

imprescindibile e approfondito, delle due lingue antiche la giusta e ben fondata motivazione all'interno del sistema educativo nazionale facendo leva sulla finalità di una "formazione generale" in questa prospettiva autenticamente antica¹².

Università degli Studi di Verona
gherardo.ugolini@univr.it

¹² Riferimento alle riforme scolastiche realizzate dai governi della Repubblica di Weimar, in particolare a quella del 1924 (riforma Richter) che aveva ridotto l'incidenza del greco e del latino nell'offerta formativa a vantaggio del tedesco e sostenendo un orientamento per cui lo studio delle lingue era concepito in una prospettiva storico-culturale come strumento per comprendere la civiltà [NDT].

KYRIAKOS TSANTSANOGLIOU

CALLIMACHUS, POSIDIPPUS, HEDYLUS, 'SOCLES', AND XAPIΣ¹

Callim. ep. 13 Pf. (*AP* VII 524) ~ Posidipp. 140 AB (IX G.-P., *AP* XII 168)
~ Hedyl. VI G.-P. (Ath. XI 473ab)

ABSTRACT

The author proposes a novel interpretation of three Hellenistic epigrams, all reflecting the competitive poetic milieu of the Alexandria Mouseion during the reigns of Ptolemy II Philadelphus and Ptolemy III Euergetes. Callimachus' ep. 13 Pf. is a stinging satire against Posidippus, the Pellaeon epigrammatist, in which the Cyrenaean poet, exploiting popular beliefs and a witty wordplay, declares that the only pleasant thing in Hades is that Posidippus is not heard. The criticism seems to depend on literary evaluation as well as on aesthetic theory, but a personal antipathy can hardly be concealed. This antipathy of the erotic and drinker poet to the self-restrained and sober poet must lie in Posidippus' epigram 140 AB, a self-referential apologetic and confessional poem, where, with one or two minor emendations, the poet admits his shortcomings and promises to change over to the opposite camp—rather metaphorically than in truth. The general term that covers the differences between the two poets is *χάρις*, 'grace, charm, delight'. So Callimachus in ep. 13 renames himself playfully *Χαρίδως*, and Posidippus in ep. 140 AB promises "to indulge in the future in a not too charmless (*ἄχαριν*) eros, whether sober or drunk". An unknown poet named *Σωκλῆς* is also characterized by *χάρις* in the epigram VI G.-P. of Hedylus. Francesca Angiò has felicitously suggested that *Σωκλῆς* must be a pseudonym since he is compared with Asclepiades under the latter's pseudonym *Σικελίδας*. She proposed that the pseudonym can stand for Posidippus, but the whole description fits well Callimachus. Like Callimachus, Socles is a heavy drinker, more pleasant and more vigorous in his playfulness than Asclepiades, but significantly, in his playful poems ἐπὶ Ἀίαντι ἡ *χάρις*, Callimachus' key attribute. The only historical Socles, whose name might be possibly appropriated by Callimachus, is an otherwise unknown Corinthian, whose speech in an assembly of Sparta's allies in 506 BCE is recorded in Hdt. V 92–93. He attacked the Spartans for planning to impose tyranny on Athens, reminding the adverse experience of his compa-

¹ A short version of the first part of the present article has been published in Greek under the title *Ο δίδωτος τῶν ποιητῶν in Δημητρίῳ στέρωνος*, Festschrift for D. Ly-pourlis, Thessaloniki 2004, pp. 217–232; see S. PAPAIOANNOU in *BMCR* 2007.01.19.

trios under the tyrannic rules of Cypselus and Periander in the archaic period. The unusually emotional style of the speech and its legendary narrative must have fascinated Callimachus who may have found the situations narrated in the speech parallel to his hometown's recent history. Cyrene, from independence and self-government passed over to foreign despotic rule, a state of affairs adversely affecting Callimachus and his aristocratic family. The pen name Σωκράτης must function differently than the other disguised personal names inside specific poems, like Βαρτιάδης and Χαγιάδας, furively indicating a patriotic identity.

Ἡ ῥ' ὑπὸ σοὶ Χαγιάδας ἀναπαύεται, «εἰ τὸν Ἀρίμμη
τοῦ Κυρηναίου παῖδα λέγεις, ὑπ' ἐμὸν».
ὦ Χαγιάδα, τί τὰ νέσθεις; «πολὺ σκότος». αἱ δ' ἄνοδοι τί;
«ψευδός». ὁ δὲ Πλούτων; «μῦθος». ἀπαλόμεθα.
«οὐτός ἐμός λόγος ὕμνῳ ἀληθινός· εἰ δὲ τὸν ἦδ' οὖν
βοῦλε, Πελλαίου βοῦς μέγας εἰν Αἰδῇ.»

Callimachus' well-known funerary epigram, fictitious or not, has been widely discussed, especially for the meaning of the phrase Πελλαίου βοῦς μέγας that closes the poem, and which evidently forms its culminating point. The prevailing and most plausible, in my view, interpretation goes back to a note of Fr. Jacobs²: "In Hades, you can buy a big ox with a Pellaeon". Πελλαίου is thought to denote the obol of Pella, the metropolitan capital of the Macedonian kingdom, in the genitive of value. The popular belief for a proverbial cheapness in the Underworld was very widespread. Two similar proverbs are recorded in the *Lexicon* of Photius: ε 1854 Theod. ἐπὶ τὰ τοῦ ὀβολοῦ χίμαρα· ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν Αἰδου ἐρημίας³, and ο 12 Theod. ὀβολοῦ χίμαρα ἐν Αἰδου, with no interpretation, but with obvious meaning. It is a transfer of the usual proverbial expression δέκα τοῦβολοῦ (the number may change) to the Underworld, for denoting something worthless or someone insignificant (cf. 'ten a penny', 'a dime a dozen'). The sense is that there is nothing worth buying, nothing valuable or essential in Hades, an absolute

ἐρημία, a "desolate market where none come to buy", in William Blake's famous quote. Callimachus makes fun of the belief in the opening of his *Lambi* (191.2 Pf), where Hipponax appears to have come back to this world ἐκ τῶν ὅκου βοῶν κολλύβου πτηνέοι, in other words, from Hades. Ath. XIV 646c quotes a Pherecrates fragment (86 K.-A.) from Κρατάρων, which has also been associated with this belief, though neither its text can be safely restored nor its meaning easily interpreted:

λήγει δ' ἐν Αἰδου κρατάρων {τριωβόλου} καὶ ψωθία.
τριωβόλου del. Meineke olim (acc. Kaibel), deinde revocavit

The only certain thing is that κρατάρων (a kind of small fish, used also of μωρός) and ψωθίον or -θία, ἥ, (small crumb, morsel), both words denoting worthless items, are employed by the comedian as trifling currency used in Hades. Poll. 9.83 refers to the same comedy: λέγει δὲ (sc. Pherecrates) τὸν μὲν κρατάρων εἶναι ἐν Αἰδου ὄραγμα, ἔχειν δ' αὐτὸν ὀκτὼ ψωθίας. Then, Pherecrates' passage can be read

λήγει δ' ἐν Αἰδου κρατάρων τριωβόλου
καὶ ψωθία (or -θίας),

meaning "you'll buy in Hades a κρατάρων worth one drachma (i.e., six obols) plus some extra ψωθία for only three obols, i.e., less than half-price" or, with ψωθίας gen., "for only three obols and one ψωθία".

However, nowhere is Πελλαίος ὀβολός attested, nor is the simple adjective Πελλαίος found to mean obol or any other coin. This is the reason why Kaibel proposed that an implied βοός should be understood beside Πελλαίου⁴; namely, that one can buy a big ox with an ox of Pella. According to Kaibel, Πελλαίος βοός must have been a specific coin of Pella depicting an ox. It was named so, just as the Attic drachmas were named by Aristophanes, *Av.* 1106, γλαυκὴς Δαυρεωτικά, from the owl depicted on the coins and the silver of Laureion they were made of, and as coins of other cities were named πῶλοι, χελῶναι (Poll. 9.74) et al. This is a common practice all over the world, and so, for instance, the

² *Anthologia Graeca ad fidem codicis olim Palatini nunc Parisini*, vol. III, Lipsiae 1817, p. 356; the interpretation was approved by Aug. MEINEKE, *Callimachi Cyrenensis Hymni et Epigrammata*, Beroolini 1861, p. 273, and the note was reproduced in Fr. DÜBNER, *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina*, vol. I, Paris 1871, p. 483.

³ In the past, I have attempted several conjectures for ἐρημίας (εὐωνίας, εὐθε/ην(ε)ίας, εὐρέλειας). I now believe that no emendation is needed.

