus’ remarks about the Telchines be projected onto the *Lyde,* and should the *Lyde* be projected onto the text of the prologue itself? In terms of their outline characteristics, the *Lyde* and *Aetia* do not appear to be greatly dissimilar: they were elegiac collections of tales, with antiquarian interest, combining erudition and mythological narrative. Del Corno, for instance, considered it strange that Callimachus should reject a poem that anticipates Alexandrian tendencies, and added that the traces of the *Lyde* and *Aetia* do not appear dissimilar:

\[E \text{ certo, per quanto entrambe le opere siano ricostruibili solo parzialmente, non riusciamo a immaginare una Lyde totalmente diversa dagli Aitia per struttura e per composizione.}\]

Wyss had noted something similar in his commentary:

\[\text{Fore ut nostri quidem aevi hominibus magnae partes Aetiorum, id carmen si servatum esset, a Lyda vix distare viderentur, mihi paene persuasum habeo.}\]

This latter position, however, is surely too extreme, and was in addition made before the discovery of several significant papyri.

The problem with examining Callimachus’ language in order to isolate the particular aspects of the *Lyde* with which he disagreed is the general nature of the

---

23 G-P (1965) 2.87.
words that are used. τορός, for instance, is a highly subjective term concerned with aural clarity, and could be applied either to the poem, or to the person hearing it. Thus Antipater could blame Callimachus’ failure to find the Lyde τορός on his own lack of that quality in his reception of the poem. Krevans’ suggestion is that the specific aural fault of the Lyde was metrical roughness, for Antimachus was writing at a period prior to various metrical refinements in elegy. Cameron, on the other hand, would have it mean ‘lack of clarity’.

The meaning of παχύς is probably best illustrated by its recurrence a little later in the Aetia prologue, where it is contrasted with λεπτότης:

\[
\text{... ... ... ...} \: \ldots \: \text{αοίδε, τὸ μὲν θύσι δὴ τι πάχιστον}
\]

\[
\text{θρέψαι, τῇ} \: \text{Μοῦσαν} \: \text{δ' όγαθε} \: \text{λεπταλέτην}. \quad (1.23-4Pf.)
\]

The preceding verses had been concerned with excesses of size: Thracian cranes attacking Egyptian pygmies, poetry measured by the Persian mile, and attempts to out-thunder Zeus. Those examples, however, formed part of the poet’s speech: the image of the Muse is placed in the mouth of Apollo. At first the contrast of fat and thin seems to continue the theme of excess from the previous verses, but it is followed by specific commands to be exclusive. In such a context λεπτός has to do with charm and refinement in poetry - the metaphor changes (along with the speaker) from excessive size to stylistic excess. παχύς at this point, therefore, carries a double force: firstly it is literally ‘fat’, ‘bloated’, secondly, in literary terms, it is ‘unrefined’, ‘overblown’. This second meaning sits well with the likely meaning of οὐ τορόν.

---

27 Cameron (1995) 337.
Krevans, Cameron and Matthews seem in rough agreement that παχύς in the comment about Antimachus means something like ‘florid’, ‘bombastic’, turgid.\(^{29}\) The meaning of ‘bloated’ nonetheless lingers in the background. The Prologue’s opening criticisms can be linked swiftly with the \textit{Lyde} through the scholiast’s mentions of Asclepiades and Poseidippus, and the opinions Callimachus attributes to the Telchines are just as swiftly made qualities to be assigned to the \textit{Lyde}. Thus Serrao and Cameron, among others, do not fail to condemn the \textit{Lyde} as \(\varepsilon\nu\ \zeta\epsilon\iota\omicron\mu\alpha\ \delta\iota\nu\nu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\zeta\)\(^{30}\). It is nonetheless noticeable that none of the favourable comments about the \textit{Lyde} show any sign of praising it for its length. There is no reliable evidence that the poem was in fact longer than two books,\(^{31}\) and it is clear that the poem could not with justice be considered an \(\varepsilon\nu\). Its fragments, as we have seen, comprise a wide variety of different heroic tales. These were not apparently merged into one unified narrative thread, let alone a unified plot. Nor does the \textit{Lyde} truly fulfil the meaning of \(\delta\iota\nu\nu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\zeta\) as ‘unbroken’, ‘perpetual’. That would only just be applicable if every tale in the \textit{Lyde} were told in full, and there is no evidence for this. It is hard to extrapolate a real unity between the different narratives: they represent stories with diverse structures, characters and themes, and would have been hard to weld into either a unified or truly continuous whole. It must be admitted, however, that unity is not required to make a poem seem to a bored listener to be ‘never-ending’. Newman thought on the strength of Quintilian’s remarks that poor organisation of material in the \textit{Lyde} might qualify the poem as \(\varepsilon\nu\ \zeta\epsilon\iota\omicron\mu\alpha\ \delta\iota\nu\nu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\zeta\), but the connotations of the phrase go far beyond such a fault.\(^{32}\) These objections to such an application of the prologue are still more


\(^{30}\) Serrao (1979) 94, 98; Cameron (1995) 348-9, 358.

\(^{31}\) For its likely length see Krevans (1993) 154.

\(^{32}\) Newman (1974) 357. Quint. 10.1.52: \textit{contra} (i.e. in contrast to Hesiod) \textit{in Antimacho vis et gravitas et minime vulgare eloquendi genus habet laudem, sed quamvis ei secundas fere grammaticorum consensus deferat, et afectibus et iucunditate et dispositione et omnino arte deficitur.}
relevant to the rest of *Kollektivgedichte*, which, as we have seen, was light and varied in subject matter and style.

The conjectural presence of the *Lyde* in Callimachus’ remarks upon the Telchines has been easily transferred to his comparison of the shorter poems of Philetas and Minnernus to longer ones.

\[
\text{[...]}\text{[.] καὶ Τε[λ]χίσιν ἐγὼ τόδε: φύλον ἀ[...]}\text{[.] τῆς[ειν] ἕπαρ ἔπιστάμενον, ...[.] ἔρευν ὥλιγοστιχος: ἄλλα καθέλικει ...ποῖλů τὴν μακρήν ὁμηνία Θεσμοφόρο[ς[...]}\text{[.] τοῦ δὲ} ὑπὸν Μίμηρίσιος ὁτι γλυκύς, α[...]
\]

(I.7-12 Pf./M.)


In the words of Pretagostini, the interpretation of 9-12 has become:

una fittissima e quasi inestricabile trama di congetture e di interpretazioni, in più di un caso con successivi ripensamenti da parte di chi le aveva in un primo momento proposte, una trama che, nella migliore delle ipotesi, rende più ostico e faticoso l’approccio al testo, quando non abbia addirittura determinato un fraintendimento, uno stravolgimento o una sovrinterpretazione del testo stesso.

(1984) 122

The line of thought that one can trace in the text itself is hard to interpret: “And I say this to the Telchines ‘Tribe of —— . . . knowing . . . to gnaw the liver . . . . . for <I> was “oligostichos”; but fertile Demeter far outweighs the large ——; for of the two of them, <the gentle> —— and not the fat lady taught that Minnernus is sweet.” 33 ὡμηνία Θεσμοφόρος was relatively unproblematically identified as Philetas’ *Demeter* by Edwards, and this is supported by Philetas’ use of ὡμηνία in his lexicographical writings. 33 The scholiast adds considerably to an outline understanding of the passage.

\[\text{ταραχίθεται τε ἐν σ(υγ)κρίσει τὰ ὡλίγων οτί—}\]

relevant to the rest of *Kollektivgedichte*, which, as we have seen, was light and varied in subject matter and style.

The conjectural presence of the *Lyde* in Callimachus’ remarks upon the Telchines has been easily transferred to his comparison of the shorter poems of Philetas and Mimnermus to longer ones.

\[ \ldots \ldots \]. [. . .] καὶ Τέλχισιν ἄγω τόδε: φῦλον ἄ[.
\[ \ldots \ldots \]. ἡπαρ ἐπιστάμενον,
\[ \ldots \ldots \]. πρὴν ἄλλῃ ἀλλὰ καθέλικεi
\[ \ldots \ldots \]. ποιλύ τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπινια Ὑσσομοφόροις;
\[ τοῦ δὲ δύοι Μίνερβος ὑπὶ γλυκὺς, α[. \]
\[ ἦ μεγάλη δ’ οὐκ ἐξιδαξεῖς γυμνῆ. (1.7-12 Pf./M.) \]

In the words of Pretagostini, the interpretation of 9-12 has become:

 Una fittissima e quasi inestricabile trama di congetture e di interpretazioni, in più di un caso con successivi ripensamenti da parte di chi le aveva in un primo momento proposte, una trama che, nella migliore delle ipotesi, rende più ostico e faticoso l’approccio al testo, quando non abbia addirittura determinato un fraintendimento, uno stravolgimento o una sovrinterpretazione del testo stesso. (1984) 122

The line of thought that one can trace in the text itself is hard to interpret: “And I say this to the Telchines “Tribe of — . . . knowing . . . to gnaw the liver . . . . . for <I> was “oligostichos”; but fertile Demeter far outweighs the large — ; for of the two of them, <the gentle> — and not the fat lady taught that Mimnermus is sweet.’” ὄμπινια Ὑσσομοφόρος was relatively unproblematically identified as Philetas’ *Demeter* by Edwards, and this is supported by Philetas’ use of ὄμπινια in his lexicographical writings.33 The scholar adds considerably to an outline understanding of the passage.

\[ παρατίθεται τε ἐν σ(υγ)κρίσει τὰ ὄλ(γων στι-\]

---

What is at issue, according to this scholiast, is a comparison between the better, shorter poems of Mimnermus and Philetas and their longer ones. This however has not gone undisputed: αὐτ’ in the manuscript when resolved as αὐτ(ῶν) renders this ‘internal’ comparison, but certain scholars have instead tried to read αὐτ(α), which might imply an ‘external’ comparison of the shorter poems of Mimnermus and Philetas with the longer ones of other authors. Analysis of the normal practice in such abbreviations, and of our scholiast in particular, shows that such an alternative is barely feasible. The idea of an ‘internal’ comparison is however rendered problematic by the fact that it is hard to extract sure candidates for the long and short poems from the little that we know of Philetas and Mimnermus. Philetas in particular was so highly regarded in Roman times that scholars do not find it readily acceptable that Callimachus should have criticised him, while Antimachus, especially as he appears through Callimachus’ eyes, seems so much more likely to be the author of the μεγάλη γυνη.

For the poetry of Mimnermus we have only two titles, the Nanno and the Smyrneis. As we have seen, however, the contents of the Nanno were varied, and it seems unlikely that they formed a single poem. As such, it cannot have been intended as the μεγάλη γυνη. The Smyrneis was apparently a ktisis poem, and seems to have had its own, rather elaborate preface (14a Allen/Paus. 9.29.4). If the title Smyrneis refers to an Amazon of that name, the poem could thus, as a narrative work named

34 See eg. Pohlenz (1933) 318; Herter (1937); Barigazzi (1956) 164; Matthews (1979a) 132.
35 Macnam (1982).
36 Porphyrio (Epist. 2.2.101) says in apparent confirmation that Mimnermus wrote two books, but does not name them. See Müller (1988) 197ff.
after a woman, be seen as Callimachus’ μεγάλη γυνή.\(^\text{37}\) This solution, however, is not unproblematic, for fragments definitely assigned to the Nanno (9&10 Allen) seem to coincide with the probable subject matter of the κτίσις poem.\(^\text{38}\) Some scholars have therefore assumed that the Nanno was a title for Mimnemus’ entire output, with the Smyrneis as its largest subdivision.\(^\text{39}\) Rostagni suggested that the ‘two books’ of Mimnemus were the Nanno, including the Smyrneis, and a collection of shorter pieces known as the κατὰ λεπτόν.\(^\text{40}\) κατὰ λεπτόν in v.11, however, has proved to be a mirage. The phrase seemed very neatly to imply the preferred Callimachean short, highly crafted poems, and provided a fixed point against which the big woman and all disapproved poetry could be contrasted. Nevertheless, this phrase was only ever a supplement drawn from the London scholiast, and when this document was re-examined with the aid of a modern microscope, it was discovered that the traces could not be made to fit the long-accepted reading.\(^\text{41}\) αἱ γυναικαί τοι // νήμες has therefore been proposed as a new supplement for the end of verse 11 and beginning of verse 12.\(^\text{42}\) As Luppe points out, νήμες, ‘the dainty maidens’, makes far better sense as part of a comparison with the ‘big lady’, and indeed, since μεγάλη γυνή was already read metaphorically, our understanding of the passage remains surprisingly unchanged: both kinds of women still stand for types of poetry. Yet in spite of this, a very slight, but still significant, emphasis on the grounds of comparison might become clearer: μεγάλη against ἀπαλάτι, γυνή against νήμες - size against grace, poetic youth against rather prosaic maturity.\(^\text{43}\) Again, though, a plurality of delicate girls or


\(^{40}\) Rostagni (1956) 67-8.

\(^{41}\) Bastianini (1996); Luppe (1997).

\(^{42}\) Luppe (1997); Sier (1998) 31-34 suggests οἱ μὲν ἄρσας // Κώται as an alternative.

\(^{43}\) Spanoudakis (1998) 61: “The exquisite vocabulary describing the good short poems is in any case markedly contrasted to the plain diction employed for the bad long ones.”
poems is quite well suited to the Nanno: there is no reason why sympotic poetry should concentrate faithfully upon a single figure.

This extension of the metaphor, however, does not ease attempts to find works of Mimnermus and Philetas that would fit the given criteria. The identification of Philetas' poetry is if anything more difficult than it is for Mimnermus. There are quotations from his Hermes and his Demeter, but the citations for the majority of the verses assigned to the latter do not in fact mention any particular work of Philetas; there is a possible reference to a Telephus (22Sp./15P.), Epigrams and Paignia, and, more dubiously, there are the shadowy Bittis (see above), Hermeneia (Strabo 3.5.1) and Naxiaca (FGrH 498). Philetas wrote at least two grammatical works. For many of the fragments attributed to him, no poem is named, and as a number are rather gnomic fragments cited by Stobaeus, there is rarely a clear indication of their original poem or context. In truth, we seem to know so little about the works of Philetas that we could be missing more than one title referring to a big or a small woman. The reference to his Telephus, for instance, suggests that the marriage of Jason and Medea at Alcinoos' house was treated - another female.

The amount of doubt surrounding Philetas' work thus makes it almost impossible to judge whether the putative Bittis was criticised by Callimachus in the Aetia prologue. On the slender basis of what we do know one argument that has been advanced against it is its 'inappropriateness'. An allusion to the poem would require the supplement γραυν in verse 10. Hollis finds such a mode of referring to 'Bittis' as 'grotesque'; Pretagostini remarks that it would be 'cattivo gusto' to refer to Philetas'

44 Still more conjectural are: possible erotic poetry with a bucolic setting - Bowie (1985); the Κλήθρη - McKay (1978); Merops / Κων - Vitelli (1935); Shardella (1996).
45 Fr. 22 Sp. Σ. A. R. 4.1141 ἐν τῷ ἄντρῳ (τῶν) Μάκριδος φησὶ τῶν γάμων γεγενήθησαν Μηδείας καὶ Ἰάσονος, Φίλητας δὲ ἐν Τηλέφῳ ἐν τῇ Ἀλκινόου οἰκίᾳ. Spanoudakis (2002) 309-312 discusses the arguments concerning the possible existence or otherwise of this poem.
beloved in such a way.\textsuperscript{46} One argument advanced in favour of the \textit{Bittis} being meant by Callimachus is the parallelism this would create with the \textit{Nanno}, when that poem is taken to be the \textit{μεγάλη γυνη}.\textsuperscript{47} The latter seems however unlikely. If the \textit{Smyrneis} is the \textit{μεγάλη γυνη}, then Philetas’ putative \textit{Κοβ} (\textit{Tales of Cos}) becomes a candidate for the rejected longer poem.\textsuperscript{48} This is argued to be a collection of myths and antiquities, associated with Cos, similar to the \textit{Smyrneis}. Sbardella presents the case for this, but the fact remains that there are no references to such a title from antiquity; his claim that the references to Cos by Alexandrian poets must stem from Philetas is undercut by his own assertion that there was a Coan epic tradition concerned with local myths.\textsuperscript{49} For Philetas, therefore, there is no apparently likely candidate to be the long poem contrasted with his \textit{Demeter}. In addition, scholars have objected to the idea that Callimachus should have differentiated among Philetas’ works, which were praised without reservation by Roman poets.\textsuperscript{50} Such an argument assumes firstly that the Roman poets had read Philetas’ work in its entirety, and secondly that Callimachus’ discrimination between the poems was intended to be read in absolute terms; that is, that his preference for the \textit{Demeter} meant that the poem contrasted must be ‘bloated’ or ‘monotonous’. It may rather be the case that in Callimachus’ opinion the shorter poems of Philetas and Mimnermus better displayed their qualities than their longer ones.

In considering a supplement to verse 10, Hollis remarked that introducing a third element into the comparison of vv.9-12 would lead to an awkward lack of

\textsuperscript{46} Pretagostini (1984) 128; Hollis (1978) 403. For Gallavotti (1932) 234 the epithet is still more problematic, because he assumes ‘Bittis’ to have been a \textit{dead wife}.

\textsuperscript{47} See e.g. Latacz (1985) 84.

\textsuperscript{48} First suggested by Vitelli (1935). This word also seems possible as a supplement in the papyrus - see Hollis (1978) 402 n.1, \textit{pace} Pfeiffer ad. loc.

\textsuperscript{49} Sbardella (1996) 104-108.

balance, clumsiness which seems especially unlikely in Callimachus. A further objection to reading that line as an ‘external’ comparison is the syntax and the validity of the point to be made. The poems to be contrasted against the Demeter of Philetas and ‘ἀπαλας’ of Mimnermus are to demonstrate through their inferiority the worth of oligostichia. If the inferior poems were to be rejected not only because of their length, but also because they were deficient in style and too ‘epic’ in subject matter, as Antimachus’ Lyde, and also Choerilus’ Persica, are claimed to be, then the specific demonstration of the value of short poetry loses its point.

That Callimachus intended to attack Antimachus’ Lyde in his prologue is none the less something very widely accepted. Cameron defends the scholiast, but holds Mimnermus and Philetas to be criticised because, in effect, of their relationship with Kollektivgedichte.

Scholars who tried to squeeze the Lyde into the lines were right in their instincts, if misguided in their methods. For Callimachus is not simply assessing the poems of Mimnermus and Philetas on their own merits. He is considering them as authorities and models.

So (Callimachus suggests) just as the longer poems of Mimnermus spawned the Lyde, so did the longer poems of Philetas spawn the Leontion. Mimnermus and Philetas were excellent poets, but some of their poems were better than others. Since the main counts against the Lyde were its length and diffuseness (the Leontion too ran to three books), it comes as no surprise that it is the shorter poems of Mimnermus and Philetas that Callimachus prefers.

The argument here is not aided by the fact that it is extremely similar to the one advanced by Gallavotti on the understanding that the Nanno set the trend which led to

---

51 Hollis (1978) 405-6.
52 Barigazzi (1956) argues for the presence of Choerilus in the passage on the basis of the rejected epic topics that follow in vv.13-16.
53 Cf. Pretagostini (1984) 131. Allen (1993) 152 approaches the point from another angle: the Telchines valued the Lyde, and so to contrast it with Mimnermus’ works would hardly force them to admit the superiority of the latter or of oligostichia.
the rejected *Kollektivgedichte*, whereas a few pages earlier Cameron had declared the *Smyrneis* to be the μεγάλη γυνή.\textsuperscript{54}

La polemica di Callimaco contro questa tradizione di poemi erotico-mitologici, come la *Lide* di Antimaco, che risaliva alla *Nanno* di Mimnermo e alla quale riattaccava anche la *Bitide* di Filito o la *Leonzio* di Hermesianatte, è limpida e coerente.\textsuperscript{1933} 234

Critics who hold that Antimachus was present in the *Aetia* prologue also subscribe to this question of authority and influence, presented in what may be referred to as the *Mimnermus redivivus* argument.\textsuperscript{55} This in effect asserts that Callimachus objected to the presentation of Antimachus as a successor to Mimnermus, and sought instead to have Philetas acknowledged as the true inheritor of Mimnermus’ style. Various subtleties have been added to this theory, some showing considerable refinement in our views of Callimachus. In Puelma’s eyes it was Asclepiades’ and Poseidippus’ championing of Antimachus that caused the depth of feeling in Callimachus’ remarks about the Telchines.\textsuperscript{56} Krevans saw the ‘anxiety of influence’ at work: Callimachus’ *Aetia* in her opinion bears more resemblance to the *Lyde* than it may have done to the work of Philetas and Mimnermus, but the poet was unwilling to acknowledge the extent of his debt to Antimachus.\textsuperscript{57} That there were alternative pairings of Mimnermus and Antimachus and Mimnermus and Philetas in Hellenistic times is borne out by the groupings to be seen principally in epigram, and in the formation of canons. Hermesianax, for example, pairs Antimachus with Mimnermus, interrupting his chronological sequence to do so.\textsuperscript{58} They are paired again by Poseidippus,\textsuperscript{59} and also appear together in two later prose sources.\textsuperscript{60} Philetas for his

\textsuperscript{54} Cameron (1995) 311.


\textsuperscript{56} Puelma (1954) 111-115.

\textsuperscript{57} Krevans (1993) 149-156.

\textsuperscript{58} Hermesianax F.7P.35-46.

\textsuperscript{59} AP 17.168.
part, however, is the one enshrined along with Mimnennus and Callimachus in the Byzantine canons:

λέγει δὲ καὶ ἀριστεῦσαι τῷ μέτρῳ Καλλίνον τε τὸν Ἐφεσίον καὶ Μίμνημον τὸν Κολοφώνιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν τοῦ Τηλέφου Φιλήταν τὸν Κώιον καὶ Καλλίμαχον τὸν Βάττον.

(Photius Bib. 319b11)\(^6\)

In addition to these testimonia, Puelma points to the praise of Philetas along with Callimachus and the rejection of Antimachus in Roman poetry as a sign of the effectiveness of Callimachus’ polemic.\(^6\)

While Callimachus was undeniably opposed to Antimachus, the idea that opinions about the Lyde led to deep divisions within Alexandrian literary circles is far less certain, as is the view that one cause of Callimachus’ antagonism was Kollektivgedichte. Poseidippus, for instance, wrote in praise of both Antimachus and Philetas,\(^6\) while, as we have seen, Asclepiades was ranked along with Philetas by Theocritus. Hermesianax, too, was willing to praise both authors. Knox remarks that Callimachus’ abuse of the Telchines may have astonished its targets.\(^6\) Puelma’s opinion (reading the prologue as an ‘external comparison’) that Callimachus’ Aetia was to present an updating of Mimnennus along the lines of Philetas to counteract the Kollektivgedichte of Phanocles, Hermesianax and Alexander Aetolus, who had followed Antimachus’ treatment of Mimnennus, appears less likely if the literary culture had no firm stratifications.\(^6\)

---

\(^6\) Solin. Coll. rem. mem. 40.6 ingenia Asiatica inclita per gentes fuere poetae Anacreon, inde Minnernmus et Antimachus ... (T15 Allen); Schl. Bob. in Cic. pro. Arch. 25 (T19 Allen).

\(^6\) T20Allen/18aSp. Cf. the Canones Byzantini (20a/18bSp.) and Tzetzes in Lyc. (20bA/18c Sp.). Spanoudakis (2001) 434 suggests that this canon derives from Callimachus’ Pinakes.

\(^6\) Puelma (1954) 113-5; cf. Propertius 2.34.30ff. & 43f.

