CHAPTER I

Performance and genre

1 INVOKING THE MUSES, EVOKING MODELS

For the Greeks, from the age of Homer to the late imperial period, the poet received his inspiration from the Muses or from some other god (e.g. Apollo or Dionysus), to whom he attributed the responsibility for the *enthousiasmos* which allowed him to sing as he wished to sing; consequently, it was a widespread practice for poets to apostrophise these divine sources of inspiration at the beginning of their works, or even to claim that they had been invested as poets by them (as in the case of Hesiod). Particularly in the Hellenistic age, however, we find that another figure takes his place beside the divine inspirer, or at times substitutes for him in the rôle of 'guarantor' of the origin of the work. The conventional rôle of acting as a source of inspiration may well be left to the Muses, but now an illustrious predecessor often steps in to teach the new poet the ropes, and how to proceed to construct the work he has undertaken, or else he verifies and ratifies the correctness of the method that the new poet has followed. In practice, in their combination of these two series of figures – the Muses and the poetic masters or models – it is as if Hellenistic poets turned to their advantage the distinction between inspiration by the poetic divinities, on the one hand, and the primacy of 'craft', *technē*, on the other; the two now formed a powerful unit, no longer a pair of opposed possibilities.

These two competing origins of poetry go back to a familiar cultural model of the fifth century, best represented for us by, on the one hand, Democritus and, on the other, by Plato's *Ion* and *Phaedrus*.[1] Socrates' words in the *Ion* are perhaps the most famous ancient assertion of the 'inspiration view' of poetry:

[1] Although poetry was considered the fruit of inspiration by the Muses throughout the archaic and classical periods, the idea of 'poetic ecstasy' and the concomitant downgrading of poetic *techne* are very Platonic, cf. P. Murray, *Plato on Poetry* (Cambridge 1996) 6–12; it is, of course, far from easy always to distinguish between poetic inspiration and ecstatic possession, cf. Finkelberg (1998) 19–20.

The poet is a light and winged and sacred thing, unable to create poetry unless he is first inspired by the god and out of his wits, with no reason in him any longer (πρὶν ἂν ἔνθεός τε γένηται καὶ ἔκφρων καὶ ὁ νοῦς μηκέτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνῇ); . . . seeing that it is not by any art that they create poetry and say many fine things about their subjects . . . but by divine destiny (θείᾳ μοίρᾳ); a poet can only succeed in the type of poetry towards which the Muse inspires him – one man in dithyrambs, another in encomia, another in hyporchemes, another in epic poems, and another in iambics – while in all the other kinds of poetry he is unsuccessful. In reality, it is not by virtue of *techne* that they speak, but thanks to a divine force: if *technē* made them capable of composing fine expressions on a single subject, they would be able to do the same on all the other subjects, too (οὐ γὰρ τέχνῃ ταῦτα λέγουσιν ἀλλὰ θείᾳ δυνάμει, ἐπεί, εἰ περὶ ἑνὸς τέχνῃ καλῶς ἠπίσταντο λέγειν, κἂν περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων). (Plato, *Ion* 534b–c)

In the *Phaedrus*, Plato does not completely deny the existence of poetry created only by virtue of *technē*, but he establishes a clear hierarchy between this inferior level and the kind created by divine inspiration:

He who arrives at the doors of poetry without the madness of the Muses (ἄνευ μανίας Μουσῶν), thinking that he can be a good poet thanks solely to *technē*, remains incomplete, and the poetry of the sane poet is eclipsed by that of the mad (ἡ ποίησις ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν μαινομένων ἡ τοῦ σωφρονοῦντος ἠφανίσθη).[2] (Plato, *Phaedrus* 245a)

So too in the *Laws*, Plato states that the poet's *technē* lies in the *mimēsis* of the characters, and again presents this 'craft' as a sort of low-level, dangerous instrument, even if he admits that the inspired poet too makes use of it to express himself:

When a poet takes his seat on the tripod of the Muse, he cannot control his thoughts. He's like a fountain where the water is allowed to gush forth unchecked. His art is the art of representation (τῆς τέχνης οὔσης μιμήσεως), and when he represents men with contrasting characters he is often obliged to contradict himself, and he doesn't know which of the opposing speeches contains the truth. (Plato, *Laws* 4.719c (trans. Saunders))

Only here in fact in Plato do *enthousiasmos* and mimetic *technē* coexist.[3]

Plato's low valuation of *mimēsis* as the *technē* of poetry, together with the idea that the only really inspired, 'philosophical' poetry was the non-mimetic kind (with its extremely limited possibilities – the dithyramb, and

---

[2] In the light of the subsequent comparison between inspired prophecy and simple divination by means of birds, it may be deduced that 'the inspired poet stands to the mere technician as the inspired prophet stands to the mere augur', cf. D. A. Russell, *Criticism in Antiquity* (London 1981) 76.

