Peter Bing

Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus[1]

In Memoriam Thomas G. McKeen

In one of the «Marvelous Things Heard» by pseudo-Aristotle (*mirab. auscult.* 131) we learn of the following very dramatic incident: the Athenians are in the process of building the shrine of Demeter at Eleusis when, all at once, they make an exciting and mysterious discovery. Something has been brought to light, closed in among the rocks. It is a stele – but a most unusual one, made of bronze. This immediately suggests an artifact of great antiquity, perhaps from the Heroic Age. The stele, moreover, is inscribed with an epigram, in the original sense of the word, that is with a metrical inscription. Its text reads as follows: Δηιόπης τόδε σῆμα, «This is the tomb of Deiope». The question arises as to the identity of this Deiope. Some argue that it is most likely the wife of the legendary singer Musaios; others, however, claim that it must be the mother of Triptolemos[2].

This thrilling tale offers us a clear illustration of how epigrams were originally tied to a particular location. That is to say: inscriptions generally refer to specific objects or monuments in a given place, where people set them up at a given historical moment, and for a certain purpose. Further, since such inscriptions are usually public, we may assume that they belong to the conceptual framework of their given community, share its assumptions and traditions, and may be readily understood by its members.

The stele of Deiope, by contrast – inasmuch as it is buried amid the rocks – has apparently been dislodged from its intended place. More importantly, people evidently no longer know who Deiope is. This prompts them to speculate: assuming that the tomb was not originally here, but somewhere else (they might say to themselves), it was still probably linked with Eleusis; and since its bronze material suggests great age, Deiope probably belongs to the mythical prehistory of the site. In other words, the readers sift through the

---

[1] Earlier versions of this paper were delivered as talks at the Universities of Tübingen, Cambridge, London, and Heidelberg. I gratefully acknowledge the criticism and suggestions of Profs. R. Kannicht, E. A. Schmidt, G. W. Most, and Drs. H. Krasser, E. Krummen, K.-H. Stanzel, R. L. Hunter, N. Hopkinson, and Peter Allen Hansen.

In addition to standard abbreviations, I note the following less common ones: *CEG* I = P. A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr. n.* (Berlin 1983); *CEG* II = *idem*, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca saeculi IV a. Chr. n.* (Berlin 1989); Clairmont = C. W. Clairmont, *Gravestone and Epigram* (Mainz 1970); *FGE* = D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981); *FH* = P. Friedländer and H. B. Hoffleit, *Epigrammata. Greek Inscriptions in Verse. From the Beginnings to the Persian Wars* (Berkeley 1948); *GG* = W. Peek, Griechische Grabgedichte (Darmstadt 1960); *GV* = *idem*, *Griechische Versinschriften I: Grabepigramme* (Berlin 1955).

[2] φασὶν οἰκοδομούντων Ἀθηναίων τὸ τῆς Δήμητρος ἱερὸν τῆς ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι περιεχομένην στήλην πέτραις εὑρεθῆναι χαλκῆν, ἐφ' ἧς ἐπεγέγραπτο· Δηιόπης τόδε σῆμα. ἣν οἱ μὲν λέγουσι Μουσαίου γυναῖκα, τινὲς δὲ Τριπτολέμου μητέρα γενέσθαι.

clues they find in the inscription, and fill these out with elements of their own knowledge, so as to form a plausible whole.

This activity might be called a process of supplementation. In Hellenistic times, as epigram became increasingly «literary», that process underwent a shift. No doubt the epigram retained most conventions of votive and sepulchral inscription, including that extraordinary concision which, as we shall see, became ever more expressive. But while the epitaph of Deiope belongs to a monument whose lack of context was *accidental*, Hellenistic epigram was often *deliberately* severed from its object or monument, and set in the as yet uncharted landscape of the book. Here, poets came to exploit, and play with, this process of supplementation in a deliberate and artful way. Indeed, it became a favored and self-conscious device. As such, I would like to call it Ergänzungsspiel[3].

Before examining this development, I would like to consider how it might have come about. In what circumstances would readers have experienced the aesthetic appeal and poetic possibilities of an epigram thus detached from its pragmatic context? If we had any certainty at all that inscriptional epigrams were transcribed early on, and available in collections, we would have a plausible source for such an experience. Scholars have spilled endless quantities of ink arguing the early existence of epigram-books[4], especially a *sylloge Simonidea*[5]. But beguiling as the thought of such early collections is, there is no hard evidence that they existed before the end of the 4th cent., that is before the start of the Hellenistic Age. It is only for this period that sources start to mention figures like Philochoros, who collected inscribed epigrams (*Suda* s. v. Philochoros Φ 441 A d1 = *FGrHist* 328 T 1), or – somewhat later, at the transition from the 3rd to the 2nd cent. – the periegete Polemon of Ilion, who travelled through the Greek cities transcribing inscriptions so as to write his book Περὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις ἐπιγραμμάτων (Athen. 10.442e)[6].

Perhaps a more productive line of inquiry will emerge from the following question: How do authors of the 5th and 4th cent. quote inscribed epigrams?[7] For the 5th century

---

[3] I have opted for this term rather than R. Ingarden's conceptually related «concretization» (*The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art* [Evanston 1973] 50–63, *et passim*) because the latter omits that self-conscious manipulation of, and (above all) *play* with, supplementation which is crucial both to creation and reception of many epigrams in the Hellenistic period. Unfortunately, I could not find a term of comparable pithiness in English to convey both this playfulness and the endeavor to make a thing whole (*ganz*).

[4] R. Reitzenstein, for instance, weighs the possibility of such a collection in the second half of the 5th cent., cf. *Epigramm und Skolion* (Giessen 1893) 115, as well as his whole discussion of book-epigram and epigram collections, pp. 104–120. Cf. further L. Weber, «Steinepigramm und Buchepigramm,» *Hermes* 52 (1917) 536–557, esp. 540 n. 1; J. Geffken, «Naξός», *Glotta* 9 (1918) 97–109, H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca* I (München 1957) 68.

[5] Cf. e. g. B. Gentili, «Epigramma ed Elegia», in: *L'épigramme grecque*, Fond. Hardt vol. 14 (Vandoeuvres 1968) 41–42. But see the welcome scepticism of Page, *FGE* pp. 120–123, 207–210, who concludes that «there is no evidence that any particular author's epigrams were collected and published before the Hellenistic period; and Simonides is no exception to the rule» (p. 120).

[6] Cf. K. Deichgräber, «Polemon, 9» *RE* XXI, columns 1288–1320, esp. 1314.

[7] The examples are conveniently collected in T. Preger, *Inscriptiones Graecae Metricae ex Scriptoribus praeter Anthologiam Collectae* (Leipzig 1891). They are (preceded by the Preger numbers in brackets) for the 5th cent.: [109] Hdt. 4.88.2 = AP 6.341; [79] Hdt. 5.59 = AP 6.6; [80] Hdt. 5.60 = AP 6.7 + 8; [72] Hdt. 5.77.2 = AP 6.343; [20] Hdt. 7.228 = AP 7.677; [21] Hdt. 7.228 = Lycurg. *In Leocr.* 109 = AP 7.249; [200] Hdt. 7.228 = AP 7.248; [84] Thuc. 1.132 = Demosth. *In Neaeram* 97 = AP 6.197; [71] Thuc. 6.54; [31] Thuc. 6.59 = Aristot. *Rhet.* 1.9, 1367 b.