⁴ «Hermes» 31 (1896), pp. 265-266.

méγas, which, in his view, means that one can buy a big ox with a coin of dark ox leather.¹¹ There is only scant evidence about leather coins in antiquity, mainly in Sparta¹², but I cannot understand why one should resort to such an intricate interpretation, when a substantivized Πελλαδίον may well mean 'Macedonian coin'.

One might imagine that the problem is definitely solved here. But the information imparted by Callimachus through his epigram or by the dead Charidas from his grave would not be worthy of the poet's characteristic wit. It is natural that Charidas, in his pragmatism, indicates cheapness as the only pleasant thing in Hades, but adopting popular fabulous beliefs is completely inconsistent with the approach of death in the previous verses. Since Charidas rejects soul immortality, he cannot, at the same time, call attention to the inexpensiveness in the Underworld. If there is nothing down there, who will buy oxen and from whom? This does not mean rationalizing the meaning of the poem, because the rationalist is clearly the dead Charidas. In any case, the true but unpleasant words of Charidas are opposed to his ἡδὺς λόγος, from which his interlocutor was supposed to derive comfort. Callimachus is playfully exploiting the motif of the cheapness in Hades, in order to report something pleasant but consistent with the eschatological nihilism of Charidas. Similarly, in the playful epigram 4 Pf. (*AP* VII 317), the dead misanthrope Timon declares that things are worse in Hades because people are more numerous there:

Τίμων, οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἔοσι, τί τοι, σκότορος ἢ φάος, ἐχθρόν;
'τὸ σκότορος· ὕμνων γὰρ πλείονες εἰν Αἰδῇ.'

The expression βούς μέγας, as Stadtmüller¹³ remarked and Grande reminded (whose overall interpretations, however, I do not

¹¹ «Hermes» 118 (1990), pp. 314-324.

¹² *FGH* 90 F 103 (Nicol. Damasc.) νομίσματα δὲ χρῶνται σκυρίῳ (sc. the Spartans) ἐὰν δὲ παρὰ τινι εὐπεθεῖ χρυσὸς ἢ ἀργυρὸς, θανάτῳ ἡμνοῦνται. Sen. *De beneficiis* 5.14.4 *ais alienum habere dicitur et qui aureos debet et qui corium forma publica percussum, quale apud Lacedaemonios fuit, quod usum numerariae pecuniae praestat*.

¹³ *Anthologia Graeca Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*, II 1 Lipsiae 1899, pp. 366-367: «τὸν ἡδὺν λόγον, quippe abhorrentem a rei veritate sibi proferre nefas apud inferos dicit Charidas».

¹⁴ «REG» 82 (1969), pp. 380-389, «REG» 85 (1972), pp. 57-62 = *Scripta minora Alexandrina* III, Amsterdam 1984, pp. 27-42; Πελλαδίου βούς μέγας coll. Ηούχ. π

adopt)¹⁴, denotes also 'silence': Aesch. *Ag.* 36-7 βούς ἐπὶ γλώσση μέγας βέβηκε, Stratis com. fr. 72 K.-A. βούς ἐμβαλὴν μέγας, and without μέγας, *Theogn.* 815 βούς μοι ἐπὶ γλώσση κρατερῶ πτοδὶ λαῖς ἐπιβαίνων, Callim. fr. 110 (Βερενίκης πλόκαμος), 72 βούς ἔπος (sc. οὐτὶς ἐπύθει), Philostratus *Vita Apoll.* 6.11.27 γλώτταν τε ... ζυνέοιγε (sc. Pythagoras) βούν ἐπ' αὐτῇ σωτῆς εὐρὼν δόγμα. Here too, the action of the proverbial expression was thought to be the Athenian or Delian coin that showed an ox; in other words, εἴ τις ἐπ' ἀργυρίῳ σωτήσοιεν (Poll. 9.62). This is the interpretation eventually suggested by Livrea. The dark leather coin, in his opinion, is the one buried with the dead, usually placed in his mouth, to be used as Charon's fare. With this coin one can buy, according to the legend, a big ox in Hades – but isn't the coin already paid to Charon? –, but in fact what one buys is the eternal silence.

The image of a huge and weighty object (βου-) that presses the tongue and inhibits speaking must have been used in other areas too. βουγλώσσον is a surgical instrument, perhaps tongue-depressor, according to LSJ s.v.¹⁵ It is also a plant, borage, whose leaf is ὅμοιον βοῦς γλώσση (Diosc. 4.127.1) or *borum linguae similis* (Plin. *HN* XXV 81), as well as a flat fish like a sole, obviously for the same reason. At the same time, however, it was believed that the product of its mixture, whether plant or fish, with other herbs and medicinal substances φμοκάτροχόν ἐστιν μέγιστον πρὸς ἐχθροῦς (*Cyran.* 2.43.11), i.e., it keeps them silent. Further, the plant was identified with ἄγχουσα, alkanet, used for rouging the cheeks, but ἄγχω, 'squeeze the throat, strangle', means also 'put to silence': Dem. 19.208 τοῦτο παραιρεῖται τὴν θρασύτητα τὴν τούτων, τοῦτ' ἀποστρέφει τὴν γλώτταν, ἐμφράττει τὸ στόμα, ἄγγει, σιωπᾶν ποιεῖ.

Livrea, very penetratively, remarks that the meaning of the epigram is structured in two levels: «la gradevole e paradossale menzogna con cui si conclude il suo consolato Bericht appartiene solo al primo livello della boutade che con il suo doppio senso costituisce la punta finale, il vil pregio delle cose nell'Ade, mentre il secondo livello esprime un'amara verità in perfetta sintonia con il pessimismo di tutta la conversazione epigramma-

1339 Πελλαδίου. Ποσειδῶν ἐν Κυβήρῃ. "Cela est la vérité (désagréable) si tu veux entendre de ma bouche un agréable mensonge, le grand boeuf est – en tant que victime envoyée au dieu infernal Pellanos – aux enfers (c'est-à-dire en ma compagnie) et il m'impose de cesser de parler".

¹⁵ H. SCHOENE, *Zwei Listen chirurgischer Instrumente*, «Hermes» 38 (1903), pp. 280-284.

tica». I fully agree about the two levels in the poem's purport as well as that the second level must be in tune with the rest of the dialogue, to be, that is, nihilistic or possibly pragmatic. But I disagree with the view that the truth that this second level is expressing must be bitter and pessimistic, since the dead man describes it as ἡδὺν λόγον, pleasant both for himself and for the passerby who is seeking information about Hades.

At any rate, whatever sense, literal, figurative or connotative, we give to Πελλαίου, both masculine and neuter genitive form of the ethnic adjective, its main significance is 'native of Pella'. Applying then the reasoning discussed above to the epigram's last verse, Callimachus' 'punta finale' should state that 'the only pleasant thing in Hades is that there is silence of the Pellaean'. The genitive is subjective: 'the Pellaean keeps silence' or 'the Pellaean is not heard'. In the superficial level of the doubtless entendre, what prevails is the playful reference to the folk belief about cheapness in Hades; but, in the latent level, the dominant idea is a self-referential poetic antipathy tainted with caustic irony and sarcasm. Who was the most famous Pellaean to whom Callimachus would refer with his gentile, without mentioning his name, and, what is more, with a wordplay, obviously wishing to avoid a straight reference? There was a Pellaean in the same circle as Callimachus, a fellow poet, and this was Posidippus, the Pellaean epigrammatist¹⁶.

Why is Posidippus the target of Callimachus' arrows? It is known that the Pellaean was one of Callimachus' opponents in the well-known Hellenistic conflict about the prescriptions as to the composition of a successful poem. The Florentine Scholia on Callimachus' *Aetia*, fr. 1 Pf. (PSI 1219, fr. 1.3 ff.), include him in the list of the Telchines: Διονυσίοις δὲ στίχῳ, τῷ εἰλίῳ c. 12]νι κ(αί) τῷ ἰαείῳ κ(αί) Ἀσκληπιάδῃ τῷ Σικελίδῃ κ(αί) Πτοσειδάρῳ τῷ οὐλίῳ c. 12]νιστῶ τῷ ὀήτορ κ(αί) Ἀντίῳ c. 12]βῶ κ(αί) Πραξιφάνῃ τῷ Μιτρίῳ ληναίῳ, τοῖς μελμοῖσιν(έν)οις αὐτοῦ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν τῶν ποιητῶν κ(αί) ὅτι οὐκ ἡνίκος ἦσαν κτλ. One or two easy supplements or emendations might be added: 4 τῷ εἰλίῳ, 'the husband of his wife's sister' (Μανοῦ (?) Pfeiffer, *Idyllon Gallavotti*); given that Pollux 3.32 describes the term as poetic (παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς), the characterization may belong to Callimachus meaning his own unknown sister-in-law's husband; we shall deal

below with 5-6 τῷ οὐλίῳ c. 12]¹⁷; 9 οὐκ ἡνίκος ἦσαν | πρὸς θεῶν (e.g.), ἀλλὰ κτλ. ('he did not love giving first place to length, but ...'). Despite several conscientious efforts, the two Dionysii remain unknown, as well as the rhetor]-γρίππος (rather Πύριππος than Ταύριππος or Μύριππος). Of the scholars who could be familiar with Callimachus, the only one who has an appellation ending in]βος is Διονύσιος ὁ Ταύβος, a grammarian who is mentioned in the Suda, together with Callimachus, as teacher of Aristophanes of Byzantium; none, however, whose name starts with Ἀναλ. The rest of the names are, however, more or less familiar to us. Related with their opposition to Callimachus and his short poems is their praise of the Colophonian poet Antimachus. Both Asclepiades and Posidippus have written epigrams in praise of Antimachus' *Lyde* (AP IX 63, XII 168), whereas Callimachus criticized it bitterly in an epigram (fr. 398 Pf.). It has also been proposed that *Lyde* is the μενῶλη ... γυνή allusively mentioned in the poem of *Aetia* (12), an identification that cannot be accepted¹⁸. The Peripatetic Praxiphanes wrote Περὶ ποιητῶν and Περὶ ποιημάτων, where he may have dealt with the same matter. It is believed, with great probability, that it is to such views that Callimachus reacted in his Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην.