[3] Cf. Finkelberg (1998) 6 n. 19.

hymns to gods or to men), led the philosopher, both in the *Laws* (817b–c) and in the tenth book of the *Republic*, to banish poetry virtually entirely from the ideal State; there was, after all, no getting away from *mimēsis*, whether by that is meant a continuous representation of characters by the author (for example, in drama), or an intermittent representation, as in the case of direct speech in epic poetry, alternating with non-mimetic episodes of narration. Aristotle started from the same presuppositions (poetry as an activity that is always predominantly mimetic, that is to say, a more or less continual representation of characters), but without Plato's metaphysical agenda he was able to consider *mimēsis* in thoroughly positive terms, as the *technē* which allows the representation of the universal, purified from accidental empirical reality. At the climax of a process which had started with the Sophists, then, the conception of poetry as deriving from divine inspiration, based on a poetics of truth (a truth of which the poet is merely a spokesman for the divine inspirer), is largely rejected, and for it is substituted a 'secular' conception of poetry as deriving from *technē*, and consequently based on a poetics of 'fiction', elaborated by means of the *technē* that the poet himself possesses.[4]

As regards the poetry of the third century, it is obvious that the intellectual climate was closer to that of Aristotle than to that of Plato; in particular, poets now cultivated a variety of genres during their careers, and the idea, most familiar from Plato's *Ion* (above pp. 1–2), that a poet could only be inspired by the god in a single literary genre must have seemed rather dated. Nevertheless, Hellenistic poets preferred not to forgo the positive advantages of the idea of divine inspiration, which guaranteed for them a sort of privileged sacrality compared with other τεχνῖται, or 'professionals'; indeed, even those who stressed the specifically professional element of their activity, stating that they had learnt how to compose poetry from this or that previous poet, transformed this idea of learning from a text-model into various forms of 'investiture' by a poet-model, which conferred on them an image almost as honourable as divine inspiration.

The introduction of the figure of the 'guarantor' of a specific *technē* is not universal to all the poets or all the compositions of the Hellenistic age; in particular, it is not found with any form of narrative epic, such as Callimachus' *Hymns*, Theocritus' epic-mythological poems, or the *Argonautica* of Apollonius.[5] Rather, this new authorising strategy is most common

---

[4] Cf. in general, Finkelberg (1998). On the rarity of references to the Muses in tragedy, cf. D. I. Jakob, Ἡ ποιητικὴ τῆς ἀρχαίας ἑλληνικῆς τραγωδίας (Athens 1998) chapter 1.

[5] Cf. Albis (1996) chapters 1 and 2 on how Apollonius presents himself as a sort of 'modern Demodocus'. See also below, pp. 96–7, 193–4.

where the precedent of a tradition either is not immediately apparent, or does not exist, and therefore must be invented. We see a clear case of this in Theocritus' bucolic hexameters.[6] In the programmatic *Idyll* 7, the first-person narrator, Simichidas, a poet from the town, meets a goatherd-singer, Lycidas, in the Coan countryside one sunny afternoon. Lycidas, the model-predecessor/guarantor, was already a famous bucolic poet, though whether he is purely fictional or an allegorical version of an author who really existed, it is impossible to say; Simichidas and Lycidas then hold a competition of 'bucolic singing' together. As a result, by virtue of both the influence of the 'master', and the inspiration of the bucolic landscape (and its Nymphs), Simichidas' song assumes a bucolic colouring and, at the end of it, he gives a sublime description of a *locus amoenus*, the aim of which appears to be to demonstrate that he is now fully mature in his bucolic sensibility.[7]