For the 4th cent.: [233] Plato, *Phdr.* 264 c = AP 7.153; [208] Plato, *Charm.* 165 a; [197] Plato, *Hipparch.* 228 d; [144] Aristot., *Rhet.* 1.7, 1365 a, cf. 1.9, 1367 b; [209] Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* 1.8.14, 1099 a 27 = *Eth.*

we can look to the numerous examples from Herodotus and Thucydides. Hdt. 4.88, which concerns the bridging of the Bosporus, is a good example[8]:

> Δαρεῖος δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἡσθεὶς τῇ σχεδίῃ τὸν ἀρχιτέκτονα αὐτῆς Μανδροκλέα τὸν Σάμιον ἐδωρήσατο πᾶσι δέκα. ἀπ' ὧν δὴ Μανδροκλέης ἀπαρχήν, ζῷα γραψάμενος πᾶσαν τὴν ζεῦξιν τοῦ Βοσπόρου καὶ βασιλέα τε Δαρεῖον ἐν προεδρίῃ κατήμενον καὶ τὸν στρατὸν αὐτοῦ διαβαίνοντα, ταῦτα γραψάμενος ἀνέθηκε ἐς τὸ Ἥραιον, ἐπιγράψας τάδε·
>
> Βόσπορον ἰχθυόεντα γεφυρώσας ἀνέθηκε
> Μανδροκλέης Ἥρῃ μνημόσυνον σχεδίης,
> αὑτῷ μὲν στέφανον περιθείς, Σαμίοισι δὲ κῦδος,
> Δαρείου βασιλέος ἐκτελέσας κατὰ νοῦν.
>
> Dareios was pleased with the pontoon, and gave the builder Mandrokles a ten-fold gift. From this, as an offering of first fruits, Mandrokles commissioned a painting, in which the bridging of the Bosporus was shown. King Dareios is seen sitting on a seat of honor, while his army makes its way across. He dedicated the painting in the temple of Hera, and wrote on it the following inscription:
>
> Mandrokles, who bridged the fishy Bosporus,
> dedicated to Hera a commemoration of his pontoon.
> For himself he won a crown, for the Samians glory,
> since he finished the task as King Dareios wished.

What is typical here, both for Herodotus and Thucydides, is the attempt to construct a context for the inscription. This allows us to experience it almost as though we were there: historical background is provided, the temple of Hera (apparently in Samos) is mentioned as the site of the dedication, the painting to which the inscription belongs is described in detail. It is striking that the epigram itself, however, gives no hint as to what the μνημόσυνον of v. 2 is. That is, there is no mention of a picture, let alone details of the army's crossing, or where the king is sitting. For: «any viewer would see that immediately ... Picture and text form an indivisible unity»[9]. And Herodotus enables us to experience that unity.

The situation is quite different when we look at how, in the 4th cent., Plato and Aristotle quote inscriptional epigrams. Let us take as an example Plato's quotation of the Midas-epigram in the *Phaedrus* (264c): Here Socrates faults the speech of Lysias, which Phaedrus had just read him with great enthusiasm, because of its arbitrary construction.

> Σκέψαι τοίνυν τὸν τοῦ ἑταίρου σου λόγον, ... καὶ εὑρήσεις τοῦ ἐπιγράμματος οὐδὲν διαφέροντα, ὃ Μίδᾳ τῷ Φρυγί φασίν τινες ἐπιγεγράφθαι ...
>
> Χαλκῆ παρθένος εἰμί, Μίδα δ' ἐπὶ σήματι κεῖμαι.
> ὄφρ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε νάῃ καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλῃ,

Eud. A 1, 1214 a 5 = *Thgn.* 255–256; [249] Aristot. fr. 565 R; [19] Aristot. fr. 565 R = AP 7.54; [74] Aristot. *de Ath. rep.* 7; [17] [Aristot.] mirab. auscult. 131 = 843 b 3; [66] [Aristot.] mirab. auscult. 58 (59); [95] [Aristot.] mirab. auscult. 133; [153] Aeschin. 3.184; [154] Aeschin. 3.187; [271] Demosth. *de cor.* 18.289; [99] Ps. Demosth. 7.39 (prob. 3rd cent.) = AP 9.786; [199] Lycurg. *in Leocr.* 109; [68] Theopompos *FGrHist* II 115 fr. 285; [73] Philochoros = *FGE* p. 406 ff.

[8] On this and other inscriptions in Herodotus, cf. S. West, «Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests», *CQ* 35.2 (1985) 278–305, esp. 282–283.

[9] «das sieht jeder Beschauer sofort ... Bild und Spruch stellen also eine untrennbare Einheit dar». Thus J. Geffken, *op. cit.* (n. 4 above) 99 with n. 4.

αὐτοῦ τῇδε μένουσα πολυκλαύτου ἐπὶ τύμβου,
ἀγγελέω παριοῦσι Μίδας ὅτι τῇδε τέθαπται.

ὅτι δ' οὐδὲν διαφέρει αὐτοῦ πρῶτον ἢ ὕστατόν τι λέγεσθαι, ἐννοεῖς που, ὡς ἐγῷμαι.

Look at the speech of your friend ... and you will find that it is no different from that epigram, that some say was written for the Phrygian Midas ...

I am a bronze maiden, and I lie on the tomb of Midas;
as long as water runs and tall trees put out leaves,
not moving from this spot, atop the much lamented grave,
I shall declare to those who pass that Midas is buried here.

You see, I imagine, that it makes no difference whether any verse of it is spoken first or last.

The fact that Socrates tells us that «some say» (φασίν τινες) that this epigram was written for the Phrygian Midas, suggests that the poem was circulating freely – whether orally or in writing – detached from its site and monument[10]. Now if we focus purely on this epigram, without taking account of Socrates' intent in citing it, and if we try to picture what it refers to, we step into a void. The repeated deictic pronouns (αὐτοῦ τῇδε v. 3, τῇδε v. 4) have no point of reference. Where are we to imagine this tomb?[11] Plato's text does not give us the means to decide. Of course, this did not stop Leo Weber, in an oft-cited essay in *Hermes*, 1917, from conjuring up a *detailed* image of the tomb's immediate environment as a rustic idyll. «The epigram is referring not just to any old trees and streams» he says, «... but to those that adorn the area around the tomb, and protect it; trees nourished by the water of a nearby spring. Should it ever dry up and grow parched, the tomb itself would be left to fall into ruin»[12]. Even if we cannot share this fantasy – for nature's persistence as described in the poem («so long as water runs and tall trees put out leaves») is a topos; its reference not concrete –, Weber's impulse to deal seriously with the hints that the poem gives, and supply the missing information, is right on the mark.

How then are we to imagine the χαλκῆ παρθένος who lies on the tomb? Could she be a Siren? A Sphinx? Or even a death-bringing *Ker*? All three suggestions have been made in modern discussions of the poem[13], and all are within the bounds of ancient tomb-iconography. Each of these mythic figures may be described as παρθένος

The kind of citation that we find in Plato opens the door to experiencing epigram in a manner quite different from an actual encounter with an inscribed monument, or even

[10] If Simonides *PMG* 581 refers directly to the Midas-epigram, we would have to imagine the poem's free circulation at a much earlier date. That is not unlikely in the case of individual metrical inscriptions, especially if they were linked with particularly famous figures (Simonides connects the poem with Kleoboulos of Lindos, one of the Seven Sages). For a detailed discussion of the Midas-epigram and related problems cf. G. Markwald, *Die Homerischen Epigramme* (Meisenheim 1986) 34–83.

[11] The ps.-Herodotean *Life of Homer* (5.24) evidently locates the tomb in Ionian Kyme, and says that it is still there (τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τόδε τὸ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς στήλης τοῦ μνήματος ... ἐπιγέγραπται). Dio Chrysostom, however, reports that he searched for the tomb and was unable to find it (37 p. 120 R [vol. II p. 304 Dind.]: ἀλλ', ὦ παρθένε, τοῦ μὲν ποιητοῦ ἀκούομεν, σὲ δὲ ζητοῦντες οὐχ εὕρομεν οὐδὲ τὸ σῆμα τοῦ Μίδου).

[12] «Nicht beliebige Bäume und Gewässer meint das Epigramm, ... sondern die Bäume, die um das Grabmal zum Schmuck und Schutze herumstehen und von dem Wasser einer nahen Quelle getränkt werden. Ihr Versiegen und Verdorren würde auch das Grabmal selbst der Zerstörung preisgeben», *op. cit.* (n. 4 above) 538.

[13] For an overview cf. Markwald, *op. cit.* (n. 10 above) 79–80 n. 113.

from the mediated encounter we had in Herodotus. As quoted here out of context, its effect on us is altered. Its concision – that traditional marker of the genre – acquires a wholly different force: It virtually demands that we act, that we use our heads to supply what is missing. And if we are willing to do this, we may just find that the action is pleasurable. We may, in other words, sense the potential appeal if an epigram were to incite us to such a process *deliberately*.

