

# Callimachea

*Lloyd W. Daly*

## I. *Epigram* XLI

**S**CHIZOPHRENIA was a theme not unfamiliar to the ancient erotic poets. Catullus' *odi et amo* (*Carm.* 85) may be the most familiar expression of this condition, but for him it was already a *topos* of honorable ancestry, and the changes had frequently been rung on it. One variation on this theme involves the poet's assuming the rôle of battle-weary lover who fears a new attack by Eros; he feels the stimulus but fears the results of yielding to it. Such is the pose of Ibycus in fragment 6 (*PMG* 287). Eros, with all his charms, threatens to cast the poet once more into the toils of Aphrodite, but Ibycus, fearing the threatened attack, trembles like an old warhorse at the thought of being forced into the fray once more.

Callimachus' *Epigram* 41 (Pfeiffer) takes this *topos* as a point of departure. He says that half of his soul is still in the land of the living but that the other half is gone; he is not sure whether Hades or Eros has carried it off. It occurs to him that it may have found its way back to one of his boy-loves, and he indignantly recalls that he had often forbade them to shelter the runaway. At this point (line 5) an unhealed corruption interferes with our understanding of the epigram.<sup>1</sup> Pfeiffer presents the last two lines as follows:

† ουκικυνηφρον· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἡ λιθόλευστος  
κείνη καὶ δύσερως οἶδ' ὅτι πού στρέφεται.

The epigram was evidently the basis for one by Q. Lutatius Catulus, whose text is given by Gellius (19.9.14= Morel p.43). Catulus is far from merely translating Callimachus, for it is his *whole animus* which has run away, and it has taken refuge, he suspects, with a specific Theotimus. His last two lines run:

*ibimus quaesitum. verum, ne ipsi teneamur  
formido. quid ago? da, Venus, consilium.*

<sup>1</sup> F. Dornseiff's explanation of the text as it stands (*SymbOslo* 30 [1953] 27–29) seems to me hardly to be taken seriously.

The *ibimus quaesitum* suggests *δίφησον* in the corrupt line of Callimachus, as it did to Jacobs, but none of the emendations proposed since the appearance of Pfeiffer's text in 1953 seems to me to have healed the passage.

The attempts at emendation known to me are the following: Bousquet<sup>2</sup> suggests *οὐκ ἐς κεῦ*; *δίφησον*; Cataudella<sup>3</sup> *οὔκουν κυν . . .*; *δίφησον*, where the points represent *aposiopesis*; Ferguson<sup>4</sup> *οὐ τις κυνδίφησον*. The last of these seems promising to me in recognizing the compound *κυνδίφησον* although the verb is not found elsewhere, but the *οὐ τις* does not seem to me to function as the sense of the line requires. The *ἐκεῖσε* which follows should point to some place already mentioned. The place may be the house or haunt of some one of the poet's former lovers previously vaguely referred to, but I would expect to find a more specific point of reference for the *ἐκεῖσε* exactly at the locus of the corruption. I would therefore suggest reading *οἰκία κυνδίφησον· ἐκεῖσε κτλ*. The word *οἰκία* seems to be a graphical possibility, and it is used twice elsewhere by Callimachus as the first dactyl in a line (fr.66.9 and *Hymn* 4.282).

My understanding of the line as emended would be: "Help me search (their) houses, for I know that lovesick scapegrace is lurking there somewhere." That the person to whom the call for help is addressed is not identified does not seem to me to require explanation in an epigram any more than we need to know who the speaker is. Catulus shows the same vagueness in his *ibimus*, which is addressed to an otherwise unidentified person, the auditor or reader of the epigram.

## II. *Epigram* XLIV

The last line of this epigram is blemished by a corrupt beginning and appears in Pfeiffer's text as:

† οὗτος οσειγαρηης† εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα βάλῃ.

If the epigram is to carry through the thought of its opening couplet, as it seems to me it should, the corrupt line ought to continue the figure of undermining there introduced. Bentley may have been aiming at this when he proposed *ὁ κυέρπηης* on the basis of the

<sup>2</sup> J. Bousquet, "Callimaque, épigramme 41," *REG* 68 (1955) 121–23.

<sup>3</sup> Q. Cataudella, "Tre epigrammi di Callimaco," *Maia* 19 (1967) 356–62.

<sup>4</sup> J. Ferguson, "The Epigrams of Callimachus," *G&R* 17 (1970) 78–79.