Herondas too, the author of mimes written in choliambs ('limping iambics'), a metre typical of the archaic iambist Hipponax, dedicates an apologetic-programmatic poem, *Mimiambus* 8, to the defence of his poet-ics. Following a familiar third-century mode, the form of this poem is not directly polemical, but rather allusive and allegorical;[8] that is to say, he attacks his critics and/or rival poets without mentioning them by name, as in Callimachus' 'Prologue' to the *Aitia* (below pp. 66–76) and *Iambus* 13. The narrator, who is probably the poet himself, relates a dream: he was in the countryside, and he was pulling a goat (a symbol of Dionysus?) behind him in a valley,[9] where there were some goatherds gathered (a symbol of rival poets: Theocritus, or Callimachus, or other mimographers?)[10]. The goat escaped, and started eating the leaves of plants in a sacred place; con-sequently, it was slaughtered by the goatherds. At this point, a new figure appears, whose dress is described in great detail: a fawnskin, buskins, and ivy on the head all point clearly to Dionysus, and in all probability allude to the theatre. The goatherds inflate a goat skin, and start playing a game of *askōliasmos*, in which men tried to stand on a greasy and inflated skin.

---

[6] Cf. below, pp. 138–40.

[7] For a more detailed analysis of *Id.* 7 from this point of view, see below, pp. 137 and 163–4.

[8] For these recurrent aspects of Hellenistic polemics cf. in particular Treu (1963). A perceptive parallel reading of Herondas, *Mim.* 8 and Theocritus 7 is offered by Simon (1991) 67–82; cf. also V. Gigante Lanzara, 'Il sogno di Eroda' in Arrighetti–Montanari (1993) 237–8.

[9] A herdsman in a lonely place is the protagonist of scenes of divine initiation into poetry from the Hesiod of the *Theogony* (cf. above) to Simichidas in Theocritus 7; the Archilochus of the biographical tradition (inscription of Mnesiepes, *SEG* XV.517) was taking a cow into town to sell it when he met the Muses. Cf. further Rosen (1992) 208.

[10] Cf. Mastromarco (1984) 70–2.

This is undoubtedly a symbol of a dramatic contest[11] (cf. the author's comment 'as we do in the choruses for Dionysus', v. 40),[12] but the others do not succeed in maintaining their balance, whereas the protagonist is twice successful.

At this point, an 'old man' intervenes (v. 59), threatening to thrash the narrator. This figure has sometimes been identified as Callimachus or Philetas, but he is now generally held to be Hipponax, who is presented as a model that Herondas had modified; irritated by these modifications, he reacts with the harshness and truculence that he had always shown in his poetry. The fact that the old man concludes his speech with the literal quotation of a fragment of Hipponax (τῇ βατηρίῃ κόψω, v. 60, ∼ Hipp. fr. 8 Degani = *IEG* 20)[13] leaves little doubt about this identification. At this point, the protagonist calls a 'young man' as a witness: this figure is probably a symbol of (again) Dionysus, who appears to assign the same punishment, or more probably, the same prize, to both the protagonist and the old man (v. 64).[14] On awakening, the protagonist interprets his dream (vv. 66ff.): the goat that he was leading represented a 'fine gift from Dionysus'; the fact that 'the goatherds violently slaughtered it in the performance of their sacred rites, and feasted on its meat' meant that 'many men will tear apart my songs [μέλεα, with a pun on 'limbs'], the product of my labours (μόχθοι) among the Muses';[15] his victory in the game of *askōliasmos*, in which he alone was successful (vv. 73–4), and his 'achievement of the same result as the churlish old man' (v. 75) meant that his poetry would bring him glory, and consequently the chance, expressed with all the emphasis of a closing *sphragis*, to 'sing, after Hipponax, the one of long ago (?) . . . limping verses to the descendants of Xouthos', i.e. the Ionians. Here, Herondas clearly seems to wish to advertise the synthesis that he has created between the comic tradition, represented by Dionysus, and the archaic iambic tradition, represented by Hipponax, who is irritated at this 'spoiling' of his genre.[16]

---

[11] There was a widespread belief that this game had given rise to comedy, cf. K. Latte, 'ΑΣΚΟΛΙΑΣΜΟΣ' *Hermes* 85 (1957) 385–91 = *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1968) 700–7. Before Herondas, the belief may already be reflected in Eubulus, *PCG* 7, but cf. Hunter (1983a) 93–4.

[12] For the interpretation of Dionysiac elements as references to comedy and mime, cf. B. Veneroni, 'Ricerche su due *Mimiambi* di Eroda' *RIL* 105 (1971) 223–42 and Rosen (1992).