Plato was, of course, not primarily (if at all) interested in offering us such an experience. Socrates' use of the quote aims in another direction, and there is nothing to suggest that Phaedrus pondered how to fill out the details that the epigram evokes. It seems important to me, therefore, that we the readers do *not* experience the poem – as Phaedrus does – while engaged in a dialogue, that is that we do not experience it orally, in circumstances in which we could easily be distracted, but rather that the text is fixed on the page (or better: the scroll), where we can examine it undisturbed and – if we are so inclined – reflect on it. The epigram fully reveals the aesthetic potential of its dislocation only when it is fixed in writing (and that need not be in a collection; quotations suffice): Only then is it likely to prompt one to consider what it would be like if one were to sever an epigram from its setting *deliberately*, and so spark the process of supplementation. To the extent that this process came to be exploited regularly and self-consciously in the ever more literary epigram of the Hellenistic Age, I call it Ergänzungsspiel.

Let us now take a look at Ergänzungsspiel in a few Hellenistic examples, specifically in several epigrams by Callimachus. I want to stress from the start, however, that I am not proposing a general strategy for interpreting Hellenistic epigram: Though Ergänzungsspiel is common, Hellenistic poets have many arrows in their quiver. Let us start with a simple and inconspicuous *distichon*, which largely retains the traditional form of a votive inscription. It is Callimachus' epigram #33 (Pf. = 21 G–P = AP 6.347):

Ἄρτεμι, τὶν τόδ' ἄγαλμα Φιληρατίς εἵσατο τῇδε·
ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν δέξαι, πότνια, τὴν δὲ σάου.

Artemis, for you Philerati̇s here set up this offering.
Accept it, lady, and keep her safe.

This poem is so straightforward, so modest and plain, that it initially makes us unsure of our critical faculties. Why do we even dignify it with our attention? Would we do so if it hadn't come down to us under the name of the great Callimachus? The feeling is like that, which one sometimes has in museums when, drifting by a painting without giving it a thought (for it is not particularly striking), one suddenly notices out of the corner of one's eye that it is labeled «Rembrandt», whereupon one snaps to attention, examines it with care and interest, and might go so far as to call it a masterpiece. On honest reflection, however, it is hard to shake the feeling that one has been a victim of, indeed perhaps has helped perpetuate, a swindle. Returning now to our epigram, we find that it is conventional to a degree one would not normally expect in Callimachus. The whole opening phrase right up through the caesura (Ἄρτεμι, τὶν τόδ' ἄγαλμα) corresponds word for word to an old dedicatory formula, which we know from inscriptional evidence[14]. The structure,

[14] Cf. *CEG* I 413 = *FH* 110: Ἄρτεμι, σοὶ τόδ' ἄγαλμα Τελεστοδί[κη μ' ἀνέθηκεν] / Ἀσφαλίο μήτηρ, Θερσέλεω θυγάτηρ. Cf. also *CEG* I 407 = *FH* 125: Ἀρτέμιδος τόδ' ἄγαλμ[α]· ἀνέθεκε{ν} δέ μ' Ε[ὔ]πολις αὐτει / αὐτὸς καὶ παῖδες εὐχσάμενος δεκάτεν.

too, is conventional. As Friedländer and Hoffleit put it, «in the dedicatory epigram it is not rare to find a break between the objective formula of dedication in the hexameter and a prayer directly addressed to the god in the pentameter» (*FH* p. 66)[15]. How, one wonders, can we distinguish the poem from any inscribed dedication that might be found in a public setting? What sets it apart as Callimachean?

The work of an epigram – of votive or sepulchral type, at least – is to make a passerby pause and, however briefly, connect[16]. That is, it seeks to engage and involve a reader's thoughts which, after all, have their own preoccupations and agenda, and elicit a response ranging anywhere from pity or sympathetic witness to approbation or mere acknowledgement. We find the process expressed with rare explicitness in a 6th cent. B. C. Attic verse-inscription on the marble base of a grave-stele (*CEG* I 28 = *FH* 83 = *GV* 1225), which virtually accosts the distracted passer-by[17]:

> ἄνθροπε hὸστείχε[ι]ς : καθ'ὁδὸ | ν : φρασὶν : ἄλα μενοινῶν, :
> στῆθι | καὶ οἴκτιρον : σῆμα Θράσονος : ἰδόν.
>
> Man, as you stride along the road with your mind on other subjects,
> stop and weep to see the tomb of Thrason.

The involvement of the reader in Callimachus' poem looks very different. Everything is indirection. A woman dedicates an ἄγαλμα to Artemis, beseeches the goddess to accept it, and asks for protection on her own behalf. There is no appeal for our attention. The goddess Artemis is the addressee; the reader is ignored. At first sight there is little which prompts us to participate in this ostensibly closed and straightforward dialogue (inasmuch as we take the trouble to read the poem at all, we appear to remain eaves-droppers, and unacknowledged ones at that). And this may explain why scholars have for the most part passed this couplet by in silence.

«Passing by» is here no idle metaphor. Our experience as readers is not so very different from that of the wayfarer going past an inscription. To be sure, the mere fact of our encounter with Callimachus' poem already assumes a voluntary act, i. e. that we have *chosen* to take up the book (or scroll) of poetry. And this signals a certain willingness on our part to listen to what the text is saying. Nevertheless, who is to say that we will choose to concentrate on this particular couplet?[18] We may well be more or less receptive to the

---

[15] The request, δέξαι, is likewise conventional (cf. *CEG* I 345: τὺ δή δήξαι, Φοῖβη Ἄπολον, 367, 418), as is the plea σάου, cf. *CEG* I 275.4.

[16] On this topic see the fine essay by G. B. Walsh, «Callimachean Passages: The Rhetoric of Epitaph in Epigram», *Arethusa* 24 (1991) 77–105. Cf. also D. Meyer, «Die Einbeziehung des Lesers in den Epigrammen des Kallimachos», in *Callimachus, Hellenistica Groningana*, vol. 1, edd. M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker (Groningen 1933) 161–175, which, with its focus on poems explicitly thematizing the act of reading, nicely complements my own work here, where the pragmatics of reading epigram are the central concern.

[17] For a similar view of this epigram, cf. *GG* p. 16, and Walsh, *op. cit.* (n. 16 above) 80.

[18] Fraser's characterization of it – without elaboration – as a «charming couplet» (*Ptolemaic Alexandria* II [Oxford 1972] 329 n. 35), suggests a low-intensity experience of the poem, with light readerly involvement, yet evidently still mildly pleasurable: the reader is charmed. For the self-conscious accommodation of different levels of readerly involvement in Callimachus, cf. P. Bing, «Impersonation of Voice in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*», *TAPhA* 123 (1993), 181–198, esp. p. 185 with n. 11, and p. 193. For a Hellenistic model of detached reading cf. «Poetry and the passions: two Stoic views», by M. C. Nussbaum, in: *Passions and Perceptions*, edd. J. Brunschwig and M. C. Nussbaum (Cambridge 1993) 97–149, esp. 136–145.

poem's bid for our attention, understated as it is – no one would argue that it thrusts itself upon our consciousness. And the possibility of neglect is heightened by the very format of the «Anthology» or «Collection», which I consider very likely for Callimachus[19], and which invites us to dip in here or there, to pick and choose whatever happens to catch our eye, rather than read its parts with equal intensity throughout, as one might a single continuous work – though even then such concentration is an ideal that scarcely corresponds to the reality of reading. The picture of the wanderer striding along the road with his mind on other things, which we saw in the Attic inscription, is thus not a bad image for the reader of epigram. Only that, in the case of Callimachus' couplet, no voice calls us to stand and pay attention.

