

## HOMER AND HELLENISTIC POETRY (OTHER THAN EPIGRAM)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The background to the topic of this chapter—the reception of Homer in Hellenistic poetry other than epigram—is his universal acknowledgement as teacher, as master, as paradigm, even as divinity. Such dominance inevitably calls forth a hugely varied range of response, but the basic fact is not in doubt. A speaker in Theocritus—admittedly, one who is looking for an excuse not to have to commission any new poets—asks why bother with anyone else, for Homer is enough for all (*Id.* 16.20). Again, if Hermesianax’s catalogue of Greek philosophers and poets is having fun by eroticising their biographies, the epithet “divine” applied to Homer is graphically realised on a famous relief by Archelaus of Priene from Ptolemaic Egypt, showing Homer being crowned and receiving sacrifice. His seated, and very Zeus-like posture, very possibly reflects the iconography of his statue in a temple constructed for him by the fourth Ptolemy in Alexandria.<sup>1</sup> Adulatory poetry regards him as the fount of all literary genres, indeed as the mouthpiece of the kosmos itself.<sup>2</sup>

In an age as self-aware and self-critical as the Hellenistic, the great preoccupation of poets was the appropriate response to their literary heritage and above all to Homer—although the question was not a new one, for Pindar (in a frustratingly enigmatic passage) had already referred to Homer, a Muse or Muses, a path and a chariot in a way that suggests he was distancing himself from his predecessor and advertising his innovation.<sup>3</sup> Certainly, for a practising poet Homer might represent continuity, tradition, and a conservative approach to poetry. But he might also provide a powerful and flexible idiom whose expressive potential had been nurtured by the centuries of attention his works had received, and which offered scope

for creativity and intelligent reworking. We should note, right at the outset, that Homeric language and style was not and never could be the carrier of single meanings and universally-agreed interpretations. It carries different significations in different circumstances. For instance: in a famous fragment from the Attic comic poet Straton, a cook who speaks in high-flown Homeric glosses is nearly incomprehensible to his interlocutors, who communicate in everyday speech and need a glossary to make sense of the bewildering idiom.<sup>4</sup> But if Homeric language is absurdly pretentious *vis-à-vis* the vernacular, within poetic language itself it may be seen as routine to the point of cliché, as suggested by an epigram in which Homeric imitation is presented as cliché-ridden hack-work.<sup>5</sup> And in another move, so far from being obscure and affected, Homer is manly, the poetry of “wine-drinkers” in contrast to a gloss-ridden, over-precious style attributed to the frugal and effeminate drinkers of water.<sup>6</sup>

Homer’s legacy for Hellenistic poetry is a dauntingly large topic for a single chapter, but it can be broken down. I shall begin by considering the special legacy of the Homeric dialect before moving on to the main content of the chapter, the legacy of Homeric epic and reactions to it—how epic is renewed, and how it is challenged. We shall review some of those who wish to revive it in some way, and those whose reaction takes the form of articulating an alternative aesthetic (the small, the pure, the exquisite). As we shall see, however, the opposition that used to be drawn between Apollonius and Callimachus as representatives of these two “schools” is a false one. Among genres which in some sense offer alternatives to the *os grande* of epic we need to consider epyllia, elegy, and bucolic. Next, there are genres which are related to epic, not by reaction and controversy, but simply through the use of the hexameter metre, metre being the favourite ancient means of classification. In other words, from an ancient point of view, they were related to epic genetically rather than through critique

and position-taking: such genres include didactic, hymn, and even bucolic (though this has a claim also to belong to the first group, as we shall see). And finally there is the special case of hymn, which certainly reacts to another item of the epic corpus, though it is not certain whether it rests on the belief that the Homeric Hymns were indeed genuine.

To begin, then, with Homer's dialect, this was itself a springboard of opportunity. Indeed, the possibilities it offered were limited only by the erudition and ingenuity of the imitator. Often it is a question of giving an impression of Homer—as Callimachus might have said (when paying tribute to Aratus' selective imitation of Hesiod), not Homer to the hilt, but what Emile Cahen called *presque Homérique*.<sup>7</sup> He described it as “the illusion of Homerism”, a style which has “enough similarities to arrest the attention and the ear by recollection and resonance, [but] enough novelty to preclude the easy convenience of exact repetition”. The aim of someone writing in this style would be, “by the resemblance of some of these groupings [sc. of phrases] to the epic text, to awaken precise recollections, by the words and their sound, without ever engaging in direct imitation”; Callimachus writing in this mode “seems to want to set the reader or listener on the path of recall and then to divert him.” The effect is like Homer through a kaleidoscope, with reassembled fragments which are individually Homeric but reconfigured, sometimes combined with words that are unHomeric, or assigned different senses from their Homeric contexts. Homeric metrical patterns may be evoked, but are now filled with different content. A clever style with subtle effects, alternately enticing and frustrating, it may convey an impression of epic narrative,<sup>8</sup> or hymn, or even didactic (on whose “epic” ancestry see below). It is harder to gauge the effect in Euphorion of Chalcis, who uses the same technique in the next generation, because in most cases the nature of the poems from which the extant fragments are

taken is unclear. But we seem to see him extending the *presque Homérique* into his favourite genre of curses, now reinvented as a species of hexameter poetry, and perhaps also into epyllion.<sup>9</sup>

This kind of Homeric evocation readily extends to other kinds of engagement with the Homeric text, erudite and specifically philological. The Homeric dialect is mediated through Homeric scholarship, in which many of the literary giants of the Hellenistic period were actively engaged. The combination of scholarship and poetry that would become such a feature of the early Alexandrian period was already pioneered by Antimachus of Colophon at the end of the classical period. The exact nature of his work on Homer is unclear, but the Homeric scholia credit him with readings mostly from the *Iliad*, and the addition of explicative notes implies some sort of exegesis as well, if not a full-blown commentary.<sup>10</sup> He is followed by glossaries by Philitas of Cos and Simias of Rhodes, neither specifically Homeric, though apparently with points of contact with the Homeric text.<sup>11</sup> Editions of Homer are attributed to Rhianus and to Aratus (the latter described as a δῖορθωσις); and while the earliest of the editions of Homer by the three big names in Hellenistic scholarship, that of Zenodotus, may or may not be reflected in the poetry of Callimachus and Apollonius, it apparently elicited a response from Apollonius—though whether it was a neutral or a hostile one is impossible to be certain from the title (Πρὸς Ζηνόδοτον could mean “to” or “against”).<sup>12</sup>

The result is a type of poetry which is sensitive to the philological issues raised by the Homeric text. It reproduces rarities, often reflecting their frequency in the Homeric text. It fills out incomplete paradigms. It offers interpretations or glosses of controversial words, sometimes reproducing each of the meanings of a word of disputed or multiple sense. And it takes a stand on *crucēs* and controverted points in

the Homeric text, implicitly advocating one interpretation or reading instead of another. Callimachus' *Hecale* is full of examples.<sup>13</sup> As a miniaturisation of the *Odyssey* (among other things) its language is considerably closer to Homer than that of Callimachus' other works, which makes it a particularly good instance of how the various facets of the Homerising enterprise—evocation, imitation with variation, and precise philological engagement—all complement each other. One small example, this time from the *Aitia*: fr. 78 ὥφελες οὖλοον ἔγχος (“if only the destructive sword”, transl. Harder) echoes a familiar Homeric formula (ὄβριμον ἔγχος), but replaces the epithet with a learned Hellenistic variation on a notorious Homeric puzzle-word (οὖλος), and in combination with ὥφελες, “would that”, also manages to recall the deprecation of the Argo's sailing from the beginning of Euripides' *Medea*. Better still, Euphorion out-Homers Homer in order to pay tribute to him. By describing him as ἀπροτίμαστος (fr. 118 P.), “untouchable”, he recycles and reinterprets (or “resemanticises”) a Homeric *hapax legomenon*. Homer had applied the epithet to Briseis, meaning that she was “undefiled” (*Il.* 19.263), but for Euphorion Homer himself is beyond all approach.