\(^6\) G-P (in favour of the Lyde), 63 A.B. (on a statue of Philetas).

\(^6\) Knox (1985b) 119.

\(^6\) Puelma (1954) 115.
The view of Gallavotti and Cameron mentioned above, that Callimachus objected to the long poems of both Mimnermus and Philetas because they inspired catalogue poetry, avoids this impression of fixed divisions, but is in truth short of real evidence beyond his known dislike of the Lyde. As I stated earlier, Callimachus’ disapproval of the poem may have been based on stylistic rather than structural grounds. If this is the case, then the principal basis alleged for Callimachus’ disapproval of Kollektivgedichte such as those of Hermesianax and Phanocles disappears. A second supposed basis of Callimachus’ dislike of the Lyde is its ‘epic’ subject matter; this is an objection that cannot be transferred to the later Kollektivgedichte, where the topics are erotic and the figures are from the margins of myth. Antimachus’ influence can at best have been only very partial here: there is no true sign that these Kollektivgedichte perpetuated the traits of which Callimachus disapproved.

4.3 Frames, Genres and their Implications

Although we know that the aetia of the first two books of the poem were embedded in a conversation with the Muses, and that the second half was enclosed by the Victoria Berenices at the beginning of book three and the Coma at the end of book four, with no transitional passages between aetia, there was nonetheless considerable variety and differing emphases in the presentation and linking of the tales within these sections. The existence of the Muse-frame does not imply a rigid or unvarying format for the segments. Generic play and thematic development were present throughout the work, not in a homogeneous fashion, but with fluctuating passages that drew particular attention to the poem’s form.
The question-and-answer format of books 1 and 2 naturally creates a segmented effect, but within this changes in the length of question, the nature of Callimachus’ response, and the number of tales evoked by a question create a texture that is far from being monotonous or mechanical. Indeed, the presence of this framework serves to create a broader context for the narrative segments, similar to that provided by the genealogy in the Hesiodic Catalogue. The first formal aetion is initiated by a direct question:

κῶς ἄνις σύλλων
ιρέζειν καὶ στεφέων εὐάδε τῷ Παρίῳ (3Pf./5M.)

At the end of this tale a further, double question is asked, addressed to the Muses as a group - θεά - and answered by Calliope.

κῶς δὲ, θεά, ἠμέρα Ἀναφαίος ἐπὶ αἰσχροῖς
ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ δυσφήμιοις Λινδος ἄγιοι δυσίην,
η ... τῆς τοῦ Ἡρακλῆσι ἄνθης:
....... ἐπίκ. [......] ἦρχετο Καλλιστὴ. (7.19-22 Pf./9M.)

Close to the beginning of book 2 not only Callimachus’ question but the mindset behind it, and also his response to the Muse’s tale, are preserved. The poet complains that whatever he ate at a symposium, and whatever garlands he wore, were all gone by the next day, but what he heard alone remains with him.

όσσα δ’ άικουσίς
eἰσεβέτημν, ἔτι μοι μοῦνα πάρεσίτι τάδε (43.16-17 Pf./50M.)

A list of Sicilian cities and their founders follows, and in conclusion Callimachus asks why it is that the people of Zancle alone do not invoke their oecists by name:

τάδεν οὐδεμιὴ γὰρ ὁτίς πο[τὲ] τείχος ἐδείμε
Ἐνανυμίν νομίμην ἐρχ[ε]τ’ ἐπ’ εἰλαττήμν.’
ως ἐφάμην: Κλεών δὲ τὸ δευτέρου ἐρχ[ε]τὸ μιθήμου
χεῖρ’ ἐπ’ ἀδελφείης ὀμόν ἔρεισιμένην’ (43.54-57Pf./50M.)

As Clio finishes her tale, Callimachus responds with wonder and a further question:
These fragments present a paradigm of question-and-answer, but the dialogue-frame did not impose a rigid structure upon the order in which the tales are presented. Even though it is at times hard to be certain whether or not Callimachus has said something that leads the Muses to digress, it is plain even from the fragments that we have that the poet’s questions initiated the telling of aetia, but did not confine these tales within limits. Thus the question about sacrifice to the Graces on Paros leads to consideration of the contradictory accounts of the Graces’ genealogy, which one might view as a pendant to the main aetion, or a separate tale in its own right. Calliope follows with three tales, one of which, that of Heracles and Theiodamas, was not anticipated by Callimachus’ question, and is concerned not with cult practice but with the action of a population shift. As these supplementary narratives are not requested by Callimachus, his control over the Muses is limited. Moreover, these digressions break free from the thematic basis supposedly underlying the aetia. The questions asked by Callimachus in this first portion of book 1 concern sacrificial practices deviating from the norm, principally in terms of elements that might be thought insulting to the deities in question. In digressing into tales linked to their predecessors by thematic links other that those suggested by the poet, the Muses attempt to direct the Aetia in ways apparently at odds with the desires of the poet figure.

Callimachus’ relationship with the Muses is in fact problematised throughout the Aetia. Neither they nor his poet figure seem in any way bound to keep within the frame he has created for the first part of the poem. When the aetion for the failure of the people of Zancle to invoke their founders by name evokes θάμβος in its hearer,
this emotion might be thought to present a paradigm of the desired reader-response not only to the Muses’ tales but also to Callimachus’ work. θάμβος, wonder, normally the response to something marvellous, often supernatural, is to be felt by the learned man when he comes to understand a complex and unusual reason or piece of thinking.67 The wonder experienced by the Callimachean poet figure should, and apparently does, inspire him to seek further knowledge. The question that results from this θάμβος, however, has nothing to do with the issue or the tale which elicited the emotion.68 It concerns the celebration of a Cretan festival at Haliartos in Boeotia. The oddity to be explained here is not the omission of a customary invocation, but an apparently misplaced rite. The Theodaisia was a banquet offered to the gods, perhaps specifically connected with Dionysus,69 and thus appears removed from the hero-cults of oecists. If there was any connection between this cult and that of the preceding aetion, it could only have become apparent in the Muse’s explanation, and thus could hardly have been in the poet-figure’s mind when he asked the question.

A second, more subtle ironization of Callimachus’ quest for knowledge has been demonstrated by Hunter.70 θάμβος and Callimachus’ ‘desire to know’ seems to evoke Aristotle’s description of the earliest growth of philosophy:

διὰ γάρ τὸ θαυμάζειν οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ νῦν καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἡρέαντο φιλοσοφεῖν, ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν τὰ πρόχειρα τῶν ἀπόρων θαυμάζαντες, ἐπὶ κατὰ μικρὸν οὕτω προϊόντες, καὶ περὶ τῶν μείζων διαπορήσαντες, οἶον περὶ τε τῶν τῆς σελήνης παθημάτων καὶ τῶν περὶ τῶν ἠλιόν καὶ ἀστρα, καὶ περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς γενέσεως. ὦ δ’ ἀπόρῳ καὶ θαυμάζων οἴεται ἄγνοειν (διὸ καὶ ὁ φιλόμυθος φιλόσοφος πῶς ἔστιν’ ὁ γάρ μύθος σύγκειται ἐκ θαυμασίων). (Aristot. Metaph. 1.982b.12-20)

This original wonder, however, arose from observed phenomena,\textsuperscript{71} whereas Callimachus’ interest is in cults and practices, some of which no one in his generation could have seen. Thus Callimachus might be said to place in doubt the mode of proceeding that was apparently his intellectual heritage.\textsuperscript{72}

The destabilised transition is typical of Callimachus’ renegotiation of the traditional relationship between the Muse and the poet-figure. The conversation with the Muses is an expansion of the traditional epic invocations, in which an initial question was followed by a short answer which introduces the narrative as a whole:\textsuperscript{73}

\begin{verbatim}
tis t' api sofse theon eridi eu neke maxhesbai;
Lhtouz kai Dios ulos; o gar basiliopi xolothelis
voouson ana straton orose kakhin, (ll. 1.8-10)
\end{verbatim}

In contrast to the relatively simple form of the Homeric questions, Hesiod seems more demanding.

\begin{verbatim}
eipate de, os t' prota theoi kai gaiia genevoto
kai potamoi kai pontos apeiritos, oidiati thius,
adstra te lampestwonta kai ourano eurw uperwven
os t' afevou diasamanto kai os timas dielouto
nde kai os t' prwta poluptuxon exou 'Olympou,
tauta moi eipete, Moussai, 'Olympia daimat' etherasa,
ex arxh, kai eipash, o ti prwtou genei' autwv.
'H toi men prwtisata Xaos genei', autar epeita
Gai eufrouterovs, pantwv edos asphalvse aiei. (Theog. 108-117.)
\end{verbatim}

These questions set out a programme for what is to come in the remainder of the poem. No divisions are made between the answers to one question and the next, but the cosmogonic and teleological narratives are woven together with no pause until Zeus’ power is established. The narratorial voice of this long section (116-962) could be that of either the Muses or the poet speaking Muse-given knowledge. ‘Hesiod’ is

\textsuperscript{71} Cf. the etymology of \texttt{Thea} as derived from \texttt{THEAOMAI}. Fantuzzi-Hunter (2002) 81.

\textsuperscript{72} Fantuzzi-Hunter (2002) 81.

\textsuperscript{73} See esp. Harder (1988) 3-8. For analysis of the form of epic invocations see Minton (1960); Steinrück (1996).
assumed to be wholly dependent on the Muses for his knowledge and the ability to
retail it. That Callimachus should be in dialogue with the Muses at all challenges
this one-sided balance of power. He is not taken over by the song that they grant
him, but retains his individuality to ask questions of them according to his own
interests and concerns. The Sicilian catalogue is the most striking occasion on which
he displays his own knowledge: he details a vast array of learning about foundation
cults, and the Muses are merely called upon to supplement his learning.

Callimachus’ relative independence of the Muses enables him to step outside
his own frame after the end of the action of Paros and the Graces.

Such a request for divine favour and long life for a poem is normally a feature of an
opening (or sometimes a concluding) invocation. In the light of this all that has gone
before no longer seems part of the main body of the poem. Callimachus also steps out
of the frame of his conversation with the Muses: his request for the success of his
poem must surely come from the mouth of ‘Callimachus the narrator’, rather than that
of ‘Callimachus the young man talking to the Muses’. This interruption shows the
author forcing the dialogue with the Muses into a secondary position. Clio may have
no notion that what she says will be separated off from her sisters’ utterances. The fact
that it is the Graces who are called upon adds further to the destabilisation of the
relationship between poet and goddesses. In the Theogony’s double beginning it was

---

74 The only exception to this rule in ancient epic is the invocation before the catalogue of ships (Il.
2.484-493) which makes explicit the poet’s dependence on the Muses, but places the catalogue that
follows in his own mouth.
75 Cf. Hutchinson (1988) 44.
called upon to help with a catalogue of this type.
78 See Massimilla (1994).
the Muses who gained the most attention.\textsuperscript{79} Here, they are restricted to the functional role of supplying the author with information, and the Graces are asked instead to grant the poetry grace. The poet seems to set limits to the Muses as well as to edit their conversation.

The effect of the relative independence of Callimachus and the Muses from each other means that the structure of this part of the poem - the order of the tales - is not tied to a strict sequence of questions and answers. This lack of rigidity allows for a considerable variety of segment lengths and for the insertion of digressions, including that of the symposium at the beginning of book 2. The dialogue-framework is in fact important not so much for the mechanics of the structure of \textit{Aetia} 1 and 2 as for the reader's perception of them. The interplay of Callimachus and the Muses creates a sense of an outer narrative into which the aetia are fitted. The \textit{Aetia} thus becomes the tale of Callimachus' acquisition of knowledge: it differs from the norm of epic and didactic in that it displays this as a process rather than merely presenting its effect. Callimachus' continual and self-conscious intrusion into his text, and the interplay between him and the Muses, stand out as the unifying characteristics of the poem's first two books.

This is particularly evident in comparison with the second half of the work. In the sequence of tales of fragments 114 and 115 Pf. (64\&65M.), probably to be assigned to book 3, the story of Onnes and Tottes appears to precede the epigrammatic dialogue with the statue of Apollo, itself followed by traces of another story, concerned with Thrace and possibly involving Diomedes' man-eating horses.\textsuperscript{80} There is no sign of any transitional material. Although the Delian Apollo segment has ties

with another genre, shared themes can be traced between the sections: Onnes and Tottes were demigods who rescued Assessos from a siege according to Apollo’s oracle and instructions, during a war begun by the murder of the king of Miletus at a festival of Apollo. As a tale of divine intervention and rescue it would thus contrast with the potential themes associated with King Diomedes, such as theodicy and punishment. The statue of Apollo, which the tales flank, bears in its right hand the Graces and in its left a bow, as emblems of the god’s capability to do good and to punish. While we cannot be certain, it therefore appears likely that the three tales were united by a fair degree of thematic coherence. If they had been presented through the medium of the dialogue with the Muses, the connections could have been signalled but, more importantly, the impression of discontinuity could have been avoided.

The abruptness of the leaps from one segment to another invites the aetia to be read as discrete pieces rather than closely related parts of a single poem.

\[ \text{The apostrophe ‘hail polygonal’ is clearly the finale of the previous section, and coupled with the reference to ‘the child at the porch’ it seems to indicate the cult of Apollo at Miletus, where γυλλοί - stones representing the Cabiri - were deposited in the porches of the temples of Apollo and Hecate.}

\[ \text{There is no space after this exclamation for any indication of a change of place, speaker, or subject: the first} \]

---

83 Pfeiffer (1952) 21.
question addressed to the statue of Delian Apollo must have been very brief, perhaps simply Δήλωσ 'ωπόλλων. A complete adjustment of focus thus appears to be required of the reader, an apparent abandonment of the preceding tale in favour of this at first sight wholly different passage.

The removal of the unifying frame in the second half of the Aetia is matched at the same time by the divisive nature of the presence of segments that suggest a strong affiliation to other genres. Book 3, for instance, begins with the Victoria Berenices in the style of a Pindaric epinician; the ‘Tomb of Simonides’ adopts the form of a sepulchral epigram as the ‘Delian Apollo’ does that of an ecphrastic epigram, while the erotic narrative of ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ is different from anything that has occurred in the Aetia so far. Allusions to other genres were of course frequent in Aetia 1 and 2 - in particular the catalogue of Sicilian cities with its similarity to epic catalogues, and the symposium scene that may have preceded it. but these passages remained integrated into the rest of the work through the voice of the poet as narrator and the device of the dialogue with the Muses. In Aetia 3 and 4, however, not only is this unifying framework removed, but the use of other genres becomes more prominent and more striking in its effect. In assuming the epigrammatic form, the ‘Tomb of Simonides’ and the ‘Delian Apollo’ segments adopt a structure that in normal circumstances attains closure and need take no account of what has gone before or is to follow. The employment of such forms thus appears to take to a new extreme the tendency of Kollektivgedichte to present tales as if separable. The Aetia shares with other works the fact that the story of one segment is not continued in the

87 Cf. Pfeiffer (1952) 26; Trypanis (1975) 88 (Maas’ supplement); Massimilla (1996) 130.
88 For other examples see esp. Harder (2001).
next, but the use of such very self-contained passages seems to deny the existence of any unifying force bringing the segments together into a single poem.

It appears that there were gestures towards outer symmetry with the *Victoria Berenices* matching the *Coma*, and the context of the Olympic games for the last action of book 3 looking back to Heracles’ foundation of the Nemean games at the end of the *Victoria*. A further gesture may be seen in the fact that the penultimate action of book 4 is an Argonautic tale, just as the second tale of book 1 was. These outer rings, however, seem only of use in setting boundaries and providing closure: they cannot lend organic coherence to the inner contents of the books. The second half of the *Aetia* thus seems to conflict with and question the generic identity of the first.

As we have seen, the constant use of forms and structuring devices from other genres makes *Kollektivgedichte* at best a very loose grouping of works, but they all share in the fact that some unifying device, whether the poet’s voice or a repeated formula, seems to create some measure of continuity. While the styles and transitions in *Aetia* 3 and 4 seem to break away from this, there is nonetheless, as I will show, an implicit thematic patterning among the different segments. Unity, although not uniformity, is maintained on a thematic level, although in purely formal terms the work seems to have become a collection of shorter pieces.\(^{91}\)

The employment of other genres in the *Aetia* goes hand in hand with the poem’s own generic self-exploration. In the passages of *Aetia* 1 and 2 that draw on other genres, Callimachus remained in charge as primary narrator.\(^{92}\) These, moreover, were gestures towards the sources for the *Aetia*’s form. The most striking, of course, is...

---


\(^{91}\) The presence of *paragraphoi* between sections in the *Diegesis* might be mentioned at this point, but their evidence is inconclusive. While *paragraphoi* were often used to separate poems in anthologies, they also appear between the segments of the *Tattoo Elegy*, which is undeniably a single piece, and between sections of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*.

the on-going intertextual play with the *Theogony*, a work which not only provides the model for a poet's privileged relationship with the Muses but also displayed the cosmos coming into being and the process by which Zeus' sovereignty became established. The nature of genealogical poetry is that the present is explained through a particular construction of the past. In this respect it has much in common with the *Aetia*, but, with the genealogy of the Graces in particular, Callimachus also highlights the differences. The *Theogony* provided an all-embracing account of the nature of the cosmos - the *Aetia* is concerned with local peculiarities. The claims made in a genealogy may be disputed, as is the case with the Graces, but Callimachus has access to special knowledge. While one could attempt to draw a parallel between the chronological scope of the *Theogony* and that of the *Aetia*, Callimachus does not present his material in any sort of chronological order. Genealogy is thus not privileged as a mode of aetiological discourse in the *Aetia*; rather, it is acknowledged as being of importance to the poet's predecessors, and the contrast with it helps to define his new, more sharply focused way of viewing the world, which looks at the oddities of the interaction of men and gods through cult, instead of the aspects of human existence determined by the cosmogony. Indeed, although the *Somnium* seems to place the *Theogony* to the fore as a model, it is the *Catalogue of Women* that provides a better Hesiodic precedent for these aspects.

The symposium scene (178Pf./89M.) considers another means of acquiring knowledge.

![Greek text]

95 For the theme of knowledge in the substance of the aetia see Hutchinson (2003).
Here, as in the Sicilian segment, Callimachus displays his motivation for asking the question - a state of mind that yearns for knowledge - again apparently modelling his own ideal reader: ὡς[α] δ' ἐμεῖο σῇθεν πάρα θυμός ἂκουσαι // ἵχανει,
tάδε μοι λ[ἔ]ξον [ἀνειρομένων]. On this occasion there is little that undercuts such eagerness. Asking scholarly questions at a time of festivity has been doubly prepared for: the allusive way in which the Anthesteria is mentioned shows off a learned mindset towards it, and then Callimachus proceeds to make clear his attitude towards excessive drinking. In effect he has marked out the particular type of sympotic tradition he takes as his inspiration. In the Protagoras Socrates distinguishes between the symposia of the uneducated, in which flute girls are at a premium because the men cannot sustain a good level of conversation, and those of gentlemen, in which each man speaks and listens in turn, although still perhaps drinking heavily.

Recitations, capped verses, and riddles (γρύφοι) were nonetheless commonplace at many symposia. Callimachus chooses the motif of the learned symposium, but also perhaps reminds the reader of the symposium as an origin for poetry and a context of its performance. Comparison with the sorts of questions asked in Plutarch's

96 ἡ δὲ πιθοῦς ἐξάθεαν ὠδὶ· ὅτε δούλοις ἡμιαρ Ὀρέστειοι λεικοὺς ἄγουσι Χόδε: Ἰκαρίου καὶ παιδὸς ἄγων ἐπέτειον ἄγιοτύν, Ἀτθίου οἰκίστη, σοῦ φασό, Ἡραγύνη, ἐς δοίην ἐκάλεσον ὁμίθεας, (178.1-5Pf.)

97 Protag. 347d.

Quaestiones Convivales shows too that the symposium is not a background merely for this segment of the poem. The subject matter of the questions asked throughout the Aetia - unusual cult practices, coupled with foundations, strange statues, and topography - is not elsewhere in poetry brought to the fore to the same extent. In Apollonius, for example, they are referred to incidentally whenever opportunity arises - throughout the course of a travelogue, for instance, but are not made subjects in their own right. Callimachus chooses to put forward here as his model not works of literature, but the conversations of learned and literary men.

The third passage from Aetia 1 and 2 that has the appearance of being drawn from another genre is the Sicilian catalogue. In this Callimachus listed at least a dozen Sicilian towns, mentioning their origins, festivals, or other notable features. This particular type of catalogue is associated with epic, most notoriously the Homeric catalogue of ships, but developed and adopted in Apollonius’ Argonautica.

"Ηλυθε δ’ Ἀστερίων αὐτοσχεδόν, ὅν ρα Κομήτης
gείνατο διήνυτος ἐφ’ ὤδασιν Ἀπιδανοίῳ,
Πειρεσίας ὅρεος Φυλλήπου ἀγχόθι ναίτων,
ἐνδὰ μὲν Ἀπιδανός τε μέγας καὶ δῖος Ἐνίπτεως
ἀμφο συμφορέουται, ἀπόπροθεν εἰς ἐν ἰόντες.
Λάρισαν δ’ ἐπὶ τοῖς λιπῶν Πολύφημος ἰκανὸν
Εἰλατίδης, ὅς πρὶν μὲν ἐρισθενέων Λαπιθάων,
ὁππότε Κενταύροις Λαπίθαι ἐπὶ θωρήσουστο,
ὁπλότερος πολέμιζε· τότ’ αὖ βαρύθεσκε οἱ ἡδή
gυῖα, μένεν δ’ ἔτι θυμος ἀρήσιος, ὡς τὸ πάρος πέρ.
Οὔδε μὲν Ἰφικλος Φυλάκη ἐνι δηρόν ἐλειπτο,
μήτρωσ Αἰσονίδας· κασιγυῆτην γὰρ ὀπίουν
Αἰασῶν Ἀλκιμέδην Φυλακηίδα· τῆς μιν ἀνώγει
tηνούσιν καὶ κῆδος ἐνυκρινθήναι ὀμίλο.
Οὔδε Φεραῖς Ἀδημητος ἑυρήμεσισιν ἀνάσσον

99 E.g. (a selection taken at random) 743c Peri tov ἄρισμοι tōn Μουσῶν ὅσα λέγεται

100 For the Aetia and prose προβλήματα see Hutchinson (2003) 48.

101 I would not however go so far as to say, with Barigazzi (1975a) 21-26 that the conversation with the Muses was itself part of a sympotic setting for the entire Aetia.
As in *Kollektivgedichte*, a common feature of these catalogues is that the outer narrative connection between the units is not dependent upon their contents. Thus Apollonius’ Argonautic catalogue can describe the confluence of the Apidanus and Enipeus in one segment and mention the Centaumachy in the next, and yet not have the passage sound disjointed, because it is understood that these sections are to be read as reflecting upon the world inhabited by the heroes, and not as narratively or thematically continuous. Callimachus shares in this practice: Gela’s Lindian ancestry, the killing of Minos and Eryx’ association with Aphrodite are all to be seen as elements that go towards a cultural portrait of Sicily. The inclusion of this catalogue is not solely owing to the author’s supposed ‘catalogue mindset’. It suggests, disingenuously, a model for a catalogue poem in which the details of the segments have apparently little to do with each other. In addition, while the form of the catalogue reflects upon that of the *Aetia*, the prominence given to the topic of foundation myths must be intended as a reference to the genre of *ktisis* poetry, and to works on local antiquities, which were an important source for Callimachus. His processes of selection and comparison are also placed on display, emphasised by the fact that the catalogue is in truth a priamel; the towns are named as a foil to Zancle. Such catalogues differ from *Kollektivgedichte*, however, in scale and the fact the
narrative segments are the exception rather than the rule, but, most importantly, in that epic catalogues, whether muster lists or periploi, are grounded in a specific narrative context, in which they participate through their themes and ethos.