I do not plan to enter into the well-known and overdiscussed issue, which traversed from Hellenistic into much later times¹⁹. Callimachus

¹⁷ See also V. GARULLI, *Posidippo in schol. Flor. Call. Aet. fr. 1 Pf.* (PSI XI 1219), «ZPE» 154 (2005), pp. 86-90.

¹⁸ M. PUELMA, «Mys. Helv.» 11 (1954), pp. 101-116. See K. TSANTSANOGLIOU, «ZPE» 163 (2007), pp. 27-36.

¹⁹ The theoretical discussion was paradigmatically focused on evaluating the poetry of Antimachus. Nicander, a Colophonian himself, must have dealt with it in his Περὶ τῶν ἐκ Κολοφώνος ποιητῶν. Dionysius Phasaelites wrote also a book Περὶ τῆς Ἀντιμάχου ποιήσεως. Age obstacles do not allow his identification with one of the Dionysii in the Telchines list, though there exists one more dissent of Dionysius Phasaelites from a view of Callimachus (*Sch. in Bacch. Dith.* 23, POxy. 2368). Antipater (rather of Sidon), AP VII 409, writes a laudatory epigram for Antimachus, who also lends his name for an obscure epigram by Crates (AP XI 218). Cicero *Bru.* 191 describes Antimachus' *Lyde* as *magnum ... volumen* and *reconditum*. Catullus 95.9-10 highlights his poetic preferences: *parva mei mihi sint cordi monumenta Philitae: lat populus tumido gaudet Antimacho*. Plutarch, *Tim.* 36, describes Antimachus' poetry as ἐπεβλασφῆναι καὶ κατὰ τὸν νότον, 'forced and laboured', and *de garrul.* 513b, refers to him as a paradigm of garrulousness. Still in the fourth century CE, Gregory of Nazianzus wrote in a letter to Nicobolus (54): τὸ λακωνίζειν οὐ τοῦτο ἔστι, ὅπως οἱ ἐκ, ἀλλὰ καὶ συλλαβὰς γράφειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλεόντων ὀλίγους. Οὕτως ἐγὼ καὶ βραχυλόγησάμενος Ὀμηρον λέγω καὶ πολὺν τὸν Ἀντίμαχον. πῶς; τοῖς πλεονασμοῖς καὶ τῶν ὀλίγων τὸ μήκος, ἀλλ' οὐ τοῖς γράμμασι.

¹⁶ S. STEPHENS, *The battle of the books*, in *The New Posidippus*, ed. by K. GUTZWILLER, Oxford 2005, p. 231, n. 7, is the only one, to my knowledge, who also thought of Posidippus as Callimachus' target, though with a different interpretation: "If you want good news, you can get a large ox in exchange for a Pellaean (= Posidippus)."

theoretical argumentation on his poetics has not survived, but the strong self-referential propensity in his poetry recompenses for the loss. Whether seriously, as in the poem of *Aetia*, or playfully, as in epigram 13, his references to living poets are covert, with ambiguous hints and equivocal wordplays, addressed to few contemporary initiated intellectuals. The mutilated condition of the Florentine Scholia does not allow us to identify all the Telchines, whereas the discussion on the interpretation of *Aet.* fr. 1.10-12 still holds on.²⁰ So, missing more specific and unequivocal objective evidence, a more close literary reading of Callimachus' epigram may prove useful.

Charidas of Cyrene, son of Arimmas, declares from his grave that the only pleasant thing in Hades is that the voice of Posidippus of Pella is not heard. Charidas, who had been considered a real person and whose identification had been formerly attempted²¹, is but Callimachus' poetic image. It is quite natural that the Cyrenaean poet, consciously *χαρίεις*, *εὐχαρίς*, and *χαριεντίκουεος*, selected this name for his *persona*²². In the opening of his *Aetia*, he devotes to the Charites, possibly as a second *Dichterweihe*, the part next to the Muses (fr. 3-7), whom he met on Helicon. It is possible that, in addition to the Muses, he met also the Charites, whose hill (Ὀρέος Χαρίτων) at Cyrene he mentions more than once (fr. 7.8, 673). Could it be a visitation site, as are mountains and sacred groves in numerous cases of visionary poetic consecrations? Be that as it may, what cannot be denied is that Callimachus' work exhibits an ideal combination of the attributes related with the Muses and the Charites, Euripides' *ἡδίστατον στυβύλιον* (*HF* 675). Concerning Charidas, it is very significant that, at the *Aetia* Epilogue (fr. 112), Callimachus reveals this poetic device himself, when he explains to Apama, the queen mother, who apparently disfavoured and, as it seems, persecuted him, that using the patronymic of Battus (Βαττιάδης) and the matronymic of Charites (Χαρίδας) is no more than a poetic trick:

²⁰ See n. 18 above.

²¹ AL. HECKER, *Commentatio critica de Anthologia Graeca*, Lugduni Bat. 1843, pp. 267-268, proposed a certain *Εὐρυαπίδης*, who appears twice in fragments of Alexis, the first time as *Πυθαγορίδων*, the second as a spendthrift person; see also LIVREA, p. 323.

²² *Χαρίεις* is a common characterization of authors. Only in Athenaeus, the adjective *χαρίεις* accompanies Aniphanes, Alexis, repeatedly Aristophanes, Anacreon, while Xenophon is *χαριότατος* and the deipnosophistae themselves *χαριότατοι*. It has been claimed, possibly erroneously, that the name of the earliest surviving novelist Chariton of Aphrodisias was also a pseudonym introducing the new charming and graceful genre.

... ὅτ' ἐμὴ μοῦσα τίλη κομ[η]τάσεται (vel τίλη τεχν[η]άσεται)
 Βάτ[η]ρου καὶ Χαρίτων [θηερτ]ήϊα. μάϊαν ἀνάσσης
 ἡμε[τέρης], οὐ σε ψευδὸν [ἐστὶν οὐνό]ματι,
 5 πάντ' ἀγαθὴν καὶ πάντα τέλ[ε]α σφόδρον. εἰτ' ἐνοχο[ν] σ]ῆ
 ζεῖνον, τῷ Μοῦσαι πολλὰ νέμονται βορά
 σὺν μύθους ἐβόλοντο παρ' ἔχλ[η]ον ὀξέος ἱκτροῦ.

1 κομ[η]τάσεται Murray, τεχν[η]άσεται Coppola 2 Βάτ[η]ρου Bignone | [θηερτ]ή]ρια Tsan. | μάϊα leg. Coppola 3 ἡμε[τέρης] Murray, ὕμε[τέρης] v. Armin, Wil. | [ἐστὶν οὐνό]ματι Murray, alii alia 4 εἰτ' ἐνοχο[ν] σ]ῆ Tsan.

"(Don't loose your temper,) when my Muse will somehow boast about (or 'contrive') a parentage from Battus and Charites. I did not cheat you about the name, you, the rearer of our queen, in every respect a noble and powerful lady. Put the blame on that man, to whom, while he tended a large herd by the footprint of the swift horse, the Muses granted fictions." Callimachus had used the patronymic Βαττιάδης in *Ep.* 35, his own fictional epitaph. As for Χαρίδας, it is only in *Ep.* 13 that such a matronymic survives. The reference to Hesiod as the recipient of the poetic gift by the Muses is identical to the one in the *Dichterweihe* at the beginning of the *Aetia* (fr. 2). The ring structure is certainly not casual, but it highlights an essential element of the poetic performance. Callimachus combines his personal case with the *Aetia* in their entirety. The Muses introduced themselves to Hesiod as knowing (*Th.* 27) *ψευδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὄνοια*. Callimachus admits that he used false parental names by poetic license, just as he warns that the *aetia* he described are legendary accounts that do not constitute scientific evidence.