[13] For the identification cf. Degani (1984) 50–6.

[14] Cf. Degani (1984) 102 n. 139 and Rosen (1992) 213–14.

[15] Poetry as the fruit of toil is a common image in Hellenistic poetry, cf. Philetas fr. 12 Sbardella (*CA* 10), Asclepiades, *AP* 7.11 = *HE* 942ff., Theocritus 7.51, Callimachus, *HE* 1293, Meleager, *AP* 12.257.3 = *HE* 4724.

[16] Cf. C. Miralles, 'La poetica di Eroda' *Aevum antiquum* 5 (1992) 111: 'Dionysus, who is young, takes sides, as usual, seeing that he is young, with the novelty of the poetics of Herondas, which is clearly rooted in the world of Demeter and the iambic tradition, but has incorporated the mime and *archaia*'.

In the polemical and programmatic 'Reply to the Telchines' (below, pp. 66–76), Callimachus defines his poetics both negatively, in comparison with the rejected works of certain previous or contemporary poets (fr. 1.9–16 Massimilla = Pfeiffer), and positively through praise of certain works by Philetas and Mimnermus, which thus rise to the level of real models, even if they are never expressly declared to be such. Callimachus then states that he is assisted and directed in these choices by Apollo and the Muses:[17] indeed, his choice of poetry is introduced as an implementation of Apollo's advice. Homer's Phemius had been proud of being αὐτοδίδακτος, in the sense that 'the god had inspired every kind of song in his heart' (*Od.* 22.347–8); Callimachus, too, affirms that he has learnt from Apollo, but unlike Phemius, who is instructed in 'every kind of song', Callimachus receives from Apollo precepts which are very similar to the principles of his own poetics: he is to nurture a Muse who is λεπταλέη, 'delicate', not overweight, and walk where no heavy carts travel, but rather along narrow, unbeaten pathways, with the result that he will sing with the voice of the cicada and abhor the braying of asses (fr. 1.22–30). Callimachus introduces his way of composing poetry, and offers his motivation for it, as a parallel to the inspiration received from the Muses by his model, Hesiod,[18] thus elaborating a sort of technical specialisation of the traditional idea of inspiration by the Muses in general (frs. 3 and 4 M.). He imagines himself transported by the Muses in a dream from Libya to Mount Helicon, where the goddesses inform him about the 'origins' of rituals, or uses and customs. This is an explicit assimilation, marked as such both by the localisation on Mount Helicon and also by allusion to Hesiod, *WD* 265 in line 5 of fr. 4, of his own experience to that of the Hesiod of the *Theogony*, who had previously been taught by the Muses on Helicon to sing of divine genealogy (cf. Call. fr. 4.1–4 M.).

Callimachus seems, however, to have adapted Hesiod's scenario to the requirements of his own poetics: in particular, the setting of his meeting with the Muses is not the foot of Mount Helicon (as in Hesiod, *Theogony* 23), but close to Hippocrene, and therefore at a higher point on the mountain;[19]

---

[17] Cf. fr. 1.22–30 M. for the assistance of Apollo, 1.37–8 for the assistance of the Muses. The very fragmentary invocation of fr. 2 M. is normally understood as addressed to the Muses, but other divinities cannot be ruled out; the Libyan Nymphs were suggested by N. Krevans, '"Invocation" at the End of the Aetia Prologue' *ZPE* 89 (1991) 19–23, or perhaps the Muses are speaking of the Charites: cf. below, pp. 52–4. The taste for variation between different inspiring divinities is most familiar from Theocritus 16, cf. below, pp. 152–3.

[18] Cf. below, pp. 51–60. Cameron (1995) 362–72 rightly pours cold water on some 'pan-Hesiodic' readings of the *Aitia* prologue, but goes too far in the other direction.