Yet the door to participation is left open, and maybe more than a crack. First of all, as we already saw in the case of the Midas-epigram, the couplet tantalizes with the specificity of its deictic pronouns (τόδ' ... τῆδε), which point to a concrete object and place. If this couplet was ever inscribed, then their «identity was clear to the worshipper» (*FH* p. 110 #114). And I certainly would not exclude that possibility: It may well be that Callimachus composed epigrams now and again on commission. But even then, I think we must reckon with the likelihood that so powerful an exponent of book-poetry as Callimachus would at the same time have contemplated his poem's place in a book. Set in the scroll of Callimachus' epigrams, or in an anthology, the couplet becomes – self-consciously, I believe – «dislocated», or better «unmoored»; τόδ' and τῆδε float free, a provocation to imaginative play. Where is this place? What was this ἄγαλμα?

Further, the private quality of the dialogue between woman and divinity is belied by the conventional 3rd pers. voice. This may or may not be Phileratis' own, and it introduces the possibility of another perspective. Is it the poet's? the stone-cutter's? or (of greatest consequence) our own, when we say the words out loud or in our minds?[20] Callimachus

---

[19] We cannot say for sure whether Callimachus collected his epigrams into a book. But given the poet's well-known role in editing his *Aitia* and *Iambi* (cf. esp. N. Krevans, *Callimachus' Aitia: The Poet as Editor* [Princeton, forthcoming]), and given the likelihood that his two sepulchral epigrams, 21 Pf. and 35 Pf., were intended to be read together – as one would in a collection (cf. p. 128 below) –, I think it probable that he did indeed put together such a book.

Epigram collections of the early Hellenistic period are known to us from papyri. The most important is the as yet unpublished 3rd cent. B.C. Milan Poseidippus-papyrus, containing ca. 600 vv. (about 100 poems, only one previously known!) from a collection of this poet's epigrams, arranged according to theme (as preserved, the scroll is divided into sections on the following subjects: various types of Rocks, Eye-Augury, Dedications, Epitaphs for Women, Statues, Equestrian Victories at Panhellenic Games, Shipwrecks, Votive Epigrams for a Temple of Asclepius, Temperaments [τρόποι]. Interestingly, no sections on erotic or sympotic themes survive). For a preliminary report, cf. G. Bastianini and C. Gallazzi, «Il poeta ritrovato», *Ca' de Sass* (journal of CARIPLO, the Cassa di Risparmio delle Provincie Lombarde, S.p.A.) n. 121 (Milano, March 1993) 34–39. For other early Hellenistic epigram collections cf. Pack #1593 = *SH* 961; the Elephantine Scholia = Pack #1924; 1594; 1596. See further the still unpublished P. Vindob. G 40611 of the 3rd cent. B.C., which contains the incipits of an extensive, multi-volume, epigram collection, cf. H. Harrauer, «Epigrammincipit auf einem Papyrus aus dem 3. Jh. v. Chr.», *Proc. of the XVI Int. Congr. of Papyrology* (Chico 1981) 49–53.

[20] In connection with the indeterminate nature of the voice, cf. Roland Barthes' description of the «plural text» in *S/Z* (New York 1974) 41: «The more indeterminate the origin of the statement, the more plural the text. In modern texts, the voices are so treated that any reference is possible: the discourse, or better, the language, speaks: nothing more. By contrast, in the classic text the majority of utterances are assigned an origin, we can identify their parentage, who is speaking ...; however, it may happen that in the classic

knew full well how, in the act of reading, a reader can be drawn into collaborating with the text: one might call this «the Acontius effect», after that character's manipulation of his beloved Cydippe when he tosses her an apple inscribed with the words «By Artemis, I will marry Acontius», which she reads out loud, thus unwittingly binding herself (Call. fr. 67, Dieg. Z 1 with Pf.'s n.)[21]. If *we*, then, speak these words on Phileratis' behalf, and lend our voices to her plea, will we not want to know more about her? Once we decide to construe the perspective as our own, won't that prompt us to involve ourselves further through a desire to learn as much of the context as we can?[22]

In what circumstances, we might ask, would this woman offer an ἄγαλμα to Artemis, and plead for her protection? Arguably on the occasion of impending childbirth (for Artemis' special role in this regard, cf. Call. H. 3.21 ff). If so, the final imperative σάου will have the poignant sense of «save from death, keep alive» (death in childbirth was a sad fact of life, as a glance at the funerary inscriptions in Peek's *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* reveals). And if this is indeed the situation, is it meaningful that Phileratis appears alone? No mention of parents. No mention of children. No mention of husband (contrast the inscription, *CEG* I 413, cited in n. 14 above). Does Phileratis' solitude in this poem suggest that the ἄγαλμα she dedicates is nothing so costly as a statue (as assumed by almost everyone)[23], but that the term denotes some humbler item, as it so often does in genuine dedications?[24] And what of her name? Though the female form is unique, the masculine is «conspicuously Rhodian»[25]. Does this suggest a Rhodian setting? Or, considering the rootless life of the hellenistic diaspora, may we imagine this solitary woman in a foreign land (in Alexandria, perhaps?), cut loose from her family?

I have spun out a pathetic tale, which readers may or may not find plausible. But that is not paramount. The point is that the poem – with that expressive brevity, which is the marker of the genre – invites such speculative play, and that Ergänzungsspiel constitutes to a significant degree the aesthetic pleasure of reading the poem. It is here, if anywhere, that the specifically «Callimachean» quality of the piece is to be found. Those readers who

---

text, always haunted by the appropriation of speech, the voice gets lost, as though it had leaked out through a hole in the discourse.»

[21] In speaking of inscribed epigrams of the more oral culture of Archaic and Classical Greece and how they enlist viewer in their own behalf, J. Svenbro goes so far as to describe the reader as «dispossessed of his own voice ...» and having «to submit to the written word ...»; «in these circumstances, the reader has but one means of resistance: he can refuse to read», cf. *Phrasikleia. An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca 1993) 47, and cf. generally chs. 3, «The Reader and the Reading Voice», and 9, «The Inner Voice: On the Invention of Silent Reading». On epigram's appropriation of the reader's voice cf. also J. W. Day, «Rituals in Stone: Early Greek Grave Epigrams and Monuments», *JHS* 109 (1989) 16–28, esp. 26–28 and L. Kurke, «The Economy of Kudos», in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics*, C. Dougherty & L. Kurke edd. (Cambridge 1993) 131–163, esp. 144–146.

[22] Compared with earlier times, the relatively greater prominence of silent, more purely visual, reading in the Hellenistic period offered readers greater latitude in deciding their degree of involvement with a text. For in their silence they might initially approach a text quite casually and non-committally: just trying its perspective on for size, while actually still withholding identification. For silent reading as mainly a «postclassical» phenomenon cf. Svenbro, *op. cit.* (n. 21 above) 167–168.

[23] Cf. G–P *ad loc.*

[24] Ceramics, for instance, cf. *CEG* I 289–292, 298, 334.

[25] P. M. Fraser, *op. cit.* (n. 18 above) 826 n. 216. Cf. *CEG* II 690 from Rhodes (ca. 360–350).

do not indulge in such play (perhaps constructing tales more plausible than mine) are missing out on the fun[26].

Now one could scarcely hope to find a passage in Callimachus where such a process of supplementation is referred to explicitly, and which would allow us to say for sure that he made deliberate use of Ergänzungsspiel[27]. But there *is* such a passage, I believe – one whose poetic significance has not yet been fully appreciated. It is fragment 57.1–2 Pf. (= *SH* 264.1–2):

> αὐτὸς ἐπιφράσσαιτο, τάμοι δ' ἄπο μῆκος ἀοιδῆ·
> ὅσσα δ' ἀνειρομένῳ φῆ[σ]ε, τάδ' ἐξερέω·
>
> [The reader] can imagine [this] for himself, and thus cut down the length of the song.
> But all that he answered to the questions, I will relate.