I shall not expand on the political factors that explain the persecution of a Cyrenaean for employing the patronymic Βαττιάδης in the time of Callimachus, an application that might suggest a return of Cyrene to the hereditary state constitution, mainly an aspiration to gain its independence from foreign rule. I have dealt with the question a few years ago, following S. A. White's key article on the subject.²³ What then about Ἀρίμματος, the name of Charidas' father? It could well be the true name

²³ S. A. WHITE, *Callimachus Battinades*, "CP" 94 (1999), pp. 168-181; K. TSANTSANOGLOU, *Callimachus Iambus XIII. A new reading*, "Trends in Classics" 2 (2010), pp. 77-114, esp. Appendix II, pp. 106-113.

of Callimachus' father, even though the poetic *persona* might be spoiled by becoming half-transparent. On the contrary, the poet should leave some indirect clues for making his *persona* recognizable, at least to the few cognoscenti. Actually, the particular name was convenient, as *Ἀπίμιας* occurs exclusively in Cyrene. *LGPV* lists 42 occurrences of the name (28 of *Ἀπίμιας*, gen. *Ἀπίμια*, and 15 of *Ἀπίμιαν*, gen. *Ἀπίμιαντος*), all from Cyrenaica²⁴. It might then be assumed that the poet used the name as a collective symbolic (and playful) designation for the whole of the Cyrenaicans, what is Fritz for the Germans, Tommy for the British, or Ivan for the Russians. Still, in that case, the combination *Ἀπίμια τοῦ Κυρηναίου* would be somewhat redundant. *Ἀδύμιας* is considered an abbreviated form, a *Kurzname* of a personal name composed of *Ἀδλ-* and a second element starting with *μ-*. W. Bechtel proposed *Ἀδύμιατος*, a common name which does not, however, occur but once in Cyrene. Numerous different proposals about the origin of the name were made: Greek, especially Macedonian, or non-Greek, Hebrew, Libyan, Iranian. O. Masson, who collected and studied the evidence, is very convincing in supporting the Greek/Doric origin²⁵. It is noticeable that Callimachus, by not mentioning his father's name in his works explicitly, leads to the belief that it was *Βάττος* not only the royal authorities of his time, but even impartial witnesses already since antiquity; e.g., Strabo XVII 3.21²⁶, Phot. *Bibl.* 239 p. 319b, Suda κ 227.

At Call. *Lamb.* 13.10, a greatly mutilated verse, a critic starts his attack against Callimachus for his audacity to write poems in the Ionic dialect and in choliambics though he was not an Ionian, with the words] $\omega\nu$ $\pi\rho\delta\alpha\beta\rho\epsilon$]²⁷. The metre demands that the syllable $\beta\rho\epsilon$ must be long, and one more syllable completes the choliambic verse. Pfeiffer proposed

²⁴ Arimmas, who was installed by Alexander as satrap of Syria and was replaced in 331 BCE, according to Arrian, 3.6.8, may also be Cyrenaean. It cannot be excluded that he is the same as the Cyrenaean general who is inscriptionally mentioned in 321 BCE: SEG IX 1, 78 + XVIII 726 (*Ἀπίμιας Θεόδωρος*). Given that Θεόδωρος is also a name of Callimachus' family (the brother of Callimachus' father was named so: SEG IX 50, 46), we may estimate that the satrap and/or general was one of Callimachus' great-grandfathers.

²⁵ «R. Ph.» iii.50 (1976), pp. 24–31.

²⁶ Actually, Strabo says only that Callimachus considers himself a descendant of Battus, an assertion that does not necessarily imply a particular name.

²⁷ Formerly, I had identified the critic with Phoenix of Colophon (K. TSANTSANOGLU, *Callimachus* *lambus* XIII, cit., pp. 104–106). I now confidently believe that the likeliest candidate is Zenodorus: K. TSANTSANOGLU, *Context of Poetry in Alexandria: Call. Ia. 1.13, Herod. Mim. 8, al., «Trends in Classics»* 11 (2019), 256–284.

interrogatively $\pi\acute{o}\delta'$ ἄβρεχ[τρον], reminding the motif of the 'untravelled' Callimachus. It is understandable that ἄβρεκτος, with $\pi\acute{o}\delta(\alpha)$ as accusative of respect, might stand in any case, e.g. nominative or vocative. Prof. Tsangalis reminds me of $\pi\acute{o}\delta\alpha\beta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, an adjective recorded in Herodotus (Orac. ap. Hdt. 1.55) as characterizing Lydians: $\Lambda\nu\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\pi\acute{o}\delta\alpha\beta\rho\acute{\epsilon}$, "tender-footed Lydian" can be considered. The adjective should probably change to $\pi\acute{o}\delta'$ ἄβρε²⁸. At line 21 of the same iambus, Callimachus is addressed by the critic with the words $\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\gamma\gamma\iota\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\Lambda\nu\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\tau\acute{o}\omega\nu\chi\iota$ $\psi\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, "for you are hardly sane, o Lydian"²⁹. And, finally, Callimachus at lines 53–56 of *Lamb.* 13 mentions an enquiry into his ancestors, mainly his great-grandfather, for slavish origins, an enquiry apparently ordered by *Ἀπάμα*, the queen-mother. Given Masson's irrefutable arguments, I would not propose a Lydian or generally Anatolian origin for the name *Ἀπίμιας*. But the target of the enquiry was not Callimachus' father, nor his homonymous grandfather, who was after all a $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$, but his great-grandfather. Of course, there were four of them³⁰, but the best known was Ἀννικερίς, as is inscriptionally evidenced (*DGE* 234.17). It is not certain whether Anniceris, the Cyrenaean philosopher must be identified with the homonymous wealthy man and famed charioteer, who had ransomed Plato, when the latter was being sold as a slave. The name Ἀννικερίς is more likely to be Anatolian. Prof. Ignacio J. Adiego kindly draws my attention to "the typical Anatolian 'tallname' Anna, Annas, Ana". Annikas is a Carian name, but it occurs, together with the feminine Ἀννίκα, also in Macedonia and Illyria. In general, name-forms starting with Ἀνν- are quite common in Northern Greek lands. It is, however, noteworthy that Ἀννικερίς too occurs only in Cyrene: the *LGPV* records ten occurrences, all from Cyrenaica.

Let us now turn to Posidippus, Callimachus' satirical target. His best

²⁸ The compound is irregularly formed: it should have been ἄβροτρον. In the oracle recorded in Herodotus, as well as in several grammatical and other references to it, one might easily read $\pi\acute{o}\delta'$ ἄβρε. In Themistius 226d, it might also be written $\pi\acute{o}\delta'$ ἄβρος in nominative, but in the *Etymologicon Magnum* 678.1 $\pi\acute{o}\delta\alpha\beta\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ is a *vox nihili*. In Call. *Lamb.* 13.10 an *exempli gratia* supplement, just for giving the gist of the verse in contact with the following verses, might be $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$... $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\omega$] $\tau\acute{o}\omega\nu$, $\pi\acute{o}\delta'$ ἄβρο', $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\chi\eta$; see K. Tsantsanoglou (*Callimachus* *lambus* XIII, cit.), pp. 79 and 83–84. Still, $\pi\acute{o}\delta'$ ἄβρεχ[τρος] is equally attractive.

²⁹ Unanimously published $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\tau\acute{o}\omega\nu\chi\iota$ $\psi\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, but the lambda is clear in the papyrus.

³⁰ See n. 24 above.

known epigram, self-referential or programmatic, is 140 AB (IX G.-P., AP XII 168), which I reproduce below from the edition of Gow and Page:

Ναυνοῦς καὶ Αὐδῆς ἐντὶ γαίῃ δύο καὶ τ' φερεκάστου
 Μιμνέρπου καὶ τοῦ σώφρονος Ἀντιμάχου·
 συγκέρασαν τὸν πέμπτον ἑμοῦ, τὸν δ' ἔκτον ἑκάστου,
 Ἡλίοδωρ, εἴτας ὅστις ἐρῶν ἔτρυχεν·
 [ἔβρομον Ἡριόδου, τὸν δ' ὄνθοον εἶπον Ὀμήρου,
 τὸν δ' ἔνατον Μουσῶν, Μνημοσύνης δέκατον.]
 μεστὸν ὑπὲρ χεῖλους πίομα, Κύπρι, τῶλλα δ' Ἔρωτες
 νῆφοντ' οἰνωθέντ' οὐχὶ λίην ἄχαριν†.