The major passages presented in the form of a specific genre in *Aetia* 3 and 4 turn away from the model of the first half. Rather than reflecting the poem’s sources and structure, they appear to problematise the process of enquiry. This is most marked in the ‘Tomb of Simonides’:

```
Οὐδ’ ἄν τοι Καμάρινα τόσον κακόν ὄκκόσον ἀ[ν]δρός 
kινηθεῖς ὅσοι τύμβος ἐπικρεμάσαι:
καὶ γιάρ ἐμὸν κοτε οῆμα, τὸ μοι πρὸ τὸλνος ἔχ[ε]υ[α]ν
’Ζην’ ὕκραγαντίνοι Ζειν[δ]ὰν ἄζομενοι,
. . . καὶ’ οὐν ἱρειμεν ἀνὴρ κακός, εἰ τιν’ ἀκουε[ς]
Φοινίκια πτόλιος σχέτλιον ἱγεμόνα·
πύργῳ δ’ ἐγκατέλεξεν ἐμὴν λίθον οὐδὲ τὸ γράμμα
ἡδέσθη τὸ λέγον τὸν ἠλε [λεω]πρέπειος
κείσθαι πρὸ τὸν θανάτον τὸν ἒρων, ὡς τὰ περισσὰ
. . . καὶ ἔβαλεν πρῶτος ὡς ἔφρασαμεν, 
οὐδ’ ύμείς, Πολυδευκε, ὑπέτρεσεν, ο七星ελαξὶρου 
μέλλοντος πίπτειν ἐκτὸς ἐθεσθε κοτε
δαιτύμλον [ο]ν ἀπὸ μοῦνον, ὡς Κρανυνώνος ζαίαί
ὁλισθὲν μεγάλοις ὠῖκος ἐπὶ Σικηπάδιας.
Ὀνακε, ἀλ. . . ἐστ’ ἐγὼ (64Pf.)
```

This is not a typical sepulchral epigram: the actual ‘epitaph’ seems to be restricted to verses 7 to 10, where it appears only in indirect speech.102 The epigram begins with an almost proverbial warning against violating a tomb before moving to the details of the specific incident. The ‘epitaph’ is summarised to show what Phoenix failed to read: this in fact mirrors the larger paradox of the segment, in that conventionally a sepulchral epigram might be cast as if spoken by a grave stele, but in this instance, although the verses appear to be in Simonides’ voice, the stone that conventionally would have conveyed his words has actually been destroyed.103 Phoenix failed to read

---

when he had the opportunity; the reader hears what no longer exists. The idea of problems in the persistence of memory of a man is highly appropriate to Simonides, who was famous for his mnemonic ability and for his sepulchral poetry. He opposed the idea that a funeral monument lasts forever (PMG 581.5-6), and expressed the idea that fame would not be destroyed by time (PMG 531.4-7). Both he and the desecration of his monument are now memorialised by Callimachus; in doing so, however, he includes them alongside his explanations of cult practices commemorating events whose fame is now all but forgotten. The epigram was not a normal source for extensive aetiological poetry, and the allusion to the form here thus reflects not so much on the sources of the poem as on failed commemorations.

Similarly, the epinician form was not one of the sources underlying aetiological poetry, and neither was erotic narrative poetry. Indeed, the ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ is striking for the fact that it has no obvious aetiological tele. It is followed, however, by what seems to be a plain reflection upon Callimachus’ sources.

Given that Callimachus’ ironic tone is in particular evidence in this segment - as witnessed by his self-rebuke (κύον, κύον 75.4) and his undercut ‘rationalisation’ of the causes of epilepsy (ψευδόμεναι δ’ ιερὴν φημίζομεν 75.14) - commentators have naturally assumed that here too he was being insincere in his apparent praise of

---

104 Harder (1998) 98.
Xenomedes. It is unclear to what extent Callimachus made open reference to his sources in the poem - it does not seem especially plausible that he should often have made comments on this scale, although there is a small trace of a citation from book 4:

\[\text{ση . . . τι . . . ψ} \quad \text{Ἀλεγανδρίδες εἰ τι παλαιάς} \quad \text{φθεγγίσωνται} \quad \text{υφαν ἱστορίαι.} \quad (92 \text{Pf.})\]

Unless this remark was followed by further details of Leandrides' histories, this seems to be a brief allusion rather than a summary of that author's work. A 'Leandros' is mentioned again by the scholiast on fragment 88 as agreeing with Callimachus about the name of the guardian of the Delphic oracle. The scholiast also supplies references to Hagias and Dercylos, two of these however, belonged to book 1, and it is hard to envisage how a citation of a prose source could have been incorporated within a Muse's aetiological narrative. Multiple explicit citations by Callimachus of the same source certainly seem unlikely.

I thus think it possible that the Xenomedes passage was the only one of its kind (at least in extent) in the Aetia. Should this be the case, then the fact that Xenomedes should have been picked out even for ironic mention should surely indicate that he was held in some kind of esteem. Πρέσβυς ἔτητημίη μεμελημένος in particular looks like praise. It has been suggested, however, that the description of Xenomedes starting from the island's earliest mythology - ἀρχηγος ὡς νήματος ξεκίθος, (56) - carries with it an implied criticism of the author's style and structure, especially as it is coupled with the use of

108 Schl. Flor. on the 'Graces' (7Pf.), Dieg. Oxon. to 'Linus and Coroebus' (21-34M.); Comm. in Antin.: 'Fontes Argivi' (65-66Pf.).
109 Cf. Krevans (1984) 157: "Callimachus does not merely name Xenomedes: he recreates in an elaborate twenty-three line catalogue the contents of Xenomedes' of Ceos. He identifies himself with Xenomedes just as he identifies himself with Hipponax in the Iambi or Hesiod in the 'Somnium'.
110 Cf. Huxley (1965) 235; Harder (1990) 302 takes it to be ironic.
formulae that emphasise the similarity of the work to a list - ἡς τε (58) - ἡς τε (60) - ἡς τε (70). The contents and arrangement of Callimachus’ summary, on the other hand, are free from monotony and, while the chronological order is maintained, this is not the sole means of organization. Population shifts dominate the first portion (56-63), followed by the story of the Telchines - a story of destruction and not foundation - and finally the histories of each of the four main cities.

The passage is an oddity, in comparison with what is normal for insets, in that the subject matter is attributed to a secondary figure, but not actually put into his mouth. Part of the game for the reader, in fact, must be the fruitless attempt to disentangle the separate contributions of Xenomedes and Callimachus. The poet’s Muse brings in a further complication. When read in isolation, Calliope’s presence here - ἐνθευ ὁ πα[ν]δός // μυθος ἐς ἡμετέρην ἐδραμε Καλλιόπην - is merely a reference to the poet’s inspiration. This comment is nonetheless surely included in the knowledge of the disorienting effect that it has upon a reader accustomed to the significance of the Muses in books 1 and 2. Even if the ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ was originally composed separately from the Aetia, as some would argue, Callimachus must nonetheless have taken a conscious decision to retain this verse in his ‘four-book edition’. Even a misleading hint that Calliope should have been herself inspired by a mortal prose author before passing her knowledge on to the poet throws into jeopardy the frame and claims to authoritative knowledge that underpin books 1 and 2.

---

111 See Fantuzzi-Hunter (2002) 86; Harder (1990) 302 suggests that as an author from ‘the past’, Xenomedes is to be suspected.
112 Cf. Harder (1990) 305.
115 Cf. Hutchinson (1988) 45. “Part of the effect with the excursus on Xenomedes comes from its undoing of the fiction in the earlier books. The final reference to ‘my Muse’ . . . only stresses that Callimachus’ real source is not a Muse but a historian.”
earlier process of enquiry is shown to be a sham. The catalogue style imposed upon Xenomedes' work in effect becomes a parodic reflection of the Aetia as a whole. Without the Muses' influence, the poem becomes a collection of disparate pieces (books 3 and 4) or a string of cultural analogues (books 1 and 2).

The different generic forms employed in the second half of the Aetia are presented as if not contributing to one another, but rather emphasising their difference. This apparent assertion that the segments are to be read as discrete units is coupled here with an attempt to discredit the unifying frame of the first half of the poem. While it has been suggested that Callimachus would not necessarily have approved of the comprehensive coverage of Cean history by Xenomedes,\textsuperscript{116} and it is certainly true that the poet seems to make plain the arbitrary nature of his own choice of topics, the Xenomedes summary nevertheless provides a counter-paradigm: a varied and yet cohesive catalogue poem.

The frames and structures of the Aetia thus contrast with each other. The fragmentation of the second half is a fitting complement to its implicit consideration of its difference from the first half with its dominating frame. It also represents a turn away from 'privileged' viewpoints and towards a more active search for knowledge; Callimachus appears as researcher, quizzing statues and perusing the work of old experts. In their outer form, then, the two halves of the Aetia stand in uneasy tension.

\textbf{4.4 Thematic Dynamics in Aetia 1 and 2}

Although the obvious frames and generic postures to be found in the Aetia are important when considering its unity and form, the interplay of themes between

\textsuperscript{116}Fantuzzi-Hunter (2002) 86.
segments is an element of the poem’s dynamics that persists throughout all four books. Unfortunately its full impact is only truly to be seen in the tales of which a fair amount survives. From these one can realise the amount of aetiological material within each tale apart from the action that is the segment’s ostensible focus. In contrast to the impression created by the lack of generic and narrative interconnection, thematic interconnection in the second half is if anything greater than it was in the first. The themes employed, however, are not constantly maintained, but are allowed to fade in and out, as do various small-scale intertextual allusions. Such dynamics above all draw attention to Callimachus’ activity as a poet.

The first action, that of the cult of the Graces on Paros, might be expected to anticipate what is to come in the rest of the poem. The topic of the central action, an abnormal cult ritual, is certainly one that recurs, but the idea of genealogical variants is not in evidence in the remaining fragments of the poem. The contradictory genealogies draw attention to the existence of incompatible views of the world and explanations for events, raising the possibility of fallibility or deceit on the part of the author or the Muses. In its rejection of Hesiod’s version of the Graces’ genealogy (Zeus and Eurynome Theog. 907-911) Callimachus’ account (Dionysus and Coronis 6Pf./8M.) attacks the foundation of Hesiod’s knowledge, and in doing so undermines his own work, for his claim to be inspired by the Muses is founded upon that of Hesiod. This early questioning of their authority thus anticipates the tension in the relationship between Callimachus and the Muses that is to come.

The address to the Graces with which the segment concludes turns it, as I have said, into a semi-proemial piece:

118 Cf the idea of lying Muses (Theog. 27-8).
This prayer for the Graces' blessing requires the reader to think more about the specific qualities assigned to the various deities. Its belated insertion here casts the previous action as an addendum to the proem, even though the opening of that section plainly anticipates the normal pattern of requests and aetia.

The section that follows begins with an apparent reaffirmation by Calliope of the link between the Muses and memory:

This introduction records in a conventional fashion first the place, then the people (Minyans) and the situation (the flight from Aeetes). ἄρχως, however, is not unloaded: the flight from Colchis was by no means a conventional place to start an Argonautica. Many of the famous incidents are thus omitted: the abandonment of Heracles, Phineus and the Harpies, Lemnos, Cyzicus, the clashing rocks, the yoking of the fire-breathing bulls and the charming of the dragon. This introduction is moreover followed not by the story of the Argonauts' homeward voyage, but of the Colchian pursuit, and that part of the story has in fact finished before the tale draws at all near to the action that Callimachus had actually requested. Calliope's story contains a great deal of other aetiological material, however, almost none of which coincides with either the themes suggested by the Charites segment or the topic that Callimachus' questions present as the main focus of the poem. His first question had concerned rites in which the traditional trappings were omitted, his second, double question now
concerns a rite to which abuse is added. The Muses, however, seek to divert these themes, in a way that perhaps suggests they see a better way of structuring the work.

The *Argonautica* is a topic that recurs elsewhere in the *Aetia* - in particular as the penultimate action (108-9 Pf. - Anchor abandoned at Cyzicus). It is not alone in this - the death of Androgeos (the background to the Parian action) also recurs in book 4 (103 Pf.) - but it becomes more curious because of the similarities between Callimachus and Apollonius. There is unfortunately no sure means of determining the relative chronology of the two poets, especially as the information concerning their relationship is so questionable.\(^{119}\) Points at which one text must be in dialogue with the other are relatively frequent. As both poets considered themselves innovators, it seems to stand to reason that at the very least one sought to express in his work his attitude towards the other’s poetics and handling of material. Even this view must be modified, however, by the ancient tradition that Apollonius substantially revised his work, the modern theory that the *Aetia* was published in two halves, and the practice of giving recitations of work still partially in the process of composition.\(^ {120}\) An amount of cross-fertilisation thus appears both likely and unquantifiable.\(^ {121}\) A further, earlier, treatment of the myth must also however be considered. Antimachus’ *Lyde* contained a substantial *Argonautica*, which comprised the building of the *Argo*, the outward journey, events at Colchis and the return trip, including the Libyan portage. It is hard to say whether these events were told in chronological order, for because the traces survive through the scholia to Apollonius, they naturally occur in the order of that poem’s events. One can however suppose it unlikely that Callimachus wished to

\(^{119}\) Most scholars now assume Callimachus’ priority. For a consideration of the internal evidence see Harder (1993).

\(^ {120}\) For book circulation in the Hellenistic period see Krevans (1984) 66-95.

let himself be influenced by Antimachus’ structure and presentation. The unusual order of events in Callimachus’ version might thus be considered part of his reaction to the earlier version.

Not only is this concentration upon Aeetes unusual, but it appears that there was considerable emphasis upon the Colchian search parties and their eventual fates as well as, presumably, the route of the Argo herself. Callimachus apparently also altered the order of events - Absyrtus was killed in the palace at Colchis (8Pf./10M.) and was thus eliminated before the pursuit began. The initial stages of the Argonautica are alluded to only at a late point in Calliope’s account, through Jason’s prayer to Apollo.

This restructuring of the narrative order is accompanied by an apparent renegotiation of the principal aetiological focus of the segment. The attention paid to the Colchians allows for the insertion of two foundation myths, and the account of the pursuit is hardly necessary to an explanation of the rites on Anaphe, for it had ended before the Argonauts drew near that place.
The topic of foundations by exiles, although apparently peripheral here, is one that will be resumed with increased emphasis in some of the Muses’ tales, although not until book 2 will it figure in Callimachus’ questions. The allusion to the stone serpent in 11.4Pf. is a reminder of the fact that Cadmus and Harmonia settled in Illyria on their exile from Thebes. The settlement on Corcyra will also be transplanted to the Illyrian mainland. Calliope knows this; the figures of whom she sings do not. The Muses can give aetia for things that are finished and forgotten, as well as for contemporary phenomena.

When finally the Argonauts do reach Anaphe, their situation seems to be described with almost epic expansion. Whereas Apollonius’ account comprises 36 verses in total (4.1694-1730), the relevant fragments of Callimachus may total up to 42, and the entire account may have been anything up to twice as long. It is unfortunate that we do not know whether Callimachus, as Apollonius did, provided an aetiology for the cult title Apollo Aegletes, along with a further action for the name Anaphe. The incident has the potential to be used to explain not only the cult practices, but also the cult title and the island’s name - in other words, the specific question about ritual could have given rise to an all-embracing action for an entire micro-culture.

The explanation concludes with a parallel example drawn from the cult of Demeter, a learned footnote, showing a similar rite with a different cause:

---

122 One might see the attention drawn to ‘Φυγάδων’ here as being programmatic for what is to come.
Coarse joking was apparently a feature of both the Eleusinian mysteries and the Thesmophoria. Rarian here as an epithet for Demeter seems to refer to the Eleusis cult, while ἡστίας must surely be an allusion to the Thesmophoria, at which the second day of the festival, when the joking occurred, was called Nesteia. The action for this is the same for both festivals. In the Homeric Hymn to Demeter (2.200-211) Demeter sits in grief at Eleusis until Iambe can make her laugh and the rites are initiated - the joking thus marks the relief brought to the goddess, rather than the release of tension experienced by the mortals aboard the Argo.

The Anaphe segment was clearly quite long, far longer than the sections of other Hellenistic Kollektivgedichte. Unfortunately it is not now possible to tell whether all the tales of books 1 and 2 were on the same scale. Indeed, for the companion tales to the Anaphe we cannot even make an estimate of the thematic range involved. The Lindian Heracles section is preserved only in two fragments (22&3Pf./24&5M.), one of a single verse, the other with traces of up to 23 verses. The number of verses surviving from the Theiodamas segment is almost exactly the same (24&5Pf./26&7M.), but there at least we do possess similar treatments of the tale. The remains of the Lindian segment do however show an example of the sort of cursing that was commemorated in cult:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{αστέρα}, \text{να} & \text{κεραών ῥηξίων άριστε βοῶν,} \\
\text{ο} & \text{μεν ἐνθ ἠράτο, οῦ δ' ὃς ἀλός ἤχον ἄκουε} \\
\text{Σιλλδός εῦ} & \text{Τιμαρίοις οὗρειν ἴκαρίης,} \\
\text{η} & \text{θέων ὃς μάχλα φιλήτορος ὡτα πεινχροῦ,}
\end{align*}\]

The irony is that in the instance when the bad language which became the ritual was actually quoted, the god himself was not listening. The similes descend in register from the stately - the Selloi, priests of Zeus - to low life - lovers and wayward sons - to the comic - Heracles himself. None of these registers - high or low - seems likely to attract the god’s notice. Heracles is in effect cast as the paradigm of the least ideal reader - his lack of attention to the ploughman is matched by his lack of attention to the lyre, and his murder of Linus, his music teacher, stands as proof of this. Such a representation of bad readership might thus create a bond of antithesis with the Graces passage, in which the poet prayed for his work’s success.

The anger motivating what was said stands in contrast to the frivolity and relief underlying the behaviour on Anaphe. The distance between the two aetia is thus greater than was implied in the opening question:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{κως δὲ, τεσα, ₁ [ ... ]μὲν ἀνὴρ Άναφαῖος ἔπι αἰσ[χροῖς} \\
\text{ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ δυ[σφήμωις] Λύνδος ἄγει θυσίν (7.19-20 Ῥ.9Μ.)}
\end{align*}
\]

A conclusion might be that diverse causes lead to the same results, or that motivations cannot always be divined from outward appearance. The omission of garlands and flutes from the sacrifices on Paros, for instance, might look like negligence in honouring the Graces, whereas the action reveals that it arose from a need not to offend against the dead, nor to interrupt a sacrifice and offend the goddesses. In the present instance there seems to be little likelihood of offending the god, because he will pay no attention.

\cite{Massimilla1996}
The characterisation of Heracles in the companion segment, the tale of Theiodamas, is of a wholly contrary nature. His tenderness towards his son is portrayed, and at first he speaks respectfully to the old man.

σκόλος ἐπεί μὲν ἔτυψε ποδὸς θέναρ· αὐτὰρ ὁ πεῖνη
θυμαίνοις λάχυνη στῆθος εἶλκε σέθεν
δραξάμενος· τίν δ᾿ ὦνα γέλως ἀνεμίσγετο λύπη,

οὔ δὲ ἐξίνοι, χαῖρε [. . . . ] μενον
. . . ἦ μὲγ' ἀριττῆ προσ[. . . . ] Js, αἰώνα δ', ἀνωγά,
εἴ τι καὶ τιμωμαθῆς οὐλάδ[λος εὐτίν ἔσω
τόσσον ὁσον τ' ἀπὸ πα[ἰδί κάκην β]ιούσαν ἀλ[σαὶ,
δὸς μια]· καὶ φιλίης [μνήσαμεν ἂν ἔδροιος,
αὐτὰρ ὅγγ' ἀγρείον κιαὶ ἀμεῖλιχον ἐξεγέλασε,
(24.1-3, 8-13Pf./26M.)

Comparison with the versions of Apollonius (Arg. 1.1211-1219) and others suggests that Callimachus is presenting a sanitised version of Heracles’ action - in Apollonius the quarrel is a pretext for war with the Dryopians, and according to Apollodorus (2.7.6-7) Heracles at the time of the encounter was in exile for murder. In Apollonius the fact that the Dryopians were given to injustice (οὐτὶ δίκης ἀλέγοντες 1.1219) is a mitigating factor, undercut by the injustice of Heracles’ attack on an innocent man as a pretext for war. Barigazzi, however, has assessed Callimachus’ characterisation here as depicting Heracles as a benefactor of humanity, in contrast with the comic characterisation of the previous episode. This differentiation may be intended to give particular point to Callimachus’ separation of the two stories. Clauss rather puzzlingly states “Callimachus combined two stories involving Heracles βουθοίνης,” in fact, as his own analysis shows, Callimachus

127 For Apollonius’ sympathetic picture of Theiodamas see Giangrande (1967) 88-90. In his Hymn to Artemis (3.160-1) Callimachus himself presents Heracles’ attack on Theiodamas as gluttony.
128 Cf. also Diod. Sic. 4.36.2; Schl. to A.R. 1.1213.
130 Barigazzi (1976c) 228-9.
has separated the two, presenting them in a way that gives them discrete identities. It would have been otiose to present two analogous tales, unless their juxtaposition could be used as a commentary upon the tendency to confuse the two incidents. Conon, for instance, has Heracles demand food for his son from a Lindian ploughman, and then kill the man’s ox and share it with Hyllus to the accompaniment of his curses.132

It is unclear in whose mouth this scholarly distinction between the two stories should be placed: no transition has been preserved and the scholion is in a poor condition.

\[
\text{παντιών } \delta\muοιοι [\text{και} \text{αλλά}]
\]

No indication of a change of subject for παρατίθεται survives, and in any case the scholiast might well not have differentiated between the ‘poet-figure’ of the dream and Callimachus’ voice as an author. It is noticeable, however, that the Theiodamas story is in essence a foundation myth rather than a cult action,133 and it does not therefore fall within the programme suggested by Callimachus’ questions. Should the Theiodamas segment have been assigned to the Muses, therefore, it would have

---

132 Conon Diegesis 11 (FGrH 26F1.x1). For versions in which Theiodamas is made a Lindian see e.g. Am. Marc. 22.12.4; Philostratus Imag. 2.24. See also Knaak (1888).

133 El. Gen. Αἰσινεὶς οἱ Δρύστες οἱ τὴν Ἀσινὴν κατοικοῦντες Καλλίμαχος ἔδειλαιος ‘Ασινεῦσιν ἐπὶ τριπτῆρος τάπασατ.’ εἴρηται δὴ Ηρακλῆς τοὺς Δρύστας ληστεύοντας ἀπ’ ὅτων περί Πυθὸν χορίων ἐν τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ μετέχισεν, ὡς δὲ τὴν πολυτιθήσιν τῶν ἔνοικοντων ἑξεργοῦτο τοῦ κακουργεῖν καὶ διὰ τούτῳ Αἰσινεῖς αὐτοὺς ὄνυμασεν, ὡς μικροὶ κατὰ τὸ πρότερον σινομένους. (25PF.27M.)
contributed to a dynamic in which the Muses sought to divert Callimachus’ thematic programme into one of their own devising.

