

The Epilogue to the *Aetia*

Peter E. Knox

FOR SOME TIME it has been thought that the difficulties surrounding the publication date of Callimachus' *Aetia* and the arrangement of its four books could be resolved by an ingenious theory of Rudolph Pfeiffer. To summarize briefly, the only part of the poem securely datable at the time of Pfeiffer's edition was the last episode of Book 4, the *Coma Berenices*, which cannot have been composed before 245 B.C. This date may hold for the Prologue as well, where Callimachus refers to himself as an old man. But other parts of the poem seem to have been used by Apollonius of Rhodes and may therefore have been written as early as 270.¹ To account for this discrepancy Pfeiffer posited an early edition of the *Aetia* that opened with the *Somnium*, depicting an encounter between Callimachus and the Muses. According to this theory the *Somnium* served as an introduction both to the entire poem and, more specifically, to the first two books, in the form of a dialogue between the poet and the Muses. This was the version available to Apollonius. Late in life Callimachus decided to reissue his poetry in a collected edition. He then attached a new Prologue and incorporated the *Coma Berenices* and perhaps other stories as well. Finally, he added an Epilogue (fr.112) announcing a transition to the "prosaic pasture of the Muses," interpreted by Pfeiffer as a reference to the *Iambi*, which followed in this later edition.²

Pfeiffer's theory no doubt accounts for several of the chronological problems posed by the fragments, and in some essentials, as we shall see, has been confirmed by recent papyrus discoveries. But certain aspects of this reconstruction depend upon a very unlikely set of assumptions, and might long since have been discarded had it not been for the considerable authority exercised by its author. In particular, the hypothesis of a collected edition of Callimachus' works by the poet himself is not persuasive. Given the nature of book production before the adoption of the codex form, a collected edition could

¹ For the evidence for Apollonius' borrowing see Rudolph Pfeiffer, *Callimachus II* (Oxford 1953) xli-xlii.

² Pfeiffer (*supra* n.1) xxxvi; also, "Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos," *Hermes* 63 (1928) 339.

only have consisted of a box containing all Callimachus' works on rolls.³ While it is conceivable that Callimachus might have written a new Prologue to serve as an introduction to his most important work,⁴ there is no reason to suppose that he might have thought it necessary, or even desirable, to link the end of one poem to the beginning of another in an entirely different genre. Pfeiffer's explanation of the Epilogue as such a linking device seems, on re-examination, to have gained premature acceptance.

The publication of the Lille Callimachus compels us to reassess another point in Pfeiffer's hypothesis. In his convincing reconstruction, P. J. Parsons has established that the Third Book of the *Aetia* opened with the elaborate piece known as the *Victoria Berenices*.⁵ While the new fragment puts it beyond doubt that a substantial reworking of the *Aetia* took place *ca* 245, Pfeiffer's argument that the *Coma Berenices* was an insertion in a second edition must be modified. As Parsons notes, the appearance of the *Victoria* at the beginning of the Third Book inescapably suggests that it is a companion piece designed to balance the *Coma* at the end of Book Four. Pfeiffer was correct in his assumption that Callimachus produced a new edition of the *Aetia*, but it most likely took the form of two new books added to an existing poem, also of two books. In the original edition a degree of narrative unity had been provided by the device of the dialogue between the poet and the Muses, while in the two books composed for the second edition this pose is dropped and the collection of stories is bracketed by aetiological tales that refer to Berenice.⁶

³ L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*² (Oxford 1974) 31, on the advantages of the codex over the roll: "It had a relevance for literary texts too: a book which could hold the contents of several rolls meant that a corpus of an author's work could be put under one cover." Callimachus, as Wilamowitz notes (*Hellenistische Dichtung* I [Berlin 1924] 210), never knew such a book.

⁴ The Prologue, in which Callimachus refers to himself as an old man, is routinely assigned to the second edition of *ca* 245. The suggestion, originally made by A. Rostagni, "Nuovo Callimaco," *RivFC* 6 (1928) 5, 23ff, that Callimachus' protests about his age were made in ironic overstatement, may deserve reconsideration; but the connection drawn by Rostagni between the Prologue of the *Aetia* and Apollonius must be rejected. The Prologue also might then belong to the first edition. Cf. also Rostagni, "I nuovi frammenti di commento agli Aitia e la polemica letteraria di Callimaco," *RivFC* 11 (1933) 207-09; C. Gallovotti, "Il prologo e l'epilogo degli 'Aitia,'" *StItal* 10 (1932) 245f. The date of the Prologue is discussed in much greater detail in a forthcoming paper by Alan Cameron, "Callimachus and his Critics." I am grateful to Professor Cameron for allowing me to read a draft and for his many helpful comments besides.