So much by way of preparing the ground for the main discussion, that of the pervasive influence of Homeric epic on Hellenistic poetry. Its ubiquity—extending well beyond epic itself—is often accounted for by the theory of “Crossing of Genres”.<sup>14</sup> As the following discussion will suggest, the term is helpful only up to a very limited extent, for it tends to mask very different kinds of interaction between genres. For instance, a formal experiment like an unfamiliar combination of metre and dialect (e.g. hexameters in the Doric dialect instead of standard epic-Ionic) is a very different proposition from the interfusion of one genre, which remains recognisably itself, with aspects of another (for example, Apollonian epic imbued with elements of

lyric, tragedy, or historiography), and different again from the emergence of a new genre like bucolic out of individually-recognisable older elements whose reconfiguration remains nevertheless without precedent. The following discussion will clarify these claims.

## 2. THE LEGACY OF EPIC

The notion that the most famous Hellenistic poets represent an anti-epic, anti-Homeric *avant garde*, and that their surviving works—in fact the majority of surviving Hellenistic poetry—should be interpreted in a framework in which the traditionalists vie with the radicals has received a steady battering over the last couple of decades, although so far it has refused to die. It is fostered by a propensity for attitudinising, for manifestos and for polemic for which the highly articulate community of scholar-poets in Alexandria was particularly notorious. And yet it is far from easy to extract firm principles or commitments from *jeux-d’esprit* and flourishes that prove extremely elusive. Callimachus’ critics (according to him) accuse him of failing to write long poems about kings and heroes, to whom he responds with a stated preference for brevity, craftsmanship, and euphony (*Aitia*, fr. 1). Elsewhere he has Apollo reject the muddy Euphrates for pure springs (*Hymn* 2.105–12). But to what do these terms refer?<sup>15</sup> It is tempting, but too much at risk of putting words into their mouths, to read into them the terms of controversies in which later figures were embroiled, as when Erycius alleges (but how ingenuously?) that the latter-day Callimachean, Parthenius, poured scorn on the Homeric poems (*AP* 7.377 = *Garland* XIII), and others (but how reliably?) that Hadrian demoted him and provocatively championed Antimachus.<sup>16</sup>

In the first place, not only Hellenistic poetry but ancient literary criticism in general is much given to statements of critical principle and aesthetic theory in which

Homer, or his imitators, or poetry with a Homeric aesthetic, figures as one half of an antithesis. This tendency is antecedent to Hellenistic poetry, but the Homeric epics themselves are in no way disparaged. For instance, in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, Aeschylus is the one with Homeric qualities<sup>17</sup> in the duel with Euripides, where the contrast turns on the archaic and the up-to-date. Euripides' poetics of craftsmanship and urbanity are destined to prevail in the long term, and in the Hellenistic period poets of course reiterate their commitment to the small, exquisite, and highly-wrought. But neither in Aristophanes is the "Homeric" tragedian allowed to suffer detriment and lose the contest, nor in the Hellenistic poets themselves is the corollary spelled out, that Homeric poetry itself is aesthetically objectionable. Rather, the issue may be made to turn on inept Homeric *imitation*, as when Lycidas in Theocritus' programmatic seventh *Idyll* attacks "the builder who seeks to raise a house as high as the peak of Mount Oromedon, and the cocks of the Muses who crow against the Chian bard [i.e. Homer] and waste their labour" (*Id.* 7.45–48), and at an (uncertain) later date, Pollianus denounces the cyclic poets as opposed to the elegists Callimachus and Parthenius (*AP* 11.130).

In the second place, it is increasingly hard to rest content with the traditional picture of an ocean of conservative Homerisers from which the élite, the innovators, emerge like a streak of foam on the crest of the billows beneath them. The latter used to be thought the vast majority. Alan Cameron laid siege to that notion, though here and there scraps of inert stuff can be found, Homeric enough to please the most conservative palate.<sup>18</sup> The suggestion has also been made that Callimachus' *bêtes-noires* in the *Aitia* prologue were actually composers of encomiastic elegies (not epics) celebrating the military prowess of contemporary rulers, some of which hack-work was no doubt (which of course implies doubt!) Homerising in quality.<sup>19</sup> Be all this as it

may, there is no basis for the essentially modern myth that Apollonius and Callimachus quarrelled over the issue of epic poetry. Sources that suggest lack of amity between the two men are Byzantine,<sup>20</sup> and none goes so far as to suggest that there was a quarrel that turned on poetic theory. Attempts to force ancient evidence into the procrustean model of traditionalists *versus* moderns are now a thing of the past. Rather, the two contemporaries were engaged in projects that could only have been formulated in a highly sophisticated environment, whether they involve radical shifts within the epic voice, cultivated games with its language, or transvaluation and the promotion of alternative aesthetic values.

Apollonius' *Argonautica*, in four long books with a total of almost 6,000 lines, falls not far short of half the length of the *Odyssey* (12,110 lines). It is by far our longest Hellenistic poem, and clearly stakes out its claim to represent multi-book hexameter epic in the old epic-Ionic idiom. The subject-matter is heroic (the Argonauts' quest for the fleece, against a backdrop of interested Olympian gods), the narrative technique derivative from Homer's (the invocation of a Muse or Muses; counterfactuals; divisions of time—at least, *some* of the time; prolepsis and analepsis), while other narrative conventions are recognisably Homeric, such as the practice of giving the background history of an object that will prove significant (3.845–68, 4.424–34). This is clearly a stunningly sophisticated engagement with archaic epic. Here we will concentrate on just some of its features.

The first is a radical rethinking of formulaic composition. The bard of primary epic leaned on verbal formulae, repetitional devices, set sequences and “type scenes” for ease of composition. The Alexandrian can treat them as one element to be juggled or jettisoned alongside all the other literary riches available to him. The literary nature of the undertaking, as opposed to its organic growth from a living oral tradition, is



evident in the tendency to offer one showpiece example of a given Homeric feature (thus, one showpiece divine scene on Olympus to open book three), and for the most part eschews verbal repetition.<sup>21</sup> A Homeric type-scene or stock situation may be evoked, but with a minimum of formulaic rigmarole. For example, a hospitality sequence is deployed for the arrival of Jason and the sons of Phrixus at Aeetes' palace, with a bath and a meal followed by questions (3.270–73, 299–316, but this time fully individuated by the bull sacrifice (NB Aeetes' animals!). The firing of a weapon becomes a show-piece when Eros' bow-shot wounds Medea. Instead of formulae and types, what Apollonian narrative tends to offer in their place are patterns of another sort, of motif and theme, sometimes brought into focus by the repetition of thematically significant words, but not by formulae: as we shall see, helplessness (ἀμηχανία) and guile, plotting, and deception (δόλος, μῆτις, and derivatives) are among the poem's recurrent notions. Similarly, gesture is far less formalised than in Homer. Supplicating Medea, Chalciope clasps her knees in the traditional way but also sinks her head on her breast as the scene develops into an intimate and emotive encounter of two suffering sisters (3.706–7). Aphrodite draws Eros' cheeks towards her and kisses him (3.149–50). Medea takes Jason's right hand (as her Homeric counterpart in the corresponding scene had not), perhaps reminding us that the right hand is involved in oaths (3.1067–68), and later sits with her cheek resting on her own hand (3.1160). Non-verbal communication is a good deal more developed too, with many references to smiles, tears, eyes timidly downcast or sensationally meeting. A contrasting approach to the use of Homeric convention, however, might be observed in Jason's yoking of the bulls at the end of the third book, where simile follows simile in an extraordinary escalation of the Homeric practice of clustering similes at moments of high tension (*Il.* 2.455–83, 15.592 ff., 17.722 ff.). It cannot be called “parody”,

which in ancient literature usually refer to the reapplication of form to new and incongruous content, but might be described as Homer overdone or overdosed, Homer on stilts.