Unfortunately, with the exception of the beginning of book 2, our knowledge of the order of tales in this half of the Aetia and the precise nature of their contents tends to be scanty. We know however that the remaining tales of book 1 included ‘Linus and Coroebus’ (26-31Pf./28-34M.), possibly another pair of tales - Artemis with a mortar on her head (31c-ePf./35-8M.) and Athene with a wounded thigh (110M) - and the story of the Locrian Maidens (35Pf./42M.). For the first of these, Linus and Coroebus, there are a number of aetia which could perhaps have been the subject of Callimachus’ question.

\[\text{Argviōs µl}\\ \text{Αρνηδας}\\ \text{kaiθανε.} \] (26.1-3Pf./30M.)

In commemoration of Linus being reared among the lambs the Argives had a month ‘Arneus’ and also a festival ‘Arneidas’, at which dogs were slaughtered in punishment for those that killed the child - this last fact seems a likely candidate to be Callimachus’ question. The myth also however contained a child-eating monster (Poine), a plague, Coroebus’ visit to Delphi to offer himself up, and his exile and foundation of Tripodiskos. Some authors linked the Linus-dirge to this myth, although it was also associated with a poet Linus, sometimes identified with Heracles’ teacher.\(^{134}\) The foundation of Tripodiskon clearly joins in the theme of oecist-exiles. It is tempting therefore to suggest that it formed no part of Callimachus’ question, but rather was included as the Muses’ imposition.

Analysis is rendered more complex, however, by verses that apparently seem to be assigned to the poet-figure.

\(^{134}\) On this question see Nilsson (1957) 435-8; Fontenrose (1959) 111-112.
The gender of δειδεγμένος rules out the possibility of 5-8 being a statement by one of the Muses about their own authority. It must thus be made either by the poet qua narrator, or by the internal poet figure. Either the Muses were interrupted (or the report of their song was) or Callimachus narrated the whole tale on his own account. While the latter is not impossible, the Diegesis suggests otherwise (P.Oxy. 2263). The text only becomes legible where the foundation of Tripodiskos is mentioned, followed by the name of the month Arneion and the rite in which dogs where slaughtered; we thus lack any lemma or indication of how the segment began. The beginning of the following tale is preserved, however:

τῶς μὲν ἐφι τὰς δ’ ἐίθαρ ἐμὸς πάλιν ἐςρετο θυμός  (31bPf./35M.)

This is plainly Callimachus responding to another’s tale, and being moved to question further. By implication, then, it was a Muse who told most of the story.

Massimilla suggests that in the fragment we have an occasion on which the poet interrupts his account of the Muse’s tale to observe that Linus’ death became the
object of epic narration (v.5), to comment on the different versions (v. 7) and finally to say that the story follows (v. 8). Should this interpretation be correct, ἰνεκὲς ἀείδω δειδεγμένος would show the narrator poet calling more attention than usual to his role in relaying the conversation that he had with the Muses. ἰνεκὲς ἀείδω would thus be an ironic comment upon the fact that Callimachus sees himself continually relaying what he has earlier heard; ironic, because in making such a remark he is interrupting his own narration. It could moreover be that here the way in which Callimachus told of his question was different. Rather than simply beginning κῶς δέ, θεσί, as elsewhere, he could perhaps have summarised what he already knew from epic before asking the Muses to supply further information. Certainly, the compression of the account of the child-eating ghouls is at odds with another fragment, which is tender, bucolic, and unhurried.

ἄρνες τοι, φιλὲ κούρε, συνήλικες, ἄρνες ἐταίροι ἐσκόν, ἐνιαυθμοὶ δ’ αὐλία καὶ βοτάναι (27Pf./28M)

The tale that followed this and was introduced by Callimachus’ remark that he was inspired to ask more in fact appears unrelated to the Linus and Coroebus story. The action concerns a statue of Artemis in Leucas that had a mortar placed on its head by Epirote raiders. The story as it stands seems rather thin, lacking the extra aetiological material noticeable in the segments so far. This is the first surviving segment to have as its focus an unusual cult statue rather than an unusual ritual practice; nor does it have any trace of a foundation myth. There is however an element of continuity from the tales before ‘Linus and Coroebus’: here is another cult feature that appears to dishonour the deity in question. Furthermore, the consultation of the

135 Massimilla (1996) 204.
136 Cf. Callimachus’ response to the Zancle aition.
The oracle of Apollo picks up on that in the preceding tale, and will become a recurrent feature in the subsequent books. It has been suggested that it was paired with the story of Teuthis and Athena (110 M.), in the way that the two stories of Heracles bouthoines were juxtaposed. This does not seem unlikely, although the reservation remains that in the fragmentary commentary on this latter passage the preceding tale apparently concerned Apollo (P.Mich. inv. fr.1.1-7). This could merely indicate, however, that the oracle of Apollo gained greater prominence in the Leucadian story than our sources suggest.

The themes the Teuthis segment shares with the Leucadian Artemis story are plain: a goddess is offended, a problem arises which requires the consultation of the oracle, who commands that the insult must be commemorated by a statue. In the Teuthis story an attack on the Athena herself replaces the desecration of a cult image, and the problem afflicting the people, a severe famine, appears more serious. As parallel tales, they are not quite so close as the Heracles pair, but some key distinction between the two incidents should nonetheless be suspected. Both are cults in which the goddess is apparently dishonoured - in the first, Artemis was offended by outsiders and rejected the attempt at restitution made by her pious followers; in the second, the commemorative statue is to be a sign of Teuthis’ guilt. Just as the sacrifices accompanied by curses had different motivations, so do the unusual statues.

The manner in which the Teuthis fragment begins, however, might reveal a separate ground of comparison between the two tales.

\[\text{Ιης ἀντὶ γεωτομίης:} \]
\[\text{Γαύκηθωι Λυκίωι, ὥτε σιφλὸς ἔπει\} \]
\[\text{ἀνθ’ ἐκατομβοῖων ἐπετείω \ λαβεῖν} \]
\[\text{συμποῦν πέλεκυν μέτα .[} \]

139 See Koenen, Luppe & Pagán (1991) 158.
These lines have been interpreted as referring to the foolishness of preferring agriculture to forestry in Arcadia: Glaucus’ swap of gold armour for bronze was proverbial for a poor exchange. In this context it appears to point up paradox - anywhere else forestry instead of agriculture would be a bad bargain; only in Arcadia is it a good deal. Should the Leucadian Artemis aetion have preceded this, then the reader would have had in mind another apparently bad bargain, that of the garlic mortar in exchange for a gold wreath. What seems right to mortals is not so to the gods. This could have provided a transition between segments - as Artemis’ preference seemed foolish but was what the situation required, so too forestry is what Arcadia requires; but once even that slight fertility failed . . . The apparent change of subject is diverted, and a doublet of the previous action follows. This can however be no more than conjecture.

The fact that the cult had ceased by Callimachus’ day adds a new dimension to the segment’s interpretation. The scholiast to Pausanias states:

> οτι φησιν ουτος έωρακέναι το της Άρηνας αγαλμα εν Τευθιδι τελαιων κατειλημένον. και η Καλλιμαχος ουτος ψευδεται ο μεν γάρ παλαιτερόν φησι λήξαι του τραύματος την θεραπείαν, ο δε έωρακέναι φησιν έτι ώσπερ επιδούμενον και θεραπευόμενον. (VIII 28 6)

Such a comment breaks the frame in a new way. Whoever narrated the action, it seems likely that Callimachus interrupted the dialogue at this point to record that the cult had ceased. If so, it demonstrates a further way in which poet and Muse interact; the basis of Callimachus’ questions has hitherto been the unusual nature of cult practices - in this instance the practice exists no longer, and can no longer arouse

---

141 See Spiro (1894) 149; Wilamowitz (1894) 244.
142 In spite of what the scholiast has to say, it seems more likely that the cult had been revived by Pausanias’ day than that Callimachus was wrong. Wilamowitz (1894) 244.
curiosity. The past is no longer explaining the present. Perhaps the Muses are telling a story that the poet figure had not asked for. Callimachus as an author is displaying his knowledge of a defunct cultural analogue, and showing that the Muses’ learning extends to things no longer in evidence in his contemporary world.

A final action to be placed in Book 1 is that of the Locrian maidens (35Pf./42M.). No quotation from this exists, but various scholia show that in total the story was complex and detailed. The first part of the tale - that concerning Aias - is given by the scholia AD on Iliad 13.66, with the attribution η ἱστορία παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ ἐν ο' Αἰτίων καὶ παρὰ τῷ ποιήτῃ ἐν τῇ δ' τῆς Ὄδυσσείας παραμερῶς. The Odyssey (4.499-511) told the story of the shipwreck and Aias’ boast that provoked the thunderbolt, and one might thus suppose that Callimachus told of Cassandra’s rape, the statue turning its eyes away, Aias’ burial, and even a full shipwreck narrative. The second part - the details concerning the Locrian maiden tribute in expiation for Aias’ crime - comes from the scholia (ss3 Tz) to Lycophron 1141-1173. The earlier set of these, however, is on the whole a paraphrase of the relevant section of the Alexandra, with the addition of the details of the plague at Locris and the oracle. Tzetzes’ scholia combine a paraphrase of the poem with a passage taken from Apollodorus’ Epitome (6.20-21); his source ascription runs: ὥς φησὶ Τίμασος ὁ Σικελός, μεμινηται δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας καὶ ὁ Κυρηναῖος Καλλιμάχος καὶ άλλως. It is thus very hard to know how much of this part of the story was given by Callimachus, and how much additional material there may have been besides, since the scholia stay so close to Lycophron’s text. Massimilla

---

143 Studies of this rite include Reinauc (1914); Huxley (1966); Hughes (1991) 166-184; Bonnechere (1994) 150-163; Ragone (1996); Mari (1997); Mazzoldi (2001) 52-58.
144 Hughes (1991) 168-169 remarks that Tzetzes was drawing upon the earlier scholia and may have lifted this citation along with the rest.
finds it implausible that Callimachus should have told the whole story, from Aias’ sacrilege through to the tribute of the Locrian maidens, and suggests that he limited himself to a description of the plague and the oracle, with a flashback to the rape.\textsuperscript{145} He is certainly unlikely to have told everything with the same degree of detail - some points will have been compressed, even if they were of importance, and others considerably expanded. It is hardly impossible, however, that the tale should have been told at length: the Anaphe rite, for example, was prefaced by a long account of the Colchian search parties.

From the outlines of the story we can see various thematic correspondences with the previous aetia. Aias’ blasphemy in raping Cassandra when she had taken sanctuary by the statue of Athena has the potential to form part of an ascending series of impieties: first Artemis’ garlic mortar, which she allows to remain, then Teuthis’ attack on Athena, punished by a plague and commemorated by a statue, and now a violation so great that the goddess demands an enduring penalty and her statue turns its eyes away.\textsuperscript{146} The order of the tales is of course unknown. If, however, the Locrian tale did follow that of Teuthis or the Leucadian Artemis, and started with the shared feature of the statue before branching out to tell of the Locrian maidens, such a diversion might recall the way in which the second Heracles story turns from the shared feature of Heracles βουθοίνης to the new element of exile. Further elements which the tale might have in common with previous aetia are the role played by the oracle of Apollo, and certain similarities to the Linus and Coroebus story. In both, people who have had no part in the original offence offer themselves up in a quasi-

\textsuperscript{145} Massimilla (1996) 313.
\textsuperscript{146} This detail of the statue averting its eyes, mentioned in the Homeric scholia, is also to be found in Lycophron 361-364. In some other versions the statue is toppled from its base by Aias’ pulling Cassandra away (See Poetae Epici Graeci p.89).
sacrificial manner, Coroebus presenting himself at Delphi, and the Locrians risking death at Troy.

The principal aetiological focus of Callimachus' account would presumably have been the treatment of the Locrian girls at Troy, and yet one wonders if any particular aspect of the situation there was given especial attention. The girls were subjected to a series of humiliations - they had to enter Troy in secret at night for fear of being stoned, if caught they were denied proper burial, and in the temple they had to work with shaven heads, barefoot, wearing only a single garment - in other words living almost as slaves. One account also claims that they were not allowed to approach the idol of Athena. Any one of these features might have given rise to an initial question from Callimachus.

The subject could however have been addressed from another direction; the testimonia about the situation are at variance with one another on points of detail, but most scholars believe that the tribute was broken off in 346, but resumed in the next generation after pressure from Delphi and arbitration by 'Antigonos'. An inscription dated to c.270-240 (IG IX 1^2 3, 706) shows that the restored tribute was continued well into the third century; it thus may have been well known in Callimachus' own day, as a rite which not merely had ancient traditions as its basis, but in more recent times had been forced to continue by a plague and an oracle. As such it would have been a foil for the extinct Teuthis cult. Questions about the action may have focused on its severity, and the cause of such great hostility on the part of the goddess. This would explain the range of material that Callimachus may have

---

149 Ragone (1996) collects the evidence together in an appendix, and presents a substantial bibliography (12-14 n.10).
covered: the details of the cult mark the extent of what needs to be explained, the
story of Aias’ crime is necessary to understand Athena’s persistent anger. One might
even wonder whether the cult details were not perhaps part of Callimachus’ question
rather than the Muses’ answer. This point is one that comes immediately to notice in
the next book: when a tale is attributed to the Aetia, it must not be assumed that it
necessarily formed an answer rather than a question.

Before I move on to Book 2, it seems convenient to address two further tales
that may have belonged to this half of the Aetia, the ‘Hyperborean maidens’ and the
‘Oinotropoi’. Neither of these are mentioned by the Diegesis for the second half of the
poem, and while a few parts of Book 3 are still uncertain, it seems more likely that
they belonged to Books 1 or 2. Apart from the series of tales that began the second
book, we know very little about its contents: it is for convenience that these tales are
dealt with before that run of continuous material, and not an indication of their
relative position in the work.

The treatment of the Hyperboreans in the Aetia is preserved only by a papyrus
fragment in which traces of 36 lines remain (186Pf./97M.). Callimachus also treated
this subject matter in his Hymn to Delos (4.278-299): there he gave a summarised
version of the itinerary of the Hyperboreans to Delphi, named the first to bring
offerings as Upis, Loxo and Hecaerge, and mentioned how the girls along with their
male escorts died on Delos; there they were commemorated by hair offerings at their
tomb. Although we do not know whether Callimachus used the same version of the
myth in the Aetia, it is possible that these offerings were the focus of the principal
aetion. Alternatively, however, it may have been the secrecy with which the offerings
were transported to Delphi that formed the aetiological basis.151

The cult of the Hyperborean maidens on Delos appears to have been a long-standing one, but one which altered over time. Herodotus knew of two pairs of maidens, Hyperoche and Laodike, the first to bring tribute, who were buried in a σῆμα at one side of the temple of Artemis and to whom Delian girls and youths offered their hair (4.33-4), and Arge and Upis, who preceded them and came to Delos ‘with the gods’, were buried in a θῆκη, and were honoured with hymns, ritual begging, and the ash from the altars of Artemis (4.35). In the accounts of Callimachus (Hymns 4.278-299) and Pausanias (1.43.4), however, Hyperoche and Laodike are no longer remembered, and the hair-cutting is transferred to Oupis and (Hek)ærge.\textsuperscript{152} This is borne out by the archaeological remains: both the σῆμα and θῆκη appear to have been identified; the former is highly ruinous, the latter, on the other hand, dating from Mycenaean times, was enhanced in the third century by the building of a semi-circular enclosure, and appears to have been sufficiently venerated to survive the Peisistratean ‘cleansing’ of the island.\textsuperscript{153}

As with the Locrian maidens, therefore, this was a cult that had attracted renewed attention in the century preceding Callimachus. It may be that he wished to look more at the ritual begging or the ancient hymn than at the well-known themes of tribute or hair-cutting. Alternatively, however, he may have wished to clarify points left vague in the accounts of the Hyperborean maidens: what caused their death, and why must the tribute be passed from community to community on its way to Delos, concealed by wheat? In this context the employment of an obscure variant of the Orion myth in which he attacked the girls seems likely. The traces seem to fit this: “they were unable . . . the most lustful . . . of corn . . . defence of a shameless eye . . .

\textsuperscript{153} Bruneau (1970) 45-46.
the goddess stopped . . . maiden daughter of Zeus, driving deer.” A possible sequence is the girls’ helplessness against Orion’s lust, the future concealment of the tribute of the offerings beneath corn, and Artemis’ intervention.

ἔπαυσε θεή (verse 30), however, becomes a potential complication here. Some scholars believe that it means ‘the goddess (i.e. the Muse) ended <her song>’.

In that case, v. 31 would follow a change of speaker, and perhaps signal a change of topic. This to me seems to call for a far more compressed transition than is in evidence elsewhere in books 1 and 2. If Artemis appears in the nominative or vocative within the dialogue frame (κεμαδοσσόε [κο]ύρη), this presumably means that she is the subject of the question leading to the next tale; but for a story ending ἔπαυσε θεή to get the response κῶς δὲ would be unprecedented elsewhere in books 1 and 2 - even the compressed transition of 43.83-5Pf. pauses to give Callimachus’ response to what he has just been told. The space between the last recognisable line of the itinerary (verse 14) and this verse moreover is a very brief space in which to tell of an attempted rape and to explain an action; the traces that survive at this point do not suggest that Callimachus proceeded in a far more compressed manner than usual.

The mentions of Troy (v.20) and Antiope (v.22) seem hard to reconcile with the Hyperborean story, and thus it is possible that the lacuna conceals a transition to a different tale or, more likely, to a digression. Antiope figures in myth as one of the Amazons at Troy, and as the wife of Theseus: neither appears to be much help here.\textsuperscript{155}

The combination of Troy and nine years (\textit{ἐννεάετας}), however, has suggested to Livrea Lycophron’s account of the Oinotropoi and their fate (569-83).\textsuperscript{156} Both tales, the Hyperboreans and the Oinotropoi, concern groups of three girls on Delos, under attack from males, connected with fertility (tribute of first fruits, ability to produce oil, wine and corn). He suggests that the fate of the Oinotropoi (metamorphosis) implies too the fate of the Hyperboreans. The scholia to the Lycophron passage, however, seem to suggest that Callimachus was using a version in which the Oinotropoi did not resist the Greeks but went with them to Troy and fed the starving army (188Pf./112M.). The cause for their flight and metamorphosis into doves thus appears to be removed, and yet some feature of the story must have provided an aetiological focus for Callimachus’ account. Lycophron in his version refers very obliquely to the Oinotropoi as ‘doves’ - \textit{οἰνοτρόπους Ζάρηκος έκγόνους φάβας} (580); the scholia, while citing Callimachus for \textit{οἰνοτρόπους} in this verse (s), fail to do more than gloss \textit{φάβας} (ss\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{4} T), and it has been suggested that if Callimachus had used the metamorphosis story the scholiast would have given a fuller explanation.\textsuperscript{157} As a parallel to the Hyperboreans, therefore, the Oinotropoi seem to diminish in relevance.

\textsuperscript{155} Livrea (1998) 24, 26 makes various suggestions.
\textsuperscript{156} Livrea (1998) 25-27.
\textsuperscript{157} Noak (1893) 147. Metamorphoses do not appear in the extant fragments of the \textit{Aetia}. 
It is possible nonetheless that they were mentioned at this point, as a periphrastic designation for Delos - 'the island whence three maidens came to Troy and fed the army while it drank from the waters of the ...' This would leave vv. 15-21 to complete the Hyperboreans' journey, and 22ff. for the assault and Artemis' punishment on Orion, and perhaps, if the concealed tribute was the focus, the aetion as well.

Whether or not they appeared in this segment of the poem, the Oinotropoi were still mentioned by Callimachus in a reasonable amount of detail. For these tales, then, we have themes and situations which intersect with each other and with the other aetia, without any knowledge of their relative position within the text. The Hyperboreans and the Oinotropoi were both groups of three maidens connected with Delos. The attack by Orion on Upis looks back to Aias' rape of Cassandra; the Oinotropoi signal a return to the Trojan war theme. As with the Locrian maidens, the girls sent by the Hyperboreans as (or bearing) tribute died. Livrea links the Oinotropoi and Hyperboreans through a motif of lost νόστος158 - the Locrian story also fits with this theme. The fertility represented by the Oinotropoi in particular, but also by the Hyperboreans' offerings, recalls the barrenness of Arcadia in Teuthis' story, and the hunger of Heracles.

This repetition and resurgence of various motifs would not have led so much to a sense of monotony as to a desire to compare motivations, reactions, and punishments; to observe the different rites by which similar incidents could be commemorated and the disparate situations that could be marked by similar cult practices. Yet this characteristic of the Aetia, the intermeshing of themes, takes place within a framework that at times appears to direct the reader in wholly different directions. Callimachus gives a further nuance to this tension by his omission of aetia

for rites that seem to lie within his programme. Moreover, two odd cultic practices are mentioned within the Hyperboreans' itinerary without explanation:

\[
\text{Ἰ. ὑπὲρ Ἑλλάδος}
\]

\[
'Ριπαίου πέμπτουσιν ἀπ' οὐρέος, ἕχει μαλίστα
tέρπουσιν λιταραί Φοιβοῦ ὀδοφαγίας
\]

\[
ἐνθεν] ἕτη πτώλιας τε καὶ οὐ[ρεα Μαλίδος αἴες
στέλλο]υσιν Νάιοι δῆτες ἀνεπτόποδες. \] (8-10, 13-14)

The donkey sacrifices of the Hyperboreans were an oddity seized upon by several of the Alexandrians (Sim. 2P; Boios A.L. 20): Callimachus shows here both his awareness of them and - through his failure to give them more extensive treatment—his selectivity. Similarly, the priests of Zeus, the Selloi, with their ambiguous epithet Νάιοι and their unwashed feet, get no more than a mention. Both donkey sacrifice and unwashed priests might appear degrading to the gods concerned, in the same way that the sacrifices accompanied by curses and Artemis' garlic mortar might. We do not know whether it is Callimachus or one of the Muses who is the narrator here: a Muse might tease the poet figure with such allusions to his chosen topic - the poet might show his independence by not enquiring of their causes.

The pieces that seem to make up the beginning of book 2 comprise one fragment of 34 verses accompanied by scraps totalling 27 verses (178-85Pf./89-96M.), and another fragment of 129 verses, with lacunae perhaps totalling 18 verses (43Pf./50M). The latter thus represents a more substantial segment of text than exists elsewhere in this half of the poem, and should demonstrate the way in which Callimachus joined his various narratives together. While this is in part the case, it is noticeable, however, that the narrative passages in this fragment are smaller than, for instance, the Anaphe narrative. The fragment begins with a number of badly damaged lines, before becoming comprehensible at verse 12; there, in 6 verses, Callimachus...
contrasts what he ate and what he learnt at a banquet. Unfortunately the precise transition from this statement to the catalogue of Sicilian cities is lost: nonetheless, the passage itself is clearly of a transitional or introductory nature, contrasting learning and self-indulgence (see below). When viewed as a question, the catalogue is of course far longer and more complex than usual; as a narrative, on the other hand, it is rather short - at most it can only be 38 verses long. The tale that Callimachus hears in return is also brief, 25 verses long. The passage in fact seems to present a further development in the relationship between the Muses and the poet figure. Here, it is the poet figure who provides the comparative material about the rites in question, before the Muses explain the exceptional case. The passage displays the poet's ability to correlate information in a manner similar to that of the Muses. He has a degree of independence from them, not just in his knowledge, but also in his intellectual processes.

