The Cambridge Classical Journal (2013) 59, 152–177 doi:10.1017/S1750270513000018
© The Author(s) 2013. Published by Cambridge University Press

CALLIMACHUS IN THE PINDAR SCHOLIA

Thomas Phillips*
Merton College, Oxford

This article analyses how Callimachus was cited in ancient scholarship on Pindar. A survey of references to literary authors in the scholia establishes that commentaries provided only minimal specification of relations between the texts concerned. Despite this, commentaries were important intertextual sites. In providing information that supplements Pindar's texts, citations of Callimachus contribute to the latter's canonical status by treating his poetry as an authoritative source of mythological and historical details. The juxtaposition of the two authors in commentaries also allowed for an exploration of their literary relationship.

Callimachus occupies a uniquely important place in the history of Pindaric studies. As a scholar who worked on classifying and organising the Pindaric corpus, as a poet who engaged in a creative dialogue with Pindar's poetry, and as a figure of scholarly and poetic authority in his own right, who is frequently cited by the Pindar scholia, Callimachus exemplifies the complexities of literary and scholarly reception. My primary purpose here is to analyse the role played by Callimachean citations in the commentaries on Pindar's epinicians, and to explore their interpretative significance. To this end, I shall first address the questions of the extent to which the extant scholia reflect the scholarly literature of the Hellenistic period, and how closely the citations in the scholia may resemble those that would have been present in Hellenistic commentaries on Pindar. I shall then examine in detail two groups of citations, the first of which can be characterised as primarily supplementary, supplying the reader with additional information about Pindar's mythical narratives and the people and places mentioned in his poems. The second group consists of citations which have more general conceptual significance, glossing Pindaric reflections on poetry's immortalising power and the correct use of wealth with similar statements in Callimachus. Such citations are part of the wider processes of literary and scholarly reception during the Hellenistic period, and a brief overview of these forms the preamble to my main arguments. I shall return to this subject in the conclusion, and address some of the ways in which the scholarly citations affect how Pindar and Callimachus might be read in relation to each other.

* Email: thomas.phillips@classics.ox.ac.uk.

I am grateful to Armand D'Angour, Tim Rood, Oliver Thomas, and the journal's anonymous referees for their comments.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Callimachus Pindaricus

The subject of Callimachus' scholarly and poetic engagement with Pindar has attracted much attention.[1] Numerous small-scale appropriations of Pindaric language and topoi are evident in Callimachus' poetry, and are by no means confined to the encomiastic works.[2] Pindaric echoes are prominent in Callimachus' most famous poetological statements; the image of the κελεύθους | ἀτρίπτο]υ̣ς ('unworn roads') at *Aetia* fr. 1.27–8 recalls, inter alia, the image of 'Homer's path' at Pind. *Pa.* 7b.11–12 (fr. 52 h S.–M.).[3] At H.2.110–12, Callimachus again draws on Pindaric images:

> Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
> ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
> πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον.
>
> The bees do not carry water to Deo from everywhere, but a slender stream that springs pure and undefiled from a holy spring, a high crown.

The μέλισσαι of 110 reference the self-characterisation of the epinician narrator at P.10.53–4 (ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων | ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον, 'the crown of praise-songs springs from one theme to another like a bee'), as does Callimachus' use of ἄκρον ἄωτον.[4] The image of the spring also recalls an opposition broached by Pindar between the nectar of his poetry and salt water (*Parth.* 2.76–8 = fr. 94b S.–M.):[5]

> μὴ νῦν νέκτα̣[ρ. . . . .]ναις ἐμᾶς
> διψῶντ' α[. . . . .] π̣αρ' ἁλμυρόν
> οἴχεσθον·
>
> Do not, thirsting for my nectar, go to the salty . . .

1 The only evidence for Callimachus' Pindaric scholarship is Σ P.2.inscr., which mentions that he took part in the ongoing controversy over the classification of this poem, arguing that it was a Nemean. This contribution is clearly related to the classificatory work required for the *Pinakes*. Cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 123–40 on Callimachus' scholarship and its influences on his poetry, and Irigoin (1952) 33; Fuhrer (1992) 33–5 on Σ P.2.inscr.

2 Cf. the passages collected by Richardson (1986) 391–7, and Asper (1997) on Pindar as a model for Callimachus; cf. also Morrison (2007) 120–2, 130–3. For Hellenistic reception of classical lyric poetry more generally cf. Acosta-Hughes (2011).

3 Cf. Cameron (1995) 59; Massimilla (1996) 219. Snell–Maehler print Ὁμήρου [δὲ μὴ τρι]πτὸν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν | ἰόντες, ἀ[λλ' ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις (11–12, 'not going on Homer's worn path but on foreign horses'), but D'Alessio (1992) showed that the lacuna in 12 is too long for Snell–Maehler's reconstruction; this observation has prompted fresh attempts at supplementation, for which cf. D'Alessio (1995); Rutherford (2001) 248–9.