Second, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are of course ambitiously rewritten, with the Colchis sequence in the third book based on Odysseus' arrival in Scheria and his truncated romance with its princess. The sheer scale of this rewriting makes it impossible to follow in all its tiny and rewarding attention to detail, but a few points stand out. First is the sheer scope that the Homeric subtext offers to intensify meaning. In this case it cannot but function to generate irony, because of the utterly different outcome of the two plot-lines. In both cases a handsome stranger meets father and eligible daughter. In the one, she is willing, he complacent, but Odysseus unavailable. In the other, however, she defies her tyrannical parent to elope with the stranger, a disaster whose shockwaves continue to spread for years to come. Second is the polyphony of the rewriting. Scheria may be the main model, but many others are in use simultaneously, such as a running suggestion that equates Aeetes with Odysseus' nightmare host, the Cyclops. In particular, the use of multiple models for Medea (Nausicaa, along with suggestions of Helen, of Circe, of Penelope, and others) enables the creation of a character who is complex, conflicted, and whose story still has several possible outcomes. Virgil will use the same polyphonic technique when he rewrites epic for himself, and in particular when he revises the Scheria sequence for Aeneas' arrival in Carthage, although I would suggest that his intertexts function more to fabricate situation than to construct character. In the *Argonautica* they are perhaps more purposeful in this respect. They enable measurement of the gulf that separates the two princesses, the *ingénue* from the maiden whose capacity for menace is already so clear.

We might note that alongside his intensive use of Homer Apollonius has also invested his narrative with an ethos that seems to owe much to the spirit of cyclic epic, although actual borrowings are hard to spot because of the death of surviving material. But one still notes the prominence of magic, an atmosphere in which the sub-Olympian supernatural, the uncanny and irrational, is more prominent than it is in the *Odyssey* (let alone the austere *Iliad*), in which the heroes have to deal with a series of monstrous adversaries (unlike the sympathetic fellow-combatants of the *Iliad*), and in which treachery and atrocity take place. There is also a notable interest in experiments in indirect speech.<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, if such features are to be recognised as a cyclic inflection of Homeric epic, the *Argonautica* is also permeated with aspects of other genres which make it reasonable to consider the poem a more radical experiment in the hybridisation of the epic genre itself. As indicated above, I should prefer to avoid the expression “crossing of genres” in favour of something like infusion or transfusion. Epic remains the main mode, but it is permeated by others, such as historiography or ethnography (3.200–9), and by the geographical genre of the *periplus* or coastal voyage, tracing their passage along the southern coast of the Black Sea. Above all, in the third book it famously receives an erotic character.

This comes about in several ways. First is the eroticisation of originally martial material. For instance, Medea’s indecision in 3.654–55 is modelled on the epic sequence “three times ... and on the fourth”, where (typically) Apollo brings an end to a series of military assaults. Here it is interiorised in all senses, translated to a girl’s chamber and turned into an entirely psychological crisis. The hexameter vocabulary of poetic seduction and delight (θέλγειν, τέρπειν) is converted into an erotic register, too. But the eroticisation is also achieved by an enormous dose of archaic lyric, especially Sappho, whose famous poem (fr. 31 Voigt φαίνεται μοι) on the physiological effects

of love is reworked time and time again for Medea's reaction to Jason. Echoes of tragedy can also be heard, as when the *schetliasmos* of love in 4.445–48 σχετλί' Ἔρως surely recalls choral commentary at Eur. *Hipp.* 525–29 (note κορύσσειο ~ ἐπιστρατεύση) and *Med.* 629–35 (where love shoots arrows)—as well as echoing Theogn. 1231. These two methods—eroticised epic and lyric infusion—readily come together. Consider a simile in which Jason and Medea, when they meet, are compared to oaks or pines in the mountains which begin to rustle when the wind shakes them (3.967–71). In the first instance, the simile recalls the two Lapiths in the *Iliad* who are like mountain oaks that stand facing wind and rain (*Il.* 12.131–34). But the onset of the wind (which in the *Iliad* is a force the oaks must permanently confront) also evokes the lyric notion of the gale force of love (Sappho fr. 47 Voigt; Ibycus, *PMG* 286.8–13). A little later (3.1019–21), Medea's heart melts like the dew on roses, just as Menelaus' melts like dew on the ears of ripening corn (*Il.* 23.597–99): the rose, Sappho's classic erotic flower, is substituted for the agricultural crop, and Apollonius adds the verb τήκεσθαι, the classic term for “melting” with desire. Indeed, the action-similes applied to Jason at the end of the third book are counterpoised by a remarkable series of mental-state similes—an unusual type in Homer—offering insight into the intensity and conflictedness of Medea's feelings (3.291–95, 656–63, 756–59; 4.35–39, 1062–65). The result of all these refinements is that the famous “objectivity” of the epic voice (never more than a half-truth at the best of times) is now distinctly subjectivised, another sophistication that Virgil will inherit. One of its tokens is a narrative voice which is far more interventionist and emotive than that of the traditional epic narrator, commenting, interjecting, and eliciting reaction in a way that reflects the greater emotional charge of his narrative.

There have been rather fruitless attempts to claim Jason as a new kind of hero, a “love hero”.<sup>23</sup> It is obvious that he is different kind of figure from Achilles and Hector. It is not merely a matter of military prowess, but also of the entire presentation of character. Jason is not the poem’s ethical centre of gravity (either occupying it or challenging it). He has no momentous decision to make, no dilemma to wrestle with, little suffering, and no basis on which to be tragic. On the contrary, the character endowed with articulacy, interiority, and conflictedness, the character we see struggle and make difficult choices, is Medea, and her situation is framed in erotic terms. It is clear from a series of contrasts with more conventional heroes (the coarsely macho Idas; Peleus and Telamon, who prefigure their heroic offspring in the generation of the Trojan war<sup>24</sup>) that a contrast is intended with the model of the “action man”. It is also true that he is prone to ἀμηχανία—but then, so are the Argonauts collectively, so too Medea,<sup>25</sup> and so too even the narrator, who has quite a different relationship with the Muses and degree of control over his narrative than his Homeric forebear.<sup>26</sup> But it is not the case that Jason lacks a Homeric counterpart, for he stands in recognisable continuity with the articulate and wily Odysseus (as well as with his own earlier smooth-talking self, above all the smooth and persuasive hero of Pindar’s fourth *Pythian*). He is often associated with flattering, cozening words.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, he uses his craftiness to more equivocal effect than the Homeric Odysseus, for Apollonius not only develops the *Odyssey*’s interest in deceptive speech, but also anticipates Euripides’ play, whose heroine rails at him for mendacity and oath-breaking. This form of implicit external prolepsis, by presuming on the reader’s awareness of a classic text that formed the sequel, is of course qualitatively different from any effect which the Homeric bard can achieve (except insofar as he may pre-empt the plots of other cyclic poems which supplied sequels to his own).

Be that as it may, guile is a pervasive theme in the *Argonautica*.<sup>28</sup> In some ways the set-up is simpler than the *Odyssey*, in others more complicated. It is simpler because, in the *Odyssey*, there are many sorts of intelligence in addition to Odyssean μῆτις (even the Phaeacians' ships have a nautical intelligence of their own); the *Argonautica* narrows this down to cunning intelligence. It is more complicated precisely because *everyone* shares this cunning intelligence and everyone is trying to outwit everyone else, all of the time. In sum, we lack a moral compass to guide us through this unreassuring world, in which the old heroic values put in fitful, unreliable appearances, and guile is the only constant presence. When Jason woos Medea, he pays court to her using old-fashioned vocabulary. She will be honoured and revered by men and women (3.1123 τιμήεσσα γυναῖξι καὶ ἀνδράσιν αἰδοίη τε); he will celebrate her κλέος throughout Greece (3.992; on the only two other occasions when the word is used in the poem it means "report"). The Homeric system is no longer what underpins the poem and gives it meaning: it has been relegated, if it appears at all, to chivalrous (and dubiously sincere) compliment. Continuities remain recognisable, but discontinuities are such that the revivals, when they occur, often serve more as markers of distance.