The verses are attributed with fair certainty to Callimachus' *epinikion* for the ptolemaic queen, Berenike II: the *Victoria Berenices*. And they probably belong to the mythical portion of the poem, where Herakles returns to his humble host, Molorchos, after having killed the Nemean Lion. The speaker is evidently the poet himself, who addresses these words to his audience. The subject of αὐτὸς ἐπιφράσσαιτο is thus a «reader» or «listener», as Pfeiffer suggested[28]. Therese Fuhrer, who recently dealt with this passage in her study on Callimachean Epinician[29], argues persuasively that what this reader is supposed to fill in for himself is the hero's well-known and stereotypical combat against the monstrous lion – a tale which the sophisticated poet naturally wanted to avoid treating *in extenso*[30]. Fuhrer demonstrates that these verses belong to a type of transitional formula that may be found in Pindar: an Abbruchsformel – here in the form of a *praeteritio* in which the reader is invited to supply the omission. Indeed, she suggests that Callimachus may have been alluding to a specific case in *Pythian* 4 (vv. 247–248), which likewise involves «the omission of an heroic combat (hero versus monstrous beast)», namely Jason's struggle with the hydra[31]. The passage is worth recalling here:

---

[26] Similarly R. Hunter, «Callimachus and Heraclitus,» *Mat. e disc. per l'anal. d. testi classici* 28 (1992) 113–123, esp. 114: «Much of what I have to say will be speculative, but – like many of the best Greek epigrams – these poems are very clearly written as a provocation to speculation. Perhaps no literary genre makes such a direct appeal to the reader's powers of intellectual reconstruction, to the *need* to interpret, as does that of epigram; the demand for concision makes «narrative silences» an almost constitutive part of the genre. In these circumstances, the refusal to speculate amounts to no less than a refusal to read».

[27] W. Iser cites a passage from Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* as «early» evidence (18th cent.!) that «Autor und Leser ... sich in das Spiel der Phantasie [teilen]», *Der Akt des Lesens* (München 1984) 176: «... no author, who understands the just boundaries of decorum and good-breeding, would presume to think all: The truest respect which you can pay to the reader's understanding, is to halve this matter amicably, and leave him something to imagine, in his turn, as well as yourself.» (vol. II, 11 [Everyman's Library, London 1956] 79).

[28] *Ad* v. 1: αὐτὸς sc. ὁ ἀναγιγνώσκων vel ὁ ἀκούων ipse excogitet quid aliud fecerint.

[29] *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel 1992) 71–75, 121–125, and *eadem*, «Callimachus' Epinician Poems», in *Callimachus*, op. cit. (n. 16 above) 85–86.

[30] *Op. cit.* pp. 72–75.

[31] *Op. cit.* p. 74. For such formulas generally, cf. B. K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin 1988) *ad* vv. 247–248; E. Thummer, *Pindar. Die isthmischen Gedichte* I (Heidelberg 1968) 122–125; W. H. Race, *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes* (Atlanta 1990) 41–57; in rhetoric, cf. T. Krischer, *Mnem.* 30 (1977) 129–130.

μακρά μοι νεῖσθαι κατ' ἀμαξιτόν· ὥρα
γὰρ συνάπτει καί τινα
οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχύν·

It is too far for me to go along the carriageway:
for time is pressing
and I know a short cut.

In discussing Callimachus' interest in this type of formula, Fuhrer stresses the similarities between examples in his own verse and in that of his predecessors. But I would insist on a basic difference, which – to my mind – is given short shrift in Fuhrer's account. In all earlier instances – and the passage from *Pythian* 4 is a good example – it is exclusively the *poet* who undertakes to shorten the poem. In fr. 57, by contrast, it is the *reader*, for the poet expressly invites him to imagine the rest for himself and thus abridge the poem. This invitation to the reader is, so far as I can see, unparalleled in earlier literature[32], and it remained so until the time of Augustus. Indeed, the first really comparable instances appear in Lucian![33]

The explicit call to supply what is missing here in fr. 57 is confirmation of the strongest sort that Callimachus knowingly and deliberately used Ergänzungsspiel in his epigrams. To be sure, the invitation to play is never so direct as it is in this fragment. On the other hand, we do quite often find Ergänzungsspiel enacted in the epigrams, that is we can observe characters in the poems themselves engaging in the game[34]. This is the case, for instance, in the sepulchral epigram #58 (Pf. = 50 G-P = AP 7.277):

Τίς, ξένος ὦ ναυηγέ; Λεόντιχος ἐνθάδε νεκρόν
εὗρεν ἐπ' αἰγιαλοῦ, χῶσε δὲ τῷδε τάφῳ
δακρύσας ἐπίκηρον ἐὸν βίον· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτός
ἤσυχον, αἰθυίῃ δ' ἶσα θαλασσοπορεῖ.

---

[32] This is the case, even though Fuhrer shows (*op. cit.* p. 123 n. 457), that already Pindar «mit dem Wissen des Publikums rechnet» when he interrupts a myth. To be sure, Fuhrer says that «Callimachus, by means of this device [scil. Abbruchsformel], challenges the reader to draw on *his own* erudition and knowledge of mythology to understand the *poet's* learned and witty allusion», but she clearly means «challenge» here quite generally, and not as an explicit invitation, cf. «A Pindaric Feature in the Poems of Callimachus», *AJPh* 109 (1988) 53–68, quote on p. 66. In the Augustan period, cf. Ovid *Amores* I 5.23–25: singula quid referam? nil non laudabile vidi,/ et nudam pressi corpus ad usque meum./ cetera quis nescit? «Who doesn't know the rest?» (which is like saying «You, the readers, know the rest, so I don't need to go into details).

[33] *Dial. Deor.* 19 (11) 2, Selene to Aphrodite about Endymion: οἶσθα· τί οὖν ἂν σοι λέγοιμι τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα;, cf. also Aristainetos I 16.33 ff.: τὰ δ' ἄλλα (οἶδας γὰρ ὁποῖα τὰ λοιπά) νόει μοι κατὰ σαυτόν, ὦ φιλότης, οὐδὲν περιττοῦ δεόμενος λόγου; and II 3.15 f.: ἆρα κατάδηλον ὃ βούλομαι λέγειν; πάντως δήπου, ἐπεὶ ταῦτα γράφω συντόμως ἐκ τούτων συνιέναι καὶ τὰ λείποντα δυναμένῃ. The idea that a reader must imagine more than is present in the text occasionally appears in ancient works of literary theory. Ps.-Longinus, for instance, says that poetry partakes of the sublime «when a reader's thought exceeds what is said» (πλεῖον τοῦ λεγομένου τὸ ἀναθεωρούμενον, 7.3). E. A. Schmidt has collected further examples in «Σχῆμα Horatianum», *WS* 103 (1990) 57–98, esp. the section «Wenige Worte – viel Sinn», pp. 90–94.

[34] Cf. the discussion of this phenomenon in Walsh, *op. cit.* (n. 16 above) esp. 98, who, however, is interested mainly in the «primary concern with information, and so with the way one acquires information. Problems look for solution; inference ... structures feeling.»

Who are you, shipwrecked man? Leontichos found the corpse
here on the beach, and covered it with this tomb,
weeping for his own doomed life. For his way is not
peaceful either. Rather he roams the sea like the shearwater.

The scene is the sea-shore (ἐνθάδε ... ἐπ' αἰγιαλοῦ). And we find ourselves at a grave-site (τῷδε τάφῳ v. 2). There is no further specification of place. A certain Leontichos has found a corpse on the beach and heaped a grave mound over it. We may assume that it was also he who commissioned the inscription.

Who asks the question with which the poem begins? Since the rest of the poem retreats into the 3rd person, it is difficult to say. It may be Leontichos, or the author of the epigram, or finally we the readers. Initially, of course, it was Leontichos who asked this question as he happened on the corpse[35]. This is clear from his reaction, when he sheds tears for his own life. In funerary epigram, tears generally flow for the dead. And after the two finite verbs of v. 2, which take νεκρόν as object, we expect the participle δακρύσας to do the same – an expectation perhaps heightened by the slight pause for the caesura after δακρύσας ἐπίκηρον. It is surprising, then, that Leontichos grieves for his *own* life (ἐὸν βίον)[36]. The anonymous corpse, however, presents a blank to all who encounter it (it is thus an ideal object of Ergänzungsspiel), and Leontichos mourns his own lot because he sees in that blank a reflection of himself. Put somewhat differently, «Leontichos» is the answer that he finds to the question «Who are you?»[37] In effect, then, he writes the epitaph for himself.