[19] Cf. Selden (1998) 357.

furthermore, to judge from the Latin echoes at least, it would appear
that Hesiod's initiation, as presented by Callimachus, involved drinking
from Hippocrene itself, or rather from the stream Aganippe,[20] and thus it
included the poetological image of the stream of pure water, familiar else-
where from Callimachus' poetry.[21] In this case, then, the model/guarantor
is shaped to look very like the poet who invokes him.[22] At the same time –
by adopting the dream form – it is likely that Callimachus was implicitly
establishing a parallel also with the experience of another theogonic poet,
Epimenides (*VS* 3B1), who had analogously imagined receiving the contents
of his work from the gods in a 'didactic dream' (ὄνειρον διδάσκαλον) dur-
ing a sleep lasting several years.[23] Finally, Callimachus returns to Hesiod,
and specifically to his inspiration from the Muses, in the epilogue to the
Aitia; verbatim repetition of the opening of the 'Dream' (fr. 4.1–4 M. ∼
fr. 112.5–6 Pf.) underlines the Hesiodic origin, the *aition*, of the poetry of
the *Aitia*.[24] Callimachus (*AP* 9.507 = *HE* 1297–1300) also made Hesiod
the model from whom Aratus derived his refined style (λεπταὶ ῥήσιες) –
in spite of the fact that the didactic-astronomical epos was, like the *Aitia*,
substantially a new genre (below, pp. 224–7).

   In an analogous but probably far more explicit manner, Timon
of Phlius presents his relationship with his main model: in his syn-
thesis of polemical derision of philosophical ideas *à la* Xenophanes
and the parodic-gastronomic poetry which largely developed after
Xenophanes, Timon clearly acknowledges his debt to the latter and
quotes, perhaps at the beginning of his poem (undoubtedly in the
first book), one of the leading exponents of such satire, Euboeus of
Paros (fr. 2 Di Marco = *SH* 776). On the other hand, however,

[20] Cf. A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik: Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos,
    Properz und Ennius* (Heidelberg 1965) 69–123, N. B. Crowther, 'Water and Wine as Symbols of
    Inspiration' *Mnemosyne* 32 (1979) 1–11. Cameron (1995) 127–32 argues against this inference from
    Latin texts.

[21] Cf. *HApoll.* 108–12 and *AP* 12.43.3–4 = *HE* 1043–4; cf. F. M. Giuliano, 'Oὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης πίνω:
    ancora poetica della *brevitas*?' *MD* 38 (1997) 153–73.

[22] Cf. Selden (1998) 357.

[23] At least until Fronto, *Epist. ad M. Caes.* 1.4.6, it was clear that the verb ἠντίασεν 'came towards',
    used by Callimachus, fr. 2.2, to describe the Muses approaching Hesiod, implied that the latter was
    awake at the time. It was only later that allegorical interpretations imagined that Hesiod's meeting,
    as well as Callimachus', had taken place while he was asleep, cf. Massimilla (1996) 234.

[24] Cf. Selden (1998) 356. On the reasons why Callimachus chooses to set the appearance of the Muses
    in a dream cf. R. Pretagostini, 'L'incontro con le Muse sull'Elicona in Esiodo e in Callimaco', *Lexis*
    13 (1995) 170–2: 'a poet of the third century BC like Callimachus, who makes truth one of the bases
    of his poetics, [. . .] in order to make the meeting with the Muses on Mount Helicon credible, has
    no other means than transferring it from the rationally incredible level of reality to the rationally
    plausible level of a dream: the epiphany of the goddesses [. . .] for the learned Alexandrine poet, can
    be hypothesised only in the realm of the imaginary'.

he also constructs his second and third books in dialogue form, as an exchange of question and answer between himself and Xenophanes (cf. Diogenes Laertius 9.111–12). Very likely, he placed this conversation during a *katabasis* in Hades, thus allowing him contact with the philosopher who had died some time before, as Callimachus' sleep allowed him contact with the Muses.[25] Here, then, Xenophanes seems to have acted at the same time as a guarantor of the truth of the contents and as a signal identifying the literary genre: he plays substantially the same rôle as the Muses for Hesiod and, in particular, for the 'Hesiodic' Callimachus of the first two books of the *Aitia*.[26]