4 Cf. Richardson (1986) 392 n. 17 for further bibliography.

5 Cf. Richardson (1986) 392.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In both of these passages, however, various metrical, generic and intertextual elements distance Callimachus from Pindar.[6] A similar balance of filiation and distinction is at work in the *Victoria Berenices* and the elegy for Sosibius' victory (fr. 384 Pf.).[7] These poems display numerous epinician motifs and Pindaric filiations,[8] but the elegiac metre and the importance of Egyptian elements distinguish them from Pindar's poetry.[9] Particularly important in the latter are the speeches of the Nile at 28–45 and Sosibius' votive offering at 50, the second of which plays on the convention of the speaking object in dedicatory epigrams.[10] The fusion of Greek and Egyptian is illustrated by the description of Sosibius' dedications at 44–9, first at the Argive Heraeon and then in the temple of Zeus Casios at Pelusium:

"ἀμφοτέρων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐπήβολος· οὐκέτι γυμνάς
παῖδας ἐν Ἡραίῳ στήσομεν Εὐρυνόμης."
ὣς φαμένῳ δώσει τις ἀνὴρ ὁμόφωνον ἀοιδήν.
τοῦτο μὲν ἐξ ἄλλων ἔκλυον ἱρὸν ἐγώ,
κεῖνό γε μὴν ἴδον αὐτός, ὃ πὰρ ποδὶ κάθετο Νείλου
νειατίῳ, Κασίην εἰς ἐπίκωμος ἄλα·

'The stranger has been victorious at both. No longer will we set up the naked daughters of Eurynome in Hera's temple.' To the person (?) speaking thus a man will give in response a concordant song. I heard about this offering from others, but saw this one myself, the one which he set at the Nile's lowest foot, visiting the Casian Sea.

These dedications connect Greece and Egypt, mapping out Sosibius' achievements. They also provide a physical instantiation of the Pindaric topos in which the fame of

6 Cf. especially Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2002) on the intertextual multiplicity of *Aetia* fr. 1. On Pindar fr. 94b S.–M. as one of the texts from which Callimachus drew on Pindar's self-referential terminology, cf. Poliakoff (1980).

7 Cf. Montanari and Lehnus (2002) 139 on the *Victoria Berenices* as amalgamating epigram and epinician, and Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 83 on the poem's Pindaric elements with further references.

8 Cf. Fuhrer (1992).

9 Cf. Stephens (2002) 255–61 on the fusion of Pindaric and Egyptian elements, creating a 'geographic doubleness' (p. 255). Cf. Cameron (1995) 45–6, 148 on Callimachus' choice of metre for his encomiastic poetry and his break away from Pindaric form.

10 Cf. Stephens (2002) 256–8 on the importance of the crossing of the low Nile (fr. 384.33–4 Pf.) as a topos in Egyptian literature. It is likely that scholarly discourses also have played a part in Callimachus' construction of the contests, and its reception. We know that a work 'On Contests' (fr. 403 Pf.) formed part of the Callimachean corpus; the mention at fr. 384.25–6 Pf. of Melicertes and Opheltes/Archemorus, in whose honour the Isthmian and the Nemean games respectively were established, could well reference a scholarly debate about the founding of the games; Σ N. hyp. preserves an alternate version in which the Nemean games commemorated Heracles' killing of the Nemean lion, and this account, together with those at Σ I. hyp., probably derive from Hellenistic and Peripatetic 'On Contests' treatises such as Callimachus'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the victor and his family is said to reach beyond the ends of the known world, as at I.6.22–3:

μυρίαι δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέ-
τμανθ' ἑκατόμπεδοι ἐν σχερῷ κέλευθοι
καὶ πέραν Νείλοιο παγᾶν καὶ δι' Ὑπερβορέους·

A myriad of paths a hundred feet wide have been cut in ranks for fine deeds, even beyond the springs of the Nile and through the Hyperboreans.

The putative, imaginary reach of Pindar's μυρίαι ... κέλευθοι is displaced by the concrete particularity of Sosibius' inscriptions. In I.6, the Nile acts as a figure beyond which (πέραν Νείλοιο παγᾶν) the discourse of praise reaches out in an unspecified movement. Callimachus appropriates this discourse by making the Nile speak about his source (ὃν οὐδ' ὅθεν ο[ἶ]δεν ὀδεύω | θνητὸ]ς ἀνήρ, 'no mortal man knows whence I travel', 31–2). The simultaneous affirmation of the source as beyond mortal knowledge and attribution of this knowledge to a character in the poem exemplifies the poem's generic and cultural transplantation of the terms of Pindaric discourse.