And yet he does *not* go that far. We saw how, in the dedication of Phileratis, readers could decide to what extent to involve themselves. And their willingness to do so depended on how they were inclined: their relative interest or indifference; alertness or inattention. Just so with Leontichos, the possible limits of Ergänzungsspiel come into view, inasmuch as *his* willingness to play may only go so far. Leontichos draws on his own life-experience in order to fill out the meager traces, which he encounters in the corpse, and so form a coherent picture. Yet Ergänzungsspiel in this instance cuts very close to the bone. If

---

[35] Following Agar, G–P print εὗρε μ', thus transforming most of the epigram into the corpse's reply – a pointless change, since the corpse does not answer the question (as surely it could). Construed thus, moreover, that question can only be taken as the reader's. But surely the point is that it was originally Leontichos' own, and that because the identity of the corpse remains a blank, Leontichos can see in it a reflection of himself.

[36] Cf. *GV* 1231 = *GG* 170, where the passerby is asked to mourn the death of a six year old boy *as though the loss were his own*:

μή τις ἀδάκρυτος παρίτω τόδε σᾶμά νέοιο,
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ οἷ τὸ πάθος τοῦτο νομισσάμενος
οἰκτισάτω πινυτὸν Νικομήδεα Θεόφρονος υἱόν,
οὕνεκεν ἐξαέτης τέρμα ἐκύρησε βίου.

This epigram differs from that by Callimachus inasmuch as a sympathetic response here causes the passerby to grieve for *another*; in Callimachus it prompts him to grieve for *himself*. The basic psychological attitude is described with greater explicitness in the passage from the *Iliad* (19.301–302) where Patroklos is mourned: στενάχοντο γυναῖκες,/ Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν, σφῶν δ' αὐτῶν κήδε' ἑκάστη. Cf. Mark W. Edwards' n. *ad loc.* in *The Iliad: A Commentary* vol. 5 (Cambridge 1991).

[37] A reader might at first think that «Leontichos» is *indeed* the answer to the question «Τίς;», since the name is placed precisely where such answers usually come in dialogue-epigrams. For such poems cf. e.g. Leonidas 70 G–P = AP 7.163, Callimachus 34.2 Pf. = AP 6.351, and the note in G–P *ad* Antipater 21; for inscriptional examples, cf. *GV* 1831 ff.

continued play means in effect constructing one's own tombstone, then perhaps the stakes are just too high. And in fact, Leontichos stops before getting to that point. He avoids naming his country of origin, his father, his family, or other identifying traits. That is, he withholds (as though superstitiously) details which would truly make the commemoration serve as his own prospective epitaph, and ensure that we, the readers, will be able to mourn *his* end[38]. Instead he moves on – restless like a sea bird – before having identified himself further. Perhaps we would like to have known more about him – his compassionate gesture[39] may well have piqued our interest. But it is hard to begrudge his evasion. For not everyone is always prepared to play the game to its bitter end – if at all. And we too will be moving on: Even if we choose to linger over this particular poem, the shore upon which it is set – an archetypically liminal location – is not where we shall stay. Our community and our home, our occupations, family, and friends are all elsewhere.

Precisely such a familial or community setting is, in my opinion, evoked in our next examples, two well-known epigrams of Callimachus. Here we return from Ergänzungsspiel played *in* the poem, to that performed by the reader. One of the poems is that on the tomb of his father (Pf. 21 = 29 G–P = AP 7.525):

> Ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα, Καλλιμάχου με
> ἴσθι Κυρηναίου παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην.
> εἰδείης δ' ἄμφω κεν· ὁ μέν κοτε πατρίδος ὅπλων
> ἦρξεν, ὁ δ' ἥεισεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης …[40]
>
> Whoever you are who bends your step past my tomb, know that I
> am both child and father of Callimachus the Cyrenaean.
> You are sure to know them both. The one led his country's
> troops, the other sang songs beyond the reach of envy …

The second epigram is that for the poet's own tomb (Pf. 35 = 30 G–P = AP 7.415):

> Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας εὖ μὲν ἀοιδήν
> εἰδότος, εὖ δ' οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι.
>
> You bend your step past the tomb of Battus' son, well skilled
> in song, well able to raise a welcome laugh over wine.

It has long been recognized that these two poems go together, and that they supplement each other. For the actual tenant of the tomb remains unnamed in his respective epigram. Only when we compare the two does it emerge – «echt alexandrinisch», as Gabathuler puts it[41] – that the first poem is for Battus, son of Callimachus of Cyrene, the second for Callimachus, son of Battus of Cyrene[42].

---

[38] Nor does he seem to draw the obvious conclusion (found in epitaphs of other ναυηγοί, e.g. Leonidas 60 and 61 G–P = AP 7.264, 266), i.e. to give up sailing altogether.

[39] N.b. the respect for the dead man expressed by the very dignified form of address, ξένος ὦ ναυηγέ. The ὦ *postpositum* is highly poetic, cf. Pf. *ad* fr. 103.1; W. H. Mineur, *Callimachus. Hymn to Delos. Introduction and Commentary* (Leiden 1984) *ad* v. 118; Allen, Halliday, and Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford 1936²) *ad* H. H. 3.14. For instances in which the first element is nominative *pro vocativo* cf. e.g. *Il.* 4.189: φίλος ὦ. Μενέλαε.

[40] This is not the place to discuss the much debated problem of the final distichon (vv. 5–6). Cf. most recently E. Livrea, «L'Epitaphio Callimacheo per Batto», *Hermes* 120 (1992) 291–298 with bibliography.

[41] M. Gabathuler, *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter* (St. Gallen 1937) 56.

[42] Thus Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* I (Berlin 1924) 175 n. 2, and Pfeiffer n. *ad* Ep. 21.5–6. Reitzenstein made the interesting suggestion that we view funerary epigrams that poets

The missing name is clearly an enticement to Ergänzungsspiel. Yet what, in this instance, are the rules of the game?[43] Claude Meillier has observed that it is not unusual for the name of the deceased to be left out in inscribed sepulchral epigram. When this is the case, one can generally find it inscribed *extra metrum* above the poem or below it[44]. Literary epigram, however, does not use such *extra metrum* inscriptions: it did not go so far in adopting the conventions of its inscriptional counterpart. Nevertheless, Meillier's obervation that the name is to be found outside the poem itself may point us in the right direction. We must simply take it a little bit further.

We know that ancient families often had family grave-plots, where – just as today – the tombstones of various family members stood *next to* each other. A good example is a grave-stele of the first half of the 4th cent. B.C. from the Piraeus (*CEG* II 512 = *GV* 1386 = Clairmont #74). The name and parentage of the deceased is inscribed *extra metrum* above an empty space, where a painting once stood: Telemachos, son of Spoudokrates, from Phlya (Τηλέμαχος | Σπουδοκράτος | Φλυεύς). Below the vacant space comes the epigram itself:

> ὦ τὸν ἀειμνήστου σ' ἀρετᾶς παρὰ πᾶσι πολίταις |
> κλεινὸν ἔπαινον ἔχοντ' ἄνδρα ποθεινότατον |
> παισὶ φίλει τε γυναικί. – τάφο δ' ἐπὶ δεξιά, μῆτερ, |
> κεῖμαι σῆς φιλίας οὐκ ἀπολειπόμενος
>
> O man that for your ever-remembered excellence won
> great praise from all the citizens, and are sorely missed
> by your children and dear wife. – I lie, mother, on the right
> of your tomb, and am not deprived of your love.

Interesting here that the deceased explicitly refers to his mother's neighboring tomb – without, however, calling her by name. She appears simply as μῆτερ, just as the father of Callimachus in epigram 21 was simply called γενέτης (v. 2). Fortunately, however, the tombstone of this very woman, the mother of Telemachos, has been found[45]. Its inscription reads as follows (*IG* 2/3 ed. min., vol. 3.2 #7695):

---

write for themselves as concluding poems for collections (*op. cit.* [n. 4 above] 139 w. n. 2): e.g. the epigram of Nossis (11 G–P = AG 7.718), of Leonidas (93 G–P = AP 7.715), and the three that Meleager wrote on himself (2, 3, 4 G–P = AP 7.417, 418, 419). We encounter such an epigram *in situ* in the final poem of Propertius' Monobiblos. Cf. further Gabathuler, *op. cit.* (n. 41 above) 48–49, 56.