⁵ P. J. Parsons, "Callimachus: Victoria Berenices," *ZPE* 25 (1977) 1-50, esp. 46ff. The *Victoria* is now available as *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, edd. H. Lloyd-Jones and Peter Parsons (= *Texte und Kommentare* 11 [Berlin/New York 1983]) 100-17 nos. 254-69.

⁶ Thus Parsons (*supra* n.5) 50, who retains the notion that both the Prologue and the Epilogue were written for the new edition.

As soon as we discount the possibility that this expanded version was intended for a collected edition of all Callimachus' poetical works, the interpretation of the Epilogue to the *Aetia* begins to pose serious difficulties (fr.112 Pf.):

...]. .ιν ὄτ' ἐμὴ μούσα τ[. . . .]άσεται
 ...]του καὶ Χαρίτων [. . . .]ρια μοιαδ' ἀνάσσης
 ...]τερης οὐ σε ψευδον[. . . .]ματι
 πάντ' ἀγαθὴν καὶ πάντα τ[ε]λεσφόρον εἶπεν . . . [. . .] [
 κείν. . τῷ Μοῦσαι πολλὰ νέμοντι βοτὰ
 σὺν μύθους ἐβάλοντο παρ' ἴχν[ι]ον ὄξέος ἵππου·
 χαῖρε, σὺν εὐεστοῖ δ' ἔρχεο λωϊτέρη.
 χαῖρε, Ζεῦ, μέγα καὶ σύ, σάω δ' [ὄλο]ν οἶκον ἀνάκτων·
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν.

Discussion of the badly-damaged opening lines is best postponed until the significance of the final line has been determined. *Μουσέων πεζὸν νομόν* is now generally understood as a reference to Callimachus' *Iambi*, an interpretation probably confirmed by Horace's reference to satire as *Musa pedestris*.⁷ The question is inextricably bound up with the dating of this fragment. The view that Callimachus here refers to his *Iambi* has until now also depended upon Pfeiffer's notion of an edition collected by the author. That notion has been lent a degree of plausibility by the fact that the *Iambi* follow the *Aetia* both in the *Diegeseis* (*P.Mil.* II 18) and the fourth-century codex that actually contained a collected edition (*P.Oxy.* VII 1011). But the coincidence does not necessarily prove that this order was established by Callimachus, or, more importantly, that it was accomplished in the manner proposed by Pfeiffer. The most obvious interpretation of the statement, "I will pass on to the prosaic pasture of the Muses," is that it is a declaration of literary intent.⁸ What is not clear is how the last line might be intended to refer to the next in a sequence of collected works being reproduced on papyrus rolls. Once the *Aetia* and *Iambi* had been juxtaposed in a codex, the final line might be so construed by a reader, but there is no evidence to suggest that he could be directed to a new roll in such

⁷ Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.17; cf. *Epist.* 2.1.250f, *sermones . . . repentēs per humum*, and Brink on *Ars P.* 28. The view that Callimachus here refers to his prose writings was held by Wilamowitz, among others; cf. H. Herter, "Bericht über die Literatur zur hellenistischen Dichtung aus den Jahren 1921–35," in Bursian, *Jahresb.* 255 (1937) 144f. But this interpretation cannot account for the future sense of ἔπειμι, because there is no reason to believe that Callimachus had not written scholarly prose before the *Aetia*.

⁸ For this older view of the Epilogue, abandoned once Pfeiffer's theory had taken hold, see H. Herter, *RE Suppl.* 5 (1931) 425f s.v. "Kallimachos."

a way.⁹ At the conclusion of the *Aetia*, it appears, Callimachus announces that he has finished with aetiological poetry in elegiac couplets and will now turn to composition in a different genre, the *Iambi*.