Studies of literary reception tend to focus, as I have just done, on the uses made by later texts of their models. Here I propose to reverse this practice and consider how later texts can resituate earlier ones and affect how they might be read. Callimachean appropriations, for instance, generate an understanding of the Pindaric corpus specifically as a source of aesthetic and intellectual positions, additionally validated by being used as a model. Callimachus' poems participate in the recontextualisation of the appropriated text, which now becomes a 'classic', an institutionalised document whose meanings and significance are mediated by scholarly and literary reception; Callimachus' appropriations might prompt us to see traces of Callimachean poetic practice 'already there' in Pindar, waiting to be exposed by Callimachus' rewritings, even as the agonistic elements just discussed serve to localise Pindar's claims to poetic authority.[11] The scholarly texts represented by the Pindar scholia can be productively read as a site of such intertextual dynamics, mediated by readerly awareness of Callimachus' wider engagement with Pindar. In citing Callimachus to 'explain' Pindar, these metatexts prompt consideration of the latter's literary influence, but also create an intertextual field in which Callimachus' poetry influences interpretation of the text on which it is made to comment.

Citations in the scholia

Before examining the scholia's citational practices, I shall examine the evidential problems the corpus poses for understanding the state of Pindaric scholarship in the later Hellenistic and early Imperial periods. The scholia in the Byzantine manuscripts are a collation of the

11 Cf. Fowler (2000) 129–30.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholarly material available in late antiquity, which was in turn formed from a collation of texts from earlier periods.[12] The total amount of Pindaric criticism in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods was clearly far greater than is represented by the scholia as we have them.[13] It is also impossible to date precisely scholia which do not refer to named scholars or other historical figures, and even when they do so they can only give us loose *termini post quem*. On the other hand, most of the scholars cited by the scholia and known to have worked on Pindar date to Hellenistic times, with some dating to the early Imperial period.[14] On this basis, Henry Thomson Deas argues for a major redaction of Pindaric commentaries in the middle of the second century AD, after which point little new material, at least that we have evidence of, entered the corpus. The fact that the vast majority of sources cited by the scholia date to the Hellenistic period and before is another pointer in this direction; the major authors of the Second Sophistic are conspicuous by their absence. We can therefore be reasonably confident that most of the material in the scholia would have been available in some form to readers of the later Hellenistic and early Imperial periods, and that passages containing extensive contextual, mythical or literary-historical information would have been considerably more lengthy in the earlier commentaries.[15] The evidence imposes methodological limitations. First, all of the following readings are to an extent provisional, in that they are working with an evidential base which does not reflect the total amount of scholarly information potentially available to readers in the period under discussion. Second, with a few exceptions, I do not attempt to localise my readings with any temporal or geographical specificity. My aim is rather to sketch out the kind of citational practices that were at

12 Cf. Irigoin (1952) 31–75 for an overview of early Pindaric scholarship. Negri (2004) gives an account of the criteria employed by the early Hellenistic scholars in ordering poems within the individual editions. On the transmission of the scholia cf. Deas (1931), who argues (p. 22) that the Didymus' commentary, which collected much of the previous material, was the main source for later commentaries.

13 The differences between the surviving scholia to P.12 and the fragment of Theon's commentary on that poem (= *POxy.* 2536) are a salutary reminder of the variations in the metatextual corpus. NB also Deas (1931) 55–7 on the Byzantine manuscripts as imperfect representations of previous scholarly work; he points to phenomena such as the substitution of past tenses for the present tenses used in ancient scholarship to refer to customs and rituals; cf. e.g. Σ P.4.338.

14 Theon (late first century BC, early first century AD; cf. Cameron (1995) 191 n. 33 for the dating) wrote a commentary on the Pythians, a fragment of which is preserved by *POxy.* 2536. It is also likely that Aristonicus, also alive during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, wrote a ὑπόμνημα; the exegesis recorded by Σ N.1.37 suggests a commentary, as does the specifically literary nature of the comment recorded at Σ O.3.31a, although the comments recorded by Σ O.1.35c, O.7.154, and N.1.inscr. could have another provenance; the first two, for instance, could come from a response to Didymus rather than an independent commentary. On Aristonicus in general cf. e.g. Pfeiffer (1968) 267–70; Montanari (1993) 279. The evidence for commentaries by later scholars is less convincing: Σ O.3.52 refers to Amyntianus' περὶ ἐλεφάντων as the source of the citation, and the two citations of Herodian (Σ O.1.18; P.3.65) concern matters of accentuation, and likely derive from a grammatical treatise. Σ I.5 inscr.a. records Hephaestion's views on the placing of the poem, but this comment need not be taken from a commentary, and given the absence of any other references to Hephaestion in the scholia, such a work seems improbable.