1 φερεκάστου: φέρ' ἐκάστου is the reading of the apographum Gothanum of the Palatinus. As F. Angiò has shown³¹, the imperative φέρε is most appropriate for the situation; she refers to the examples of Anacreon PMG 356 (a).1 and 396.1, which are exactly parallel. For the second half of the word, I would prefer ἐραστοῦ, genitive of ἐρατός, not ἐραστής, after φέρ' ἐραστῶν of Salmasius and φιλεράστου of Jacobus³². ἐρατός, is used both in prose and poetry, of persons and things indiscriminately; ἐγατός and ἐγατός are freely interchangeable, depending on the metrical requirements. The palaeographical change is minimal (P for K), given that ἐκάστου obviously derives from the same word at the same position of line 3. The adjective, which qualifies Μιμνέρπου, is necessary for an antithetic parallelism between Μιμνέρμου' eroticism and Antimachus' continence³³, a parallelism, as we shall see, observed in the whole epigram. Used of Mimnermus, ἐρατός does not mean simply 'lovely, beloved', functioning as a laudatory description, but it means 'amatory, erotic' opposing σώφρων, but also, to a certain extent, opposing ἀνέρατος. Angiò cites also Hor. Ep. 1.6.65-66 *sì, Mimnermus uti censet, sine amoris iocisque | nil est iucundum, vivas in amore iocisque*, which seems to paraphrase Mimn. fr. 1.1 τίς δὲ βίος, τί

δὲ τερπνὸν ἄτερ χροστῆς Ἀποδοίτης combined with the contents of the next three or so verses of the fragment which might be rendered *ioca*. The antithetical couples in the first four verses are Ναυνώ + ἐρατός Μιμνέρπος vs. Αὐδῆ + σώφρων Ἀντίμαχος, and ἐγώ vs. ἑκάστος ὅστις ἐρῶν ἔτρυχεν. Obviously, Posidippus avoids qualifying himself with a restrictive adjective, because this is the object of the epigram: to qualify the poetic subject through parallelism and comparison with older respected precedents. However, the conclusion in these first lines can only be that 'I' is in the opposite camp of ἑκάστος ὅστις ἐρῶν ἔτρυχεν, therefore = 'I am not ἐρῶν'. However, after the addition of the last verses, after drinking that is the cup of wine, one expects something like 'I now hope to somehow pass to the camp of the ἐρῶντες'.

7-8 The daggered words from τῶλλα to ἄχαριν have been subjected to numerous conjectures. Gow and Page discussed most of them without reaching an answer. Jacobs: ὡς νῆφοντ' ἀριθμεῖν, ναίχι λίην ἄχαρι ("unum poculum tibi, o Venus, bibam, reliqua autem iam sine numero"); Edmunds: τῶλλα δ' ἔρωτος νῆφοντ' οἰνωθέντ' οὐχὶ λίην μ' ἄραρεν ("the rest of love, whether I'm drunk or sober, pleases me but little"), "a strange conclusion", as Gow-Page note, if the poet is concluding an erotic epigram by declaring that he doesn't like love so much; Wilamowitz: νῆφον τ' οἰνωθεῖς οὐχὶ ἀλίσσα χάριν ("gratiam non reddidi iritiam"); Schott: νῆφον τ' οἰνωθεῖς οὐχὶ μίληα χάριν ("gratiam quam vobis debeo nunquam adhuc violavi"); Dübner and Paron believe that the pentameter should be transposed elsewhere, Gow-Page obelize the whole passage from τῶλλα to ἄχαριν, and, assuming that two verses were lost after τῶλλα δ' Ἔρωτες, adopt Jacobs's conjecture ἄχαρι ("drunk or sober, it is pleasant enough to ...". After G.-P., Austin in AB 140 proposed: νῆφειν οἰνωθέντ' οὐχὶ λίην ἄχαρι (ἄχαρι iam Jacobs) ("minime inuicunda est sobria ebrietas"). Only Giangrande, considering the text sound, connected the accusatives νῆφοντ' οἰνωθέντ' and ἄχαριν not with the poetic subject but with the understood κύαθον and attached them to πίομα.

Since πίομα implies the nominative of the first person pronoun (ἐγώ), whereas νῆφοντ' οἰνωθέντ' imply an accusative, it is necessary that a verb is interposed to account for this accusative. In the words intertaining between the verbal forms (Κύπρι, τῶλλα δ' Ἔρωτες), there is no other word that might change than Ἔρωτες. I propose a minimal change:

³¹ *Posidippo di Pella*, Ep. IX, 3086-3093 *Gow-Page* (Ant. Pal. XII 168), «Mus. Helv.» 60 (2003), pp. 6-21.

³² West, *JEGP* ii p. 84 (Mimn. testimonia) notes: 'fort. de Pherecle (Hermes. supra) cogitandum'. Hermesianax fr. 7.39 mentions Φερεκλήν as an erotic rival of Mimnermus.

³³ "contrapposizione tra la 'sfrenatezza' di Mimnermo e la 'moderazione' di Antimaco", Angiò (n. 31), p. 12.

μεσὸν ὑπὲρ χεῖλους πτόμα, Κύπρι, τᾶλλα δ' ἐρῶτε
νήφοντ' οἰνωθέντ' οὐχὶ λίην ἄχαριν.

τᾶλλα is used adverbially of time = τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον = τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον (LSJ s. ἄλλος, 6). ἐρῶτε (opt. pres.) is palaeographically almost identical to Ἐρωτες; however, ἐρώω is constructed c. gen. pets., and so cannot govern ἐμέ, which one might think is implied from the accusatives νήφοντα, οἰνωθέντα, and ἄχαριν. Nevertheless, the accusatives must suggest a cognate construction (Eur. *Hipp.* 32, ἐρῶσ' ἔρωτ' ἐκδημον, Pl. *Smp.* 181b πάνδημος (sc. ἔρωσ) ... ὄν ... ἐρῶσιν), i.e. ἐρῶτε (ἐρωτα) ... οὐχὶ λίην ἄχαριν. The omission of the cognate substantive, when an adjectival attribute may stand for it, is very common (e.g., βάδιζε τὴν εὐθείαν, παῖσον δὲ τῆλ' ἄν), "I'll drink it filled to the brim, o Cyprus. And from then on may you (pl.) take pleasure in a love, no matter whether a sober or a drunk love, not too graceless." The fact that Posidippus, in other epigrams, invokes or mentions Ἐρως/ἔρωσ or the Ἐρωτες (123, 126, 128, 129, 130, 134, 135, 136, 138 AB) – as does the entire Hellenistic erotic poetry – has facilitated the slight corruption. It would be pointless for the poet, right after invoking Cyprus, to change his invocation, this time to the Erotes, since the plural gods share exactly the same area of responsibility, the same function and the same power as Cyprus. With ἐρῶτε, Posidippus is no longer addressing Heliodorus or Cyprus, but his poetic audience in the guise of his fellow-drinkers. ἄχαρις is sometimes used in erotic sense, as it is employed by Sappho: fr. 49 ἠράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἄτθι, πάλαι ποτὰ – σμικρά μοι πᾶς ἔμμεν' ἐφάιντο κάχαρις³⁴. Hsch. κ 1933 κάχαρις ... ἡ χαρίζεσθαι μὴ δυνάμενη ἢ οὐκ εὐχαρις. The use of χάρις 'in erotic sense, of favours granted' (LSJ s.v. III.2) completes the image. However, by using the cognate construction, Posidippus excludes the carnal side of the meaning, which would make himself the object of the erotic desire, and limits the omitted cognate accusative to the sense of a meta-referential 'poetic theme of eros'. It is ἔρως, i.e., the erotic theme in epigrams, that is sober

or drunk, i.e., combined with the convivial theme or not, and is ultimately promised to become not too charmless³⁵.

So, the former sentence (μεσὸν ὑπὲρ χεῖλους πτόμα, Κύπρι) is coloured differently. Posidippus is admitting that till now his poetry had been ἄχαρις, loveless and charmless, and is promising Cyprus that henceforth he is going to change his attitude toward love and sex in his poems. He is expressing the hope from now on to shake off the blame and be considered a poet οὐχὶ λίην ἄχαρις. The expression is not a figure of *litotes* = λίαν χαριεῖς. In combination with the temporal τᾶλλα and the operative ἐρῶτε, the poet is referring to a former negative condition, which he plans to change to a certain extent, hoping that the outcome will be welcomed by his public. It is an allusive promise to his poetic audience that his new thematics will not be so charmless. 'Whether sober or drunk' slightly qualifies the promise. The poet does not intend to deal solely with erotic themes, but to enrich his usual repertoire with charming subject matter. Metaphorically, the enrichment will come from drinking the full cup of wine, which consists of old poetic paradigms. Half of them are erotic, but the other half are temperate and self-controlled. His new repertoire will contain specimens from both halves, 'whether sober or drunk', but the blend will affect both in terms of χάρις³⁶.

