

es vielleicht auch eine Art „Pfropfen“ sein, der sich aber leicht entfernen läßt, also nicht tief steckt. Wahrscheinlicher ist jedoch (auch von der Bedeutung des Wortes her) die Annahme von G. Senn, daß es sich um einen „Deckel“ handelt. Beim Umwenden wird er jetzt allerdings mit der Hand gehalten und kann dicht schließen, da das Gefäß nicht mehr „rasch“ umgedreht zu werden braucht.

Hamburg

Anargyros Anastassiou

DIRECT SPEECH IN THE HYMNS OF CALLIMACHUS

In this paper I propose to consider how far Callimachus, in his Hymns, complies with, and differs from, the employment of direct speech in Homer as analysed in part by Heřman, Waehmer and Wille¹). Direct speech in the Hymns of Callimachus differs in two main ways from that of Homer and other early epic writers: i) in the use of formulae of “saying” etc. which introduce and follow direct speech, and ii) in the space occupied by direct speech within the unit of the hexameter. Callimachus’ use of these features is unusual, and sometimes produces problems, as an examination of some of the instances will show.

i) In his Hymns Callimachus uses formulae of “saying” etc. which do not occur in Homer, and which rarely occur in Homer.

rung vom Experiment der kommunizierenden Gefäße: *συναμύσας ὡς κάλλιστα ... καὶ ἐγγέοι ἡσυχίῃ*, *Morb.* IV 92, 17f J. = 7, 556, 19f Li.). Es liegt also nahe, bei *ἐν τάξει* an „ordentlich, ordnungsgemäß“ zu denken. Das „Ordnungsgemäße“ könnte man im vorliegenden Fall in der Wahrung der Reihenfolge der Hantierungen sehen, die notwendig sind zur Schaffung der Voraussetzungen für die Entfernung des Deckels sowie in dem damit verbundenen Walten der nötigen Vorsicht und Sorgfalt. Eine genaue Parallele für das derartige Verständnis von *ἐν τάξει* läßt sich jedoch weder im CH noch in den einschlägigen Hilfsmitteln finden. Es geht aber kaum an, aus diesem Grund auch die M-Überlieferung in Frage zu stellen.

1) Heřman, *Die formale Technik der homerischen Reden*, *Progr. Villach*, 1877; Waehmer, *Über ἦ, ὡς φάτο, ὡς εἰπὼν und verwandte epische Formeln*, *Progr. Göttingen*, 1883ff.; Wille, *Auf welche Weise stellt Homer ... Progr. Neustettin*, 1885–6, cf. also Führer, *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*. *Zetemata* 44, 1967.

Homeric formulae which he does use are often varied considerably. Unhomeric, for instance, is / τοῖα ... καλιστρῶν / which introduces the speech of Triopas at *H.* VI, 97; this verb never appears in Homer²⁾. Its equivalent *καλέω*, however, appears very rarely before direct speech at *Il.* 3, 161; 17, 507, but not with an internal accusative. Likewise *κερδαλέω μῦθω σε, θεή, μάλα τῶδε πινύσκει.* (*H.* III, 152), which introduces a speech of Heracles, uses the verb *πινύσκω* which is not found in Homer. Sometimes Callimachus uses rare Homericisms. Thus *ὣς ἦ παῖς εἰποῦσα* (*H.* III, 26) follows the speech of Artemis. *ὣς* is separated from the participle as subject in such contexts only once in Homer – *ὣς ὁ μὲν εἰπὼν* (*Il.* 2, 70) which Callimachus reproduced at *H.* III, 39. Cf. also *ἀ μὲν τόσσ' εἰποῖσα* (*H.* VI, 65) which follows the speech of Demeter, and *Batrach.* 122. Again, *ἐπηύτησε δὲ λαός*, which precedes direct speech at *H.* II, 102, recalls *μέγ' ἄντει* (*Il.* 21, 582), the only instance of this verb in connection with direct speech in Homer. It is noticeable that Callimachus, *Alexandrino more*, has used the compound verb instead of the simple verb which appears in Homer.