[43] Walsh, *op. cit.* (n. 16 above) 94, thinks «the riddle is solved by the younger Callimachus' fame – everyone must know his patronym. Fame, more or less, is the point of the poem». But if fame is the point, why are the poems so carefully harmonized, so as to supplement each other? J. Ferguson aptly cites «the remark of Abraham Mendelssohn, son of the philosopher and father of the composer: ‹I used to be the son of my father, but now I am the father of my son›», *Callimachus* (Boston 1980) 141. How many, one might ask in response to Walsh, would know the name of this son of a famous father, and father of a famous son?

[44] C. Meillier, *Callimaque et son temps* (Lille 1979) 139. I would cite the following examples: *CEG* I 77, 89, *CEG* II 477, 512, 520, 524, 528 (?), 531, 532, 564, 570, 571, 585, 589 («This is the sister of Smikythos» – the sister herself remains unnamed), 590, 594, 595, 596, 513, 670, 671, 677, 678, 684, 703 (?), 722, 724, 741.

[45] Cf. A. Conze, *Die attischen Grabreliefs* I–IV (1893–1922) #803, Taf. 150. On family grave-plots cf. S. C. Humphrey, «Family Tombs and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens – Tradition or Traditionalism», JHS 100 (1980) 96–126; R. S. J. Garland, «A first Catalogue of Attic Peribolos Tombs», *ABSA* 77 (1982) 125–176; *idem.*, *The Greek Way of Death* (London 1985) 106–107.

Μελίτη Σπουδοκράτος γυνὴ Φλυέως
Melite, wife of Spoudokrates, from Phlya

Thus, we only learn the mother's name from this second tomb. Here, to be sure, the names of the deceased are present on their own tombs. This was not the case in Callimachus: his omission of the same shows that he «is playing with the conventions of real-life sepulchral epigrams»[46]. But Callimachus can reckon with the reader's ability to see through his game and realize that the poems supplement each other. For the reader knows about such family grave-plots, and so possesses the information necessary to play the game. One of the pleasures of Ergänzungsspiel, in this instance, is that the reader must translate the context of such real-life family-plots on to the very different landscape of the scroll: the *Sitz im Leben* becomes the *Sitz im Buch*[47]. And if we do this, if we imagine the Callimachus family plot set on the papyrus, it follows with virtual certainty that his two epigrams (though separated in the tradition) were juxtaposed on the scroll. The only uncertainty is which came first, which second.

The two epigrams do not, of course, refer to each other as overtly as in the sepulchral poem for Telemachos, where the deceased explicitly says «I lie, mother, on the right of your tomb». Nor are there the visual links that might obtain between tombs in a genuine family-plot (common elements of style, matching decoration, placement on the plot). Instead, Callimachus devises a subtler way of expressing family relationship, namely by having each poem's opening words unmistakably echo the other's:

Ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα ... (21.1)
Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας ... (35.1)

The repeated phrase, παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα(ς), is utterly convincing as a traditional funerary formula – *so* convincing, in fact, that up till now no one has noticed that the expression πόδας φέρειν is not attested before Callimachus[48], and appears again only much later[49]. Did Callimachus here coin his own conventional (i. e. familial) funerary idiom? And is that how he suggests the relationship, or family resemblance, that exists on the one hand between the poems, and on the other between the deceased?[50] Is the repeated phrase a signpost to help orient us in the landscape of the book, as we engage in Ergänzungsspiel?

---

[46] Thus A. Köhnken, «Schlusspointe und Selbstdistanz bei Kallimachos», *Hermes* 101 (1973) 425–441, here p. 426.

[47] For this «literary» landscape, cf. P. Bing, *The Well-Read Muse* (Göttingen 1988) 39–40.

[48] It is formed on analogy with such phrases of journeying as πόδας ἕλκειν, Eur. *Phoen.* 302, Soph. *Philoct.* 291, Theocr. 7.21 (Σιμιχίδα, πᾷ δὴ τὺ μεσαμέριον πόδας ἕλκεις;); πόδα τιθέναι, often in Euripides, e.g. *Suppl.* 171 (w. Collard's n.). Cf. also πόδας νωμᾶν in Homer, *Il.* 15.269, 22.24. *N.b.* that φέρειν πόδας inverts the common Homeric πόδες φέρον [scil. τίνα], *Il.* 6.514, 13.515, etc.

[49] 2/1 cent. B.C.: *GV* 1990.5 = E. Bernand, *Inscriptions métriques de l'égypte gréco-romaine* (Paris 1969) #38.5: ξεῖνε, σὺ δ' ὃς παρὰ τόνδε φέρ(ε)ις πόδας ἠρέμα χῶρον. Cf. AP 8.188 (Gregory of Nazianzus, 4th cent.). C. A. Faraone refers to *GV* 2036.11 (ὃς τὸν ἐμὸν παρὰ τύμβον ἄγεις) but adds a non-existent πόδα after ἄγεις, and sets the poem in the 4th or 3rd cent. *B.C.*, rather than A.D. as it should be, «Callimachus Epigram 29.5–6 (Gow–Page)», *ZPE* 63 (1986) 53–56, here p. 55 n. 8.

[50] The relationship between father and son, expressed by the identical phrase, corresponds to that in Ep. 21 between grandfather and grandson, expressed in their identical name. As Reitzenstein observed, the name Callimachus is here used in its etymological sense, «an able warrior». The family resemblance can still be felt across generations in the fact that the grandfather was a «Callimachus» in a martial sense, the grandson in a literary sense (ὁ μέν ... ὅπλων / ἦρξεν, ὁ δ' ἤεισεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης vv. 3–4),

Before closing, I want to discuss one last epigram of Callimachus, and thus deliberately extend the meaning of Ergänzungsspiel. The epigram is #22 Pf. = 36 G–P = AP 7.518:

Ἀστακίδην τὸν Κρῆτα τὸν αἰπόλον ἥρπασε Νύμφη
ἐξ ὄρεος, καὶ νῦν ἱερὸς Ἀστακίδης.
οὐκέτι Δικταίῃσιν ὑπὸ δρυσίν, οὐκέτι Δάφνιν
ποιμένες, Ἀστακίδην δ' αἰὲν ἀεισόμεθα.

Astakides the Cretan, the goatherd, was abducted by a nymph
from the mountain, so now it's «sacred» Astakides.
No longer beneath Diktaean oaks, no longer of Daphnis
will we herdsmen sing, but evermore of Astakides.

The sophisticated Alexandrian poet presents himself here – no doubt, with a smile – in the guise of a lowly Diktaean herdsman[51]. Wilamowitz summed up the situation as follows: «A herdsman has vanished on Mt. Dikte, ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο. The other herdsmen tell a tale, as they would today, that a Nereid got him. But back then a Nereid was no devil, and being transported to fairy-land did not cost one one's eternal bliss, it bestowed it. The herdsmen will now sing a ballad on the abduction of Astakides, and he will become a ἥρως αἰπολικός, as Daphnis was before him»[52].

Gow and Page found the epigram «puzzling», and suspected that it was simply «a joke, though if so the point is ... lost» (*ad loc.*). I believe that their suspicion was correct. But in order to get the joke, we must look (as in the two funerary epigrams treated above) beyond the poem itself for additional information. Here, however, our search takes us beyond even the poem's immediate vicinity on the scroll. It leads into the broader literary landscape of Hellenistic Bucolic.

Pfeiffer observed (*ad loc.*) that the repeated οὐκέτι – at the start of v. 3, and after the bucolic diaeresis – recalls «anaphora bucolica». This type of repetition is a fairly common feature in Theocritus. I doubt, however, that Callimachus merely intended a general stylistic reference. Rather, he had a certain Eidyllion in mind. For «anaphora bucolica» is the specific, and very distinctive mark of one particular Theocritean song: the Daphnis-song in Theocritus 1 (vv. 64–142)[53]. Here it occurs 22 times in 78 verses, that is over 4 times as often as in any other poem by Theocritus. Moreover, it appears in 3 of the first 4 verses of the song, thus constituting a kind of metrical signature. Given that the anaphora of

---

«Horaz und die hellenistische Lyrik», *NJA* 21 (1908) 85–86. On *isonumia*, the reuse of a family name over several generations, cf. Svenbro, *op. cit.* (n. 21 above) ch. 4, «The Child as Signifier».