15 An exception to this are the unattributed paraphrasing exegeses, many of which may have developed, at least in part, in response to the demands of school teaching, for which cf. Deas (1931) 28.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

work in Pindaric scholarship of this time, and the kind of interpretative situations to which they may have given rise. Although the effects of the citations examined below would be open to some alteration by being located in a more determinate scholarly context, the evidential problems posed by the scholia need not preclude their use as witnesses to earlier scholarly discourses surrounding the Pindaric corpus.[16]

The scholia frequently cite poets for exegetical and comparative purposes, but usually without much contextualising or qualification. The work from which the citation comes is often not mentioned, and there is rarely any attempt to formulate a particular relation or mode of interaction between the citation and the primary text or between their authors. Citations are usually introduced by simple phrases devoid of contextualising comment,[17] and a poet is occasionally listed as part of a group furnishing evidence for a particular datum (δέ, ὧν ἐστι καί, Σ O.1.91a). At Σ O.7.66a a reference to the poems of Musaeus is given with the generic phrase ἐν τοῖς Μουσαίου.[18] Occasionally, a slightly more specific form of citation is employed to elucidate a similarity between the text being commented on and the cited text, as when Euripides is cited with the expression τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ καὶ Εὐριπίδης κέχρηται ('Euripides uses the same trope', Σ I.4.39a). It is fairly rare for the scholia to make reference to any form of literary influence; an exception is Σ O.6.26, where Asclepiades is reported as saying that Pindar has 'taken' a detail from the *Thebaid*, although there is no additional comment on the nature of the literary strategy involved in this borrowing.[19] Exceptions to the absence of contextualising information are few and far between, and even when they do occur they are not extensive; *Il.* 11.846 is cited as spoken by Patroclus (Σ P.4.394), and Orestes is mentioned as the speaker of A. *Ch.* 6–7 (Σ P.4.145). Related is Σ O.2.150c where 'a herdsman' is cited as the speaker of Theoc. 18.48.[20] Σ N.3.82 specifies a citation coming from the second book of Apollonius, and a considerable amount of detail is given about the 'Archilochus Song' at Σ O.9.1a. In general, however, the scholia's citational apparatuses are minimalistic.

There are no notable differences between citational practices employed for different poets, and generic and chronological distinctions are equally unmarked. For instance, μνημονεύει occurs most often in connection with citations of Homer, in variations of the form ὡς καὶ Ὅμηρος μνημονεύει (e.g. Σ O.1.37a, Σ O.8.41b, Σ O.8.60c, Σ N.8.28), and is not used of any of the lyric poets or the tragedians. However, it is also used of a Hesiodic citation (Σ O.7.118c), of Herodotus (Σ P.4 inscr. b), Apollonius Rhodius (Σ P.4.376b) and Callimachus

16 On the general importance of the Pindar scholia cf. Calame (2009); his analysis focuses on their exegetical interest.

17 The author's name alone (Σ O.3.19b, Σ O.3.50c); ὡς (καὶ) φησίν (Σ P.2.18a); καὶ φησίν (Σ P.4.122); ὁ δὲ . . . λέγει (Σ O.1.40a); ὡς with author's name (Σ O.4.31a); καὶ with author's name (Σ P.4.253c); ὡς καὶ with author's name (Σ O.7.4); καθὰ καὶ with author's name (Σ I.6.10a); ὅμοιον τῷ παρα with author's name in the dative (Σ O.1.129b); καὶ τὸ παρὰ with author's name in the dative (Σ O.3.50b); οὕτω/οὕτως καὶ with author's name (Σ P.2.132c); καθὼς καὶ (Σ N.4.5); ὥσπερ with author's name (Σ P.3.177b); καθάπερ καὶ with author's name (Σ I.8.17b).

18 Paraphrasing citation; O.7.86b. For other types of citation cf. O.9.74b, N.2.17a. N.6.85b (καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς) is a fairly rare instance of a play being specified as the source of a quotation.

19 Cf. also Σ N.10.114a for Didymus' citation of the *Cypria* as part of a textual debate.

20 Cf. a similar comment at Σ I.2.68.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Σ P.4.523).[21] Nor is there a distinction in the word's use of glossed text and cited text: Σ I.2.inscr. a and I.6.95 use the term of Pindar himself. It therefore seems likely that its more frequent appearance in connection with Homer is simply due to the greater number of Homeric citations rather than because it has a particular connection with them. Similar citational phrases are deployed in an equally unmarked way.[22] It might, however, be objected that given the processes of redaction to which the metatextual corpus was subject in later antiquity, the forms of citation in the extant scholia may not reflect the citational practices of the earlier commentaries, and that the minimalistic apparatuses employed are the result of a more general diminution.

While it may well be the case that at least some of the earlier commentaries included fuller contextualisation of the citations they offered, the evidence of Theon's commentary on P.12 (*POxy.* 2536) tells against supposing too great a difference between the extant scholia and earlier works. His citation of Euripides to gloss the phrase καὶ δονάκων τοὶ παρὰ καλλιχόρον ναοισι ('and the reeds which grow by the (city) of fair dancing-squares') (ἄκυρον τὸ [δονάκων· Εὐριπί]δης δ' ἐν Οἰδίποδι· τόν θ' ὑμνοποιόν δόνα[κα ὃν ἐκφύει Μέ]λας ποταμὸς ἀηδόν' εὐπνόων αὐλῶν σοφήν, '"reeds" is used in an unusual sense. Euripides in *Oedipus*: the hymn-making reed which the Melas river breeds, wise nightingale of fair-breathing *auloi*') does not differ significantly from similar citations in the scholia. Although he names the *Oedipus* as the source of the quotation, the citation is deployed simply to illustrate linguistic usage, and there is no attempt to formulate a literary relationship between the primary text and the citation, and no attention given to the original context of the cited utterance. Moreover, we may hypothesise that if such contextualising details had been an important part of citational practice, at least some such would have carried over into the editions of the scholia in late antiquity; the fact that there is so little citational qualification suggests that it never played a particularly large role in the process of commentary.[23] These citational forms contribute to the