Still, an epic is what it remains, and Apollonius' approach might be contrasted with that of other works where epic appears among the ingredients but is no longer the dominant genre. Bucolic is one example. Parts of the *Aitia* could be mentioned, too, which, in the course of what is formally an elegiac poem, evokes a variety of genres, whether *in extenso* or more episodically. The second *aition* of the first book, which also concerns the Argonauts, evokes a number of formal features of epic, and is narrated by its Muse: consider the initial accusative noun(s) stating the topic, the motif of "memory", the use of ἄρχεσθαι to open the narrative, speech formulae (fr. 7c,5–10),

and later an elaborate dawn formula (fr. 21.3–4). Even more sophisticatedly, within a formal evocation of a Pindaric victory ode at the opening of the third book, Annette Harder draws attention to more epic (or in this case mock-epic) elements in the story of the peasant Molorchus' entertainment of Heracles, who was on his way to kill the Nemean lion. These include a time-indication and simile (fr. 54c, 5–11), philological niceties (fr. 54c, 5–6, the αὔλιος ἀστήρ) and of course the *presque Homérique* style (e.g. frr. 54c, 14 ξείνοις κωκυμούς; 54i, 17 ] ?θυμὸν ἀρε[σσύμενος), a leisurely narrative pace including considerable direct speech, and a hospitality scene recalling the Eumaeus episode in the *Odyssey*—whose fascination for Callimachus we shall consider shortly. What Callimachus shares with Apollonius is the art of fusion. But instead of a epic base, we find epic formal features and a (mock-)epic ethos employed for a myth within an *Ersatz* epinician erected on a neutral elegiac base—a veritable game of Chinese boxes.

We also find it much reduced, of course. This is indeed an abiding concern of Hellenistic poets, and it is easy to point to epyllion, the diminutive of *epos*, as a realisation of the principle that small is beautiful. Epyllion, however, is an amorphous and problematic category—a modern one, too, so that we may well be shadow-boxing with an entity not perceived as distinct in antiquity at all. Among Hellenistic narrative poems that occupy a single book or less, there is no intrinsic and invariable relationship with epic: it is not the case that they are all Homer writ small. Archaic and classical poetry offered many other models for short self-contained mythological narratives, including Homeric Hymns, segments of the Catalogue of Women, mythological stories in lyric, and narrative exempla which occur in many genres including sympotic elegy. Some poems placed in the category of epyllion look to have their main affiliations with genres other than epic, though forms are never pure. Even a

poem like Theocritus' *Hylas* (*Id.* 13), formally an illustrative *exemplum*, and very lyric in ethos, contains epic elements including a couple of similes and indications of times of day, as well as a basic epic dialect inflected with Doric elements. But let us concentrate on the most Homeric of all the epyllia that survive.

Callimachus' *Hecale* is a homage to the *Odyssey*. Though it miniaturises it, it was itself substantial enough<sup>29</sup> for the scholiast on *Hymn* 2.106 to treat it as a μέγα ποίημα, written to prove to his critics that Callimachus had sufficient stamina. Whether or not it had any such polemical intent is quite uncertain. The discovery of the first line established once and for all that it had no opening manifesto to match that of the *Aitia*. At the same time, its techniques and theme, which has significant points of contact with the *Argonautica*, are quite enough to wreck any simple opposition between "Homerisers" and moderns, and between Apollonius' approach to the Homeric legacy and that of Callimachus.

Like the Molorchus story in the *Victoria Berenices*, the *Hecale* reworks books 14–17 of the *Odyssey*, where Eumaeus entertains his incognito master in a show of exemplary behaviour in humble surroundings. The character-type is also represented by the hospitable Axylos who gets a cameo mention in *Il.* 6.12–15 (compare his death-notice with Hecale's in fr. 80.3–5 Hollis): both were wont to entertain "all" passing wayfarers, though Axylos was rich and Hecale quite the reverse. Moreover, just as the *Odyssey* poet produced an extended meditation on the hospitality theme which he offset by spectacular counter-examples—the Cyclops who ate his guests (9.288–98), and Heracles who slew them (21.27–30), Callimachus seems to have proceeded in the same way, if indeed it is the case that Theseus described how, on his journey *en route* from Troezen to Attica he encountered the loathsome Sciron, who used to force his guests to wash his feet before pitching them over a precipice.<sup>30</sup> Above all, he engages



closely with the Eumaeus books, from which he takes the details of spreading a humble couch for the guest on arrival (frr. 29–30), splitting logs (fr. 32) (the bathing of the hero's feet is taken from the Eurycleia scene later on), and then, after the meal (for Eumaeus' boar-sacrifice Callimachus substitutes a minutely-itemised vegetarian supper), a long narrative by the host of his/her life-story which, although the details differ, involves a *peripeteia*: s/he was not always poor. This close attention to detail is matched by a closer adherence to Homer's language than Callimachus displays in his other works.<sup>31</sup> Adrian Hollis draws particular attention to fr. 74.22, where Callimachus has tessellated two Odyssean passages linked by a common phrase. *Cento* is a technique employed by other poets, but is rare in Callimachus, and testifies to his wish to create a Homeric effect. An effect, but *not* a pastiche—for the poem is also infused with vocabulary culled from Attic comedy, whether directly or from a monograph or glossary, in order to heighten local colour.<sup>32</sup> Observe how many of the borrowings are common nouns, creating a truly tangible environment and sense of particularism and quiddity.

Narrative technique also derives from Homer. Quite unlike the intrusive presence in the *Aitia* or the *Hymns*, the narrator is unforthcoming; what little intervention there is is in keeping with the epic manner (perhaps apostrophe in fr. 15 Hollis τὸ). Similes are rare in what survives of Callimachus, but in *Hecale* there were at least three (frr. 18.13 ff., 48.7 ff., 69.11–12). Above all, there is a timespan of limited compass. There are two days, whose divisions are marked in the Homeric manner, largely taken up with the narration of various kinds of life-story (Theseus', *Hecale*'s—and now, also, that of a comically garrulous crow), just as Odysseus' (fake) life-story was followed by that of Eumaeus in *Odyssey* 14–15. (As if to make sure we don't miss the correspondence of the basic structure, fr. 74.21f. echoes *Od.* 15.493–5,

where the conversationalists finally, briefly, go to sleep.) But this is sprung open by proleptic and analeptic inserts to give the impression that the narrative encompasses a great deal more than the small segment of the present. These breaches seem to have included retrospectives by the poet (Aegeus' instructions to Aethra; Theseus' youth in Troezen), but also narratives by characters (Theseus' to Hecale about his journey to Athens; Hecale's life-story). The effect, narratologically speaking, is similar to that of the *Odyssey*, in which a dense narrative of a strictly delimited period is opened up by the narrator's ingenuity to cast an eye forwards and backwards over an expanded field. But where the archaic poet had cast his glance over the Trojan War and its aftermath as it affected many people other than the protagonists, and did so using story-telling extensions of himself, Callimachus offers a spectacularly bizarre and humorous alternative in the form of the aforementioned crow (shades here of other eccentric internal narrators). The crow discourses on Attic prehistory (the daughters of Cecrops and Erichthonius, Athena's acquisition of Attica, the exclusion of crows from the Acropolis) and anticipates the future fate of her interlocutor, a raven. By modelling the crow's prediction on Achilles' prophecy of his own death (fr. 74.14 ~ *Il.* 21.111), Callimachus both acknowledges the literary source of the technique of prolepsis and marks his distance from his model. Digressions are often held to characterise the epyllion, but they work in very different ways: this one packs an antiquarian poem with even more lovingly-assembled detail on Attic antiquities. In short, in the *Hecale* Callimachus employs different aspects of his heritage—epic, Attic Comedy, Atthidography, paradoxography—to further a coherent vision. The result is a highly attractive and influential symbiosis of ethical traditionalism, folktale, erudite wit, and modernist narrative experiment.