There is further evidence to suggest that Callimachus is here making a literary statement, not directing traffic in a *capsa*. The attachment of an epilogue, often taking the form of a *sphragis*, to a long poem or collection of poems is a familiar practice in the Roman poets: Verg. *G.* 4.559–66, Hor. *Carm.* 3.30, Ov. *Met.* 15.871–79. In lines 5f of the Epilogue Callimachus refers to his own words in the *Somnium* (fr.2.1), providing what amounts to a *sphragis* identifying the poet as the same one who had earlier been visited by the Muses. The metaphor of the poetic *νομός* is consistent with the Hesiodic character of the Heliconian locale represented at the beginning of the *Aetia*.¹⁰ Something of the same imagery is apparent in the programmatic statements of Latin poets. Propertius so refers to poetry in the Callimachean vein when he represents Apollo diverting him from heroic epic: *mollia sunt paruis prata terenda rotis*, 3.3.18.¹¹ But another parallel is even more suggestive. The final poem in Ovid's collection of *Amores* is just such a *sphragis* (*quos ego conposui, Paeligni ruris alumnus*, 3.15.3), and at its conclusion the poet announces his intention to turn to composition in another genre (3.15.17f):¹²

*corniger increpuit thyrso grauiore Lyaeus:
pulsanda est magnis area maior equis.*

Callimachus' Epilogue can only make sense if it is read as a prelude to further poetic endeavours. The practice of Latin poets indicates that they, at least, read it in this way.

If the Epilogue of the *Aetia* refers to the *Iambi* as a future composition, certain chronological complications must be faced. Although

⁹ The last couplet added to Book II of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* is not an exact parallel. Ovid specifically refers to a following roll (*uos eritis chartae proxima cura meae*, 2.746), and this announces a new book apparently added to the same poem, not a different work in a collected edition.

¹⁰ Callimachus' formulation perhaps recalls *Hymn.Hom.Ap.* 20, *πάντη γάρ τοι, Φοῦβε, νομὸς βεβλήσεται ὠδῆς*. Cf. *ἐπέων νομὸς* at *Il.* 20.249, Hes. *Op.* 403.

¹¹ M. Rothstein, *Propertius* II (Berlin 1898) *ad loc.*, refers to this as another instance of chariot racing as a metaphor for poetry; but chariots were not ordinarily raced in meadows. The same imagery occurs at Manilius 2.53, *integra quaeramur rorantis prata per herbas*, in a passage that makes heavy use of Callimachean terminology. Cf. Prop. 2.10.2, *et campum Haemonio iam dare tempus equo*; Ov. *Am.* 3.1.26, *Ars Am.* 1.39, *Tr.* 2.327.

¹² Ovid uses the metaphor again, echoing this passage, at *Fast.* 4.10, *nunc teritur nostris area maior equis*.

the *Iambi* offer no precise indication of date, a consensus seems to have emerged that they belong to the earlier part of Callimachus' career.¹³ It would certainly be awkward to attribute the composition of all the *Iambi* to the period following 245, when Callimachus was already an old man. And perhaps it is unnecessary. Several allusions in the text suggest that the Epilogue forms a carefully constructed pendant to the *Somnium* in Book 1. As we have already seen, Callimachus refers in lines 5–6 of the Epilogue to the encounter with the Muses on Helicon. There may be a further reference to *Aetia* 1 in the fragmentary opening lines of the Epilogue. The *Χάριτες* who appear in the second line obviously recall the appearance of the Graces as the subject of the first aetiological tale after the *Somnium*.¹⁴ Many other details of interpretation would be clearer if the *ἀνάσσης ἡμετέρης* of lines 2–3 could be certainly identified. Pfeiffer, among others, originally suspected Arsinoe, but the consensus has shifted to Berenice.¹⁵

The principal difficulty in the identification with Arsinoe is its juxtaposition with the *Coma Berenices*, which precedes this passage as the last *aition* in Book 4. It may therefore be objected that Callimachus would not have referred to a different queen so obliquely here. But the beginning of the Epilogue is badly damaged, and there is no reason why the text might not have supplied further information to identify the queen as Arsinoe. Nor is there any reason why the juxtaposition of Berenice and Arsinoe should have seemed awkward to Callimachus:¹⁶ he may well already have placed her on Helicon in *Aetia* 1, where he apparently encountered—in addition to the nine Muses—a tenth unnamed one. The London Scholia report that she was Arsinoe, but it would appear that this is only a guess, for another commentary offers two other suggestions as well.¹⁷ But the identification with Arsinoe is not to be dismissed lightly. A reference to Arsinoe as the tenth Muse would constitute a graceful compliment by

¹³ For the somewhat vague indications of an early date for the *Iambi*, see P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* I (Oxford 1972) 734, with references to earlier literature. A date prior to the *Argonautica* for at least *Iambus* 8 (fr.198 Pf.) is argued by A. Cameron in his forthcoming paper (*supra* n.4).