21 Cf. also Σ N.7.53 for its use of the historian Hippias.

22 Compare the use of μαρτυρεῖ, which is used at Σ O.1.97 g of Pindar, at Σ O.1.122b and Σ N.3.82 of Apollonius Rhodius, at Σ O.1.127b of Hesiod and Epimenides, at Σ O.9.39c and Σ N.6.1 of Hesiod alone, at e.g. Σ O.2.51d, Σ O.7.36c, and Σ P.8.53a of Homer, at Σ O.9.70a of Acousilaus, at Σ P.3.166 of Callimachus. Similar is the case of ἱστορεῖ, which is used most often of citations from historians (e.g. Σ O.2.15d, Σ O.3.28a, Σ O.5.10a, Σ P.3.59), but is also used of Callimachus (Σ O.6.145c), Apollonius (Σ P.4.133b), Stesichorus (Σ O.10.19b), Ibycus (Σ N.1.1a), Lycophron (Σ N.4.96), Homer (Σ I.5.44b), and Pindar himself (Σ O.7.42a), and at Σ N.3.16b collectively of Mimnermus and Alcman. Cf. also Σ P.1.100: τῇ ἱστορίᾳ καὶ Βακχυλίδης συμφωνεῖ ἐν τοῖς διθυράμβοις and Σ P.4.451. On enunciative positions in the Pindaric scholia cf. Muckensturm-Poulle (2009), particularly pp. 87–8; her analysis is confined to the scholia to O.6.

23 Also comparable is the citational apparatus at *POxy.* 2737 fr. 1 col. i 20–6. The fragment is part of a commentary on a comedy, probably by Aristophanes, and the section concerned discusses the provenance of the phrase κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων (which occurs at *h.Hom.* 21.1). The commentary records various scholars' attribution of the phrase; Aristarchus' to the beginning of a poem by Terpander, Euphronius' to Ion of Chios, an unnamed scholar's to Alcman, to which the commentary adds a reference to the *Homeric Hymns*; none of the references, however, specifies the individual text to which it alludes. The author of the commentary was clearly cognisant with a range of scholarly opinion, and the fact that he has scrupulously recorded the different positions without connecting the phrase κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων with particular texts suggests that this further step was not

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

construction of a minimally differentiated intertextual field; by not explicitly formulating the poetic relationships on which these intertextual connections are based, the scholia leave open the possibility of the kind of achronological intertextuality mentioned above. Two related points should be noted. First, such an intertextual mode of reading does not exclude a more traditional notion of literary history based on earlier authors exerting influence on the later authors who respond to them, but can be viewed as an alternative way of construing textual relationships. Second, this view of intertextuality is not predicated on the scholia's citational practices, but on the notion of literature as a public body of utterances and intertextual matrices located in readers' receptions; in short, the scholia's citations do not offer a serious impediment to thinking about intertextuality in these terms.[24]

Callimachus is cited more often in the Pindar scholia than any other poet except Homer and Hesiod, usually as a source for recondite mythical and historical data.[25] Because none of the Callimachean references are explicitly attributed to named scholars, it is difficult to tell exactly when this process began, but the scholia do afford us some hints. There are no such citations connected with Aristarchus' Pindaric commentary, and given his critical methodology it may seem unlikely that he would have drawn on Callimachus as an exegetical source.[26] Among Aristarchus' successors, Ammonius does not seem to have used Callimachus, and neither does Aristodemus, although it should be noted that the remains of these scholars' works are so exiguous that we cannot be certain that they did not contain at least some Callimachean references.[27] A more probable candidate for such citations is Artemon, the Pergamene grammarian who may have written a commentary on the Sicilian odes.[28] Σ P.1.31c records that he participated in the debate over the location of Typhon (στασιάζεται ἡ περὶ τοῦ Τυφῶνος ἱστορία, 'the story of Typhon is disputed', Σ P.1.31a). It is possible that his work referenced *Aetia* fr. 1.36, cited by Σ O.4.11c, where Callimachus identifies Enceladus rather than Typhon as trapped under Sicily, as part of this controversy, although his explanation of Typhon's multiple localisations (καθάπαξ γάρ φησι πᾶν ὄρος ἔχον πυρὸς ἀναδόσεις ἐπὶ Τυφῶνι καλεῖσθαι. ἔστι δὲ τὸ πιθανὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος ἱστορίας· τύφειν γὰρ τὸ καίειν ('for he says absolutely that all volcanic mountains are named for Typhos. And

thought necessary. Equally, the author makes no attempt to distinguish between the different uses of κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων in the authors cited.