On the strength of Callimachus' comments about symposia and knowledge at the beginning of this fragment, it has been widely accepted that fragment 178Pf./89M., 'the Ician Guest', may have preceded it. This view, first proposed by Swiderek and then reasserted by Zetzel, is based upon the observations that the setting and detail of the 178Pf. symposium scene seem to mark a significant division of the poem, suggesting that it should stand at the beginning of a book, and that the passages share a view of symposia which creates a kind of frame. Furthermore the comments in 43Pf. seem to presuppose a fuller treatment of the subject, and, if the

---

160 Swiderek (1951) 234 n.18; Zetzel (1981).
163 Barigazzi (1975a) 21.
passages were not connected into a single framing argument, the presence of two such comments might be regarded as repetitive.\footnote{Massimilla (1996) 320.}

There is less agreement, however, about how 178Pf. should fit into the dialogue with the Muses: did the entire passage stand outside the dialogue frame,\footnote{Zetzel (1981) 33; cf. Hutchinson (2003) 50, who views the passage as an excursus.} was the symposium a story told to the Muses,\footnote{Cf. Cameron (1995) 1135; Hunter (1996) 22; Massimilla (1996) 320-1.} or is it evidence of some outer symposiastic frame for the \textit{Aetia} as a whole?\footnote{Barigazzi (1975a) 23ff.} While the state of the evidence naturally precludes a firm judgement on the matter, it seems that an excursus is the solution that fits best with what is known of Callimachus’ technique (this of course must be accompanied by the caveat that his technique was varied). The record of the poet-figure’s conversation with the Muses seems closely tied to the question-and-answer sequence; although the question in 43Pf. in unusually long, it is all subordinated to the end of acquiring knowledge from the Muses themselves. What is evident in the surviving text, on the other hand, is the poet’s ability to step outside the frame, as witnessed, for example, by his apostrophe to the Graces (7.13-4Pf./9M.), and perhaps also by fragment 26Pf./20M.\footnote{Cf. Harder (1988) 10-11.} Because Callimachus is telling of the conversation of his poet figure with the Muses, but standing apart from it, he is free to insert his own interjections. The beginning of a book is a suitable place to do this, an opportunity for the authorial voice to reflect upon what it narrates and to compare it to other forms of knowledge. Thus it is not wholly valid to claim, as Zetzel did, that the passage means that the view that books 1 and 2 consisted solely of Callimachus’ conversation with the Muses ‘is no longer tenable’.\footnote{Zetzel (1981) 33.} Rather, books 1 and 2 consisted of Callimachus’ report, with his own interjections, of his poet-figure’s encounter.
passages were not connected into a single framing argument, the presence of two such comments might be regarded as repetitive.\footnote{Massimilla (1996) 320.}

There is less agreement, however, about how 178Pf. should fit into the dialogue with the Muses: did the entire passage stand outside the dialogue frame,\footnote{Zetzel (1981) 33; cf. Hutchinson (2003) 50, who views the passage as an excursus.} was the symposium a story told to the Muses,\footnote{Cf. Cameron (1995) 1135; Hunter (1996) 22; Massimilla (1996) 320-1.} or is it evidence of some outer symposiastic frame for the \textit{Aetia} as a whole?\footnote{Barigazzi (1975a) 23ff.} While the state of the evidence naturally precludes a firm judgement on the matter, it seems that an excursus is the solution that fits best with what is known of Callimachus’ technique (this of course must be accompanied by the caveat that his technique was varied). The record of the poet-figure’s conversation with the Muses seems closely tied to the question-and-answer sequence; although the question in 43Pf. in unusually long, it is all subordinated to the end of acquiring knowledge from the Muses themselves. What is evident in the surviving text, on the other hand, is the poet’s ability to step outside the frame, as witnessed, for example, by his apostrophe to the Graces (7.13-4Pf./9M.), and perhaps also by fragment 26Pf./20M.\footnote{Cf. Harder (1988) 10-11.} Because Callimachus is telling of the conversation of his poet figure with the Muses, but standing apart from it, he is free to insert his own interjections. The beginning of a book is a suitable place to do this, an opportunity for the authorial voice to reflect upon what it narrates and to compare it to other forms of knowledge. Thus it is not wholly valid to claim, as Zetzel did, that the passage means that the view that books 1 and 2 consisted solely of Callimachus’ conversation with the Muses ‘is no longer tenable’.\footnote{Zetzel (1981) 33.} Rather, books 1 and 2 consisted of Callimachus’ report, with his own interjections, of his poet-figure’s encounter.
The narratives themselves that occur within this segment are at first sight relatively unconnected to one another. The story of Peleus on Icus is unknown - the only indication comes from a single verse:

\[ \text{o}\nu\delta' \varepsilon\tau\iota \nu \Phi\theta\iota\varsigma\omega\nu \varepsilon\iota\chi\varepsilon\nu \ \alpha\nu\alpha\kappa\tau\omicron\omicron\nu\iota\nu. \] (184Pf.95M.)

Pfeiffer interpreted this as referring to Peleus being exiled from Phthia by Acastus or his sons in his old age;\textsuperscript{170} the main traits of the tale would seem to be exile and loss of status. The details of the cult are likewise all but unknown, but Callimachus’ question concerned at least in part a girl with an onion or a leek.

\[ \tau\varepsilon\delta' \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu \gamma\iota\tau\iota\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu \ \iota\nu\iota [\ldots] \iota\rho\tau\omicron\nu \ \varepsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma. \] (89/178. 25-6)

The tale asked of the Muses is of a wholly different order: Zancle was founded under the leadership of two oecists, Perieres and Crataimenes, from Cyme and Chalcis, but they forgot to watch out for a bird of ill omen when building their walls, and contention arose between them. They consulted Apollo about whom the city should be named after, but the god said that it belonged to neither. Since then, the oecists have been summoned to sacrifices under a general formula, rather than by name. None of the topics involved here apparently correspond to those of the Peleus tale. Admittedly, we do not know how close the tales stood to one another, but the two symposium passages must not have been too widely separated. It has been observed that \[ \varepsilon\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \] at 43.6 could be read \[ \varepsilon\iota \Theta\epsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \] with reference to Peleus’ wife, although other word divisions are possible.\textsuperscript{171}

The final tale in the segment, the result of Callimachus’ \[ \theta\acute{a}m\beta\omicron\varsigma \] at the Zancle tale, as I have said, appears to bear little resemblance to that story.

\[ \text{Κ\iota\sigma\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\varsigma \pi\acute{a}r' } \acute{u}\ddot{d}\omicron\rho \text{ \textOmega\sigma\omicron\delta\alpha\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\iota\iota} \text{ } \text{K\iota\nu\iota\varsigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu } \text{ } \acute{e}\iota\omicron\nu\acute{t}\iota\nu.\]
Styrax, the Theodaisia, and Rhadamanthus all originated in Crete. Styrax was an oriental plant used similarly to incense: according to Plutarch, its presence near Haliartos was regarded as proof that the Cretan Rhadamanthus had once dwelt there (Lys. 28.4). In the same passage Plutarch mentions ‘the spring called Cissoura’, where the infant Dionysus was said to have been bathed after birth. The way in which Callimachus’ question combines the two suggests that the styrax was connected to the festival, or at least to Dionysus. Barigazzi points to a tension of ideas here: why should the locally-born god be honoured by imported rites? He suggests that Rhadamanthus was responsible for their introduction.\(^{172}\) The chthonic Dionysos Zagreus also originated from Crete,\(^{173}\) and represents a different aspect of the god from the one connected with Cissoura. It is frustrating that we do not know more about this complex of ideas: did the Theodaisia originally celebrate Zagreus, and was styrax used in its ceremonies? Even the presence of Zagreus in this fragment is not beyond question, as it is dependent upon a supplement to the text.

Callimachus’ question runs: \textit{why does Haliartos, city of Cadmus, conduct the Theodaisia, a Cretan festival, by the water of Cissoura, and why does the land bear styrax in the towns around Haliartos alone, and the great cities of Minos?} Was this to be treated as two questions or one? The question seeks the reason for something out of place - the Cretan festival in Boeotia - and at the same time seeks the reason for

---

\(^{172}\) Barighazzi (1975a) 16-17.

something that binds two places together - styrax. The need to reconcile alien ideas and concepts which makes the segment hard to understand may well have provided the original motivation for Callimachus’ query.

The range of themes here differs considerably from those of the Zancle aetion: no city is founded, no rite is omitted. There are however correspondences with the earlier section - Peleus’ exile is recalled by that of Rhadamanthus, and the festival of Dionysus recalls the setting for the symposium. More important, what is at point in both cases is a question of misplaced cults. 178Pf. provides a contemporary variant on this idea: Pollis is celebrating an Athenian festival in Egypt. The theme of displacement recurs, too, in other aspects of 178Pf., and, to a lesser extent, in the Sicilian catalogue, yet in the Zancle aetion it is given little attention - that story, instead, looks back to the themes of book 1.

Rites that might be thought to dishonour a god or hero were the mainstay of the questions there - here, the oecists are not called upon by name. The foundation of cities by exiles, on the other hand, might be thought of as a suppressed topic of the first book - it occurs in the Theiodamas story, as a side-issue also in the Anaphe tale, and as Coroebus’ eventual fate - in none of these instances, however, did it form the main substance of the aetion or the question. In book 2, on the other hand, foundations and exiles both figure more prominently, but foundation by exiles does not. Peleus and Rhadamanthus, both exiles, do not found cities in the tales here. The foundations in the Sicilian catalogue were on the whole not by people forced out of their homelands, although some cities later became known for their forcible dispersal by Hieron (Thapsos and Naxos 43Pf./50M.36-39).

Heraclea Minoa, on the other hand, may be thought of as being partially named after the exiled Minos, not because he was

174 Cf. Strabo 6.2.2.
its founder, but because he was murdered there by the daughters of Cocalus (43/50.48-49). In addition, the Anthesteria setting of 178/89 makes clear allusion to Orestes, who came to Athens as an exile seeking purification. As an expatriate, Pollis is part of this theme of displacement himself. This is still more the case with the Ician:

\[\text{τιρισμάκαρ, ἦ παύρων ὁ λβίσος ἐσεὶ μέτα, ναυτιλῆς εἰ νῆν ἔξεις βίον ἀλλ' ἐμὸς αἰὼν κύμασιν, σιλβής μαῖλλον ἔσωκίσατο} \ (178\text{Pf./89M.32-34})\]

Displacement in another sense, however, is also displayed in the catalogue: Naxos, Thapsus, Megara, and Euboea all have the names of places in Greece transferred to a new Sicilian setting (even though the founders of Euboea were in fact Leontinians). To descend to a metatextual level, the catalogue does not follow a geographical order, as might be more normal, but instead flits between different parts of the island.

The symposium segment makes considerable use of paradox. It might be said to present a confusion of ideas, or a contradictory view of the world that mirrors the contradictions in cult for which the Callimachean poet-figure seeks answers. The aetia that are given bring about understanding of the inconsistencies, but do not fully resolve them. Choes, for instance, was a ‘white day’ for slaves, but a ‘black’ one for citizens. There is also a paradox about the setting on two levels. Choes, the second day of the festival, involved a solitary drinking competition. The Aiora, which appears to have taken place on the third day, commemorated what is virtually a cautionary tale against excessive drinking. It is the most fitting day of the festival for Callimachus and Theugenes, but in truth they seem out of place in a festival of new wine. The ὀλίγου κιοσύβιον (v.12) oxymoron, with its allusion to Odyssey 9, and

175 Cf. Strabo 6.2.6 - Cocalus is normally located some way inland from Heraclea Minoa, at Camicus.
176 Strabo 6.2.6.
the Cyclops’ fatal consumption of excessive quantities of neat wine, parallels the Icarius story, but is a deliberately perverse turn of phrase.

Displacement and dissonance, then, are inherent in 178Pf./89M. In 43Pf./50M. the theme appears at first to be continued; Callimachus’ programmatic comments about gaining most from a banquet from what came in via his ears runs counter to what one expects of a feast. That the poet-figure should seem to impart information to the Muses is also contradictory. The outcome, too, of his θέμβος defeats expectations. It is thus the more unfortunate that, having identified the apparent thematic basis of the book, we lack almost anything of the rest of it, so that it is impossible to say how this theme in its various aspects might have been continued. The only other tales securely attributed to the book are those of Busiris and Phalaris (51M./44Pf., 52&3M./45&46Pf. + SH 252.). We know nothing of how Callimachus treated these tales, but the topic of role reversal inherent in them is a further type of displacement.

4.5 Coherence and Dissonance in Aetia 3 and 4.

As I said above, in Aetia 3 and 4 the frame of the dialogue with the Muses is discontinued, there are no linking passages, and trans-generic elements in individual aetia further divide the books into series of discrete segments. The nature of the fragments available for analysis is also different. The Diegesis to book 4 is complete, so that we have the first line of almost every segment, but, apart from the Coma Berenices, there are only one or two other segments for which any more complete verses survive. Our knowledge of book 3 is likewise increased by the Diegesis, but

here it is more fragmentary: the order of tales was set out by Parsons in 1977, but a new fragment published in 2001 pointed to the presence of further, unknown tales.\(^{180}\)

The order of segments in book 3 as established by Parsons and Gallazzi and Lehnus is as follows:

- *Victoria Berenices*  
- *Phalaecus Ambraciotes*  
- *Thesmophoria Attica*  
- *Sepulcrum Simonidis*  
- *Fontes Argivi*  
- *Acontius et Cydippa*  
- *aition ignotum*  
- *aition ignotum*  
- *Eleorum ritus nuptialis*  
- *Hospes Isindius*  
- *Phrygius et Pieria*\(^{181}\)  
- *Diana Lucina*  
- *Euthycles Locrus.*

In addition, the sequence *Cabiri - Apollo Delius - Fabula Thracia incerta* (115+114Pf) should probably stand in the lacuna marked (1).\(^{182}\) For the aetia preceding the Elean nuptial rites only a few words and part-words from the right-hand margin of the *Diegesis* exist. The aetion following ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ (2) began:

\[\text{où γάρ τας πολίων οἰκήσιας άισομαι ἥδη}  
\text{ἔστι γε Πισσιόον Ζηνός ὄπις π...θην}  
\text{άλλ' ἐν...νη} \text{κρουτουά...} \]

Throughout the course of book 3, a subtle but significant change in attitude towards the nature of aetiology becomes apparent. Because Callimachus is no longer asking the Muses for information on particular aspects of cult, the reader is no longer


\(^{181}\) There is a possibility that the order of *Phrygius et Pieria* and *Diana Lucina* should be reversed, based on an apparent contradiction in the order given by P.Oxy. 2212 and P. Mil. Vogl. I 18 col. 1. See Parsons (1977) 47 and Gallazzi & Lehnus (2001) 17 n.44.

\(^{182}\) The papyrological evidence for these pieces suggests that they belong close to the beginning of either book 1 or book 3: see Lobel (1948) 1; Massimilla (1996) 383-4.
immediately directed to view the aetion as the *telos* of a segment, or, indeed, told what is to be explained. Thus while some passages, like the *Thesmophoria Attica*, retain the view of aetiology established in books 1 and 2, others, like the *Sepulcrum Simonidis*, take a new approach. Rather than concentrating upon aetiology as an explanation of cult practices and cultural features which commemorate past actions, more emphasis is laid upon the different forms of commemoration that exist, and problems in perpetuating the memory of people and events. Thus the *Sepulcrum Simonidis* has no apparent aetion in the conventional sense, but displays the problems in remembering someone whose memorial, which might otherwise provide explanations or even be the subject of an aetion, has been destroyed. In ′Acontius and Cydippe′ cult features that might require an aetion are left unexplained, while what some have identified as a possible aetion - the clan Acontiadae - is in itself a self-explanatory commemoration of the fact that Acontius fathered children. Aetiology itself, however, is also a form of commemoration, for by providing an explanation it re-establishes a memorial to the past.

*Aetia* 3 could be said to divide into 2 set pieces and 2 major thematic sections. The *Victoria Berenices*, the first set piece, presents a wide range of potential topics: the establishment of the Nemean games, hospitality, the idea of being under siege and that of liberation, and coming of age; the idea of commemoration is central, of course, to the entire poem, but is given particular attention through Heracles' instructions for different rites to be performed in the event of his success or failure (*SH* 260A). The establishment of an iconic image, elsewhere in the *Aetia* viewed retrospectively in the context of explaining statues, is enacted as Heracles assumes his lion-skin (*SH* 268B, 667 Pf.). Only a certain selection of these topics, however, is used in the first major
section of the book (*Onnes & Tottes - Sepulcrum Simonidis*). These tales involve a nexus of themes, not all of which are always present: the motif of a tyrant or a siege, and their converse, liberation; embassies or hospitality; prohibitions and punishment. The second set piece is the tale of Acontius and Cydippe: it retains some of the previous themes, such as that of prohibitions, but adds a strong emphasis on love, prenuptial rites and festivals. The second thematic section (*Fontes Argivi - Euthycles*), which follows this, combines these topics with those of the first sections.

The *Victoria Berenices* is programmatic for Callimachus' ironising play on the idea of commemoration. Throughout the book, there is a tension between physical memorials and re-enactments, and commemoration through speech and memory. The former is displayed in two different forms: the instructions for different commemorative sacrifices show the seeds of a hero cult:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{1. } & \text{πελάσασι μόνων περιβα[} \\
\text{2. } & \text{εσεω[} \text{καὶ τάχα βουκτέανο[ς] } \\
\text{3. } & \text{ς ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπικλ[el]νες } \\
\text{4. } & \text{... πε[pl]σω Ζεὺς ὁτι παιδογ[ynos]} \\
\text{5. } & \text{... . . . πέσω δ' ὑπ' ὀδόντ[} i
\end{align*}
\]

Parsons reconstructs the sense of this as follows: Molorchus had only one ram (54PF.), which he was to sacrifice to Heracles' ghost if he did not return, and to Zeus Saviour if he did. If Heracles was successful he would be rich in cattle, if he failed he would lose what little he had.\(^{183}\) These sacrifices seem to be intended as one-off acts, rather than offerings to be repeated over the years. Nonetheless, they establish a pattern, a precedent for some more lasting mode of commemoration, such, indeed, as the Nemean games. The command to offer sacrifices also marks the status of Heracles' endeavour as something worthy of remembrance whatever its outcome.

Heracles' assumption of the lion-skin functions slightly differently:

\(^{183}\) Parsons (1977) 30.
The lion-skin is one of Heracles’ identifying features. It has an iconic force, a defining symbol of his identity and characteristics. The imagery of the statue of Delian Apollo is of a similar nature - the Graces in his right hand showing his connection to the arts and readiness to reward, the bow, showing his capacity to punish, in his left hand to signify that he is less ready to do so. Neither passage, however, is typical of the context in which statues normally occur in the poem. As we saw in book 1, they are normally introduced as the centres of odd cults that require explanation, like those of Athena with the bandaged thigh, and Artemis with the mortar on her head. In book 3, too, aetia of this type seem to have occurred: the Phalaecus story, at least in Nicander’s version (A.L. 4), was commemorated by a statue of Artemis as queen with a lioness by her side; in Euthycles’ tale, the athlete’s statue is to be paid special, compensatory honours (84-SPf.). The Heracles story differs from these instances not simply because the image is a general one, but because Heracles is shown in the process of establishing what will later become his defining image. There is not yet a statue to be explained, but we know that it will exist, in the same way that the parsley wreath of the Nemean games existed (SH 266/54Pf.).

Book 3 thus began with descriptions of the initiation of what in future would become commemorations. These were accompanied by an apparent refusal to give a verbal commemoration:

αὐτὸς ἑπιφράσατο, τὰμοι δ’ ἀπὸ μῆκος ἀοιδῆι.
όσσα δ’ ἀνειρομένῳ φη[σ]ε, τάδ’ ἐξερέω
"Ἀττα γέρον, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πα[ρῶν ἐν δ]αιτί μαθήσει,
νῦν δὲ τὰ μοι πέσηι Παλλά[ς . . . . . .] [SH 264.1-4/57Pf.)
This promise of information at a later date does not appear to be fulfilled, either for Molorchus or for the reader. Responsibility for this deferral remains ambiguous: in the passage that follows Heracles tells of Athena’s instructions about the wreath at Nemea. The poet could have taken responsibility for not repeating his account of the lion-slaying, or Heracles himself may have decided not to tell the tale.  

This unfulfilled promise of a tale introduces a book full of a range of such defeated expectations: aetia, most noticeably, are omitted from some of the stories and cult features are left unexplained. Certain themes, too, have the appearance of coming to nothing - Apollo, for instance, after his statue speaks of his capacity to reward and punish, is limited once more to dispensing oracles. Heracles himself only figures once more in the book (the Elean marriage rites).

The theme of siege, tyranny and liberation, on the contrary, begins with the dual siege of the Victoria Berenices and is maintained further. The lion leaves the countryside desolate, and its inhabitants unable even to go out and cut wood, and the mice, which plague Molorchus on a smaller scale, eat his food and clothing and even dance on his forehead at night. Heracles, of course, is the liberator, killing the lion and repaying Molorchus for his hospitality with cattle. The topic of hospitality is also burlesqued. The lack of wood means that no meal can be cooked, and the hut is invaded by the mice soon after the meal has begun (SH 259.1-14). Molorchus describes them in terms of their unwelcome effect on guests - εἰς ὄντας κραυγοὺς ἐπλασεν ὑμίμε θεός (SH 259.14). The allusions to Eumaeus’ reception of Odysseus might raise the tone to an epic level, but, when the mice arrive, bathos

---

185 For analysis of this scene, see Rosenmayer (1991) 403-413, (1993).
187 For these allusions see Harder (2001) 194.
surely makes an appearance too. Heracles for his part fulfils the obligations of *xenia* in keeping his promises to his host. He hurries back to Molorchus in time to stop him sacrificing to his ghost (*SH* 266/54Pf.), and has mules sent to him, perhaps, it has been suggested, in replacement for an animal used as bait.\(^{188}\)

\[
\text{oúdè} \varepsilon\iota\nu\vartheta\omicron\omicron\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \varsigma \lambda\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha\beta' \upsilon\piο\sigma\chi\varepsilon\sigma\iota\si\varsigma, \\
\pi\epsilon\iota\mu\iota\epsilon \delta\epsilon \omicron \iota \tau\omicron\iota\varphi\iota \omicron\eta\alpha, \tau\iota\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon \varepsilon \omega\varsigma \varepsilon\nu \pi\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron (SH 265.19-20/59Pf.)
\]

The *Victoria Berenices* thus differs in its nature from the narratives which follow it, in which the martial tone is far more pronounced, and the rescues sent and offences committed treated in a far more serious manner. The idea of divine punishment and prohibitions, notably, is absent. The tale of the Cabiri, for example, is one of treachery, in which the liberators, while still demi-gods, effect a rescue in a far more miraculous manner than Heracles, who strolled into Cleonae as the strong hero, ready for his task.

The tale of the Cabiri presents the siege theme in its full seriousness:\(^{189}\) Amphitres treacherously killed Leodamantes, king of Miletos, and besieged Assessos, where Leodamantes’ sons and supporters had taken refuge. In accordance with an oracle, Onnes and Tottes arrived bearing ‘the sacred objects of the Cabiri’, and struck terror into Amphitres’ soldiers. A partial reversal of the hospitality theme is represented by sentries’ initial suspicion of Onnes and Tottes. The people of Assessos originally promised to establish the sacred objects and worship them, perhaps indicating that at first Onnes and Tottes were viewed more as messengers than as demi-gods. The actual cult which the action apparently explains, however, is that of

\(^{188}\) Parsons (1977) 41.
\(^{189}\) The story is told by Nicholas of Damascus (*FGrH* 90F52).
the Cabiri themselves, in which Onnes and Tottes were represented by γυλλοί -polygonal stones placed in the porches of the temples of Apollo and Hecate.\(^{190}\)

\[\eta \; \piολυγώνε, \chiάρε \]

\[\tauαξίδος \; \epsilonπί \; \piροθύροις \quad (114.2-3Pf.)\]

The connection of these γυλλοί to the ‘sacred objects of the Cabiri’ is uncertain. It seems, however, that the commemoration, like that of Heracles, took the form of an acknowledgement of divine help as well as a memorialisation of the demi-gods who conveyed it.