¹⁴ See Pfeiffer's note on fr.112.2. These links between the Epilogue and *Aetia* 1 were rightly stressed by M. Pohlenz, "Kallimachos' Aitia," *Hermes* 68 (1933) 323–27.

¹⁵ In his note on this passage, Pfeiffer admits Arsinoe as a possibility, but retracts this note in his addenda (II 116). Early arguments in favor of Arsinoe were made by A. Rostagni, "Nuovo Callimaco," (*supra* n.4) 33ff, and Pohlenz (*supra* n.14) 325f.

¹⁶ The appearance of Berenice and her dynastic parent Arsinoe at the end of the *Aetia* might then have served as a model for Ovid's pairing of Augustus and Julius Caesar at the conclusion of the *Metamorphoses*.

¹⁷ Cf. fr.2^a in Pfeiffer (*supra* n.1) 102.

Callimachus to his patroness, paralleled by *Ep.* 51, in which he praises Berenice as the fourth Grace.¹⁸ Certainly Arsinoe's importance to Callimachus warranted a compliment of this sort.¹⁹

If we accept this identification, then there is nothing in the Epilogue that presumes the existence of *Aetia* 3–4. All the references in the text take us back instead to the opening of the poem. A possible solution suggests itself to the chronological problems raised by the appearance of Arsinoe and the allusion to the *Iambi* as a projected composition. The death of Arsinoe in 270 may provide a *terminus ante* for the composition of the Epilogue, and it would then follow that these lines originally constituted the conclusion to the first two-book edition of the *Aetia*. If the Epilogue originally appeared at the end of Book 2, the identification of the divinity in line 7 as one of the Muses makes better sense than it would if the piece had been designed to follow Book 4, where the dialogue with the Muses had been abandoned. In the Epilogue Callimachus consistently refers to the introduction of the poem, and he frames the entire work with flattering references to his queen, Arsinoe.²⁰ This pattern lent itself to repetition: when he attached two new books to his *Aetia* he provided a structure by bracketing the addition with episodes that included his new queen, Berenice.

The question of what changes, if any, Callimachus made in his second edition has long proved troubling. Now that it appears that the major change involved the addition of two new books, the one element in the existing books that may well have demanded revision would be the end of Book 2: a poem cannot include an epilogue at its midpoint. But if Callimachus thought the piece worth preserving, there is no reason why he need have discarded it. Obviously, incorporating the Epilogue into a new edition of the *Aetia* would create chronological inconsistency if the *Iambi* were mentioned as a forthcoming work when, in fact, they had already appeared. But there is no reason to assume that this would have disturbed Callimachus as much as it has modern scholars. Ovid again offers an instructive parallel. When he issued a second edition of the *Amores*, it ended

¹⁸ As noted by Gallavotti (*supra* n.4) 245, this parallel implies that Arsinoe may have been alive when Callimachus wrote these lines.

¹⁹ Cf. Pohlenz (*supra* n.14) 322: "Arsinoe hat er schon bei ihrer Ehe gefeiert, und ihr Tod hat ihm ein lyrisches Gedicht eingegeben, aus dem persönlicher Schmerz und tiefe Verehrung sprechen. Es war für ihn keine Redensart, wenn er am Eingang seines poetischen Hauptwerkes seine Herrscherin als die Persönlichkeit nannte, die für ihn und seine Dichtung dasselbe bedeutete wie für den alten Sänger die Musen."

²⁰ Pohlenz (*supra* n.14) 327: "eine 'Ringkomposition' grössten Stils, durch die er in Prolog und Epilog die Aitia zu einem subjektiven *éπ* zusammenschliesst."

with a renunciation of love elegy and the announcement of a tragedy at a time when the *Medea* was a thing of the past and Ovid was once again deeply involved in elegiac composition. Further, it may be relevant to note that when Ovid composed a new proem to the *Fasti* he did not jettison the original invocation of Augustus, but simply removed it to the Second Book.²¹ It would follow that the displacement of the original Epilogue of the *Aetia* to the end of the revised work was merely an easy and necessary adjustment made by Callimachus once he had decided to reissue the poem in an expanded version.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

February, 1985

²¹ Cf. F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten* I (Heidelberg 1957) 19.