24 Cf. Fowler (2000) 130.

25 There are 40 Callimachean citations in the scholia vetera. Euripides is cited 25 times, Sophocles 23, Aeschylus 15, Simonides 14, Archilochus 14 (mostly metrical), and there are a handful of citations for each of Alcman, Anacreon, Bacchylides, Ibycus, Sappho and Stesichorus. Other Hellenistic poets are also less well represented: Apollonius Rhodius is cited 12 times, Theocritus 3.

26 Thus Irigoin (1952) 55. Cf. however Vassilaki (2009), who argues that Aristarchus' analyses recorded in the scholia to O.2, O.3 and O.5 do take account of historical information and are not focused on purely internal exegesis.

27 Cf. Irigoin (1952) 59–60. Cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 216, 273–4 on Ammonius.

28 For this commentary cf. Σ I.2.inscr.a, and for his other Pindaric work cf. Σ O.5.1b and P.3.52b, with Irigoin (1952) 62. For further comments on Artemon's work cf. *FGrH* 569 = *BNJ* 569.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the persuasiveness comes from the very history of the name itself, for *typhein* is "burning"') does not relate to this citation.

Didymus probably drew on Artemon in writing his Pindaric commentary.[29] Didymus is cited as the source for the disquisition on Sicilian history at Σ O.2.29d, at the end of which Callimachus (= *Aetia* fr. 50.45–7 M) is referenced as a source for the foundation of Gela, and it seems likely that Didymus' commentary is the source of this reference.[30] Given that Artemon also discussed Gela (Σ O.2.16b), it is possible that he also drew on the *Aetia*'s account of Sicilian cities. Didymus appears to cite Callimachus (Σ O.10.55c = fr. 179 M) in support for his case that Pindar calls Pisa Elis. Another case of possible use of Callimachus by Didymus is Σ O.13.27a, where fr. 670 Pf. is cited to illustrate Didymus' metaphorical reading, which sees the text as referring to the potter's wheel rather than to the horse's bridle. Although the scholia do not explicitly attribute the citation to Didymus, it is likely to derive from his commentary since he is the only proponent of the 'potter's wheel' reading.[31] Although the evidence does not admit of certainty, it seems highly likely that Callimachean citations were fairly common in the Pindaric scholarly tradition by the late first century BC, and that Didymus' work may have been particularly important in establishing them, but given Callimachus' importance as both a poet and scholar we cannot rule out the possibility of their presence in earlier Hellenistic scholarship.[32]

The scholarly tradition represented by the scholia is an important channel of Callimachean reception; by citing his work to explain and supplement a classic poet, and by citing him in similar terms to those used of Homer, Hesiod and the other canonised poets, this tradition accrues to Callimachus a poetic and intellectual authority comparable with those of his classical and archaic predecessors.[33] The following readings are in part an examination of how these receptive practices function. More generally, they show that the scholia, and the commentaries on which they were based, function in ways other than the narrowly exegetical. In supplementing the texts on which they comment,

29 On Didymus' Pindaric scholarship cf. Irigoin (1952) 67–75, and in general Pfeiffer (1968) 274–9.

30 Thus Irigoin (1952) 73.

31 Σ O.13.27c cites Theophrastus' 'On Inventions' as a source for Hyperbion's invention of the wheel rather than as an exegesis of Pindar.

32 There are several other places where Callimachean citations form part of scholarly debates, such as Σ P.5.31, where Callimachus' reference to the hill of the Graces (fr. 673 Pf.) substantiates an interpretation of Pindar's κᾶπον Ἀφροδίτας as referring to this location, rather than to Cyrene in general. Σ N.1.3 records a debate over the identification of the δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος which goes back to Aristarchus, who interprets it as a reference to Ortygia. The scholium then mentions 'others', presumably post-Aristarchean critics, who interpret the phrase ἱστορικώτερον as referencing the Alpheus' love for and pursuit of Artemis. Callimachus fr. 302 Pf. is then cited as proof of Artemis' general connection with Sicily to support the identification with Ortygia (ἔχοι δ' ἂν οὐ φαύλως δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος λέγεσθαι τὴν Ὀρτυγίαν, οἷον ἐνδιαίτημα καὶ διατριβήν· ἱερὰν γὰρ τὴν πᾶσαν νῆσον Φερσεφόνης εἶναι· ὅτι δὲ ἡ αὐτή ἐστι τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, Καλλίμαχος ἐν Ἑκάλῃ κτλ.): this citation may derive from Artemon's commentary, or from Didymus'.