Most often, however, Callimachus makes use of a traditional Homeric formula of “saying” etc. in typical Hellenistic fashion, i. e. by varying it. Thus Rheia’s one line speech at *H.* I, 29 is introduced with *καὶ ῥ' ὑπ' ἀμνηχανίης σχομένη φάτο πότνια Πείη.* In Homer, when *φάτο* appears before direct speech it always governs a noun (*ἔπος, μῦθος* etc.); but the active *ἔφαν* is found before direct speech at *Od.* 10, 471. This same speech in Callimachus is immediately followed by *εἶπε, καὶ ...* (again at *H.* IV, 133; cf. *εἶπεν ὁ παῖς* *H.* VI, 56) which is not Homeric. When this verb is used in Homer to signify the end of a speech it is always accompanied by *ὣς* – with the exception of *Batrach.* 122, where *ταῦτα* is found instead – and appears either as a participle (*εἰπὼν, -οῦσα, -όν*) or, in the indicative, in the iterative form *εἶπεσκε*. Again, Zeus’ speech at *H.* III, 29 is introduced by *φῆ δὲ καταροέζων* (cf. *H.* VI, 45) which is unhomeric. In Homer *φῆ* either introduces indirect speech, or concludes direct speech (*Il.* 21, 361, Homeric *Hymn. Dem.* 145 etc.). *ἦ μὲν ἔφη* (*H.* IV, 249) which follows the speech of Hera, never appears thus in Homer, but is a variant of the common Homeric *ὣς ἄρ' ἔφη* which frequently closes direct speech. Different from Homer also is Callimachus’ use of *λέγω, καταλέγω* and *προσλέγω*. It is

2) Cf. Giangrande, *C.R.* 1971, p. 356.

generally agreed that this verb never means “speak” in Homer³). Callimachus uses it with precisely this meaning, following post-Homeric practice. The simple verb appears at *H.* IV, 201 *θαρσαλή τὰδ' ἔλεξας...* introducing the speech of the island Delos. Likewise *τῷ μάλα θαρσαλή σφε τάδε προσελέξαι τῆμος* (*H.* III, 80) introducing the speech of Artemis. At *H.* IV, 274, on the other hand, *ὧδε σὺ μὲν κατέλεξας* comes after the speech of Delos. With this post-Homeric meaning of *λέγω* we can compare *τοῖσι δ' Ἀθηναίῃ λέγε κήδεα πόλλ' Ὀδυσῆος | μνησαμένη...* introducing a speech of Athene at *Od.* 5, 5, and *καὶ τότε τῶν ἄλλων ἐτάρων κατέλεξεν Ὀλεθρον*, introducing the speech of Eurylochus (within the speech of Odysseus) at *Od.* 10, 250. In these instances *λέγω* is usually translated “recount”. Again, Callimachus' *ἀλλά ἐ παιδὸς ἔρourkeν ἔπος τόδε* (*H.* IV, 162) which introduces the speech of Apollo, is different from Homeric usage: Homer uses this verb before direct speech (*Od.* 3, 345, cf. *Od.* 10, 429), but always with a personal subject, never non-personal (as *ἔπος* in Callimachus). Interesting also is *H.* VI, 80 *τὰν δὲ γυνά... ἀμείβετο ...* preceding the reply of the mother of Triopas to Polyxo. *ἀμείβουμαι* is commonly used on such occasions in Homer, when one speaker answers the speech of another. But here in Callimachus there is no direct speech beforehand; the request of Polyxo is simply a part of the preceding narrative. *ἦνθε Πολυξώ, | μάτηρ Ἀκτορίωνος, ἐπεὶ γάμον ἄρτε παιδί, | ἀμφοτέρων Τριόπαν τε καὶ Νίεα κικλήσκουσα.* This is extremely rare in Homer; it occurs at *Od.* 17, 122f. where Menelaus replies to what Telemachus has told him: *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τῷ πᾶσαν ἀληθεῖην κατέλεξα | καὶ τότε δή μ' ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπεν*. Cf. also *Od.* 4, 234, where Helen's speech, introduced with *ἀμειβομένη* is not directly related to any previous direct speech; also *Od.* 15, 439, where the daughter of Arybas' speech is prefaced with *ἀμείβετο* although the direct speech which precedes is also spoken by her. This technique by Homer and Callimachus is rather like the use of *ὧς ἔφατο* immediately following narrative rather than the normal direct speech. This is extremely rare in early epic, but is found in the Homeric *Hymn. Dem.* 316, 448; Hesiod, *W. & D.* 69; it then reappears, as one might expect, in Apollonius Rhodius IV, 236. Apollonius added further refinement by also using, for variety, *ὧς ἄρ' ἔφη* (IV, 1121) and *ἦ* (I, 512).

3) Cf. for instance, *LSJ* s.v. *λέγω* (B) III. La Roche, *Homeric Studies*, p. 197.