In the *Iambi*, Callimachus both evokes the model and 'specialises' it, i.e. he declares (or rather, he lets the model itself declare) in what terms he intends to adapt it. In the first *Iambus*, which is clearly programmatic in character, Callimachus does not appear to have involved the Muses, but he introduces his poems as a sort of answer to the provocation/invitation of the iambic poet *par excellence*: he imagines that Hipponax comes back from the dead to Alexandria, in order to hold lessons on good manners for the philologists of the Museum. In this rôle of critic and corrector of morals, which a powerful Hellenistic-Roman tradition actually attributed to him,[27] Callimachus' Hipponax clearly maintains his customary critical and polemical spirit; thus, in addressing the philologists of the Museum, he uses expressions that verge on contempt for the abusive *psogos* of the archaic iambic (vv. 26–31),[28] but at the same time he states that he is 'bringing' to his new place of performance, the Alexandria of the third century, iambics which are 'singing not the warfare against Bupalus' (vv. 3–4). In other words, the new *iambi* are purified from the biting personal aggressiveness with which, according to the biographical tradition, the archaic Hipponax drove his enemies, Bupalus and Athenis, to commit suicide (just as the other principal archaic iambic poet, Archilochus, was believed to have done to his beloved, Neobule, and/or her father). In so doing, Callimachus' Hipponax not only reveals, with a keen sense of history, that invective poetry was closely linked to the specific context where it was produced (the culture of archaic Ionia), but he also reflects, within the scope of his new poetic programme (and that of Callimachus), a sense of the progressive elimination of personal polemic, which had marked the evolution

[25] The most recent editor, M. Di Marco (*Timone di Fliunte. Silli* (Rome 1989) 22–5), substantially adopts this idea of Meineke (with some important modifications).
[26] See below, pp. 44–6.
[27] Cf. [Theocritus], *AP* 13.3 = *HE* 3430ff., Horace, *Epod*. 6.11–14, Degani (1984) 180–1.
[28] Cf. D. Konstan, 'The Dynamics of Imitation: Callimachus' First Iambic', in Harder–Regtuit–Wakker (1998) 135.

of comic and satirical literature from iambic poetry to Middle and New
Comedy.[29]

It is not only this clear statement that demonstrates that the *Iambi* of
the resurrected Hipponax have been carefully adapted to the reality of
third-century Alexandria. Hipponax's *rhēsis*, 'discourse', is very similar in
its formal organisation to the typical discourse of an orator or philosopher
of third-century Alexandria.[30] His words abound with images connected
with reading and writing (cf. vv. 11, 31, 88), appropriate to the everyday
life of a Museum scholar,[31] but obviously not to the real Hipponax (early
sixth century).[32] Even the movement of the Callimachean Hipponax from
the Underworld to the world of the living underlines the idea that he is
a model adapted to the new reality, one brought 'up to date'; Hipponax,
moreover, agrees to be resurrected to third-century Alexandria, whereas the
judgement and/or the special knowledge of the great figures of the past had
regularly been obtained by means of *katabaseis*, descents to the Underworld,
in which it was the living who took the initiative and the dead whose spirits
and knowledge remained unaltered, fossilised by death (cf. Aristophanes'
Frogs and *Gerytades*,[33] and the *Silloi* of Timon (above p. 7–8)).

The archaic Hipponax, however 'Alexandrianised', is still clearly recog-
nisable in the first five poems, not only in the choliambic metre and the
Ionic dialect, but also in the technique of first-person speech and assumed
personality, which looks to a specific mode of archaic poetry:

As regards the presentation of moral character (τὸ ἦθος), there are certain things
which, if said about oneself, may be the cause of envy or prolixity or contradic-
tion, or if said about another, leave us open to the charge of being abusive or
rude; it is therefore advisable to have these things said by another person (ἕτερον
χρὴ λέγοντα ποιεῖν), as Isocrates does in the *Philip* and in the *Antidosis*, and as
Archilochus does when he expresses criticism (ὡς Ἀρχίλοχος ψέγει). Archilochus
makes a father speak about his daughter in the iambic poem, 'There is nothing

---

[29] Cf. Hunter (1997) 50–1.   [30] Cf. Falivene (1995) 921–5.   [31] Cf. Bing (1988) 10–48.

[32] Cf. Falivene (1995) 923 and Acosta-Hughes (2002) 24–5, 51–2. Hunter (1997) 48–9 offers an attractive
reading of the story of Bathycles' cup. Even as he preaches peace between the learned scholars, the
Callimachean Hipponax, with the agonistic attitude of the Hellenistic philologist, may have supplied
a different version from the one given by the original Hipponax for the same episode; it cannot be
excluded that fr. 65 Degani = *IEG* 63 ('Myson, who was declared by Apollo to be the wisest of all
men') refers to this story; cf., however, Degani (1984) 46–7 for a sceptical position on this kind of
interpretation of the fragment.