The dialogue with the statue of Delian Apollo marks a divergence from these themes, and, more particularly, the manner in which they are presented. It connects with ideas of benefit and punishment distributed by the god. Apollo and his oracle figured regularly in book 1; in the dialogue, however, the god is the sole focus of the segment, noted not for his oracle, but for his intervention in man’s affairs. The greater readiness to reward than to punish was at least partially demonstrated by the preceding story, in that Apollo causes Leodamantes, who was his worshipper, to be avenged.

The punishment theme may have been more fully developed in the next story, *Fabula Thracia incerta* (114.18-25Pf.), which possibly referred to Diomedes of Thrace and his stranger-eating horses.\(^{191}\) The use of the statue to explain the god’s characteristics, rather than a particular aspect of cult, shows aetiology moving in a new direction. The segment is a description of the god’s function within the framework of divine justice, and through this, his identity itself.

Whether Apollo also played a part in the Phalaecus segment is less certain. Antoninus (*Met. 4*) tells a complex story, attributed to Athanadas, in which Apollo claimed Ambracia because he had stirred up stasis against the tyrant Phalaecus, but


Artemis claimed she had caused his death, through making a lion cub appear in front of him when he was out hunting - he picked it up and had his chest ripped open by its mother. The liberated Ambraciotes made offerings to Artemis as queen and set up an image of her as Huntress, along with a bronze lioness. A scholion to *Ibis* 501-2 (665Pf.) only credits Callimachus with the lioness part of the story, but this was the only part mentioned by Ovid. The themes of tyranny, rescue and punishment are plain, and in an interesting reversal of role, the lioness, which in the *Victoria Berenices* besieged the countryside, here becomes the agent of liberation.

These themes, however, were not maintained uniformly. In the *Thesmophoria Attica* (63Pf.), the action explains the prohibition of unmarried girls from the Thesmophoria, although the state of the fragment leaves the reason for this unclear. The story appears to be that of an old woman, a neighbour, and a rather upset goddess, who was first weighed down by fate (v.2), and then pained in spirit (v.7) and harsh to a girl (v.8), and who, because of the Thesmophoria action, was probably Demeter. Stories of offences to the goddess include those of Iambe (alluded to above) and Ascalabus (Ov. *Met.* 5.444ff.); the latter is excluded here by the offender's gender, but both tales point to a group of traditions in which Demeter was insulted by a member of her host's family.192 Alternatively, following Hollis' suggestion, could the theoxeny have turned sour because the girl saw something she should not (v.5 ἵσειν οὗ γάρ ἄνω)?193 The *xenia* theme would thus have recurred in a new context.

The *Sepulcrum Simonidis* (64Pf.) presents the themes of the section in an entirely new light. The destruction of the tomb was a breach of a very important prohibition. It took place at a time of siege, but was also a violation of *xenia*:

---

Simonides was a Cean, honoured by the citizens of his host city Acragas, who had erected the tomb.\textsuperscript{194}

\begin{verbatim}
καὶ γὰρ ἐμὸν κοτὲ σῆμα, τὸ μοι πρὸ πόλης ἔχειν αὐτὸν Ἀκραγαντίων ἰτίννα ἄξωμαι 
\end{verbatim} 

(64.3-4Pf.)

The element of divine rescue in the story, however, does not concern the war or the tyrant, but a wholly different situation, Simonides saved by the Dioskouroi from a collapsing building.

\begin{verbatim}
οὐδὲ ἔμειν, Πολύδευκε, ὑπέτρεσαν, οἵ μὲ μελάνθιμοι μελαντήτων πίπτειν έκτῶς ἐθεσθέ κοτὲ 

δαίτωμόνων ἀπὸ μοῦνον, ὅτε Κραννώνοις ιαίατ 

ὑλίσθειν μεγάλοισι οῖκος ἐπὶ Σίκυοιπάδιατ. 
\end{verbatim} 

(64.11-14)

According to legend the poet was called from a banquet to speak to a pair of young men, only to find that there was no one there. The building collapsed before he could return inside, killing all his fellow guests.\textsuperscript{195}

The implications of this segment for Callimachus’ process of inquiry have already been described above. In contrast to the stories explaining rites or statues that commemorated a particular event, the passage provides an implicit action for the absence of any monument to Simonides. The stone that was destroyed, in addition, in telling as it did of the Dioscouri’s rescue, provided a memorial to that event just as the Nemean games, and the cult of the Cabiri, did for the rescues in those stories.

So far as we can tell, the Fontes Argivi marks the beginning of a new set of themes, concerned with courtship and pre-nuptial rites and birth, and paradoxes that occur in these contexts, in addition to elements of the previous nexus of themes. The biggest statement of this change of emphasis is the ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ centre-
piece. As the *Fontes* segment precedes this, at first it appears as a partial oddity. In addition, however, it could draw attention to a series of precepts that had emerged through the preceding passages.

\[\text{Αὐτομάτης} \text{ ἐναές ἐπόων[μον, ἀλ]ι᾽ ἀπὸ σεῖπο λούνται λοχίῃν οἰκέτιν [......... ἦς} \text{ (65Pf.)}\]

\[\text{ηρῶσσαι [.........], ίας ἱασίδος νέπ[ο]δες: νύμφα Π[οσ]ειδάωνος ἐφοδιαία, οὐδὲ μὲν Ἰῳη ἀγνόον ὑφιανέμεναι τῆι μέμηλει πάτος στήναι [πάλ]ρ κανόνεσαι πάρος θέμις ἢ τεὸν ὕδω[ρ κὰκ κεφ[α]λῆς ἴρὸν πέτρον ἐφεξιμένας χεύσοντα, τὸν μὲν οὐ μέσον περιδέδρομας ἀμφίσ: πότεν Ἰμμωήνη καὶ Φυσάδειν φίλη Ἰππή τρ Αὐτομάτη τε, παλαίτατα χαίρετε νυμφέων οἰκία καὶ λιπαραὶ ρέιτε Πελασγιάδες} \text{ (66Pf.)}\]

The passage is dissimilar in form to any of the other segments, apparently comprising a set of vignettes concerned with each of a group of fountains in turn, followed by an apostrophe to them. The springs are connected to the legend that a drought occurred after Danaos arrived at Argas and he sent his fifty daughters to look for water. At least four - Physadeia, Amymone, Hippe and Automate - found it; Amymone had intercourse with Poseidon and was rewarded with a spring at Lerna.\(^{196}\) It is impossible to tell now from the state of the text whether Callimachus did any more than allude to the tale. It provides a background, however, that looks forward to more erotic narratives and away from the stories of oppression and liberation. The erotic background is accompanied by the reference to the cleansing of slave women after childbirth, which, while less erotic, nonetheless adds to the sense of a change of focus.

A sense of paradox also seems to be present: Automate has a holy name (εὐναξες

\(^{196}\) [Apoll.] 2.1.4; Strabo 8.6.8 (371); Hygin. *Fab.* 169A.
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...but - a strong ἀλλά - her water is used for the ‘unclean’ process of cleansing women who were not only polluted but also slaves.

The apostrophe to the springs was followed by an opening which signals a very different type of narrative.

Αὐτὸς Ἐρως ἔδιδαξεν Ἀκόντιον, ὁππότε καλῆ ἦθετο Κυδίττητι παῖς ἐπὶ παρθενικὴν (67.1-2 Pf.)

This opening - love as teacher, a boy, a girl, a trick - might seem a suitable beginning for erotic epigram. The nature of the story seems to be marked out clearly: it is not anchored in or focalised through cult or iconography, and as if to emphasise this, rites in the festival scene that follows are left unexplained. The festival itself is introduced parenthetically, sandwiched between the young people’s islands and parentage.

Callimachus’ wording puts the god in the background, just as does the mothers’ concern to secure Cydippe as a bride for their sons.

None of the girls who come to the ‘dripping stone of hairy Silenus’ or who joined in the dance of ‘Ariede’ were as beautiful as Cydippe - what those rites were not from Physadeia, rather than that the scholiast drew this conclusion from the fact that Callimachus gives this function to Automate, and mentions it here to contradict what Antimachus may have said.

---

197 Another interpretation of ἀλλά is that it is part of a denial, begun in the previous verse, that Physadeia had such a role (See Pfeiffer 1949 68). The source for the passage (Comm. in Antim. PRIM I no. 17 col. II 14-16 Wyss p. 81) reads οὐκ ἄ[πο] τῆς Φυσ[αρνί]ς φησίν ὃ Καλλιμάχος τὰς λεχούς λύσκεθαι, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῆς Αὐτομάτης. It then goes on to cite Hagias and Dercylos for the same version. This may not necessarily mean, however, that Callimachus said in so many words ‘not from Physadeia’, rather than that the scholiast drew this conclusion from the fact that Callimachus gives this function to Automate, and mentions it here to contradict what Antimachus may have said.
and their aetia seem, for the moment, unimportant.\textsuperscript{198} The disconnected fragments that follow seem to imply a detailed narrative of Acontius’ life as a lad lusted over on his way to school and the baths, and then falling in love in his turn, wandering abroad and carving Cydippe’s name on trees (68-73Pf.). Such an extensive erotic narrative has no parallel elsewhere in the \textit{Aetia}. Substantial narratives may not have been particularly unusual in the poem: one can think, for example, of the Anaphe and the Linus and Coroebus narratives, but in these, as in the \textit{Victoria Berenices}, the story was strongly subordinated to a pre-defined aetiological \textit{telos}.

This change of emphasis is accompanied by a further play on the idea of aetiological knowledge. The poet’s mock-consternation over the nuptial rite is accompanied by criticism of having knowledge without showing restraint in its dissemination:

\begin{quote}
"\textit{Ηρην γάρ κοτέ φασι - κύον, κύον, ἱσχεο, λαιδρέ}
θυμέ, οὖ γ’ ἄειση καὶ τά περ οὐχ ὀσία:
ἐναφ κάρτ’ ἐνεκ’ οὖ τι θείς ἱδε ἱερὰ φρικτῆς.
ἐξ ἂν ἐτεί καὶ τῶν ἄργυς ἱστορήν.
ἡ πολυδρείη χαλεπόν κακόν, ὅστις ἀκαρτεὶ
γλώσσης· ως ἔτειν παῖς ὅδε μαῦλιν ἔχει."
\end{quote}

Far more clearly than the abandonment of the dialogue with the Muses or the change in the nature of the narrative, this marks out the new attitude in this part of the \textit{Aetia} to the acquisition of knowledge. It is now a potential danger:\textsuperscript{199} aetiology no longer seems wholly desirable, in spite of the original aims of the poem. The exclamation is an expression of the poet’s awareness of his tendency to parade his knowledge, and reminds the reader of the forces controlling the selection of his tales.\textsuperscript{200}

\textsuperscript{198} In case of curiosity, consult Barigazzi (1975b) 203-4.
\textsuperscript{200} Fantuzzi-Hunter (2002) 83.
This development of attitudes to knowledge away from dependence on the Muses is not confined to books 3 and 4 - the opening of book 2, for example, saw Callimachus turning to others for knowledge, and parading his own learning. The lack of the Muse frame in book 3, as well as permitting a looser approach towards aetiology, permits more of the portrayal of other modes of gaining knowledge. Autopsy has become possible, and characters (such and Apollo and Simonides) can speak directly to the poet. This diffusion is complemented by the creation of ambivalent attitudes towards learning, a process begun here and swiftly continued by Callimachus’ remarks on epilepsy.\(^{201}\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{δειεινή} \quad \text{τὴν} \quad \delta' \quad \text{εἶλε} \quad \text{κακὸς} \quad \chiλός, \quad \text{ἡλθὲ} \quad \text{δὲ} \quad \text{νοῦς}, \\
\text{αἰγὸς} \quad \text{ἐς} \quad \text{ἀγριάδας} \quad \text{τὴν} \quad \text{ἀποπειμῶμεθα}, \\
\text{ψευδόμενο} \quad \delta' \quad \text{ιερὴν} \quad \text{φημίζομεν}. \\
\end{align*}\]

(75.12-14Pf.)

The learned attitude, that epilepsy is not sent by the gods, is fatally undermined by the narrative context.\(^{202}\) The inherent contradiction is amplified by the idea of banishing the disease into goats. This does not appear to be covered by \[\psiευ\deltaό\muε\nu\iota\], and yet such a ‘cure’ surely belongs to folk superstition rather than scientific thought.

The consultation of the oracle is also part of this theme of learning. Hutchinson sees in the poem an opposition between the poet’s search for scholarly facts and the characters’ struggle to gain information.\(^{203}\) Ceyx (Cydippe’s father) is looking for truth from Apollo as Callimachus once sought it from the Muses, but now Callimachus’ ‘Muse’ is fed by book learning.\(^{204}\) The oracle, moreover, is couched in terms of truly Alexandrian obscurity:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Ἀρτέμιδος} \quad \text{τῇ} \quad \text{παιδὶ} \quad \text{γάμον} \quad \text{βαρὺς} \quad \text{örκος} \quad \text{ἐνικλαί}: \\
\end{align*}\]

\(^{201}\) Harder (1990) 299 considers the way in which understanding of Callimachus’ remarks requires knowledge on the part of the reader.


\(^{203}\) Hutchinson (2003) 49.

\(^{204}\) Hutchinson (2003) 52.
Once again, what is meant by ‘troubling Lygdamis’, or why Artemis should braid rushes at Amyclae, is not explained, although both are potential subjects for aetia. The description of trapping quail as a way of characterising Ceos seeks by its obscurity to create questions rather than to provide answers. Apollo and Callimachus conspire to renege on the Aetia’s original aim, even though it is Apollo who started the poet on his course.

The summary of Xenomedes’ history, as we saw above, is of a piece with this fresh attitude towards aetiology and the sources of knowledge. In thematic terms, its subject matter is more traditional than that of its parent narrative. Foundation stories were an underlying topic of book 1 and featured prominently in book 2, but are far less in evidence in books 3 and 4, this passage excepted. The punishment of the Telchines (75.64-69) is coupled with the divine rescue of Macelo and Dexithee; Demonax’ fault may have been a refusal to offer hospitality to the gods. The idea, on the other hand, of prose commemoration, or of the establishment of a clan as a type of memorialisation, is in keeping with and expands the range of the new types of commemoration introduced in book 3.

4.5 The Aetia and its Structural Dynamics: Coherence and Dissonance in Aetia 3 and 4

Keîe, têon δ’ ἡμεῖς ἵμερον ἐκλύομεν
tônde παρ’ ἀρχαῖοι Ζευς ἱμέδεος, ὡς ποτὲ πᾶσαν
νήσου ἐνὶ μνήμῃ κάθετο μιθολόγῳ (75.50-55).

‘Acontius and Cydippe’ was followed by at least three unknown aetia. The first of these seems to begin

οὗ γὰρ τὰς πολίων οἰκήσιας άισωμαί ἡδη:
ἔστι γε Πισσάιου Ζηνός ὁπίς π...αθην (P.Oxy. 1011 fr. 1’ 79-80)
although the text is very poor at this point. It seems perhaps to signal a change of focus to examine the houses, or the temples, of cities, as a task previously neglected. Such a reading would imply the poet re-establishing the aims and boundaries for his work within the enlarged understanding of aetiology that he had just created. The change of topic it implies, however, does not seem to have been extensively fulfilled.

The marriage rite of the next known aetion, the Elean marriage rites, looks back to ‘Acontius and Cydippe’. Its background, Heracles’ sack of Elis in punishment for Augeas’ injustice, reverses the earlier norm of oppression and siege being countered by liberty and justice. The first line of the segment is tantalising:

Εἶπ’ άγε μοι...[.]...α...[......]...[.]...αἰήνις (Diegesis I 3)
It plainly appears to be after the style of an invocation of the Muses, something that would cut across all the traits established in the poem, and indeed take the relationship of poet and Muses back to a simpler form than that established in Aetia 1 and 2. It is not impossible that Callimachus, having ironised this relationship, might equally ironically revert to it for one segment out of the many that did not require the Muses’ assistance. The exact Homeric precedent for the phrase, however, shows the oddity to go back to the Iliad itself. There, the question was addressed to Helen during the teichoscopia, when Priam had asked her about Odysseus.

207 See Pfeiffer’s apparatus (1949) 84.
The deceptive nature of this allusion - an apparent address to the Muse concealing something different - recalls the unexpected sense of ‘Calliope’ at the end of the Xenomedes catalogue (75.77Pf.): both in their different ways reduce the status of the Muses of the first half of the poem, so that here their presence proves to be a mere phantom. Callimachus’ line is another question about a different sort of warrior. One wonders about its addressee - if it was a woman, in line with the Homeric parallel, might this woman have first-hand experience of the rite?

Towards the end of the book, ‘Phrygius and Pieria’ (80-83Pf.) appears to present a grittier version of ‘Acontius and Cydippe’. It repeats the idea of love at a festival, but removes the barriers created by the lack of communication. Acontius’ use of a trick, rather than speaking outright to Cydippe, led to confusion and frustration, especially when coupled with Cydippe’s initial failure to tell her parents what had occurred. The barrier is principally one of ignorance, perhaps coupled with immaturity. For Phrygius and Pieria, on the other hand, a potentially far more serious obstacle, that of war between their states of Myous and Miletus, is broken down by speech. The siege / liberation topos is thus combined with the love motif. While ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ created a marked departure from the topics that had preceded it, in ‘Phrygius and Pieria’ the old motif of war is actually resolved through the application of the new theme of love. The festival, too, is turned to greater effect than it was in ‘Acontius and Cydippe’, for it combines with ideas of xenia. The previous section (Hospes Isindius 78Pf.) had shown the murder of a guest, the plainest breach of this, coupled with exclusion from a festival. Now the combination of ideas is maintained but the situation reversed: Myous is not excluded from a festival on
Miletus in spite of the hostilities, and good comes from such hospitality. Love is in
effect given a different role in the two stories, turning from the mischief and tricks in
‘Acontius and Cydippe’ to the role of ambassador. ‘Phrygius and Pieria’, then, shows
the erotic earlier tale transformed so that a similar initial scenario now has more far
reaching and important results. The idyllic story is brought to the more gritty world of
the rest of the Aetia. The segment’s action, like that of ‘Acontius and Cydippe’, was
apparently not to do with cult or ritual. The point to be explained seems to have been
proverbial: women wished for their husbands to honour them ‘as much as Phrygius
loved Pieria’.208 This, once again, it looks at a fresh type of commemoration.

The oddity in ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ and ‘Phrygius and Pieria’ by which the
virgin Artemis becomes a promoter of love seems to have gained more emphasis in
the next segment (79Pf.). Three different aetiologies were apparently given for why
Artemis should be called upon by women in childbirth: people call upon her because
Leto bore her without pain; or because Eileithyia, ordered by Zeus, gave her that
privilege, or because she served as her mother’s midwife when her own twin was
born. The Diegesis says that these different accounts were given one after the other
(ἐξήκοντο), and does not indicate that Callimachus gave any of them preference. The range
of different potential reasons if anything increases the sense of paradox, for the
absence of any one accepted explanation creates a sense that none of the solutions
supplied may be the truth. The segment thus draws attention to the limits of aetiology,
continuing the questioning of the genre that ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ had brought to
the fore.

208 Aristaen. Epist. 1.15 & Plut. Mul. Virt. 11.253f both include this, indicating its presence in their
original source. For the relationship between Aristaenetus and Callimachus see Barigazzi (1976a),
Arnott (1982).
The book’s final action, in contrast, appears to have been conventional. Euthycles was an Olympic victor from Locri, who was sent on an embassy and returned home with some mules, which one of his hosts had given to him. He was falsely accused of accepting them as a bribe and his statue was disfigured. A plague then occurred and the citizens learnt that this was because of the dishonour done to Euthycles. In restitution they had to restore his statue and honour it equally with that of Zeus. The idea of the Olympics and the gift of mules both recall the *Victoria Berenices* and, similarly, the desecration of a monument recalls the *Sepulcrum Simonidis.*

The theme of xenia recurs; any erotic element is lacking. The action is simply that of a cult, rather than a more complex consideration of types of commemoration. The narratorial voice is that of Callimachus, apostrophising Euthycles in relatively unambiguous language.

This staid approach, indeed, is apparently carried over into the first surviving action of book 4, the *Delphic Daphnephoria* (87-89Pf.). The *Diegesis* is fragmentary at this point, but describes Apollo washing his hands in the Peneios after killing the Python as a boy, and then cutting some laurel. Stephanus and Theopompos add further information about the rite. Every ninth year well-born boys went from Delphi to Tempe to sacrifice and make laurel wreaths for use at the Pythian games, travelling by the ‘Pythian road’ and dining at ‘Deipnae’, so called because Apollo dined first there after his purification. There is ample aetiological material here: the rite itself, the name of the village, the particular provenance of the laurel used at the games. In this it recalls the *Victoria Berenices*, and a further point of

---

210 This was preceded by a segment of which we know almost nothing. See below.
211 Theopompos FGrH 115F80 / Aelian VH 3.1.7.
similarity is that the stories of Heracles and the Nemean Lion and Apollo and the Python both tell of an initial task, one accomplished as the god becomes an adult.

This conventional opening gives a deceptive impression of book 4 as a whole. As in book 3, the opening action is followed by a differing, but thematically coherent section, which is then interrupted by contrasting passages: in book 3 this break was marked above all by ‘Acontius and Cydippe’; here it is a pair of ekphraseis about statues of Hera on Samos (100-101Pf.). In book 4, however, after the interruption the previous topic is reasserted for some time and is far less obviously influenced by the themes of the centre-piece. The book ends with first a conventional action (“The Anchor of the Argo at Cyzicus” 108-9Pf.) and then the long Coma Berenices. Books 3 and 4 are thus made to appear mirror images, or, to use another term, are unified by ring-composition:


A problem with such an analysis, however, is that it is dependent upon the supposition that the reader of the complete text would have been able to perceive the runs of themes. In addition to removing authorial guidance about how the aetia are to be viewed, the absence of the dialogue with the Muses in books 3 and 4 reduces the visibility of paired or contrasted narratives and situations. This was evident in particular in book 3, where the changing generic associations of the different segments have a greatly disunifying effect. The themes of tyranny and xenia did not always overlap, so that, for instance, as the Phalaecus story was about tyranny but not xenia, and the Thesmophoria Attica about xenia but not tyranny, any sense of thematic
continuity or unity becomes fractured. This might argue against viewing this half of the poem as a *Kollektivgedicht*, as might the size and apparently self-contained nature of the set pieces. The opening of the segment following ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ appears to view the book as a single entity, but the invocation beginning the ‘Elean Marriage Rites’ gives a contrary impression.

For book 4, on the other hand, we lack evidence for the generic associations of most of the segments. What are more evident are the dynamics by which themes were developed and contrasted to grant coherence to the book as a whole.

The *Diegesis* to *Aetia* 4 (II.10.1-3) began

\[ \text{Μοῦσαι μοι βασιλῆς} \]
\[ Λ\text{'υτη πρώτη ἔλεγξεία} \]
\[ ἐστὶν ἱστορία\]
\[ ἀπερ\]

The lemma thus suggests a rather conventional opening, in which the Muses were asked to sing to the king - perhaps a dedication to the Ptolemies, although *βασιλῆς* might also refer to Apollo, or to Zeus.\(^{212}\) As in 76.1Pf., the use of such formality takes the relationship of the poet to the Muses back to a more basic form than that of *Aetia* 1 & 2. On this occasion, such an outwardly formal approach might be appropriate, if Ptolemy were indeed being referred to at the opening of the new book. The first line of book 3 was likewise conventional, a vote of thanks to the gods at the beginning of an epinician. Unfortunately, nothing shows what the story might have been.