4 Rhein. Mus. f. Philol. N. F. CXVII, 1/2

One of the more interesting features of Callimachus' style is the frequent absence of a formula – such as ὡς ἄρ' ἔφη... , ἦ... etc., – which should indicate that the direct speech has come to an end. Such formulae are, of course, extremely common in Homer⁴); where they are absent, the end of direct speech is often signalled by a word such as ἀμειβόμενος. There are, however, a very few instances in Homer where the end of direct speech is not acknowledged in the normal way; thus *Od.* 22, 200 where the speech of Eumaeus to Melanthius is immediately followed by ὡς ὁ μὲν αὖθι λέλειπτο, ταθεις ὀλοῶ ἐνὶ δεσμῶ or *Od.* 19, 412 where the speech of Autoclus to Eurycleia is followed by τῶν ἔνεκ' ἦλθ' Ὀδυσσεύς, ἵνα οἱ πόροι ἄγλαια δῶρα⁵). In Callimachus, however, almost one third of the speeches have no "formula" to indicate that the direct speech has come to an end; see *H.* II, 113; III, 105; IV, 86, 215; VI, 41, 50, 77, 83. Such an absence accounts for the famous problem of where the speech of Triopas, which begins at *H.* VI, 98, ends. Schneider and Pfeiffer think that it ends after line 110, Wilamowitz, Cahen and Mair after line 106⁶). Either, of course, could be right. An even more interesting use of direct speech, however, occurs at *H.* VI, 84–6:

δαίνυνεν εἰλαπίναν τις· “ἐν ἀλλοτρία Ἐρυσίχθων”
 ἄγετό τις νύμφαν· “Ἐρυσίχθονα δίσκος ἔτυφεν.”
 ἦ “ἔπεισ' ἐξ ἱππῶν” ἦ “ἐν Ὀθρονὶ ποίμνι ἀμυθρεῖ”.

There is nothing like this in Homer; but cf. Hesiod, *W.&*

D. 453–4:

ὀηίδιον γὰρ ἔπος εἶπεῖν “βόε δὸς καὶ ἄμαξαν”
 ὀηίδιον δ' ἀπανήρασθαι “πάρα ἔργα βόεσσιν.”

ii) The extent of direct speech in relation to the hexameter unit in the Hymns of Callimachus is also interesting. Frequently a speech begins or ends half-way through a hexameter. This is an extremely rare phenomenon in early epic⁷). There are a very

4) Cf. in particular Heřman, *op. cit.* 42 ff.

5) Cf. also Heřman, *op. cit.* p. 49. Führer, *op. cit.* 46ff; 57ff.

6) Bergk, on the other hand (see Schneider's apparatus) preferred to assume a lacuna.

7) See Page, *Hesiod, Homeric Hymns and Homeric*, (Loeb), p. 612, n. 4.

few examples in Homer: *Il.* 2, 70 | ἐκ Διός· ἀλλὰ σὺ σῆσιν ἔχε φρεσίν.” ὧς ὁ μὲν εἰπὼν |⁸⁾, *Il.* 6, 479 | καὶ ποτέ τις εἶποι “πατρός γ’ ὄδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων |, *Il.* 15, 82 (νοήση) | “ἔνθ’ εἶην ἢ ἔνθα,” μενοιώησι τε πολλὰ | *Il.* 23. 855 | τοξεύειν “ὄς μὲν κε βάλῃ τρηχέωνα πελειδαν. These are, however, not quite exceptions to the Homeric norm: *Il.* 2, 70 and 6, 479 form part of a direct speech, i. e. they comprise a speech within a speech, and the direct speeches of which they are a part begin and end normally. *Il.* 15, 82 is, in fact, not so much direct speech as direct thought (νοήση). These passages are, none the less, striking. With regard to other early epic, there are no instances of direct speech occupying less than a full hexameter in the Homeric Hymns⁹⁾. Hesiod, however, has an example at *W.&D.* 453-4 (quoted above); and there is one in the *Batrach.* 172-3 | ἦδὸν γελῶν ἐρέεινε: “τῖνες βατράχοισιν ἀρωγοὶ | ἢ μυσὶν ἀθανάτων;” καὶ Ἀθηναίην προσέειπεν |. In Callimachus, however, it is quite normal to find direct speech occupying part of a line, as *H.* III, 29 | φῆ δὲ καταρρέζων “ὅτε μοι τοιαῦτα θέαναι |, which ends | ἔσση καὶ λιμένεσιν ἐπίσκοπος.” ὧς ὁ μὲν εἰπὼν |. (III, 39). Other instances are *H.* II, 104; IV, 150, 162, 212; VI, 41, 53, 77, 84-6. Callimachus’ fondness for this device, coupled with the frequent absence of closing “formulae” to his speeches, causes problems at *H.* IV, 116:

“σήμερον ἐξαπίνης; ὁ δ’ ἀνήκοος. ὦ ἐμὸν ἄχθος”

which forms part of the speech of Leto. ὁ δ’ ἀνήκοος is regarded as part of this speech by Schneider, Cahen and Pfeiffer; Wilamowitz and Mair remove it from the direct speech and make it part of the general narrative. Since, however, there is no instance in the Hymns of narrative intruding into the direct speech of an individual (apart from the innocuous ἔφα, *H.* VI, 53)¹⁰⁾, this perhaps suggests that ὁ δ’ ἀνήκοος is spoken by Leto. While Callimachus shows such unorthodoxy, his contemporary Apollonius Rhodius always makes direct speech occupy a full hexameter¹¹⁾.