[51] Cf. *H. Art.* 170–182, where the poet adopts the guise of a simple farmer, and where – as here – that guise actually has to do with literature, not farming. On this passage cf. P. Bing (*op. cit.* n. 47 above) 83–89.

[52] «Ein Hirt ist im Diktäischen Gebirge verschwunden, ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο. Da erzählen sich die Hirten, was sie sich auch heute erzählen würden, eine Nereide hat ihn geholt. Aber damals war die Nereide kein Teufel, und die Entrückung ins Feenland kostete nicht die ewige Seligkeit, sondern verlieh sie. Die Hirten werden nun eine Ballade vom Raube des Astakides singen, er wird ein ἥρως αἰπολικός werden, wie es bisher Daphnis war». *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* (Berlin 1906) 176 n. 1. For this topic generally cf. W. R. Conner, «Seized by the Nymphs: Nympholepsy and Symbolic Expression in Classical Greece», *CA* 7.2 (1988) 155–189, on our poem esp. p. 165 f.

[53] E. A. Schmidt, *Bukolische Leidenschaft* (Frankfurt 1987) 93 with n. 65, has likewise pointed to the influence of Theocritus 1 for the «anaphora bucolica» of Ep. 22, but does so without seeing the consequences for our understanding of Callimachus' poem.

οὐκέτι in our epigram also occurs in connection with Daphnis (οὐκέτι Δάφνιν ... ἀεισόμεθα, vv. 3–4)[54], that the speaker presents himself as a ποιμήν (ποιμένες ... ἀεισόμεθα v. 4) like Thyrsis in *Idyll* 1 (vv. 7, 15), and that in both poems the song is performed under tree-cover (ὑπὸ δρυσίν ~ ὑπὸ τὰν πτελέαν Theocr. 1.21)[55], it seems likely that Callimachus was directly alluding to – perhaps gently mocking – that song: as though to say «enough already with Daphnis! ... enough![56]»

This tone of gentle mockery fits perfectly with that of the rest of the poem. The exaltation of the goatherd – «the lowest grade of herdsman», according to Gow (*ad* Theocr. 1.86) – to heroic status is expressed with a witty turn: the nymph abducted Astakides, and now ... The pause after καὶ νῦν at the caesura arouses our anticipation: «and now» ... what? The position of ἱερὸς immediately following is thus emphatic. Placed thus, it becomes the comic contrast to the αἰπόλος that Astakides was[57]. Further, with the bucolic scene set in Crete rather than Sicily (where the Daphnis legend is usually set), and with the speaker a Cretan herdsman, we would do well to look out for tricks. Though the speaker claims that herdsmen «will sing *evermore* of Astakides» (Ἀστακίδην δ' αἰὲν ἀεισόμεθα, v. 4), this previously unattested Astakides does not in fact appear in poetry ever again: Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται. In the short space of this epigram, however, he is ubiquitous! The threefold repetition of his name[58] (which incidentally means «son of a lobster»), each time at an emphatic position[59], seems exaggerated – a case of goatherd-boosterism run riot. Surely it strikes a humorous note[60]. In short, I believe that in this epigram Callimachus was poking fun at Theocritus not just for the «anaphora bucolica» of the Daphnis song, but for what has been called «the most prominent single characteristic of Theokritos' style», his well-known taste for repetition[61].

---

[54] For the anaphora in οὐκέτι, compare Theocritus 1.116–117: ὁ βουκόλος ὔμμιν ἐγὼ Δάφνις οὐκέτ' ἀν' ὕλαν,/ οὐκετ' ἀνὰ δρυμώς Has Callimachus deliberately reversed Theocritus' anaphora from buc. diaer. + verse-start to verse-start + buc. diaer.?

[55] The setting of the Daphnis-song ὑπὸ τὰν πτελέαν in Theocritus 1 is right across from a place ἅπερ ὁ θῶκος / τῆνος ὁ ποιμενικὸς καὶ ταὶ δρύες (vv. 22–23). This sounds curiously like *Callimachus'* setting (ποιμένες singing ὑπὸ δρυσίν). Did the poet of the epigram pointedly set his herdsmen's song at a site that recalled the unused one just opposite in Theocritus? Allusions such as those considered here and in the previous note would – in the narrowness of their focus, the detail of their reference – virtually preclude detection and appreciation if experienced aurally (e.g. if one merely heard this epigram at a symposium). As stressed in connection with the Midas epigram in Plato's *Phaedrus* (cf. p. 117 sq. above), one needs the texts, and time to examine them, to get the most out of Ergänzungsspiel.

[56] Callimachus seems to be contrasting the luckless love of Daphnis with Astakides' successful consummation. Herdsmen will hereafter sing only of love fulfilled.

[57] ἱερὸς is pointed, moreover, because it denotes what belongs to the god (something dedicated to the god), which human hands may no longer lay claim to. Astakides now belongs entirely to the nymph and is no longer fair game for human affections.

[58] Might Callimachus here be alluding to another poem by Theocritus, namely the *Hylas*? There a heroized victim of nympholepsy is likewise named three times (13.58–59), apparently as an *aition* of the triple cry in the Hylas-cult, cf. Gow *ad loc.*

[59] Verse-start, verse-end, and right before the caesura.

[60] Threefold repetition of a name is entirely atypical of Callimachus. The poet generally avoids repetition of names by using patronymics or ethnica (e.g. epigrams 2.1, 4; 6.1, 4; 10.1, 3; 27.3, 4). Cf. F. Lapp, *De Callimachi Cyrenaei Tropis et Figuris* (Bonn 1965) 25: «ad nomina propria sive vitanda sive varianda Callimachus saepissime ea circumscriptione utitur, cui nomen est antonomasiae».

[61] Cf. K. J. Dover, *Theocritus. Select Poems* (Glasgow 1971) xlv: «The most prominent single characteristic of Theokritos' style is his repetition or partial repetition of words.»

As already mentioned, this instance of Ergänzungsspiel looks rather different from that in our previous examples. There, the game was sparked by the fact that, in the ever more literary epigrams of the Hellenistic period, the *deixis* of the old inscriptional poems lost its real point of reference. But the Hellenistic poets were able to turn this referential vacuum to advantage, and give it appeal, by inviting their readers to supply the missing references themselves. Here, on the other hand, the references which must be supplied are not to some concrete object or place, but rather to another work of literature. No doubt this is Ergänzungsspiel in an extended sense. But I would see in it a different manifestation of what is essentially the selfsame game. For its motive force is the same: a preference for the kind of text that Barthes has (perversely) termed «writerly», i. e. one that puts the reader to work (*if* of course he is so inclined), allowing him to be «no longer [just] a consumer, but a producer of the text»[62]. This preference in fact represents a typical trait of Hellenistic poetry, for the authors of the age ask their readers to supply a great deal. They are expected to recognize, and bring to the text an understanding, not just of *literary* allusions (as above), but of those to history, geography, medicine, religion, etc. And this too can be considered a type of Ergänzungsspiel. The words of Wolfgang Iser could well describe the particular pleasure of Hellenistic poetry: «Reading becomes fun,» he says, «only then, when we play a productive role, and that means when texts give us the chance to use our abilities»[63].

[62] R. Barthes, *op. cit.* (n. 20 above) 4. This as opposed to the «readerly» text, which forms «the enormous mass of our literature» (p. 5) wherein the reader is «plunged into a kind of idleness» (p. 4), and in which reading is merely «the reactive complement of a writing which we endow with all the glamour of creation and anteriority» (p. 10). «We call any readerly text a classic text» (p. 4).

[63] *Op. cit.* (n. 27 above) 176: «Das Lesen wird erst dort zum Vergnügen, wo unsere Produktivität ins Spiel kommt, und das heisst, wo Texte eine Chance bieten, unsere Vermögen zu betätigen.»