



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Callimachus on Aratus' Sleepless Nights

Author(s): Alan Cameron

Source: *The Classical Review*, Jun., 1972, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Jun., 1972), pp. 169-170

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/708361>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

The Classical Association and *Cambridge University Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Review*

In the light of those considerations there seems to be a strong case for listing one Euthycles as envoy to Persia in 367 and 333.¹

University of Sheffield

D. J. MOSLEY

EMPEDOCLES, HERA, AND *CRATYLUS* 404 c

To Professor Guthrie's discussion (*Hist. of Greek Philosophy*, ii. 144–6) of the allocation of the four Empedoclean elements to the four divinities Zeus, Aidoneus, Hera, and Nestis might be added a small point in favour of his decision that Hera is most probably to be associated with Air rather than with Earth.

Plato writes in the etymology section of his *Cratylus* that 'the name [Hera] may have been given when the legislator was thinking of the heavens, and may only be a disguise

of the air, putting the end in place of the beginning. You will recognize the truth of this if you repeat the letters of Hera several times over' (404 c, trans. Jowett). Plato's somewhat whimsical manner of expressing the relationship (*ἡραῖρα* becoming *ἀήρᾶήρ*) is perfectly typical of the mood of this section of the *Cratylus* and need by no means imply that there was not a real connection in his mind between the goddess and the element.

University of South Carolina

ROSAMOND K. SPRAGUE

CALLIMACHUS ON ARATUS' SLEEPLESS NIGHTS

CALLIMACHUS concludes his famous (if puzzling) epigram on Aratus (*A.P.* ix. 507 = xxvii Pfeiffer = lvi Gow and Page) with the words

χαίρετε λεπταί
ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη.

Or so at any rate the *Palatinus*. Two 'Lives' of Aratus (by Theon and Achilleus) offer instead *σύγγονος ἀγρυπνίης*, whence Ruhnken's banal *σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης*, approved by Wilamowitz, Pfeiffer, Beckby, and now Gow and Page. Yet *σύγγονος ἀγρυπνίης* (adequately condemned by Bentley) is a shaky foundation on which to build, since (as Kaibel saw²) the *ἀγρυπνίης* is best explained as a deliberate correction of the Palatine *ἀγρυπνίη* to harmonize with a *ΣΥΝΤΟΝΟΣ* misread as *ΣΥΝΤΟΝΟΣ*.

Furthermore, as G. Lohse has recently observed,³ in the Byzantine epigram *A.P.* ix. 689. 2, on which Ruhnken's emendation largely rests, *σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης* is used in a wholly different sense and context. Lohse concludes, rightly, that *σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη* is

what Callimachus wrote, describing Aratus' poem, the product of 'intense sleepless nights', by the effort⁴ which produced it. Compare the similar use of *πόνος* in both Callimachus (lv Gow/Page) and Asclepiades (xxviii Gow/Page, with their note).

In corroboration I draw attention to an early witness to the Palatine text hitherto overlooked. The preface to the (probably mid-fifth-century) 'Life of St. Melania' includes in a long list of the great lady's remarkable qualities *τὴν τε σύντονον αὐτῆς ἀγρυπνίαν καὶ χαμευνίαν ἀνένδοτον* (ed. D. Gorce, 1962, p. 126). Now *ἀγρυπνία* by itself is an obvious enough, indeed almost inevitable, virtue to ascribe to a saint, but with the epithet *σύντονος* the only other example is Callimachus' epigram. Surely an echo of Callimachus, *ἀγρυπνία* suggesting *σύντονος*. I have not noticed any other classical quotations in the 'Life', but the preface is where one would expect the author to offer all he had. A hagiographer of the following century, Cyril of Scythopolis, tells us that he was quite unable to compose the

¹ I am grateful to the Research Fund Committee of Sheffield University for its support.

² *Hermes*, xxix (1894), 121.

³ *Hermes*, xvc (1967), 379–81.

⁴ On this sense of *ἀγρυπνία* see too now J. Robert, *R.E.G.* lxxx (1967), 286–7. Mr. A. H. Griffiths draws my attention to the

note in F. Jacobs' edn. of *A.P.* (not his *Animadv.* to Brunck's edn.) quoting Theoph. Sim. *Ep.* 54, where Medea tells Jason that his *σύντονος ἀγρυπνία* *παρόχηκε*, viz. that he does not stay awake at nights thinking of her the way he used to. Once more (in a cultivated Egyptian writer) surely an echo of Callimachus.

preface to his 'Life of St. Euthymius' till the Saint himself appeared in a dream and anointed Cyril's lips with the appropriate inspirational fluid.

We know that Callimachus was still widely read in the late Empire (see Pfeiffer,

Callimachus, ii, pp. xxxii-xxxiii), and even if the author of the 'Life of Melania' had read little or none on his own initiative, he is bound to have had some thrust on him at school (cf. Palladas, *A.P.* ix. 175. 1, and Damascius, *Vita Isidori*, frag. 282, p. 227. 10 f. Zintzpen).