8) The “indirect” part of *Il.* 2, 70 is repeated exactly by Callimachus at *H.* III, 39, same *sedes*.

9) Although Allen attempted to introduce an instance in the Homeric Hymn. *Herm.* after line 526.

10) This introduction of a verb of “saying” into the direct narrative is not found in Homer; but cf. the insertion of the direct φημί, spoken by Apollo within his speech in Homeric Hymn. *Herm.* 549.

11) The only exception is III, 797, which, like two of the Homeric instances, is part of a speech within a speech.

The fifth hymn, of course, is written in elegiac couplets, and there is thus no reason why it should adhere to epic techniques in the matter of direct speech. It displays, in fact, many of the features of the other hymns. Thus τὸδ' ἔλεξεν ἔπος precedes Athene's speech at line 96; and direct speech occupies only part of the hexameter at line 85. Unusual also is the lengthy sequel to Chariclo's speech, at lines 93–5 ἃ μὲν (ἄμ') ἀμφοτέραισι φίλον περιπαῖδα λαβοῖσα / μάτηρ μὲν γοερῶν οἴτον ἀηδονίδων / ἄγε βαρὸν κλαίουσα...¹²). But early elegy is occasionally somewhat free in its use of direct speech, occupying less than a full line, for instance, at Theognis 22, 489–90, 921 etc.

It is clear from the above that Callimachus, in his treatment of direct speech, has utilised Homer and early epic in his usual manner: he has developed, within the epic genre, “not what was the norm, but what was the... exception in Homer”¹³).

Birkbeck College,
University of London

G.R. McLennan

12) <ἄμ'> is Schneider's suggestion to correct the unmetrical / ἃ μὲν ἀμφοτέραισι of the mss., and appears in Pfeiffer. The parallels which Schneider quotes – *Il.* 7, 255; 23, 686; Homeric *Hymn. Herm.* 39, *Dem.* 15 – do not involve λαμβάνω (except perhaps the last ἢ δ' ἄρα θαμβήσασ' ὠρέξατο χερσὶν ἄμ' ἄμφω / καλὸν ἄθρομα λαβεῖν, where χερσὶν ἄμ' ἄμφω goes more naturally with ὠρέξατο). This, of course, need not matter. It is just as likely, however, which no-one seems to have noticed, that Callimachus wrote ἃ μὲν ἐν ἀμφοτέραισι ..., haplography causing the present reading of the mss. (as also Schneider's ἄμ'). With ἃ μὲν ἐν ἀμφοτέραισι ... παῖδα λαβοῖσα cf. *Il.* 8, 116 Νέστωρ δ' ἐν χεῖρεσσι λάβ' ἡρία ..., Sophocles, *O.T.* 912–3 τὰδ' ἐν χερσὶν στέφη λαβούση ... For ἐν with ἀμφοτέραισι cf. Theocritus 7, 157 ἐν ἀμφοτέραισιν ἔχοισα. Oppian, *Hal.* 5, 635 παλάμησι δ' ἐν ἀμφοτέρησιν ἀείρει. ἐν in such cases need not mean literally “in”, and in the present case is not inappropriate to the age and size of Teiresias. In Homer, for instance, at *Od.* 10, 397 the companions of Odysseus are converted back from swine to men by Circe, and recognise their leader: ἔγνωσαν δ' ἐμὲ κείνοι, ἔφην τ' ἐν χερσὶν ἕκαστος. “And they all knew me again and each one took my hands” (Butcher and Lang). Or again at *Il.* I, 441, Odysseus returns Chryseis to her father Chryses πατρὶ φίλῳ ἐν χερσὶ τίθει, and he receives her gladly (446) ὧς εἰπὼν ἐν χερσὶ τίθει, ὃ δὲ δέξατο χαίρων / παῖδα φίλην. “So saying he gave her to his arms, and he gladly took his dear child” (Leaf).

13) Cf. Giangrande, *Antiq. Class.* 1970, p. 48, and *Class. Rev.* 1970, p. 153 for the development of early epic “Ansätze” by Hellenistic epic poets. It may well be, of course, that Callimachus' employment of the features examined was also encouraged by the influence of genres other than Epic, but the fact remains that the features under discussion are Homeric rarities, and that it was typical of Hellenistic epic poets to develop such rarities.