It should be explained that the enumeration down to δέκατον implies κύαθον, but μεσὸν must imply a large cup, masculine or neuter. Archaeologists name two different objects by the name 'kyathos': a certain kitchen vessel we now name 'ladle'. Whichever of the two is implied in the first six verses, it is used for drawing wine out of the crater and filling the cup. The poet will not drink a ladle of wine, but a large cup symbolically filled with ten ladlefuls. Pragmatically, the symbolic cup that could hold ten ladles might be a χοῦς, or even a κάδος, as described in the epigrams of Hedylus G.-P. V (3 ἀλλὰ κάδοις Χίου με κατάρβρεχ) and VI (2 πίτει τετραχόοισι κάδοις).

³⁵ ἐπεῖτε might also stand, 'you will call me, whether sober or drunk, not too graceless', but the corruption of so common a word would be less justifiable.

³⁶ Erotic disposition and poetic commendation appear combined later in Bion (fr. 9 Gow):

³⁴ Later authors understood the word in the same way. *Sch. Pind. Pyth.* 2.42 χαρίζεσθαι γὰρ κυρίως λέγεται τὸ συνουσιάζειν, ὥστερ ... Σατρώδ'· σμικρά μοι πᾶς ἔμμεν' ἐφάιντο κάχαρις ἢ μὴπω δυνάμενη χαρίζεσθαι. Plut. *Aimat.* 751d, χάρις γὰρ οὖν ... ἡ τοῦ θήλεος ὑπερίεξ τῷ ἄρρενι κέκληται πρὸς τῶν παλαιῶν ... καὶ τὴν οὕτω γάμων ἔχουσαν ὥραν ἡ Σατρώδ' προσαγορεύουσα φησιν ὅτι· σμικρά μοι πᾶς ἔμμεν' ἐφάιντο κάχαρις.

κτῆν μὲν ἄρα νηυγᾶν τις ἔχων ἀνέπαστον ἀείδῃ,
τῆνον ὑπεκφεύγοντι (sc. ταί Μοῖσαι) καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλοντι διδάσκειν,
ἦν δὲ νόον τις Ἐρωτι δονεῦμενος ἀδῶ μελιόδηι
ἐς τῆνον μᾶλα πᾶσαι ἐπειγόμεναι προρέοντι.

Further, if Callimachus, in an epigram satirizing Posidippus, names his *persona* Χαρίδας, i.e., in an oblique manner χαριεῖς or εὐχαριεῖς, is it not clear that his target, Posidippus, was considered by him and his milieu οὐκ εὐχαριεῖς, i.e., ἀχαριεῖς? Were it not for the closing couplet, we might suppose that Posidippus is composedly replying to the challenge by declaring his own credo of poetic moderation. The last two verses, however, place him on the defensive if not in retreat. A number of erotic epigrams by Posidippus has survived, though the great majority, especially after the publication of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, deals with non-erotic themes. The question whether, after this 'self-criticism', we must consider all of Posidippus' erotic epigrams posterior to ep. 140 AB cannot but remain unanswered.

Edmonds deleted verses 5-6 of Posidippus' epigram, reasonably according to Gow-Page, since "Hesiod, Homer, the Muses, and Menemosyne are out of place in the middle of an epigram which begins and ends with love". It cannot be excluded that the couplet is a later addition to an original form, made by Posidippus himself, when he realized that to keep his profile high he needed more noted and respected poets to be compared with than Mimnermus and Antimachus. Still, Hesiod is an erotic poet, since, in his *Catalogue of Women*, numerous love stories between gods and mortals are recounted. His relation with the Muses in the Proem to the *Theogony*, 1-115, is famous as well as his dictum 96 f. ὁ δὲ Ὀλύμπιος, ὄντινα Μοῦσαι φιλοῦνται. Homer is not erotic, since his function as an epic poet is to eternalize the memory (μνημοσύνη) of κλέα ἀνδρῶν. His relation with Menemosyne is one of poetic commitment, not a relation of love³⁷.

Apart from ep. 140, three more Posidippus erotic epigrams utilize a motif that will later enjoy a wide application in poetry, not only in epi-

³⁷ Obviously, I accept Austin's 'moderate mixture' (*Posidippus and the Mysteries ... of the Text*, in *Il papirò di Posidippo un anno dopo*, edd. G. BASTIANINI & A. CASANOVA, Firenze 2002, pp. 7-19, esp. p. 10), without resorting, however, to his emendations and with somewhat different ingredients in the 'sober poets', since I conscript Hesiod and the Muses into the erotic camp. I also agree, in general terms, with the poetological approach and the interconnection with Callimachus' standpoint that are put forward in the papers of M. R. ALBIANI, *Ancora su "bevitore d'acqua" e "bevitore di vino" (Accep. XLV, Hedyl. V G.-P.)*, *«Elkasmos»* 13 (2002), pp. 159-164, and B. M. PALUMBO STRACCA, *I brividi antichitimi di Posidippo* (Anth. Pal. 12, 168 = 9 G.-P. = 140 A.-B.), in *Callimachea. Atti della prima giornata di studi su Callimaco*, edd. A. MARTINA & A. T. COZZOLI, Roma 2003, pp. 163-179.

grams. They extend the theme of Hippolytus and chastity to the domain of the erudite poet, who defends himself with great self-restraint against erotic temptations. If, as seems likely, the first to apply this motif was Posidippus³⁸, it is expected that his poetic thematics would affect his personal image.

135 AB (V G.-P., *AP* XII 45)

Ναὶ ναὶ βάλῃς "Ερωτες· ἐγὼ σκοπὸς εἰς ἅμα πολλοῖς
κείμε· μὴ φείσῃς, ἄφρονες· ἦν γὰρ ἐμὲ
νικήσῃς, ὀνομαστοὶ ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἔσεσθε
τοῖότῃς ὥς μεγάλης δεσπότης ἰοδόκης.

137 (VI G.-P., *AP* XII 98)

Τὸν Μουσῶν τέττιγα Πλόθος ὄψας ἐν' ἀκάνθαις
κοιμῆεν ἐθέλει πῦρ ὑπὸ πλευρᾷ βαλὼν.
ἦ δὲ πρὶν ἐν βύβλοις πεπονημένη ἀλλ' ἀθερίει
ψυχὴ ἀνηρῶ δαίμονι μεμφομένη.

138 AB (VII G.-P., *AP* XII 120)

Εὐορῶ καὶ πρὸς σε μαχίσομαι, οὐδ' ἀπεροῦμαι
θνητὸς ἑών· σὺ δ' "Ερως, μηκέτι μοι πρόσσυε.
ἦν με λάβῃς μεθύοντ', ἄραγ' ἔκδοτον· ἄχρι δὲ νήφω,
τὸν παρὰτάξαμενον πρὸς σε λογιμὸν ἔχω.

Sobriety and reasoning may possibly constitute some defence against Eros, but they certainly are not the best armour towards poetic success. Ep. VI G.-P. of Hedylus is of great interest. Angio has meticulously dealt with it as it treats – as well as ep. V G.-P., which will not concern us here – the topic of the relation between wine-drinking and poetic inspiration³⁹.

ἐξ ἡοῦς εἰς νύκτα καὶ ἐκ νυκτὸς πάλι Σωκλῆς
εἰς ἡοῦν τίθει τετραχόοισι κάδοις,
εἴτ' ἐξάφνης πού τυχὸν οἴχεται· ἀλλὰ παρ' οἶνον

³⁸ It is unknown whether Callimachus' epigram 46 Pf., which defines poetry and hunger as charms against love and sex, is older than Posidippus' epigrams or not. Actually however, the ironic character of the epigram is obvious, and the specific *remedia amoris* have nothing in common with the abstinence extolled by Posidippus.

³⁹ Above n. 31, pp. 18-20.

5 Σικελίδεω παίλει πουλὺ μελυχρότερον,
 ἔστι δὲ τῶν πουλὺ στιβαρότερος· ὥς δ' ἐπιδάμτει
 ἡ χάρις, ὥστε, φίλος, καὶ γράφει καὶ μέθει.