It is tempting to suppose that we can give an account of the *Hecale*'s rationale and Callimachus' *modus operandi*, despite the poem's fragmentary condition and Callimachus' notorious unpredictability. Ironically this seems harder with another work that survives in its entirety, (ps.-?)Theocritus, *Id.* 25 (*Herakles Leontophonos*). It is at least clear that it, too, offers a reduced version of epic, but does so in a different way, presenting three self-contained extracts from a larger whole (the cleansing of the Aegean stables, Heracles' fifth labour) which is never told in its entirety. Rhapsodic recitation has often been suggested as the model for the unusual form—compare the Odyssean Demodocus, selecting where to begin within a larger corpus (8.500)—while drama may form an additional model at least for the first and third extracts, which contain direct speech (the second is pure narrative).<sup>33</sup> The loss of previous Heracles epics has left much of the background enigmatic, but the debt to Homer is clear, with yet more borrowings from the Eumaeus episode in the first extract,<sup>34</sup> the second extract sharing a sub-heading with part of *Iliad* 4,<sup>35</sup> a couple of Homerising similes in the second and third extracts from that very section of the *Iliad* (both exhibiting the characteristic technique of dovetailing two passages linked by shared phraseology<sup>36</sup>), and of course the *presque Homérique* style. The piece is intriguing and nicely constructed, with a crescendo effect that builds from (Eumaeus) guard-dogs through a prize bull (the climax of the *epipoleis*), to the Nemean lion itself. Yet it is hard to be persuaded that we have found the key that unlocks it. The rewriting of Homer, or even beliefs, however eccentric, about Homeric performance practice, are unlikely to be such a key, although a combination of that with dramatic form is more persuasive. As we shall see, other Theocritean *Idylls* experiment with a composite of epic / narrative form and dramatic / mimetic content.

### 3. EPIC AFFILIATES: DIDACTIC, BUCOLIC

This section considers a couple of genres which are related to epic, or indeed are regarded as epic *tout court* according to the ancient principle of classification by metre.<sup>37</sup> They used the hexameter, and that was enough to draw them into the ranks of the *epos*.

Didactic is the older. Its founding father was Hesiod, but in practice Hellenistic didactic writers are poised between him and Homer. Nicander begins his *Theriaka* with an allusion to Hesiod (albeit to a myth which the extant Hesiod does not narrate), and ends with a *sphragis* asserting himself as “Homeric” (*Ther.* 10–12, 957). The *Lives* of Aratus engage in a rather pointless debate about whether to regard their subject as more Homeric or more Hesiodic (Vit. I, p. 9.10–18, II p. 12.15–18, IV p. 21.7–8 Martin). When, according to Callimachus, Aratus set out to recreate the sweetest aspects of Hesiod’s style (Call. *Ep.* 27 = *AP* 9.507 = *HE* LVI), he nevertheless does so in standard epic language. He even seems in the main to eschew Hesiodic peculiarities, and has a pronounced liking for Homeric rarities instead.<sup>38</sup> So too, Nicander’s (admittedly very idiosyncratic) idiom owes more to Homer’s language than it does to Hesiod’s: assured Hesiodisms are few and far between, whereas Homerisms are legion.<sup>39</sup> This is not simply a matter of the inescapability of Homer’s influence, nor even of the affiliation of epic and didactic *via* their common metre. It is also warranted by the ancient regard for Homer as the father of didactic as well as of everything else. It followed from his omnicompetence. Strabo, for one, bears witness to a debate that went back to the Hellenistic period, one side of which attributed to him expertise in matters as diverse as geography, generalship, agriculture, and rhetoric.<sup>40</sup> So when it comes to literary influence, while both authors furnish aspects of catalogue technique such as structuring devices and listing techniques, which were to prove endlessly

fascinating to Hellenistic poets, Hesiod's further contribution includes mythography and facets of a narratorial personality, while Homer furnishes the linguistic base. And this means not merely the dry details of phonology, morphology, and syntax, nor even a supply of rarities, but also the contexts in which those words were embedded, with all of the scope for sophisticated and playful effects of allusion and combination which that entails.

Bucolic, a highly composite genre that is new in the Hellenistic period, presents a much more complex case. Of its various aspects, I deal first with the simultaneous presence of elements derived from epic and from drama, in different proportions in each poem. This variegatedness is acknowledged in an ancient taxonomy which holds that bucolic contains examples of "narrative", "dramatic", and "mixed" modes.<sup>41</sup> Theocritus' *Idylls* (the title itself, which means "specimens of poems of different types", already implies variety) are full of the interchange of speech and song. Two sources of variation are whether these are set within a frame (narrative in *Id.* 6 and 18), and whether the speakers' words are introduced and terminated by speech formulae, as in epic, or are presented directly and mimetically, as in drama. Complicatedly, other considerations cut across this. For instance, a purely mimetic poem such as *Id.* 2, a monologue by a highly-characterised first-person speaker, may nevertheless be full of epic allusions and resonances. For after the speaker, who is embarking on a magic procedure, has moved through initial instructions and ritual incantations to review her love-affair, she does so in a style which invests betrayal in urban back-streets with epic grandeur.<sup>42</sup>

Another consideration is the relation of dialect and content. Homeric language and epic subject-matter are distributed unevenly across the collection. There are Doric idylls portraying rustic life which have different degrees of Homerism, and there are

poems with epic subject-matter, two of which (22, 25) are in epic dialect, while that of the rest is mixed with Doric elements.<sup>43</sup> There is no necessary correlation between a given poem's degree of linguistic epicism and either its form (epic / dramatic) or its content. For instance, *Id.* 1, another purely dramatic / mimetic poem, is also among those with the highest degree of Homeric linguistic colouring. The Cyclops' serenade for Galatea (*Id.* 11), despite the Homeric subject-matter, is the least linguistically Homeric of the Doric poems, yet when a couple of herdsmen return to the subject and sing a pair of matching songs about Polyphemus, one even in his own voice, this (*Id.* 6) is among the *most* Homerising of the poems. It is, however, notable that linguistic Homerising tend to marry up quite closely with adherence to Callimachean metrical rules, so that Homerism and Callimacheanism would certainly not appear to be at odds with one another in Theocritus' rule-book.<sup>44</sup> Both should perhaps be seen as signifiers of refinement as opposed to lack of sophistication, whence the low ranking on both scales of the Cyclops in *Id.* 11 and the reapers in *Id.* 10.

We turn now to the Homeric antecedents of the bucolic mode. If any archaic material provided more substantial antecedents (Stesichorean lyric? sub-literary herdsmen's songs?), it has been lost, and no attempt is being made here to claim epic as a dominant source. But the Shield of Achilles and its descendant, the Hesiodic *Scutum*, furnished rustic scenes (of which more below), and the *Odyssey* a particular spot, transitional between town and country, whose elements (spring, nymphs, grove of trees) are taken over for a second, and far more enigmatic, encounter between a traveller and a goatherd (*Od.* 17.204 ff. ~ *Id.* 7.6 ff.). The Odyssean Cyclops is of particular significance, though by the time he reaches the Hellenistic poets the figure has been mediated through later classical and post-classical representations such as those of Epicharmus, Euripides, and Philoxenus (who gave him a girlfriend). The

element of continuity is pastoralism. Beyond that there is no single overriding template or pattern. We find elaboration (the references to his mother in *Id.* 11.25–27, 67–71, come from *Od.* 1.71–73), realignment, and soft-peddalling of unwanted elements. The Golden Age coloration of the Homeric Cyclopes is replaced by something generic in a different way, the *locus amoenus* set in an idealised Sicilian countryside (*Id.* 11.45–48). Their defiance of ordered society and civilised convention is recast as solitary living at a low cultural level, but the implied antithesis between Polyphemus and modern urban(e) life also applies to the whole bucolic universe. What is given new prominence is an element already embryonic in the *Odyssey*, when the blinded monster directs a self-pitying address to his ram: that is, comical, incongruous character depiction, which figures above all in his shambolic attempts at love-making. Note the stress on his youth and ineptitude, with fresh down on lips and temples (*Id.* 11.9). Instead of the frightful monster we now have a vulnerable adolescent, unsure of himself and vacillating between boasting and agonising self-consciousness. He has become a hero of *ethopoia*.