Bedford College, London

ALAN CAMERON

ZENO'S COSMOLOGY?

IN the ninth book of his *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers*, Chapter 29, Diogenes Laërtius attributes to Zeno of Elea the following physical theory (D.-K. 29 a 1):

ἀρέσκει δ' αὐτῷ τάδε· κόσμους εἶναι κενόν τε μὴ εἶναι· γεγενῆσθαι δὲ τὴν τῶν πάντων φύσιν ἐκ θερμοῦ καὶ ψυχροῦ καὶ ξηροῦ καὶ ὕγροῦ, λαμβανόντων αὐτῶν εἰς ἄλληλα τὴν μεταβολήν· γένεσίν τε ἀνθρώπων ἐκ γῆς εἶναι, καὶ ψυχὴν κράμα ὑπάρχειν ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων κατὰ μηδενὸς τούτων ἐπικράτησιν.

The ascription of these views to the Eleatic Zeno has been widely condemned by scholars. The belief in a plurality of worlds certainly cannot be attributed to an Eleatic. And, as Zeller has pointed out, there is evidence which suggests that Zeno wrote only the one work, and the utter silence of Aristotle and his commentators as to any physical utterances on the part of Zeno shows that none was known to them. It is Zeller's opinion that this ascription of a plurality of worlds to Zeno of Elea stems from the confusion between him and Zeno of Citium and that otherwise Diogenes' testimony records the former's agreement with the doctrines of Parmenides.¹ But this belief is both complicated and unconvincing. The following theory is attributed to both Melissus and Zeno by Stobaeus (i. 127 *Dox.* p. 303):

Μέλισσος καὶ Ζήνων τὸ ἓν καὶ πᾶν, καὶ μόνον αἰδιον καὶ ἀπειρον τὸ ἓν. καὶ τὸ μὲν

¹ *A History of Presocratic Philosophy* (tr. S. F. Alleyne, London, 1881), i. 611 n. 2.

² Cf., e.g., F. W. Sturz, *Empedocles Agrigentinus* (Leipzig, 1805), p. 168.

³ Aristotle, apparently, had this practice of Zeno in mind when he called him, if we can trust Diogenes Laërtius (viii. 57 [D.-K. 29 a 10] and ix. 25 [D.-K. 29 a 1]), the 'inventor of dialectic'. Although Aristotle's remark on the *Sophist* may well have been a good deal less specific than Diogenes' comment here implies (cf. Sex. Emp. *adv. math.* vii. 6 and Quint. iii. 1. 8 [D.-K. 31 a

ἐν τὴν ἀνάγκην, ὅλην δὲ αὐτῆς τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα, εἶδη δὲ τὸ νεῖκος καὶ τὴν φιλίαν. λέγει δὲ καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα θεοὺς καὶ τὸ μῖγμα τούτων τὸν κόσμον. καὶ ἴπροστ ἀναλυθήσεται τὸ μονοειδές· καὶ θείας μὲν οἶεται τὰς ψυχάς, θείους δὲ καὶ τοὺς μετέχοντας αὐτῶν καθαρῶς καθαρῶς.

Both of these accounts, as may now more clearly be seen, seem to represent a garbled account of Empedocles' physics.

Certain scholars, making allowance for the accommodation and misrepresentation, have correctly realized this and it has been suggested that the name of Empedocles has been omitted from the text of Stobaeus.² But this latter suggestion is quite unnecessary. Since Zeno's procedure was provisionally to accept a thesis of his opponents and then to refute it by deducing intolerable consequences from it,³ this confusion in the doxographic tradition between him and Empedocles could readily be explained if Zeno had, in fact, devised arguments specifically in opposition to the Empedoclean form of pluralism, as part of his arguments against plurality generally.⁴ It is noteworthy, too, that the *Suda*, enumerating what are believed to be the works of the Eleatic Zeno, ascribes to him a treatise entitled 'Ἐξήγησις τῶν Ἐμπεδοκλέους (D.-K. 29 a 2). It has been argued that this cannot possibly be a genuine work, since Zeno would hardly have written a commentary upon a pluralist whose work was patently written to circum-

19]), the evidence which may be accepted for Zeno's method has one important element in common with dialectic as conceived by Plato and Aristotle, namely the practice of refuting an opposing thesis by deducing intolerable consequences from it.

⁴ Upon this assumption the report in Epiph. *Adv. Haer.* 1087 c Pet.: *Dox.* p. 590 (Ζήνων ὁ Ἐλεάτης ὁ ἐριστικός ἴσα τῷ ἐτέρῳ Ζήνωνι καὶ τὴν γῆν ἀκίνητον λέγει καὶ μηδὲνα τόπον κενὸν εἶναι) can easily be explained. It is most unlikely that we have here a confusion between the two Zenos, as Zeller thinks.