33 For scholarly exegesis of Callimachean (and other) Hellenistic texts cf. Cameron (1995) 230; Rengakos (2000); Montanari (2002).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

amassing mythical and historical information which expands on that offered by the poems, they open up intertextual associations that shift the terms in which the primary texts can be understood.[34] Sensitivity to these relationships entails seeing the scholia as a distinctive textual field, with functions which are in part independent from the texts on which they comment. Citational practices, and the citation of Callimachus in particular, are sites where issues of scholarship and literary reception intersect.

Supplementations

I begin with two citations which crystallise the issues involved in a later poet being cited to gloss an earlier. The first (Σ O.7.156b = fr. 198 Pf.) explains the type of contest held at Aegina with reference to Callimachus *Iamb* 8, a poem written for Polycles of Aegina to celebrate his victory there: ἐν δ' Αἰγίνῃ τὰ Αἰάκεια· οἱ δὲ Οἰνώναια· ἀμφορίτης ἀγών, οὗ Καλλίμαχος μέμνηται ἐν τοῖς ἰάμβοις ('the games in Aegina are the Aeaceia, by some called the Oenonaea. The contestants run bearing amphorae, as Callimachus mentions in his *iambi*'). Although only the first line of the poem survives, we know from the *diegesis* that the poem explained the origins of the contest, which commemorated the Argonauts competing with each other to fetch water.[35] The citation forms part of a wider project in the scholia of providing supplementary information about the catalogue of Diagoras' victories at O.7.80–7,[36] and despite its brevity, the citation draws on the aetiological structure of *Iamb* 8, itself a feature taken from earlier epinician poetry,[37] by calling on it as a source for a fuller account of the contest referred to by Pindar's laconic Αἴγινά τε (O.7.86). Given the number of Pindaric epinicians for Aeginetan victors, it is likely that *Iamb* 8 contained at least some interaction with Pindar.[38] If this was the case, the reader of the scholia would have been confronted with a poem written (at least partly) through engagement with Pindar being cited to expand on and explain a Pindaric reference, re-routing this engagement back into a reading of Pindar through the filters of literary and scholarly receptions. A second citation where this two-way dynamic is evident is Σ N.10.64a, where the earthenware jars of olive oil given as prizes at Athens (γαίᾳ δὲ καυθείσᾳ πυρὶ καρπὸς ἐλαίας | ἔμολεν Ἥρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν ἐν ἀγγέων ἔρκεσιν παμποικίλοις, 'the olive's fruit in earth baked by fire came to Hera's brave people in the

34 On the scholia's intepretative shortcomings see in general Lefkowitz (1985). Muckensturm-Poulle (2009) 91 argues that the scholia's citational practices are primarily 'scientifique et pédagogique'; such an exegetical conclusion should not, however, be allowed to obscure their more general supplementary functions.

35 On the poem in general cf. Kerkhecker (1999) 197–204. NB particularly pp. 203–4 for his suggestion, based on the conventions of epigram, that the victor was the poem's narrator. If this was the case, it would have been a notable departure from Pindaric models, although cf. Σ P.8.78a, Σ P.9.161, Σ N.10.73b, Σ I.7.55b for the view that the glossed passages were spoken in the persona of the victor.

36 A similar project is at work in the glosses on the festivals at which the Oligaethidae won their victories: cf. Σ O.13.152, 156a, 159a–b.

37 Cf. Kerkhecker (1999) 199.

38 Cf. Clayman (1980) 38; Kerkhecker (1999) 202.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

decorated coverings of jars', N.10.35–6) are explained with reference to Callimachus' mention of them in his victory poem for Sosibius (fr. 384.35–6 Pf.), a passage which probably alludes to the passage in N.10 it is being cited to explain.

I have already noted the citation of Callimachus as a source for the foundation of Gela in conjunction with Didymus' use of Timaeus as a source for the historical events of Theron's own time (Σ O.2.29d = fr. 50.45–7 M). This citation exemplifies the receptive dynamics at work in the scholarly use of Callimachus, the aetiological function of whose work is validated by its use as a source of information about the past. Callimachus also appears alongside Timaeus (Σ P.1.185) in a gloss on Pindar's mention of Phalaris at 95–6 (τὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκέῳ καυτῆρα νηλέα νόον | ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντᾷ φάτις, 'hateful speech everywhere encompasses Phalaris who with his cruel mind burned men in his bronze bull'). The historian is cited for the story that the people of Acragas threw the bull into the sea, and that the bull on show in the city is not that of Phalaris, as commonly thought, but a representaiton of the river Gela. Callimachus is the source for the story that Perilaus, the bull's creator, was also the first person to be burned alive in it: κατασκευάσαι δὲ αὐτόν φασι Περίλαον καὶ πρῶτον ἐν αὐτῷ κατακαῆναι. Καλλίμαχος [*Aetia* fr. 53.1–1a M]· πρῶτος ἐπεὶ τὸν ταῦρον ἐκαίνισεν, ὃς τὸν ὄλεθρον | εὗρε τὸν ἐν χαλκῷ καὶ πυρὶ γιγνόμενον ('They say that Perilaus constructed it and was the first to be burned in it. Callimachus (says): "Since he who invented the bull first found death made in bronze and fire"'). As in Σ O.2.29d, the citation validates Callimachus as a source, as his account is chosen to exemplify a well-known story (φασί), but it also decontextualises the quoted lines by extracting them from their original context and drawing them into the orbit of another textual project.