The obvious restoration of 5 πο<υ>λὺ στιβαρότερος was rejected by Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* i.144 n. 3, because the lengthening falls in the arsis. Gow and Page, though keeping the daggers in the text, object that πουλὺ seems natural after the same word in the preceding line and note an instance of που(λυ) in arsis by Callimachus. However, που(λυ) in arsis occurs, no doubt rarely, in Homer (*Il.* VIII 472), Hesiod (*Th.* 190), Theognis (211, 509), and others. In any case, ἔστι δὲ δη<ύτ>ε πολὺ στιβαρότερος might stress the opposition between the two poets and drinkers even more. Since Socles' feature of 'sweetness' might be thought to imply softness and weakness, Hedyllus hastens to add the opposite feature of στιβαρός, highlighting the antithesis by the parallel formulation: πουλὺ μελυχρότερος ~ πολὺ στιβαρότερος. I would strongly disagree with G. Giangrande's interpretation of στιβαρότερος as a physical and not stylistic remark ('more robust' or 'more corpulent')⁴⁰, because both παίλει μελυχρότερον and ἐπιδάμτει ἡ χάρις clearly refer to the composition of charming poetic paegnia, and it would be strange if between the two a comment from a different semantic domain intervened. Hedyllus does not commemorate Socles for his heavy drinking, but for his charming and playful poems written under heavy drinking. Paegnia are no doubt 'light poems', but they can also be sturdy and weighty. Line 3 εἴτ' ἐξαίφνης που τυχὸν οἴχεται should not be given too much importance. Understandably, Hedyllus does not intend to present Socles as an incurable alcoholic duffer. Still, I suspect that the statement is but an allusive remark on a pause from the drinking bout, for making an unavowed erotic break. On the other hand, Cameron's attempt to insert Antimachus and *Lyde* in Hedyllus' epigram (by emending ἔστι δὲ που Ἀνδρὺς στιβαρότερος) not only compares a poet to a poem, which might be metonymically tolerable, but also compares playful epigrams to a huge and cumbersome epic. Further, if the motive for the emendation is to add Hedyllus to Asclepiades and Posidippus who praised Antimachus and *Lyde*, the attempt is unsuccessful, since the epigram ultimately presents an unknown poet as prevailing over *Lyde*⁴¹.

Angiò made the ingenious proposal that Socles is a pseudonym. In an epigram which mentions two poets, and one of them, Asclepiades, is mentioned by his well-known pseudonym Σικελίδας, one would expect the other one to be mentioned also by his pseudonym. The proposal is corroborated by the fact that Socles, though a completely unknown poet, is described as distinctly prevailing over Asclepiades, one of the most famous Hellenistic poets. Had such a poet existed, shouldn't we have heard something about him? Angiò depending on the friendly connection between Asclepiades, Posidippus, and Hedyllus suggests that Socles was the pseudonym of Posidippus, of whom no pen name has survived. Accordingly, she supplements the list of the Telchines in the Florentine Scholia on Callimachus' *Aetia*, fr. 1 Pf. (PSI 1219, fr. 1.5 f), κ(αι) Ποσειδίππῳ τῷ ὄνῳ[[μαζομ(έν)ῳ Σωκλεῖ κ(αι)]]].

In absence of solid evidence, I can neither accept nor reject Angiò's proposal. Socles is, however, described as a real heavy drinker (such is also Hedyllus, as is clear in ep. V G.-P.), something not unusual among inspired poets since Archilochus and Aeschylus. On the other hand, Posidippus is, at least in the self-referential epigram 140 AB, a metaphorical drinker. First-person references to wine drinking occur in some Posidippus epigrams (123, 124, 130, 138 [see above] AB), but, as is the case also with the erotic epigrams, the question is bound to linger on: when is the poet more truthful? in his sparse clichéd 'drunken/erotic epigrams or in his programmatic and confessional ep. 140? In a somewhat in-between state we may place ep. 123 AB (I G.-P., *AP* V 134), where a possibly temporary change of course in his literary interests or in his self-restrained behaviour is implied:

Κερκορί, ράινε, λάγυνε, πολύδροσον ἱκμάδα Βάκχου,
 ῥάινε, δροσιέσθω συμβολικῇ πρόποσι,
 συνάσθω Ζήνων ὁ σοφὸς κύκνος ἄτε Κλεάνθους
 μουσα· μέλαιο δ' ἡμῖν ὁ γλυκύπικρος Ἔρως.

To sum up, the mental image I have forged for Posidippus shows a serious and prudent poet, who sides with σώφρων Antimachus. The edition of P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 has shown a diligent and fastidious epigrammatist. However, Callimachus' opinion about his poetry would be what he illustrates at *Ia.* 13.60 as οὐδὲν πτόν, ἀλλὰ λιγυρά, 'not juicy, but gaunt, famine-stricken'; cf. Lat. *jejunus*, 'fasting, hungry' used of speech, 'meager, dry, spiritless'. If we restrict ourselves to the issue of wine drinking, we may easily place him in the opposite camp of Hedyllus

⁴⁰ G. GIAGRANDE, *Symptic Literature and Epigram*, in *L'épigramme grecque*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique XIV, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1967, pp. 158-163.

⁴¹ Cf. G. GIAGRANDE, *Antimachus and the Epigram*, in *Antimachus*, *Antimachus* 1995, Appendix A, pp. 485-487.

(V G.-P. πίνωμεν· καὶ γάρ τι νέον, καὶ γάρ τι παρ' οἶνον | εὐρουμεν
 λερὸν καὶ τι μελῆχρὸν ἔπος), Callimachus (*Ep.* 35 εὐ μὲν ἀοιδὴν |
 εἰδότες, εὐ δ' οἶνῳ κάρπια συγγελάσαι), and Socles (the whole of
 Hedylus' epigram VI G.-P.).

There is, however, one more candidate for the pseudonym Socles, and, though the evidence is still slender, the image fits perfectly. I must admit that the suggestion I am going to make in contrast to Angiò's proposal stems from a remark made by Angiò herself with regard to the supposed opposition of Hedylus to Callimachus; p. 19 n. 38: 'In ogni modo, i termini adoperati da Edillo negli epigrammi V e VI G.-P. sono gli stessi che caratterizzano l'estetica di Callimaco.' Accordingly, I venture to propose that Socles may well be Callimachus himself. The aggregate impression suggests a sweet (μελῆχρότερον) and playful (παίξει) poet, yet forceful (στίβαυότερον), whose charm (ἡ χάρις) glitters on his creations (ἐπιλάμπει). And all this is done under heavy drinking. It is important, however, that all these features of Socles are compared to the performance of Asclepiades/Sicelidas. If Hedylus' taste can be trusted (and he had every reason to be biased in favour of his compatriot Samian Asclepiades), no other living poet than Callimachus can be linked with Socles.

I have already proposed that Callimachus had used two more pseudonyms: Βαρνάδης and Χαρίδας. These names, however, are not normal pen names, but designations of a *persona* within specific poems. Outside these poems they would not be easily effective. We never find someone else using them for Callimachus, as is done with other pseudonyms, such as Sicelidas, used for Asclepiades by Theocritus, Hedylus, Meleager, and, of course, the Scholia on Theocritus and Callimachus. The interpretation given by Callimachus himself in the epilogue of the *Aetia* for these two names is, I believe, as discussed above, clear and to the point.

If Σωκλῆς is Callimachus' pen name, it need not be a permanent one. A pseudonym was not necessarily the fictitious name of an author under which his books were published, like say Molière or Lewis Carroll. It may well be a nickname used on special occasions, for instance by friends in a symposium or for a disguise inside a poem. Possibly, such was the case of Σικελίδας for Asclepiades, regardless if its application was eventually expanded, as well as Σιμυρίδας for Theocritus, and possibly Τίτυρος for Alexander Aetolus. Several of the names mentioned in Theocrit. *Id.* 7 (Θαλύστια) seem to be pseudonyms of poets, whether

of the topic in his Theocritus edition (vol. II, 127–131) is enlightening. Pseudonyms were usually explained as deriving from the father's name, but Socles is certainly not a patronymic. Σωκλῆς is no doubt a pan-Greek name (P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford 1972, II, 817, n. 163), meaning 'whose glory is intact' (Angiò n. 37), but an explanation specially for Callimachus may be needed. The proposal of Al. Sens concerning the provenance of Σικελίδας as nickname of Asclepiades may be instructive⁴². The family of the poet must have been banished from Samos together with the entire population of the island by the Athenian forces in 365 BCE and was impossible to return before 322 BCE. If during the exile the family had lived in Sicily, it is conceivable that the nickname was coined, in order to commemorate Asclepiades' familial past and possibly his childhood in Sicily. This is a plausible political/familial/personal interpretation. Can a similar interpretation be applied to Callimachus?