Finally, we should consider the poetics and aesthetics of bucolic as a response to Homer. Here, if anywhere, a case could be made for an attempt to erect a rival set of values. A fairly late example, ps.-Moschus' *Lament for Bion*, sets up a synkrisis between Homer and Bion, respectively poets of war and of rusticity and love (70–84).<sup>45</sup> This tendency to drive an opposition between epic and the more unpretending genre seems to develop over time, so that Virgil's sixth *Eclogue* begins with a *recusatio* of one genre for another. The first-generation Alexandrians did not go as far as to shun whole genres. Yet oppositions are there. On David Halperin's analysis, bucolic relates to traditional *epos* through the techniques of inversion (the application to lowly characters of heroic language and motifs, as we saw with Simaetha in *Id.* 2)

and subversion (where the heroic is domesticated),<sup>46</sup> and to this we could add that of substitution—instead of Muses, nymphs; instead of a Shield, a carved cup; instead of bards, rustic poets (who do indeed behave a good deal like rhapsodes, both performing pre-composed pieces and improvising repartee,<sup>47</sup> and use the language of ἀοιδή and ἀείδειν). Throughout we find compounds and syntheses whose elements are in creative tension, Homerisms and Dorisms, grandeur and colloquialism.

It is striking that genres which surface for the first time in the Hellenistic period, and at first sight seem as remote as can be from the grandeur of epic, opt to represent and promote themselves in Homer or para-Homeric terms. As we have seen, the programmatic first *Idyll* offers a carved cup, a *kissybion*, as a response to Achilles' Shield. It contains three scenes which closely relate to the Shield (or the *Scutum*), of which the most extensive is the last. The boy plaiting a cricket-cage (52–53) answers to the scene where the vintage is being gathered in in woven baskets (*Il.* 18.568 πλεκτοῖς ἐν τάλαιροις), with weaving now invested with poetological overtones. The lyre with which Homer's young boy accompanies his agricultural ditty now reappears as pan-pipes, while the aesthetic implications of his high-pitched song (*Il.* 18.571 λεπταλέῃ φωνῇ) were not lost on the euphonist Callimachus, who recycled the rare epithet in the *Aitia* prologue (fr. 1.24). And if Theocritus draws on Homer for the lineaments of an emblem for his new genre, so, too, does the mime-writer Herodas, whose sixth *Mimiambus* seems to figure its own mischievous poetics in the dildo which is described in para-rhapsodic terms (51 ῥάψαι; 58, where its stitcher comes from the Homeric heartlands of Chios or Erythrae). So where Homer could be read as supplying an image of pastoral within epic, the Hellenistic writers of mime respond with images suggestive but subversive of traditional high poetics within their unconventional new domains.



I conclude with Homeric hymns, which are perhaps special cases. Obviously members of the hexameter canon, Callimachus takes up the challenge to imitate them, and does so with sufficient recognisability that manuscripts transmit his six hymns together with the Homeric collection as well as the Orphic corpus and Proclus' seven compositions in Homeric metre and language. Callimachus, as we have seen, uses the *presque Homérique* and even endows the fourth hymn with a number of epic similes, in remarkable contrast with the dearth of similes in the Homeric hymns themselves. We can include them in the present discussion provided that it is recognised that this is no guarantee that Callimachus or any other third-century poet would have allowed them to be genuinely Homeric works.<sup>48</sup>

It is quite clear that they are Callimachus' primary referent. He uses the Homeric collection to place his own: the vacillation about the correct birthplace of Zeus in his first hymn recollects a similar uncertainty in the first hymn of the Homeric collection for Zeus' son, Dionysus. But by now we are primed to expect contamination or hybridisation of genre and form. Callimachus' hymns retain rhapsodic characteristics, indeed precisely those formal elements that can serve as what Ian Rutherford has called "generic signatures":<sup>49</sup> introductory and closural elements, including the vocabulary of ἀοιδή and ἀείδειν (1.1; 3.1, 137, 268), the closing salutation χαίρει (1.94, 2.113, 3.268, 4.326, 5.140–41, 6.134) and prayer for divine favour (3.268),<sup>50</sup> and in some cases a narrative centrepiece. But Callimachus does not remain faithful to the conventions of rhapsodic hymn. The last two, of which the fifth is in elegiac couplets, have Doric dialectal coloration; as with Theocritus' *Idylls*, this is quite compatible with Homeric diction. Furthermore, they may be combined with other kinds of hymn, particularly those that suggest a particular setting or context, even if a hexameter background is lacking. For example, the first line of the first hymn

suggests a libational performance at a symposium. The second seems to want to evoke the paian by the use of the refrain ἦ ἦ παιῆον (21, 27, 103, cf. 25, 80), while repetitional devices and jingles throughout suggest indebtedness to choral hymns and a more popular tradition of song. The best-known feature of Callimachus' hymns (nos. 2, 5, 6) is his creation of a new, mimetic, form, which recreates the ongoing circumstances of its performance. It is true that the Homeric Hymn to Apollo contains a remarkable evocation of a Delian festival (147–64), but the fiction of live enactment looks more like a hyper-development of some of the conventions of the first-person enunciations of choral lyric.

Some hymns adhere more closely than others to a rhapsodic ground-plan. This is perhaps clearest in the two central hymns, to Artemis and to Delos, which are also the longest. But although the fifth and sixth hymns are both mimetic, in other words supposedly *viva voce* enactments of an ongoing public ceremony, the mimetic elements enclose a central panel of mythological narrative whose origin is in the rhapsodic tradition (5.57–136; 6.24–117). Both are carefully given rationales in their respective contexts; Callimachus works to “naturalise” both, despite their origin in an independent strand of hymnody, in a tradition (found or invented) of public choral song.<sup>51</sup> With Callimachus' hymns, it is, in short, rather as in Theocritus' *Idylls*. We cannot speak of the reproduction of an archaic genre. It is always a cross-fertilisation of different strains.

Among the corpus of Homeric hymns, Callimachus seems to have been particularly attracted by the second longest, the Hymn to Apollo. In that it depicts a god's birth and acquisition of powers and prerogatives, it is characteristic of ancient hymn: Callimachus replays the motif over and over again in his first four hymns, often very idiosyncratically, never more so than in his revision of Leto's wanderings and

Apollo's birth in the *Hymn to Delos*.<sup>52</sup> In other respects it stands out from the rest, in its presentation of a communal festivity on Delos (again updated by Callimachus in *Hymn* 4.278–79<sup>53</sup>), and in the emergence of an overt narrator, self-conscious and proud of his poetic achievement. To what extent that lies in the background of the disconcertingly sudden appearance of poetological material in *Hymn* 2.105–12 is unclear, but it does seem that Callimachus was drawn to the hymnode's two reflections on the choice of his material (3.19–28, 207–15, both passages commencing πῶς τ' ἄρ σ' ὑμνήσω πάντως εὖθυμον ἔόντα;). In essence a formal and self-conscious device employed by a poet to fix on a theme, in Callimachus' hands the priamel is particularly pointed, as he reflects on his control over and shaping of his material.<sup>54</sup>