The fact that the Diegete thought it necessary to state that this was the first piece of the new book, \(\text{αὐτή πρώτη ἔλεγξεία}\), even though there is a clear section heading in the papyrus, makes it tempting to speculate that this was the result of a clearly proemial character for the segment, in keeping with its formal first line. Such a passage could have provided space for Callimachus to outline his projected subject

\(^{212}\) See Pfeiffer (1949) 95. The line recalls the opening of the *Theogony* and the *Homeric Hymns.*
matter and to guide the reader’s response to it. The extent to which a conventional, perhaps solemn opening may be typical of the book that followed is hard to gauge. One noticeable feature of several of the opening verses is that they appear to be apostrophes or invocations, and two at least of the others begin with moralising statements (93 & 96). The degree of irony in these instances is, again, hard to judge; one might, however, posit a book outwardly solemn in form, to fit its dire subject matter; alternatively, the poet may have cast the segments as dialogues with or speeches from monuments or individuals, giving the impression of autopsy as part of his process of enquiry.

As the “Delphic Daphnephoria” had a purification as its basis, so too does scapegoat ritual at Abdera. Another link might be that scapegoat rituals were often connected to Apollo. It is noticeable that the Diegesis describes the rite in detail, but does not apparently give any action for it. Istros did have an aetiological myth to account for the sybakhoi at the Thargelia, explaining it as an imitation of the stoning of Pharmakos, who had stolen the sacred vessels of Apollo. Hughes finds it more likely that the legend belonged originally to an Ionian city other than Athens, and Jackson has suggested that Abdera is a suitable candidate, and that Istros may have discussed the rite with Callimachus. This legend, however, seems an unconvincing back-formation. The focus on the details of the rite in the Diegesis seems to suggest that, as in the Delius Apollo, there was more of a concentration on particular points of interest and their reasons than on explanations in terms of mythology. The figure

---

through whom the piece is focalised may also be of importance: the first verse seems to imply the speaker’s close connection to the rite:

"Ενθ’, 'Αβδηρ’, οὗ νῦν. [. . .]λεω φαρμακὸν ἁγινεί

The Diegesis passage is an important piece of evidence for the view that the pharmakos was driven out but not killed.\textsuperscript{217} This segment about a ritual acting-out of killing is followed by a description of human sacrifice itself, child sacrifices to Melicertes, distanced from the poet and his readers by being set in the remote mythical past.\textsuperscript{218} In one respect the segment’s action appears plain: the child Melicertes’ death at the hands of his mother leads to a rite in which mothers kill their own infants in times of crisis. The segment appears to have been cast, at least initially, as an address to Melicertes

'Α[όνι] ω] Μελικέρτα, μηῆς ἐπὶ πότνια Βύη

It was plausibly suggested by Norsa and Vitelli that supplying ἀγκύρης in the next verse would make sense of the phrase.\textsuperscript{219} The idea that children are their parents’ anchors is common in Greek literature,\textsuperscript{220} and it was proverbial that two anchors provided greater safety than one.\textsuperscript{221} The sense would thus perhaps be that Athamas’ killing of Learchus had deprived Ino (Bune) of one anchor, and in her madness and desperation she leapt into the sea with the other. The cult, however, had been discontinued, not within the historical period (like the lapsing of the cult described in the Teuthis story), but in the mythological past, when Orestes settled on Tenedos. What is to be explained is thus a tradition of which only faint traces could still have

\textsuperscript{218} Hughes (1991) 134.
\textsuperscript{219} Norsa & Vitelli (1934). Callimachus expresses a similar sentiment at \textit{lamb}. I 19.47 Pf.
\textsuperscript{221} E.g. Pind. \textit{Ol}. 6.170; Eur. \textit{Phaeth}. 124.6 (Diggle); Demosth. 56.44; Aristides \textit{Panath} 176d; Herond. 1.41.
remained. The passage might perhaps be seen as a variant on the foundation myth: the norm is that a name or piece of ritual commemorated the circumstances of a foundation; here, instead, it is the cessation of a cult, a civilising act, for which the establishment of the colony will be remembered.  

The fragment that follows, *Theudotus Liparensis* (93 Pf.), brings the idea of human sacrifice closer to Callimachus’ own times, although it is committed by non-Greek perpetrators. The story is set in the context of the friction between the Etruscans and the inhabitants of the Lipari islands in the six and fifth centuries BC. It is the climax of a triad: first the representation of human sacrifice with the scapegoat at Abdera, then the mythical sacrifices to Melikertes, and now the ‘historical’ sacrifice of a Greek from Lipari to ensure victory for the ‘barbarian’ Etruscans. The killing of Theudotus is distanced from the Greek world, but, through the involvement of Apollo, it is perhaps not quite as far off as a Greek would wish.

Verses quoted by the C & D scholia on *Ibis* 465-6, which tell the story, seem to express this abhorrence at the idea that human sacrifices could be offered to a Greek god.

*Theodotus captus Phoebo datur hostia,quamvis nequaquam sit homo victima grata deo.*

One possible interpretation of the fragment’s enigmatic opening verses is that they reflect this mindset.


---

222 Secci (1959) 98.
224 For the history of this see Gras (1985) 514-522.
Barber suggested that human blood or flesh was contrasted with nectar and ambrosia as the food or drink of the gods, but admitted “The restoration of the line still seems impossible.” While such a sense fits the context, the lines that follow the opening couplet read as though they are a moralising reflection upon unfortunates (δείλατοι) who are misled by the seemingly attractive nature of something that is in fact harmful.

This something, addressed in the second person plural (v.3), must presumably have had its identity indicated in the opening couplet, and it seems likely that γένος formed part of this. γένος tends to be translated as ‘race’, but in this sense it cannot easily fit into the extended metaphor of tasting and consumption. The combination of the first couplet with the outline meaning of verses 3 - 6 suggests a sense of something like ‘the nature of X is sweeter than nectar . . .’, with X in all probability being a moral failing. γατι ἀνέδωκε, however, and also the plural form of ύμέας, are hard to reconcile with this. One thing the ground does not bear is moral failings, and they in Greek are normally expressed by singular abstract nouns, such as ἑ ὑβρις and ἑ χλιδη. Thanks to this difficulty, the segment’s action is once again wholly unclear.

226 Barber (1935) 177.
228 The issue is not simplified by the reading of the Diegesis, which has ἑυθον for γλύκον, χύθον - ‘young, a youth’ has been suggested, (Vitelli & Norsa (1935) 19, who cite Lobel) but this sheds no more light on the passage as a whole, for while it might be brought to agree with the idea of acceptable
The Leimonis story (94-5Pf.) diverges from the focus on sacrifice, but retains the emphasis on cruelty and vengeance. The location of the tale, Athens, removes the comforting attribution of such conduct to the barbarians. Ancient attitudes to the incident, however, seem to have varied. Aeschines holds up the father, Hippomenes, as an example of a stern moralist, but Diodorus, on the other hand, calls it ‘a cruel and extraordinary punishment’ (τιμωρίαν ... ἀνήκεστον καὶ παρηλλαγμένην).\(^{229}\) An inscription apparently referring to the site has been found (IG II\(^2\) 13126) and it has been suggested that it was erected for the sake of tourists in the first century BC or AD.\(^ {230}\) The tale was thus perhaps sufficiently grotesque to be appealing. It appears to have provided the action for the place’s name: this is a feature of all treatments of the myth.

Ovid mentions the punishment of both Leimonis and her seducer in the *Ibis*, and seems in both passages to lay emphasis on the novelty of the penalties.

\[
\text{Utque novum passa genus Hippomeneide poenae tractus in Actaea fertur adulter humo. (335-336)}
\]

\[
\text{Solaque Limone poenam ne senserit illam, et tua dente fero viscera carpat equus (459-460)}
\]

There is nothing in the fragments to show us how Callimachus treated the tale, or whether Ovid took this aspect of the story from him. The apparent absence, however, of any involvement of the gods may be a noteworthy feature. In all the segments in book 4 so far, the gods have been the recipients of sacrifice and, in the case of the ‘Delphic Daphnephoria’, the initiators of rites. Killing without reference to the gods here might provide a foil to the killing of Theudotus in Apollo’s name.

---


The segment that followed stands in contrast to this. The *Venator Gloriosus* (96 Pf.) appears to be a relatively straightforward theodicy. It marks a break in the chain of related topics that had been followed since the Abdera aetion. A huntsman killed a boar, and boasted that those who surpassed Artemis had no need to dedicate trophies to her. He dedicated the boar’s head to himself and hung it on a tree: it fell onto his head while he was asleep, and killed him. The opening line apparently pointed the moral:

\[ \text{Θεοὶ πάντεις κοιπῶσι νεμεσῆμον, ἐκ δὲ τε πάντων } \]
\[ \text{Ἀρτέμις.} \]

The verse and its interpretation are uncomplicated. Hybris is countered by nemesis. Motivation is simple, and there are no ambiguities of ritual death or infanticide for the common good; nor is there human violence. As a morality tale, the segment seems to have a lack of complexity very rare in the *Aetia*, and perhaps paralleled only by the Phalaecus story.\(^\text{231}\) In Diodorus (4.22.3) the story is given in explanation of a rock formation near Paestum, and that may also have been the aetion here;\(^\text{232}\) if so, it was a rather conventional type of aetion, and also one that was not connected to cult or culture. This change of gear provides a moment of respite in the poem. It stands in contrast to all the problematic attempts at human interaction with the gods, and shows the gods imposing their own forms justice and revenge. This, however, inevitably has the potential to be double-edged: is Artemis’ action a reassertion of the natural, ‘correct’ order of things, or merely a parallel to the human spite displayed by the Etruscans in their killing of Theudotus?

---

\(^\text{231}\) This of course must come with the caveat that the renditions of the tales may have had twists that are no longer apparent.

The Aetia and its Structural Dynamics: Coherence and Dissonance in Aetia 3 and 4

The loss of the opening segment makes it difficult to tell how Callimachus directed his readers to consider issues of sacrifice, purification and revenge in this part of the book, while the loss of most of the text makes it equally hard to judge how the segments may have differed from one another in their presentation. In book 3 the play on the ideas of commemoration and aetiology encouraged the reader to consider the very nature of the poem. Here many of the aetia are left unclear: the Diegesis fails to indicate an action for the Abdera and Melicertes segments, and in the case of Leimonis what it mentions is little more than a commonplace, for the name ‘The Horse and the Girl’ was widely known. The Theudotus story also lacks any clearly aetiological element. The form of the segments could have replaced aetia with an earlier stage in the learning process, the autopsy of monuments and rites themselves. Alternatively, the absence of aetia may have marked off these tales, inviting the reader to consider them more closely and to search for the reason for their inclusion. One could perhaps conclude that such events should lack commemoration. Book 3 dealt with mankind’s duties, to one another and to the gods (xenia, love, suppression of tyranny): this section presents a far more disturbing view of the world, in which certain imperatives - protection and revenge - lead to monstrous behaviour and the gods, intended recipients of those acts, fail to intervene. The flanking sections, then, the ‘Delphic Daphnephoria’ and ‘Boastful Huntsman’, show the world of myth to be far more reassuring than ‘historical’ events. It could thus, perhaps, call attention to the inability of aetia to explain human behaviour in matters more important than cult trivia.

Fragment 97, the ‘Pelasgian Wall’, marks a new section in the book, in which ekphraseis of concrete objects occur. The ‘Pelasgian Wall’ is followed by another tale
of violence (98-99 Pf.); two descriptions of statues of Hera on Samos come next (100-101 Pf.), followed by a further story of violence, that of Pasikles (102 Pf.); this in turn was followed by another ekphrasis, the ‘Hero of the Stern’ (103 Pf.). It is unclear what Callimachus had to say about the Pelasgian Wall, beyond the fact that he put the segment into the wall’s own mouth:

Τυρσηνῶν τείχισμα Πελασγικῶν εἶχε μὲ γαῖα

The Diegesis is very brief, perhaps even indicating that the commentator was unsure of the point of the passage. Certainly, no action is mentioned.

'Ιστορεῖ περὶ τῶν 'Αθήνησιν Πελασγικῶν ὄρων καὶ τοῦ ποιηθέντος ὑπ’ αὐτῶν τείχους.

This terseness is the more frustrating because there do seem to have been legends connected with the wall and its builders. Herodotus has a story (which he ascribes to Hecataeus) that the Pelasgians were given a piece of land in payment for building the wall, but later were driven out of Attica and settled on Lemnos. In revenge they abducted Athenian women, but later killed them along with their sons, for fear they were growing too strong. It is perhaps nonetheless possible that Callimachus phrased his ekphrasis in a way that would have recalled the tale to a well-read reader. This could have been a development of the marginalisation of aetiology in this book: here the reader also has to work hard to understand the tale’s connection to the other stories.

The myth of Euthymus at Temesa (98-99 Pf.) returns to many of the themes of the previous section. It has elements of sacrifice, expiation and revenge, and barbarian customs, removed by the Greeks. The version of the story given by the Diegesis is that a hero left behind by Odysseus’ ship imposed a tribute on the inhabitants and their

233 Hdt. 6.137-8; Hecat. FGrH I F 127.
neighbours. They were to provide him with a bed and a maiden ready for marriage, and leave without turning back. In the morning the girl was returned a woman. Euthymus did away with the tribute. The story is told by a number of other authors. Strabo names the hero as Polites, and specifies that Euthymus was a boxer, and that his combat with and defeat of the hero took place when the Locrians had captured Temesa. Pausanias supplies the romantic addition that Euthymus fell in love with the maiden as she was being led away to the demon and vowed to marry her if he could rescue her. Aelian, however, says that the hero of Temesa exacted taxes from his neighbours, and that when he was defeated by Euthymus he was made to pay back his takings with interest.

The story thus stands at the interface of historical and mythical narrative. It is possible to account for the different versions as showing either a rationalisation of myth or a fantacisation of actual events. It also provides a new angle on themes that had already occurred in Aetia 4. The topics of the sacrifice of young people and pre-marital sex appear in a symbolic form, and both this mimesis and the idea of communal expiation through a single figure recall the scapegoat. The action of the segment, however, is again unclear, although there are two potential candidates: a proverb and a story about Euthymus’ statue. The proverb, according to Aelian, was that those who make a useless profit encounter the hero at Temesa. Strabo gives a different version: the merciless are said to be set upon by the hero at Temesa.

---

235 Paus. 6.6.7-10.
236 Aelian VH 8.18.
238 Aelian VH 8.18 οὶ παροιμία ἡ λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλυσίτελεσ ζ τι κέρδανθων ὅτι αὐτώις ἀφίζεται ὡς ἐν Τεμέσι ήρως.
239 Strabo 6.1.5 παροιμίαν εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς ἀνὴρεῖς, τοῦ ήρωα τοῦ ἐν Τεμέσι λεγόντων ἐπικείοθαι αὐτώις.
stand as affirmations that wrong-doers eventually face justice. Alternatively, Callimachus is known somewhere in his works to have described how the statues of Euthymus at Olympus and Locri were struck by lightning on the same day, and an oracle then commanded that sacrifice should be offered to him (Pliny NH 7.47.152/699Pf.).

The explanation of such honours paid to Euthymus would be a surprisingly conventional action by the standards of book 4, although mitigated by the bizarre nature of the main story.

The two segments that followed were both concerned with statues of Hera on Samos (100&101Pf.). The fact that each segment had its own passage in the Diegesis must show that there was sufficient difference between the passages for the commentator to treat them as discrete sections, but nonetheless there seems to be no parallel in the Aetia for two adjacent passages on the same topic. In book 1, the paired passages on ritual abuse at sacrifices concerned different cults, and the two stories of Heracles Bouthoines involved different scenarios and different outcomes. Both aetia on this occasion, however, concern the same cult and the same aspect of the cult, its statues.

The first of the segments seems to have described at least two statues. A lacuna means that the Diegesis lemma is lost, but we have four lines preserved in a fragment of Plutarch.

Οὐπω Σκέλμιον ἔργον ἐχόουν, ἀλλ' ἔπι τεθηνὸν
dημαίον γυτφάνων ἄξοος ἡσθα σανής.

The first of the segments seems to have described at least two statues. A lacuna means that the Diegesis lemma is lost, but we have four lines preserved in a fragment of Plutarch.

241 100Pf. / Euseb. Praec. Evang. 3.8.99
The statue in its most primitive state seems to be addressed, and from the Diegesis we learn that Callimachus mentioned the first carved statue, made when Proclus ruled.242 The shaping process itself may have gained most attention.243 Pausanias (7.4.4) attributed the carved statue to ‘Smilis of Aegina, son of Eukleides’, who belonged to the age of Daedalus.244 The scholiast to this passage remarked ὁ δὲ Καλλίμαχος Σκέλμις ἀντὶ Σμιλίδος φησί.245 This points to a play on words by Callimachus: Wilamowitz derived Σκέλμις from the Thracian word οκάλμη = ‘knife’, and compared this to the Greek σμίλη = ‘carving knife, chisel’.246 This has been given greater point by the observation that (Σ)κέλμις was the name of one of the Idaean Dactyls.247 Pfeiffer objected to this as Kelmis was a metal worker,248 but Papadopoulos suggests that nonetheless he could be alluded to here as the πρῶτος εὕρετής of statuary.249

The Diegesis gives no sign that Callimachus mentioned the other traditions associated with the statue of Hera on Samos, even though one story in particular contained enough material about cultic oddities.250 A story about the development of art and cult, forming a marked contrast with the preceding material in the book, may well have signalled some reflection by Callimachus on not only his own art, but also...
his subject matter. The history of the statue’s shape might also be read as an acknowledgment of the development of cults and rites over time, and even of the role art plays (whether in terms of sculpture or mythography) in shaping the rites that Callimachus explains. His Aetia both act out and bear witness to acts of commemoration: the Delphic Daphnephoria is a commemorative re-enactment of the journey undertaken by Apollo, but Callimachus’ act of describing it is also a form of commemoration in itself. Both in re-enactments and in sculpture that recalls a particular transaction (for instance Artemis with the mortar, or, in the Phalaecus story, Artemis with the lioness) art plays some part in forming the way in which events are to be remembered, and this mode of remembrance must in turn shape cult. Callimachus’ explanations thus become the most polished shapings of the tales already given sometimes rudimentary iconographic expression through cult.

The second piece on a statue of Hera (101Pf.) also seems to have been an *ekphrasis*, rather than a narrative telling of incidents related to the cult.

"Ἡρῇ τῇ Σαμίῃ περὶ μὲν τρίχας ἀμπελος ἔρπει

Λέγεται ὡς τῇ Σαμίᾳ Ἡρᾶ περιέρπει τὰς τρίχας ἀμπελος, πρὸς δ’ ἐδάφει λεούντῃ βέβληται, ὡς λάφυρα τῶν Διὸς νόθων παίδων. Ἡρακλέους καὶ Διονύσου.

Unlike the description of the iconography of Apollo’s statue on Delos, this description seems to look at Hera’s relationship with other gods, and not with mankind. If this impression is correct, it had no precedent in the extant parts of the Aetia.

Unfortunately, we do not know whether Callimachus suggested any particular way in which Hera’s assumption of the symbols of Dionysus and Heracles was to be viewed. The appropriation of their iconography might, for instance, be seen as a means of depriving them of their identity and even their existence within cult. Such an
attempt at their symbolic exclusion would indeed fit Hera’s indignation at Zeus’ bastard sons. Throughout the *Aetia* iconography has been used as a means of commemorating particular facets of the gods’ characters or histories. The description of misappropriated symbolism could thus perhaps increase appreciation of iconographic details by focusing attention on their significance for the realisation of a god’s character.

This pair of segments on statues of Hera was succeeded by a return to tales of violence, this time the story of the murder of Pasikles. This story is one of tragic irony. Pasikles was archon of Ephesus, and was attacked leaving a banquet. His enemies were hindered by the darkness, but when they approached the temple of Hera, Pasikles’ mother, who was priestess there, heard the noise and ordered a light to be brought, enabling the attackers to see and kill her son. Next to nothing is known about this story, and the aetion is again unknown.

Similarly, the subject of the next fragment, Androgeos, the ‘Hero of the Stern’, is unfamiliar. Apart from Clement of Alexandria, who merely repeats Callimachus, the only other author to mention this cult is Pausanias, whose phrasing implies that the hero was obscure even in antiquity. The passage is once again placed in the artefact’s mouth:

"Ἡρώς ὁ κατὰ πρῶτον, ἐπεὶ τὸ δὲ κύρβις ἀείδει (103Pf.)"

The identity of the κύρβις is uncertain, but D’Alessio suggests that it refers to an ancient inscription, as the putative source of whichever Atthidographer provided Callimachus with his information.²⁵¹ The use of ἀείδει implies that Callimachus

²⁵¹ D’Alessio (1996) 517 “L’identificazione sarà frutto dell’ erudita tendenza alla razionalizzazione dell’ originario culto anonimo. Callimaco, tramite la probabile mediazione di qualche ignoto attidografo, risale alla fonte più antica, le kyrbeis (tavolette triangoli iscritte, montate a gruppi di tre a formare una piramide), che, insieme agli axones, conservavano disposizioni giuridiche e religiose attribute a Solone.”
animated the *kybris* rather than simply citing it as his source. This would bring it into close parallelism with the Pelasgian Wall. Both were speaking stones, both Attic, both flanking a portion of text contrasting in its content the remainder of book 4. Curiously, both segments also have unusually uninformative *Diegeseis*. Just as that for the Pelasgian Wall merely indicated the structure’s history, for the Hero the *Diegesis* mentions how once Phaleron, and not the Piraeus, was the port of Athens:

> Φησίν ὁ καλοῦμενος 'κατὰ πρῶτον ἥρως Ἄνδρογεώς ἔστιν: πάλαι γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τὸν Φαληρικὸν ὄρμον εἶναι, οὗ τὰς ναύς ὀρμίζοντο πρὶν γενέσθαι τὸν Πειραιᾶ.

The implication must be that Callimachus emphasised Androgeos’ character as a minor naval deity, and that he cited the location of the cult (and perhaps the location of the *kybris*) in Phaleron as proof of the place’s past as a shipping centre. Although Hollis has suggested that Callimachus might have told of the establishment of a hero cult for Androgeos at this point,252 the fact that the *Diegesis* can find so very little to say must argue against this. Once again, therefore, the *Diegesis* is silent about the existence of a more dramatic narrative, that of Androgeos’ murder, the subsequent war, and the sending of Athenian youths to the Minotaur, even though Phaleron’s two other heroes were part of this adventure. All would have been in accordance with the themes of book 4, and, in particular, would have revived the idea of human sacrifice. Here, however, unlike with the Pelasgian Walls, it is easier to feel sure that the reader would have recalled the associations implicit in the tale. The Leimonis story was commemorated by the landscape: here, the background is left to tell its story without Callimachus’ intervention.

The next two segments (104&105Pf.) resumed explicit narration of tales of violence and revenge. The first apparently told of wars between the Parians and

---

252 Hollis (1992c) 78.
Thracians on Thasos, sparked by the murder of the Thracian Osydres. The *Diegesis* for 105 is at its most fragmentary, but Pfeiffer’s conjecture is that it told of Antigone’s attempt to provide her brothers with funeral rites, and perhaps of the divided flame of their pyre.\(^{253}\) The aetion appears to have been that of another place name, the σύμμετρα Αὐτιγώνης, which Pausanias records as a memorial of Antigone’s piety (9.25.2).\(^{254}\)

The story is one, then, that arises out of a tale of hatred, the more extreme because it culminated in fratricide. It seems, however, to mark a move away from this emphasis, because greater stress may have been laid upon the more positive quality of Antigone’s piety and heroism.