Since Σωκλῆς is neither a patronym nor an ethnic name, it is likely that it was appropriated from a former owner. The most famous bearer of the name is the otherwise unknown Corinthian who, in an assembly of Sparta's allies in 506 BCE, harangued harshly the Spartans for planning to impose tyranny on Athens. His speech (Hdt. V 92–93), one of the most important speeches in Herodotus, is very concise in setting forth political or philosophical arguments against tyranny, but very extensive in narrating the adverse experience of the Corinthians under the tyrannic rules of Cypselus and Periander in the archaic period. The speech is presented in an emotional style as a legendary narrative appealing to any story-teller, at points reading much like a Callimachean action. The poet's hometown Cyrene enjoyed in the past independence and self-government, inside which Callimachus' aristocratic family had a prominent position. However, already before his early childhood, his city was subjected to foreign despotic rulers, Ophellias, Magas, Demetrius the Fair, and Apama. These rulers, styled whether governors or kings, apart from depriving the citizens of the rights they enjoyed in the past, exploited the people of Cyrene for their personal interests and ambitions, by allying with the Seleucids and rebelling against the Ptolemaic rule, at the same time, however, driving the people to revolt. Such a revolt, after the death of Magas in 250 BCE and the affair of Apama, his widow, with Demetrius the Fair, her son-in-law, led to the formation

of a short-lived Cyrenaean *koinon*, before the definitive return to the suzerainty of the Ptolemies. Apama, who survived the revolt and followed Berenice II, her daughter and later wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes, to the royal court in Alexandria, may have retained some of her influence there. Expectedly, she must have harboured vindictive feelings against the Cyrenaicans who happened to flourish in the Alexandrian court, especially if they belonged, like Callimachus, to the Cyrenaean aristocracy which no doubt had a say both in the revolt and in the formation of the *koinon*. Possibly goaded by envious fellow poets, she may have persecuted the poet, as described above, for subversive activities, like the use of the patronymic Βατριάδης and the theonymic Χαρίδας. An inquiry had also been ordered about Callimachus' aristocratic ancestry, examining whether one of his great-grandfathers was a Lydian of slave status. In spite of being a court poet, Callimachus had been rather unfavourably treated: though the most appropriate person for directing the Library, he was never appointed to the post. Ep. 21 Pf., the fictitious epitaph of Callimachus' father, is dramatically alluding to a familial and personal predicament. Firstly, by refusing to mention the dead father's name he deliberately nurtures the impression that he is called with the suspicious and forbidden name Βάρτος. Secondly, with stressed patriotic pride, he declares his aristocratic military ancestry. Thirdly, he accuses envious rival poets for some undefined act of treachery against him. Fourthly, he expresses the faith that the Muses will not abandon him in his old age, in other words that he will not only keep his poetic efficiency intact, but also will not be dismissed from the Mouseion, as his rivals apparently pursue.

“Οστις ἐμὸν παρὰ στήμα φέρεῖς πόδα, Καλλιμάχου με
 ἰσθί Κυρηναίου παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην.
 εἰδείης δ' αὖθις κεν· ὁ μὲν κοτε πατριδὸς ὄπλων
 ἤρξεν, ὁ δ' ἤγειρεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης.
 5 οὐ νέμεσις· Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὄμματι παῖδας
 ἄχρη βίου πολλοὺς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους.

Lines 5-6 recur in the introductory part of the *Aetia*, fr. 1.37-38, – unjustifiably deleted for this reason from the epigram by Pfeiffer –, though the issue of envy and resentment is there camouflaged under the cover of the poetic efficiency during old age.

To return to the Herodotean Socles, the famous story, narrated in his speech, of how Thrasylbulus, the tyrant of Miletus, asked by Periander's emissary in what way his master could keep his tyranny safe, proceeded

by cutting off the tallest ears of wheat in a field, implying the elimination of prominent citizens, might well be explained by Callimachus as pertaining to his personal case. Of course, I do not imply that Callimachus, by using the name of Socles, intended to appear as a revolutionary against the existing regime. We know that, in parallel with his nostalgic references to his native city's glory, he praises the present rulers, whether Magas or Berenice or the Ptolemies. The Socles speech is helpful, since the speaker avoids using, as the opposite of *τυραννίς*, the politically arguable terms *δημοκρατία* or *ἀξιότοξαρχία*, and employs instead the unusual word *λοκπατία*, recurring later only as a term of cosmology. Thus the pseudonym Socles may be interpreted in political/familial/personal terms certainly not as belonging to a militant subversive, but as designating an exponent of anti-tyrannic values.

What is stressed in the epigram of Hedylus is Socles' prevalence over Asclepiades in the art of poetry, under wine-drinking. All this sounds much like the humorous 'sepulchral' epigram 35 Pf.:

Βατριάδεω παρὰ στήμα φέρεῖς πόδας εὖ μὲν ἀοιδίην
 εἰδότες, εὖ δ' οἶνω καίρια συγγελάσας,

where poetry coexists with the wine-drinking and joking company. Actually, the expanded description of Hedylus fully accords with Callimachus' condensed one: εὖ ἀοιδίην εἰδὼς = πρὸς στιβαρός, ἐπιδάμτει ἡ χάρις / εὖ οἶνω καίρια συγγελαῖ = παρ' οἶνον παίζει πρὸς μέλχρον. As for the convivial occasion described in Hedylus' first three verses, Callimachus limits it to the preposition σὺν of συγγελάσας. One is given the impression that the two epigrams communicate with each other, with Callimachus elegantly compacting Hedylus' six-verse story into two verses, and adding only the element of the epigraph, which is but the charming stratagem to avoid the blame of self-admiration. Straight references to Callimachus are the key-words μέλχροτερον and, primarily, ἡ χάρις. Socles is not merely forceful (στιβαρότερος than Asclepiades) but grace shines over his poetry (ἐπιδάμτει ἡ χάρις). Further, Asclepiades is enumerated among the Telchines, a fact that implies at least a different approach to poetic theory. Ποσειδῶντι τῷ οὐοῖ] υγίτρῳ τῷ ῥήτορι, might possibly be supplemented

τῷ ὀνομαστῷ ποιητῇ κ(αι) or
 τῷ ὀνομαστῷ Πελαδαίῳ κ(αι),

depending on the exact size of the gap. Posidippus himself addressing the Erotes (ep. 135 AB) claims that if they manage to defeat him, they will become *ὀνομαστοί ἐν ἀθανάτοις*, apparently since they will have defeated one who is *κατ' ἀνθρώπων ὀνομαστός*, as Theognis 23 claimed for himself. Posidippus' self-conceit is best perceptible in his so-called 'testament' (118 AB), in which he claims from Apollon an oracle advising the Macedonians to honour him by erecting his statue at the marketplace of Dion, their sacred city, as the god had lately done with Archilochus, a poet who was after all, as he claims, unlike himself, extremely displeasing⁴³. Thus, it is not merely a theoretic difference on poetry aesthetics, but also Posidippus' conspicuous vanity that may have annoyed Callimachus prompting him to write the sarcastic ep. 13 Pf. Finally, wouldn't it be reasonable for Callimachus to suspect Posidippus, the only Macedonian in the poetic and scholarly circle of the Mouseion, as the informer for Apama on his supposedly dissident ideas? No doubt, in a case of limited evidence as this, we are bound to resort to guesswork.

I do not know whether the epigrammatist Hedylus and the Hedylus who composed a commentary on Callimachus' epigrams are the same person or not. Both the rareness of the name and the common occupation with the same poet, whether by writing an epigram about him (granted that Socles is Callimachus) or by composing a commentary on his epigrams (which need not denote an inimical stance towards the poet), rather speak for the identification. Be that as it may, I strongly disagree with the views of A. Cameron⁴⁴, who considers Hedylus one of Callimachus' opponents. See Angiò's thoughtful objections, (n. 31 above) 19 n. 38. No doubt, Meleager places Hedylus in the same group with Asclepiades and Posidippus, actually in the same distich *AP* IV 1.45–46, all three write about the same persons⁴⁵, and the last two are enumerated in the Florentine Scholia among the Telchines. But this does

not mean that all three shared invariably and at all times the same friendships and the same poetic and stylistic principles. Being the only poet in the triad who did not praise Antimachus' *Lyde*, as noted above, and who was not included among the Telchines, Hedylus may have been well disposed towards the Cyrenaean. Further, Angiò's remark, that the terms used by Hedylus in epigrams V and VI G.-P are the same that characterize the aesthetics of Callimachus, is of crucial importance in interpreting the whole complex of the poetic company at the Mouseion.

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
kyrtzan@gmail.com

⁴³ K. TSANTSANOGLOU, *Critical Observations on Posidippus' Testament* (118 A.–B.), «ZPE» 187 (2013), pp. 122–131. Fr. Angiò communicated to me her brilliant interpretation of a critical word in the testament (18 ἀμυνω), as referring to the two Macedonian empires outside Macedonia, the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, where Posidippus wished to be honoured (ὄφρα με τιμῶσιν Μακεδόνες, οἱ τ' ἐν Νεῖλῳ | οἱ τ' Ἀσίῃς πάσις γέγονες ἡῖόνος). I am not sure whether this interpretation annuls the solicited erection of his statue in the marketplace of Dion or adds two more statues to that one. In any case, it adds considerably to Posidippus' self-conceit.

⁴⁴ *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford 1993, pp. 369–376.

⁴⁵ C. V. RADINGER, *RE* 14 (1912) 2593 s.v. Hedylus.