The example in 4.28–9 stays close to the Homeric model in one sense, as it bridges the hymn's attributive and mythical material. At the same time, however, it introduces the myth with deliberate indirection, as the floating island of Asteria is an *exception* to the events the priamel inaugurates. And in *Hymn* 1.4 πῶς καί νιν, Δικταῖον ἀείσομεν ἠὲ Λυκαῖον; | ἐν δοιῇ μάλα θυμός, the poet feigns genuine *aporia*: how *is* he to sing of Zeus? His answer—an equivocation between plural versions—may be, according to taste, an attempt to throw dust in the reader's eyes, or an acknowledgement of the crowded traditions and competing interests of the Hellenistic world. Either way, when a Hellenistic poet comes to reflect on the question “how shall I sing?”, he engages with a world that is more multivocal than ever before. And that can serve as an epigraph for this whole chapter.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hermesianax, fr. 7.29 P. θεῖος Ὅμηρος; for Archelaus' Apotheosis of Homer (London, BM Sc 2191), see Zahra Newby, "Reading the allegory of the Archelaos relief", in Zahra Newby and Ruth E. Leader-Newby (edd.), *Art and inscriptions in the ancient world* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 156–78, with bibliography. For the Alexandrian Homereion, see Aelian, *VH* 13.22, whose word is νέωζ.

<sup>2</sup> Page, *GLP* no. 93 (a) 9–16 = Powell, *CA* pp. 187–88 (and the apparent travesty in Aelian, loc. cit.); Antipater of Sidon, *AP* 7.6.3–4 = *HE* IX.3–4 (226–27). For the image of Homer as Ocean, see n. 15 below.

<sup>3</sup> Pindar, *Pa.* VIIb.10–14; Ian Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 247–49.

<sup>4</sup> Strato, *Phoenicides*, *PCG* vol. VII, fr. 1.40–46, ap. Athen. *Deipn.* 9.383 a–b + P. Cair. 65445.

<sup>5</sup> Pollianus, *AP* 11.130 (date uncertain; the Hadrianic period has been suggested, but only on the basis of his literary attitudes, so that the argument becomes circular).

<sup>6</sup> Antipater of Thessalonica, *AP* 11.20 = *Garland* xx.

<sup>7</sup> Emile Cahen, *Callimaque et son oeuvre poétique* (Paris, 1929), pp. 519–23 (on Callimachus' hymns).

<sup>8</sup> For Apollonius, see James J. Clauss, *The Best of the Argonauts: The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book One of Apollonius' Argonautica* (Berkeley, 1993), pp. 5–6; Antonios Rengakos, *Apollonios Rhodios und die antike Homererklärung* (Munich, 1994).

<sup>9</sup> Enrico Magnelli, *Studi su Euforione* (Rome, 2002), pp. 11–15.

<sup>10</sup> Victor J. Matthews, *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary* (Leiden, 1996), pp. 46–51, and his frr. 165–88.

---

<sup>11</sup> For Philitas, see Jane L. Lightfoot, *Hellenistic Collection* (Cambridge and London, 2009), pp. 4–5; E. Dettori, *Filite Grammatico: Testimonianze e frammenti:*

*Introduzione, edizione e commento* (Rome, 2000), pp. 27–28; for Simias, fr. 29–32 Fraenkel, of which fr. 29 is taken from *Od.* 18.300.

<sup>12</sup> Stephanie West, in Alfred Heubeck, Stephanie West, and John B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, vol. I. Introduction and Books I–VIII* (Oxford, 1998), “The transmission of the text”, pp. 41–45; Antonios Rengakos, *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter* (Stuttgart, 1993), pp. 9–10, and Index s.v. Zenodot von Ephesos.

<sup>13</sup> Adrian S. Hollis, *Callimachus, Hecale* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 11–13.

<sup>14</sup> Wilhelm Kroll, “Die Kreuzung der Gattungen”, in *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1924), pp. 202–24.

<sup>15</sup> For Frederick Williams, *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 85–89, Envy's reference in l. 106 to the sea (πόντος) as a symbol for copiousness implies the ancient notion of Homer as the Ocean, though Apollo, in his reply, does not disparage Homer himself; see *contra* Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), pp. 403–7.

<sup>16</sup> Dio 69.4.6 = *Suda* s.v. Ἀδριανός (α 527), Antim. Test. 30 Matthews ... τὸν γοῦν Ὅμηρον καταλύων Ἀντίμαχον ἀντ' αὐτοῦ ἐσῆγεν (cf. Ewen Bowie, “Hadrian and Greek Poetry”, in Erik N. Ostenfeld (ed.), *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks: Studies in Cultural Interaction* (Aarhus, 2004), pp. 172–97, at p. 173: “silly gossip”).

<sup>17</sup> He is credited with Homeric wrath (803–4, 814, 844, 855–56, 994, 998, 1006), given the epithet of Homeric Zeus (814), and adorned with elemental and bestial imagery from Homeric similes (e.g. 822–25, 848, 852, 859, 902–4). In Athen. *Deipn.*

---

8.347 E Aeschylus is said to have called his plays scraps from the great banquet of Homer.

<sup>18</sup> Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics*, pp. 263–302; Peter Bing, *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen, 1988), pp. 50–56, adducing *SH* 946–47 (Rhianus?); see too Annette Harder, *Callimachus: Aetia*, 1 (Oxford, 2012), p. 34.

<sup>19</sup> Silvia Barbantani, “Callimachus and Contemporary Historical ‘Epic’”, *Hermathena* 173–4 (2002–3), pp. 29–47.

<sup>20</sup> Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics*, p. 227.

<sup>21</sup> For repetition in Apollonius, see George W. Elderkin, “Repetition in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius”, *American Journal of Philology* 34 (1913), pp. 198–201; Francis Vian, “Notes critiques au chant II des «Argonautiques»”, *Revue des Études Anciennes* 75 (1973), pp. 82–102, at pp. 98–99; Marco Fantuzzi, “‘Homeric’ formularity in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes”, in Theodore D. Papanghelis and Antonios Rengakos (edd.), *Brill’s Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden, 2008), pp. 221–41, at pp. 230–31.

<sup>22</sup> Jasper Griffin, “The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer”, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97 (1977), pp. 39–53, esp. pp. 40–41, 45–47, 49–50.

<sup>23</sup> Much bibliography in Mary M. De Forest, *Apollonius’ Argonautica* (Leiden, 1994), p. 47 n. 1; Richard L. Hunter, *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 15–25.

<sup>24</sup> Idas: 3.556–66; Peleus: 2.1217–25, 3.504–15 (playing the role of Iliadic Diomedes as he grasps the initiative), 2.878–93 (contrasting with Jason’s defeatism); Telamon: 1.1286–95 (impetuosity contrasting with Jason’s resourcelessness), 3.382–85 (vehemence contrasting with Jason’s diplomacy).

<sup>25</sup> Jason: 1.460, cf. 535, 1286; 2.409–18, 885–93; 3.422–23; 4.1318. The Argonauts: 1.1053; 2.577–78, 681, 860; 3.504; 4.825, 880, 1259 (Ancaeus), 1308, 1701. Medea: 3.772, 951, 1157; 4.107, 1049.

<sup>26</sup> Invocations of the Muse(s) at the beginnings of books retreat from assertiveness (1.22, where they are *his* interpreters) to *aporia* and dependence (4.1–5, cf. 1381–82). Elsewhere their role varies: they are monitresses at whose prompting a misapprehension is corrected in 2.844–45; in 4.552–56 they are invoked but what follows is apparently the poet's conjecture (cf. 557 *πov*), and in 4.984–85 they tolerate a story rather than inspire it. Erato's name is connected with the loveliness of song (Hes. *Th.* 65, 70), but (like other poetological vocabulary: see above) is reinterpreted in erotic terms in 3.1–5.

<sup>27</sup> His speech characteristically *μειλίχιος*: 1.294; 2.621; 3.319, 385, 1102; 4.394; cf. 2.1196; 3.396, 974, 985, 1141, 1146; 4.410; compare Pind. *P.* 4.101, 136–38.