Gaius Romanus (106-7Pf.) seems to continue this move away from the tales of violence, not because it contains none, but because the focus seems to have rested on the mother’s patriotism. The story indicated by the *Diegesis* is that when the Πευκετίων were at the walls of Rome, a Roman named Gaius leapt from the walls and killed their leader, being wounded himself in the thigh in the process. When afterwards he was complaining of his limp, he was rebuked by his mother, and stopped worrying. The Πευκετίων and their siege of Rome are something of a historical riddle that has been extensively discussed, with no true consensus reached.\(^{255}\) The story bears the most resemblance to that of Sp. Carvilius,\(^{256}\) but the timing of the incident and other details have also suggested the tales of Cocles and Scaevola.\(^{257}\) Cicero’s version of the Carvilius story gives the substance of the mother’s rebuke:

\(^{254}\) Cf. Aricò (1972) 312-321.
\(^{255}\) Stroox (1934) 301-309; de Sanctis (1935); Pohlenz (1935-6); Altheim (1938); Pasquali (1939-40); Früchtel (1941); Della Corte (1941); Andor (1951);
\(^{256}\) Stroox (1934) 304-5; Pohlenz (1935-6); Pasquali (1939-40) 73-4; opposing view given by de Sanctis (1935) 289-90.
\(^{257}\) de Sanctis (1935) 289-296; Pasquali (1939-40) 78; Früchtel (1941) 196; Della Corte (1941) 280; Trypannis (1975) 79.
Nam quod Sp. Carvilio graviter claudicanti ex vulnere ob rem publicam accepto, et ob eam causam verecundanti in publicum prodire, mater dixit, ‘Quin prodis, mi Spuri? quotienscumque gradum facies, totiens tibi tuarum virtutum veniet in mentem.’ (de Orat. 2.249)

The action once more remains unclear, and the end to which Callimachus included the story is made more perplexing by the first line.

'Ωδί ο[σθᾶοι] γείνεσθε, Πανελλάδος, ὡδε τελέσοσι

An appeal for all Greece to learn virtue from the tale would be wholly unprecedented in the Aetia, in which the only outright moral applications have referred to literary endeavours. It seems hard however to find a likely speaker for the line among the characters of the story. One possible solution might be that the entire tale was placed in the mouth of an internal narrator, who may have lamented a decline in Greek virtue or courage. While this figure must remain entirely conjectural, he would have presented an opportunity perhaps to draw together some of the book’s themes, contrasting vengeance, murder and human sacrifice with the far nobler motive and action of defending one’s country.

The penultimate segment of the Aetia once again centres on an artefact. The theme of violence is entirely absent, and the action is conventional in its nature: the reason why there should be a rock associated with the Argonauts on Cyzicus. Once again, the Diegesis gives no sign that Callimachus might have told of the more interesting story associated with the rock. According to Pliny, it was believed that the rock moved from its place, and so it was fixed down with lead (NH 36.99). This continued silence on the part of the Diegesis leaves us with a dilemma, for there was a

259 The Diegesis never seems to indicate such figures - cf. 97Pf. (the walls speak) and 103Pf. (a pillar speaks).
260 This sense of decline could have been given some point by the fact that a similar story had once been told of the Spartans: Stobaeus 3.7.8. See Pohlrenz (1935-6) 120; Pasquali (1939-40) 74-78. Lehnus (2004) 30-31 suggests that the tale may have been set against a background of a clash of Greek colonies around Tarentum.
similar tale, also ignored by the *Diegesis*, about the statue of Samian Hera. If Callimachus did mention both, then this penultimate segment would lack its impression of being slightly divorced from the rest of the book. As it stands, the piece is only related to the Samian section by their mutual lack of any reference to bloodshed.

If one assumes for the sake of argument that Callimachus' silence is genuine and deliberate, this apparent lack of aetiological material in a text whose ostensible aim was to provide the reader with explanations may imply that the reader is by now assumed to be sufficiently knowledgeable to discern aetiological elements lying like a palimpsest beneath the tales. Under the account which Callimachus chooses to give of his landmarks and statues, aetiological narratives remain visible. The reader, then, conditioned by the attitudes in the first three books of the poem, could be led automatically to seek for cults and associations which the author will in fact choose to leave unmentioned. Moreover, the reader may be led to seek the reasons why Callimachus should include stories in which the role of aetiology is so diminished. This would to some extent have been prepared for by the altered nature of the aetia given in book 3, where the types of commemoration involved are greatly different to those in books 1 and 2. Having encouraged his readers to take a broader and more probing view of aetiology, Callimachus now seeks to make them search out for themselves the tales they might have expected. Awareness of how the Pelasgian Wall and the 'Hero of the Stern' are connected to the wider themes of book 4 is seemingly dependent upon the reader's own knowledge. Similarly, any sense that a stone anchor weight dedicated to Athena could have any similarity with the cult of Hera on Samos is left unstated.
The 'Anchor', then, seems at least at face value to be detached from the rest of the book in its themes and subject matter. At the same time, scholars have remarked that it is made part of a unifying frame for the entire poem: the penultimate narrative segment, like the second (Argonautarum reditus 7-21Pf.), takes its subject matter from the argonautic myth.\textsuperscript{261} The extent, however, to which this parallel could have provided anything more than a sense of a contrived and superficial ring is, I believe, questionable. With the exception of the 'Hero' four segments earlier and its connection to the story of sacrifices on Paros at the beginning of the Aetia (3-7Pf.), nothing has prepared the reader for such a gesture, and the segment's lack of connection to the rest of book 4 increases the impression that this is a deliberately forced attempt to recall the opening of the Aetia. Can a piece that fails to partake in the concerns and themes of what has gone before really be said to provide them with a sense of closure?

The status of the final narrative segment of the Aetia is peculiar. Up until the discovery of the Diegesis no one suspected that the Coma Berenices had formed part of the Aetia,\textsuperscript{262} and it is now commonly supposed that it was first published as a self-standing occasional poem.\textsuperscript{263} As Ciresola has explained, it certainly has the characteristics of such a piece, finding its origin in a particular event, and giving the details of the political circumstances.\textsuperscript{264} The fact that it is thought to have had this separate existence perhaps makes one reader to view it as somehow only loosely attached to the rest of Aetia 4. The astronomical nature of the action might be cited in support of this, (although Cat. 66.79-88, should they have come from Callimachus'.

\textsuperscript{261} Harder (1993) 102.
\textsuperscript{262} Ciresola (1957a) 123.
\textsuperscript{263} E.g. Ciresola (1957b); Krevans (1984) 153; Hollis (1986); Koenen (1993) 111-112.
\textsuperscript{264} Ciresola (1957b) 483-5.
version, do provide a ritual action) for almost every other recognisable action explains a facet of cult or culture. The piece inevitably seems unusually long in the context of the scanty fragments from the rest of book 4, but at 94 verses it is less than half the minimum length of the Victoria Berenices (c.200 verses), and shorter too than the total fragments of ‘Acontius and Cydippe’ (c.110 verses): both those poems could apparently be incorporated within book 3 in spite of their length. The principal themes of the Coma have already been used in the Aetia: hair cutting was a feature of the Hyperborean segment in book 1; the possible nuptial rite (79-88) has parallels in book 3, and the erotic element finds its precursor in ‘Acontius and Cydippe’. The outer form of the piece, a dedicatory elegy, has already been prepared for by the preceding segment. The most important development to be observed may in fact be that it is a description of a process, the coming to be of a constellation, so that it is only in later times that the question ‘Why is the Coma Berenices . . .’ may be asked of it.

As Gutzwiller in particular has shown, the piece represents above all the queen’s personal life, and her lock’s love for her: this, along with the fact that the speaking voice is that of the lock, makes the piece stand out from other court poetry. None of this, however, could have been deduced from the Diegesis:

Πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμματίαιν ἱδῶν ὅρον ἢ τε φέρονται

Φησὶν ὁτι Κόνων κατηστέρισε τὸν Βερενίκης Ἰόστρυχου, ἄνθισει ὑπέσχετο κεῖνη, ἐπειδὰν ἐπανήκη ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Συρίαν μάχης.

The baldness of this description, when contrasted with the Greek fragments and the Catullan rendition, calls attention to just how much the Diegesis may be an unreliable

guide for the presentation and tone of any segment. It is worth noting, however, that it leaves the potential action implicit only, just as do the fragments of the text itself.

The quoted *incipit* - πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμματίσιν ἰδὼν ὥρον ἦ τε φέρονται - needs its context, and also the outline meaning obtainable from Catullus 66.1, to be assigned the specific meaning of ‘Having seen the whole horizon in his charts, and where <the stars> travel .’ A reader lacking this context and knowledge, coming to the piece as a conclusion to *Aetia* 4, might have been tempted to construe the verse as the beginning of a closural section: there is, after all, nothing to show that ὥρον is specifically the celestial horizon, rather than some other boundary, perhaps to learning, or that γραμματίσιν should not refer to other written works, including Callimachus’ own poetry. ‘Having viewed every boundary in writing, and where they bear . . .’ The putative unsuspecting reader might anticipate some conclusion to be drawn about the boundaries of knowledge, or the limits to literature. In a poem that has frequently called attention to different modes for the transmission of knowledge, this would not seem inappropriate for a concluding segment.

Even once the true nature of the verse has become clear, the lines of astronomical learning that follow do not seem to have established any particular subject for the piece, beyond the fact that unlike the previous segments, which on the whole have detailed incidents of human brutality from all over the known world, this will focus on the heavens. Only in verses 7-8 does it seem to have become clear that the lock of Berenice was speaking, and that its dedication would be the subject of the piece.

* ἦ μὲ Κόνον ἔβλεψεν ἐν ἡρί τοῦ Βερενίκης
  βόστρυχον ὅπε χεὶνη πᾶσιν ἔθηκε θείας (110.7-8 Pf.)

267 Cf. Pfeiffer (1949) 112; Marinone (1997) 78-9 (with additional bibliography).
This delay in the nature of the segment becoming apparent may not in fact have been particularly rare in book 4. The Theudotus segment, for instance, began with at least six moralising lines before the precise subject could have been identified. Both long preludes create a strong break with the previous segments and serve to present the pieces as if they were to be read as separate poems. In addition, first-person narratives do not appear to have been at all uncommon in the book, and, as the *incipit* is, as here, not necessarily good evidence for the presentation of a piece, the number of such narrators, some of them inanimate, may have been still higher.

Koenen has viewed the rejection of any focus on the wars in Syria in favour of erotic struggles\(^\text{268}\) as a statement of Callimachus’ poetics:

> Not much is said about the real war, as if the lock wanted to state that love, not history and war, are the métier of the poet. In other words, the lock sticks to Kallimachos’ program. (1993) 97

Callimachus’ ‘programme’ for the rest of book 4, however, has included a number of wars and very little love, and one should be wary of projecting generalisations culled from the Catullan *ethos* back upon him. What is notable here is that at long last there has been a turn away from the book’s grim themes to a more light-hearted treatment of less dire subject matter. The *Coma*, like the *Victoria Berenices*, provides a representation of the book’s themes with their seriousness absent. The characterisation of the lock in particular seems to bring this out.

\[\text{καὶ διὰ μείῳσον}\\ \text{Μηδείων ὅλοις ὥς ἔβησαν Ἀθω.}\\ \text{τὶ πλόκαιμοι βέβαιων, ὅτ’ οὕρεα τοῖα σιδῆρωι}\\ \text{ἐίκουσιν; Χαλύβων ὡς ἀπόλοιτο γένος,}\\ \text{γειώθεν ἀντέλλουτα, κακῶν φυτῶν, οἱ μὲν ἔριναν}\\ \text{πρῶτοι καὶ τυπίδων ἔφρασαν ἐργασίην} \quad (110.45-50 \text{ Pf.})\]

\(^{268}\) Cf. Catullus 66.11-14.
As scholars have pointed out, the lock’s grand *exemplum* of the power of iron - the cutting of the canal through Athos - and its Homeric language are understandable from the lock’s own viewpoint, but seem comically disproportionate from a human perspective. This curse against the discoverers of iron is one of a number of such maledictions on the *protos heuretes* of certain things which occur in various, often humorous, contexts. It is notable, however, that here it comes at the end of a book in which iron has been used frequently in war and sacrifice - the lock’s complaints may outdo those of the people who have really suffered from the sword. Similarly comic is the way in which the lock swears by the head of its own queen (v.40) - she, of course, was responsible for its cutting. The lock, in effect, debunks itself by its own vehemence. The sacrifice of an inanimate object that protests as if it had suffered real harm provides comic relief after the human sacrifices and murders. The light-handed approach gives a further element of parallelism with the *Victoria Berenices*, but it also goes a step beyond the pattern which has already been observed, in which the segments at the opening and close of books 3 and 4 tend to be more conventional in their form than those in the middle of the books. By returning to a more unpredictable form, the *Coma* paves the way for the open-endedness of the *Epilogue*.

### 4.6 The Epilogue

The *Epilogue* to the *Aetia* exists only as a short fragment, but it is nonetheless problematic:

---

269 τί πλόκαμοι πέζωμεν (v.47) cf. II. 19.90 ἀλλ' τί κεν πέζσαμι (Agamemnon countering the reproaches of the Achaeans by pointing to their helplessness in the face of Ate). See Pfeiffer (1932) 192.


271 E.g. Arist. Lys. 946, Eur. Hipp. 407; Naev. fr. 18R; Tib. 1.10.1, Prop. 1.17.13; 4.3.19; Hor. Sat. 4.3.19.

... [ ... ν ὀτ' ἐμὴ μούσα τ' [ ... ]άσαται ... Ἰτού καὶ Χαρίτων [ ... ]ίσα μοιαθ' ἀνάσσης ... Ἰτερὴς οὐ σε ψευδοὺ ... ]ίματι πάντ' ἀγαθὴν καὶ πάντα τῇ εἰλεωφόρῳ ἐπέγ' [ ... ] [ ... ] ... τῷ Μούσαι πολλὰ νέμοντι βοτά σὺν μοθοὺς ἤβαλοντο παρ' Ἰχνίον ὄξεως ἵππου· χαϊρε, σὺν εὐεστοῖ δ' ἔρχεο λωτέρη, χαϊρε, Ζεῦ, μέγα καὶ οὐ, σάω δ' ἐδοκον ὀικον ἀνάκτων· αὐτάρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἐ]πείμι νομὸν (112 Pf.)

The theory of a dual edition of the Aetia means that this piece could have first been intended to stand at the end of Aetia 2.\textsuperscript{273} This has had implications for the text of the Coma: it is supposed that verse 94aPf. - χίλη, τεκέεσσι. [ ... ] may have been omitted from the version in Aetia 4 because of a possible unwelcome duplication of invocations beginning χαϊρε ... \textsuperscript{274} Similarly, ἀνάσσης (112.2), if the piece stood at the end of Aetia 4, might refer to Berenice, but if at the end of Aetia 2, to Arsinoe.\textsuperscript{275}

To these problems must, of course, be added the larger one of the final line of the Epilogue. It is generally agreed to be a reference to the Iambi,\textsuperscript{276} but, as it seems unlikely that Callimachus could have envisaged a 'collected edition' in the modern sense, it has been suggested that the line refers to Callimachus' plans for future composition.\textsuperscript{277} The Epilogue is clearly designed to recall the Somnium and the first action.\textsuperscript{278} Verses 112.5-6 are a direct echo of 2.1-2 Pf:

\[
\text{ποιμένι μὴλα νέμουντι παρ' Ἰχνίου ὄξεως ἵππου 'Ἡσίοδος Μουσέων ἐσόμοις ὀτ' ἤμτασεν}
\]

and the Χαρίτων of verse 2 recall the Graces on Paros. It has been suggested that Callimachus is in fact outdoing Hesiod here: in the Theogony the Muses commanded Hesiod to sing of them first and last (34), but he apparently failed to do so.\textsuperscript{279}

\[274\text{Ciresola (1957b) 488.}\]
\[276\text{E.g. Pfeiffer (1949) 125; Knox (1985a) 60-63; Clayman (1988) 277-9; Cameron (1995) 141-173.}\]
\[277\text{Knox (1985a); Cameron (1995) 141-173.}\]
\[278\text{Puelma (1957b) 253; Knox (1985a) 63.}\]
\[279\text{Clayman (1988) 280.}\]
Callimachus is supposedly fulfilling what Hesiod had failed to achieve. The presence of the Muses here, however, is hardly overpowering. They appear in the retrospective look at Hesiod, and in Callimachus' anticipation of the Μουσάων πεζών . . . νομόν, but χαίρε in verse 7 is assumed not to refer to one of the Muses, and ἐμῆ μοῦσα in verse 1 seems more like a reference to Callimachus' poetry than to one of the individual Muses of the dialogue which formed the basis of books 1 and 2.

In its position at the end of book 4, however, the closural function of the Epilogue may stand in a different light. The conventional re-evocation of the Hesiodic model was fitting in its original position, but here is undercut by the way in which Aetia 1 and 2 and their modes of enquiry have been subjected to irony and distortion in Aetia 3 and 4. To recall Hesiod receiving instruction from the Muses, when Callimachus has received his information from Xenomedes, Leandrius, and his own encounters (as research fieldwork, perhaps) with statues, walls and pillars, is arguably to see the old model as a frame that is too small for its picture. Such a view may be supported by the simplification and conventionalism of the other framing episodes in books 3 and 4, such as the 'Delphic Daphnephoria' and the 'Anchor of the Argo', in comparison with the inner episodes. Simple frames surrounding complex topics inevitably lead to the validity of the viewpoints of such frames being challenged.

The *Aetia* represents the limits of the listed narrative form, and tests the boundaries to breaking point by paring away unifying features and adding dissociative elements until almost everything that might bind the segments together is removed. The earlier stages of the poem, however, may be seen to show the most important elements of the listed narrative form that made it attractive to the Hellenistic poets: its association with the process of enquiry, its tendency to compile paradigms or exempla, its foregrounding of marginal figures and myths, and its ability to reflect the cultural situation. Not all the *Kollektivgedichte*, of course, have displayed all these features. Curse poetry, in particular, employs the catalogue form as a means of displaying paradigms of punishment, but has little to do with the process of enquiry.

In spite of the allusion to the *Theogony* in the *Somnium*, it was the *Catalogue of Women*, rather than the *Theogony or Works and Days*, that showed how mythological narratives could be linked to the contemporary cultural situation in a catalogue form. Although it would be unwise to claim that the *Catalogue* was the most privileged source for the *Aetia*, it is the *Catalogue* that used segmented narratives to elucidate the genealogy in a manner that prefigured the later aetiologies. The process-of-enquiry motif in the *Catalogue*, however, is seen to be separate from this; as in epic catalogues, it was displayed by the questions in the proem, the same model, that is, that was used by Callimachus for his dialogue with the Muses. The specific response to those questions, however, lay not in the stemmata as a whole but in the *Ehoiai*. This duality was repeated in Phanocles' *Erotes*, where the aetia within the segments were used alongside initial formulae - apparently referring to the
characters’ actions - in response to some question at the beginning of the poem. Thus, in expanding the interrogation of the Muses in the Aetia to include the aetiology, Callimachus is seen to synthesise the two elements.

The foregrounding of marginal figures and situation was something common to all Kollektivgedichte. Such material lends itself to the segmented form, for, outside of genealogy, the stories are rarely connected to one another, and tend to lack the potential to be treated at length. The Catalogue also provided a model for the presentation of episodes culled from the larger myths and focalised in an unconventional way. This process was greatly aided by the listed narrative form, for the lack of continuity meant that episodes and their viewpoints need not be bound to a narrative plot. Thus Callimachus could begin his ‘Argonautica’ (Argonautarum reditus et ritus Anaphaeus 7-21Pf./9-23M.) with the flight from Colchis, focus extensively on the Colchian pursuit, and then switch to the Anaphe incident, because this sequence is not required to form a coherent, uniformly presented component of a larger plot. The focus could be away from the Argonauts for a long time because they were never the principal subject of the poem. Likewise, Euphorion could begin the story of Comaetho and the Teleboeans with Elektryon’s attack, and describe Comaetho’s crime before mentioning why the Teleboeans should not have gone to the islands in the first place (Thrax SH 415.II.14-19), because the emphasis of the section was on the workings of Justice, and not, for instance, a story of Alcmene and Elekryon in which the events on the Echinades played a defined role.

The idea of exemplarity in the remains of the Catalogue seems largely to be implicit only; that is, while the Ehoie formula suggests a comparative function, the purpose of the comparison remains unclear. The women displayed a number of
paradigms, but drawing conclusions from them was difficult. Even if more had survived, the message would not necessarily have become clearer: the purpose of the Catalogue of Heroines in the *Odyssey* (11.225-332) is not made explicit. In the Hellenistic poems the degree to which myths were explicitly presented as exemplars varies. In the curse poems, naturally, almost all the myths were exempla of punishment or suffering, but they were not always presented as such, but rather as things that the recipient should himself undergo. The poets and philosophers from the *Leontion* catalogue were explicitly proofs of the power of love. Several of the segments of the *Teiresias*, too, were paradigms of various type-stories, applied to a single figure. In the *Aetia*, however, and probably in metamorphosis poetry as well, explicit exempla lists were limited to insets, such as the Sicilian catalogue in *Aetia* 2 (examples of places where oecists were invoked at sacrifices) and the list of sex-changes in Nicander's *Leucippus* segment (A.L.17). Whether narratives were explicitly present as exempla or not, however, the listed narrative form allowed for juxtapositions and arrangements that called attention to certain traits. In the *Catalogue*, for instance, the stories of Clytemnestra and Deianeira were brought into close collocation. In *Aetia* 4 stories of violence formed a sequence, and parts of the *Heteroioumena* may also have been arranged on thematic grounds.

The adoption of these aspects of the listed narrative form by the Hellenistic poets went alongside the abandonment of the most characteristic feature of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, the genealogy. While we do not know whether Nicaenetus retained it in his *Catalogue of Women*, Phanocles seems almost certain to have abandoned it in the *Erotes*, and it is still less likely to have appeared in other forms of *Kollektivgedichte*. At the same time, 'Hesiodic-style' formulae were retained, and in
the *Tattoo Elegy* were applied in a wholly different context. Indeed, as the use of segmented narratives in the *Catalogue* resulted from the dictates of the genealogy, all the Hellenistic poets were using the form detached from the context that had shaped it. This divorcing of the form from its original context may be seen as a partial explanation of the prominent role played by *Kreuzung der Gattungen* in *Kollektivgedichte*. Lacking the grounding of a precedent with a traditional *occasion*, the listed narrative form could be applied to curse poetry, erotic poetry and metamorphosis poetry (itself a compound of didactic, aetiology and paradoxography), which all have very different implicit contexts. Rossi formulated the assertion that in the Hellenistic age generic laws were written down only to be broken;\(^1\) where no such laws existed at all, however, the licence to draw on the characteristics and motifs of numerous genres must have increased considerably.

The greatest tribute to *Kollektivgedichte* is perhaps that of Ovid. His *Metamorphoses* employs the idea of *Kreuzung* until it is impossible of determine the poem's genre; uses marginal figures, and has unusual emphases in narrative segments drawn from the traditional epics; applies metamorphosis to his contemporary culture, and juxtaposes myths as exempla of unnatural love, theodicy, or artistic struggles, to name but a few topics. The poem thus displays the characteristics that *Kollektivgedichte* had drawn from the Hesionic *Catalogue*. This reception of the tradition is thus a monument to the versatility of the listed narrative form.

---

\(^1\) Rossi (1971) 83-4.
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