[33] In the Χείρωνες 'The Cheirones' of Cratinus (*PCG* 246–68), however, Solon returns to earth to
advise the city, and in Eupolis' Δῆμοι 'The Demes' (*PCG* 99–146), the same function is performed
by a delegation of past Athenian statesmen (Solon, Aristides, Miltiades, and Pericles). In view
of the clear contextual affinities, these comedies are Callimachus' most likely model. Cf. further
L. Bergson, 'Kallimachos, Iambos I (fr. 191 Pf.), 26–28', *Eranos* 84 (1986) 15–16, Vox (1995) 276–8,
Kerkhecker (1999) 15–17.

that cannot be expected or that we can swear to be impossible' (*IEG* 122.1), and
he makes the carpenter Charon speak in the iambic poem that begins 'Not for
me the estate of Gyges' (*IEG* 19.1); so too Sophocles presents Haemon speaking
about Antigone to his father, as though quoting what others have been saying (cf.
Antigone 688–700). (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.1418b23–33)

In archaic iambic poetry, then, a speaking 'I', who was not the same as
the author, seems to have been not infrequent, and this could give rise to
misunderstandings about the identity of the *persona loquens* for anybody
not present at the first performance of the work.[34] Aristotle, as we have
just seen, identifies certain cases where Archilochus places criticism in the
mouth of a 'third party',[35] and Simonides too presented a cook speaking in
the first person (fr. 24) and possibly also a hetaera (fr. 16). As for Hipponax,
the use of different *personae* is not as easy to ascertain as it is for Archilochus
(thanks to Aristotle)[36], but it is likely that the adoption of the iambic 'mask'
of the petulant miser was a common feature of his poetry;[37] be that as it may,
Callimachus' use of Hipponax as his spokesman clearly adopts a familiar
technique of archaic iambic. Moreover, Hipponax or his characters regularly
speak of Hipponax himself in the third person,[38] and this too is a mode
aped by Callimachus' Hipponax, who from the very beginning speaks of
himself in the third person.[39]

   It is in *Iambi* 1–5 and 13 that the clearest elements of continuity with Hip-
ponax are seen: here is the true ἰαμβικός character – aggressive, bantering,
admonitory – expressed in the Ionic dialect; *Iambi* 1–4 are in choliambs,
the metre expressly connected with Hipponax in *Iambus* 13,[40] while in

---

[34] Cf. K. J. Dover, 'The Poetry of Archilochos', in *Archiloque* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique
10) (Vandoeuvres–Geneva 1963) 206–8, M. G. Bonanno, 'L'io lirico greco e la sua identità (anche
biografica?)' in I. Gallo and L. Nicastri (eds.), *Biografia e autobiografia degli antichi e dei moderni*
(Naples 1995) 23–39.

[35] The views of 'Charon' on wealth went against contemporary conceptions, cf. e.g. Alcaeus fr. 360
Voigt, M. Noussia, *Solone. I frammenti dell'opera poetica* (Milan 2001) 303, and this was presumably
not a unique example.

[36] For other possible examples, cf. West (1974) 29–33 and G. Nagy, 'Iambos: Typologies of Invective
and Praise', *Arethusa* 9 (1976) 191–205.

[37] Cf. West (1974) 28–33, Degani (1984) chapters 2 and 3.

[38] Cf. frs. 42b1.4 Degani = *IEG* 32.4; 44.2 Deg. = *IEG* 36.2; 46 Deg. = *IEG* 37; 79.9 Deg. =
IEG; 196.4 Deg. = *IEG* 117.4),

[39] The first verse of *Iambus* 1 has sometimes been considered to be a verse of Hipponax, used as an
opening 'motto', cf. Degani (1984) 44–5, A. Cavarzere, *Sul limitare: il 'motto' e la poesia di Orazio*
(Bologna 1996) 61–64, Acosta-Hughes (2002) 37–8.

[40] On the choice of choliambs, rather than the iambic trimeters which were now indissolubly connected
with drama, cf. Kerkhecker (1999) 5–8. By including poems in various different metres within a
collection framed by 'exemplary' choliambs (*Iambi* 1–4 and 13), Callimachus probably recalled the
original polymetry which characterised the Hellenistic editions of both Hipponax and Archilochus
(cf. below, pp. 14–15, 25–6).