Vocabulary associated in early Greek hexameter poetry with alluring, sometimes deceptive, speech and song are applied to him and the effect of his words, especially on Medea: 3.458, 3.982–83, 1140–41. When Hera beautifies him, it is not, as in Homer, confined to his physical appearance, but extends to his speech (3.923).

<sup>28</sup> *δόλος* and *μητις* and their derivatives are especially prominent. Divinities: 3.12, 24, 30, 210, 1134. Jason: 3.184, 4.404, cf. 3.426 *κερδαλέοισιν*. Argus: 3.475. Chalciope: 3.668. Medea *passim* (partly punning on her name), e.g. 3.89, 687, 720, 743, 781, 912, 1026; cf. 3.1168 *δῆνεα*, 1364 *Μηδείης πολθκερδέος*; 4.416 *μειλίξω*, 442 *παραιφαμένη*, 456 *δολωθείς*; Jason and Medea together: 4.421. Aeetes: 3.373, 578, 592, 599 (his accusations against others reflect his own thinking). See also *αἰμύλιος* in 1.792 (Hypsipyle), 3.51 (Aphrodite).

<sup>29</sup> For estimates of length, see Hollis, *Hecale*, pp. 337–40.

---

<sup>30</sup> fr. 60 Hollis, which Hollis suggests, *contra* Pfeiffer, pertains to Theseus' washing of Sciron's feet rather than Hecale's washing of Theseus'.

<sup>31</sup> See Hollis on his fr. 32 and Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics*, p. 441.

<sup>32</sup> Hollis, *Hecale*, pp. 9, 13.

<sup>33</sup> Richard L. Hunter and Marco Fantuzzi, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 210–15; Richard L. Hunter, "Before and after epic: Theocritus (?), *Idyll* 25", in Annette Harder, Remco F. Regtuit, Gerry C. Wakker (edd.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (Groningen, 1998), pp. 115–32 = *On Coming After*, 1 (Berlin, 2008), pp. 290–310.

<sup>34</sup> 68–77 ~ *Od.* 14.29–38, 526–27 + *Od.* 16.8–10.

<sup>35</sup> *Il.* 4.223–421 ΕΠΙΠΛΩΗΣΙΣ ("Review" or "Inspection"; by Agamemnon of his troops, by Augeas of his herds).

<sup>36</sup> 89–95 ~ *Il.* 4.274–79 + 422–26 (94 ~ *Il.* 4.274 κορυσσέσθην, 4.424 κορύσσεται).

<sup>37</sup> E. Pöhlmann, "Charakteristika des römischen Lehrgedichts", *ANRW* I.3 (Berlin, 1973), pp. 820–5; David M. Halperin, *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the ancient tradition of bucolic poetry* (New Haven, 1983), pp. 18–19, 212–16; Katharina Volk, *The Poetics of Latin Didactic* (Oxford, 2002), p. 29.

<sup>38</sup> Of the 278 words which feature in Johannes Paulson's *Index Hesiodeus* (Lund, 1890) as non-Homeric, only a dozen recur in the *Phaenomena*, and of the exclusively Hesiodic formulae listed by Martin L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 78–79, not one makes its way into the later poem. For Aratus' Homerisms and pseudo-Homerisms, see too Wilhelm Kroll, *RE* s.v. Lehrgedicht, coll. 1849.7–1850.12; Douglas A. Kidd, *Aratus: Phaenomena* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 23–25.

<sup>39</sup> Jean-Marie Jacques, *Nicandre. Œuvres*, 2 (Paris, 2002), pp. cvi–cix, and 3 (Paris, 2007), pp. xciii–xcv.



---

<sup>40</sup> Strab. 1.1.2, 1.2.3 (= Duane W. Roller, *Eratosthenes' Geography: Fragments Collected and translated, with commentary and additional material* (Princeton, 2010), fr. 2, and pp. 112–14); Michael Hillgruber, *Die pseudoplutarchische Schrift De Homero*, 1 (Stuttgart, 1994), pp. 5–35, “Homer als Quelle allen Wissens”.

<sup>41</sup> Σ Hes. *Op. (Prol. Procl.)* p. 5.8–21 ed. Gaisford; Probus, *comm. in Ecl., praef.* 329.10–16 Hagen; Pöhlmann, “Charakteristika des römischen Lehrgedichts”, pp. 827–28.

<sup>42</sup> e.g. 64–65 πόθεν ... ἐκ τίνος ἄρξωμαι; ; possibly the verse-initial verb in asyndeton in 66 to begin a story; 82 ~ *Il.* 14.294; 112 ~ *Il.* 3.217; 147–48, dawn formula.

<sup>43</sup> Vincenzo Di Benedetto, ‘Omerismi e struttura metrica negli idilli dorici di Teocrito’, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 25 (1956), pp. 48–60; Kenneth J. Dover, *Theocritus: Select Poems* (London, 1971), pp. xv–xvi.

<sup>44</sup> Richard Hunter, *Theocritus: A Selection* (Cambridge, 1999), 22. The same is true of Nicander: Enrico Magnelli, “Nicander’s Chronology: A Literary Approach”, in Annette Harder, Remco F. Regtuit, and Gerry C. Wakker (edd.), *Beyond the Canon* (Leuven, 2004), pp. 185–204 (pp. 198–201 on metre).

<sup>45</sup> See Flora P. Manakidou, “Epitaphios Adonidos and Epitaphios Bionis: Remarks on their Generic Form and their Content,” *Materiali e Discussioni* 37 (1996), pp. 27–58, at pp. 49–50, with further bibliography. Compare already the carved cup in *Id.* 1 which serves as a rustic analogue or challenge to Achilles’ shield, and replaces the legal quarrel on the latter with a quarrel between two men over a woman (*Id.* 1.32–38; 35 νεκείους’ ἐπέεσσι ~ *Il.* 18.497–98 νεῖκος, ἐνείκεον).

<sup>46</sup> Halperin, *Before Pastoral*, pp. 217–48.

---

<sup>47</sup> Compare the types of exchange in the bucolic poems with those of Homer and Hesiod in the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*: they both show off the best of their existing art and engage in quick-fire improvisation.

<sup>48</sup> Mary Depew, “Delian Hymns and Callimachean Allusion”, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98 (1998), pp. 155–82, at p. 157 n. 6, citing Thomas W. Allen, William R. Halliday, and Edward E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford, 1935), pp. lxxix–lxxxii.

<sup>49</sup> Ian C. Rutherford, *Pindar’s Paeans: A reading of the fragments with a survey of the genre* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 72, 113, 246.

<sup>50</sup> The prayers at the end of the fifth, sixth are more communal than the Homeric norm (though see HHom. 13.3); this is in keeping with the communal celebrations portrayed there. The prayer concluding the first Hymn echoes HHom. 15.9, 20.8.

<sup>51</sup> It cannot even be said that there is a direct association between the choice of Doric colour and the evocation of cult hymn, since the second hymn, which evokes a paean in the Dorian cult of Carnean Apollo, is in fact in epic-Ionic.

<sup>52</sup> Bing, *Well-Read Muse*, pp. 91–143, 146; Depew, “Delian Hymns”; the commentary by Wilhemus H. Mineur, *Callimachus: Hymn to Delos* (Leiden, 1984), pp. 4–9, stresses its rhapsodic antecedents.

<sup>53</sup> Philippe Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l’époque hellénistique et à l’époque impériale* (Paris, 1970), pp. 108–9, and pp. 16–52 on the hymn’s *actualité*.

<sup>54</sup> On Callimachus’ adaptation of the priamel, see Elroy L. Bundy, ‘The quarrel between Kallimachos and Apollonius : I : The epilogue of Kallimachos’ Hymn to Apollo’, *CSCA* 5 (1972), pp. 39–94, at pp. 66–72.