Hesychius gloss *σιγέρπησ· λαθροδάκτησ*, but the gloss seems to suggest that *σιγέρπησ* is a compound invented to describe a stealthy dog or other animal, and *σιγέρπησ* would thus mix the figure of the epigram further and weaken, rather than sharpen, the effect.

The epigram opens with an oath by Pan and Dionysus that there is “some fire hidden here beneath the ashes,” the same figure that Horace uses in *Carm.* 2.1.7–8 to describe the hidden hazards of the course Asinius Pollio had chosen to tread. In Callimachus, however, the second and third lines make clear, if there had been any doubt, that the hidden fire is that of love. He says, “I don’t trust myself; don’t put your arms around me. Often a silent stream eats away beneath a wall and no one knows.” The figure of the unseen fire has given way to that of the unseen stream, but both the fire and the stream are working away stealthily beneath the surface. The last two lines continue, “That’s why I am afraid now, Menexenus, that this *σειγαρνησ*<sup>†</sup> may steal in and throw me into—love.” Whatever is represented by the corrupt word must stand for the insidious influence of the lover’s nearness.

There is a family of words: *σῆραγξ* or *σῆραγξ*, *σῆραγγοσ*, *σῆράγγιον*, *σῆραγγώδησ*, *σῆραγγόω*, and Hesychius defines the first of these as *σῆλαιον*, *κοιλότησ*, *ὑφαλοσ πέτρα ρήγματα ἔχουσα*. The similarity of words of this group to our corrupt word and the appropriateness of its meaning to our context seem suggestive. Furthermore Hesychius offers the equation *σῆράγγων· σῆλαιών*, *ἐπιθυμιών*, suggesting a poetic source where the lemma, whose basic meaning is *σῆλαιών*, has the figurative meaning *ἐπιθυμιών*, and this would seem to be precisely the case with our corrupt word. Since, however, Hesychius’ lemma is in the genitive it cannot be claimed for this epigram, and none of the recorded congeners of *σῆραγξ* will, in the nominative, substitute for the corrupt word. If it were possible to suppose that Callimachus here used or coined a word *σῆραγγεύσ* or *σῆράγγησ* (both agents), we would have a most satisfactory sense. The epigram would be saying, “That is why, Menexenus, I now fear that this underminer may find its way in and topple me into love.”

### III. *Hymn* 6.135–37

The hymn to Demeter ends with a leavetaking and an appeal to the goddess to preserve the city. The appeal is expanded in detail in the following lines:

φέρει δ' ἀγρόθι νόστιμα πάντα·  
 φέρβε βόας, φέρε μᾶλα, φέρε στάχυν, οἷσε θερικμόν,  
 φέρβε καὶ εἰράναν.

These lines inevitably recall the puzzlingly corrupt abnormal lines of Sappho (104 L.P.), which have troubled critics and appealed to poets.

\*Ἐσπερε πάντα φέρων ὄσα φαίνολις ἐσκέδασ' Αὔως,  
 †φέρει οἶν, φέρεις αἶγα, φέρεις ἄπυ† μάτερι παιδα.

That Callimachus had these lines in mind would seem to be guaranteed by the fact that in the dramatic opening of the hymn the appearance of Hesperus is emphatically referred to (7–8).

Callimachus is not, in fact, the first to have made poetic allusion to these Sapphic lines. In fr.51 (PMG 396) Anacreon turns the anaphora to a different use:<sup>5</sup>

Φέρ' ὕδωρ, φέρ' οἶνον, ὦ παῖ,  
 φέρε <δ' > ἀνθεμεῦντας ἡμῖν  
 στεφάνους, ἔνεικον, ὡς δὴ  
 πρὸς Ἔρωτα πυκταλίζω.

The repetition of the verb is not, of course, remarkable, but the similarity of pattern in the three passages is so striking as to seem to me to exclude coincidence. If the Sapphic lines were well enough known to have led Anacreon to imitate them, it may well be that the metrical problem which they present was a subject of scholarly discussion among Callimachus' Alexandrian contemporaries. On this supposition one might further suppose that his substitution of *φέρβε* at the beginning of the two lines was intended as a sort of comment on the problem, a technique not unexampled in his poetry.<sup>6</sup> It could also be that he was not unaware of the Anacreontic lines, since he varies the forms of *φέρω* with *οἷσε* as Anacreon had done with *ἔνεικον*.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
 June, 1975

<sup>5</sup> I have followed the punctuation and orthography of B. Gentili, ed. *Anacreon* (Rome 1958) fr.38, p.30.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 139f.