The citation contributes to the supplementation, which in providing additional information about Phalaris participates in the Pindaric project of figuring him as a paradigmatically negative tyrant; as such, the citation reinforces the rhetorical point made by Pindar's text. But Callimachus' lines describe an event not mentioned or even alluded to by Pindar, and the Perilaus story makes a moralising point about a reprehensible act of invention that is remote from Pindar's focus on the figure of the tyrant. The totality of text and metatext brought about by the citation thus highlights the two poets' narratorial differences, resituating Pindar's portrayal of Phalaris by allowing it to be compared with another treatment of similar material. The narrowness of Pindar's focus also contrasts with the greater range of Callimachus' treatment of the story. His version made Phalaris follow the example of tyrannical cruelty set by the Egyptian king Busiris (τὴν κείνου Φάλαρις πρῆξιν ἀπεπλάσατο, 'Phalaris imitated his action', fr. 52 M), and although the full treatment does not survive, we can hypothesise that the broader canvas of the story, assuming that it was known to a reader of the citation, would have contributed to the recontextualisation of Pindar's treatment.[39] From another angle, the citation can be read

39 There are also hints of an adversative relation between Callimachus' version and Pindar's: if Plutarch's statement at *Mor.* 315c (= *Aetia* fr. 47 H) that Phalaris 'for once acted justly' (τότε μόνον γενόμενος δίκαιος) in throwing Perilaus into the bull goes back to Callimachus, it indicates a rather different tone from Pindar's outright condemnation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as drawing on the rhetorical structures of the two passages, grounding Pindar's negative exemplum in Callimachus' aetiological narrative by making the latter provide a causal structure for the events alluded to by the former. Although our understanding of this process is limited by the fragmentary state of Callimachus' text,[40] it is clear that the citation validates the *Aetia* as a canonical archive, and expands the referential frame with which the reader approaches Pindar's text.

In the example just examined, the cited text is both appropriated to the function of the text on which it comments, and made to intervene in that function. A particularly complex instance of such supplementation is when a scholium on N.10 (Σ N.10.1c) glosses Pindar's command to the Graces to sing of Ἄργος Ἥρας δῶμα θεοπρεπὲς ('Argos, home of Hera fit for a god', N.10.2). In order to show that τὸ Ἄργος . . . οἰκητήριον θειωδέστατόν ἐστι τῆς Ἥρας ('Argos is Hera's most sacred dwelling place'), the scholia cite *Il.* 4.51–2 (ἦτοι ἐμοὶ τρεῖς μὲν πολὺ φίλταταί εἰσι πόληες, | Ἄργος τε Σπάρτη τε καὶ εὐρυάγυια Μυκήνη, 'indeed three cities are dearest to me, Argos and Sparta and Mycene of the wide ways') and Callimachus fr. 146 M (τὸν μὲν ἀρισκυδὴς εὖνις ἀνῆκε Διὸς | Ἄργος ἔθειν, ἴδιόν περ ἐὸν λάχος· ἀλλὰ γενέθλῃ | Ζηνὸς ὅπως σκοτίῃ τρηχὺς ἄεθλος ἔοι, 'Zeus' wrathful consort sent it [sc. the lion] to ruin Argos, her own portion though it was, and so that it would be a hard labour for Zeus' clandestine offspring').[41] Neither of these passages, however, fit particularly well with the glorifying rhetoric of Pindar's invocation; in the *Iliad* passage, Hera says that she is willing to allow Zeus to sack even one of the cities most dear to her in exchange for Troy's fall, and Callimachus, as part of an *aition* of the Nemean games,[42] tells of Hera sending the Nemean lion to ruin Argos because of her anger (ἀρισκυδής) over Heracles' illegitimate birth (γενέθλῃ . . . σκοτίῃ) despite her connection with the city (ἴδιόν περ ἐὸν λάχος). This clashes with Pindar's account at N.10.13–18 which makes no mention of Hera's anger, and has her presiding over Heracles' marriage to Hebe (οὗ κατ' Ὄλυμπον | ἄλοχος Ἥβα τελείᾳ παρὰ ματέρι βαίνοισ' ἔστι, 'whose wife Hebe walks on Olympus beside her mother, the Fulfiller').[43] These two citations, with their presentations of a Hera willing to countenance the suffering of one of her favourite cities in order to further her own interests, could simply be dismissed as irrelevant to the rhetorical function of Pindar's text, and read purely as additional instances of Hera's connection with Argos. But even this dismissive interpretation entails thinking about what is involved in making such a move, and a consequently refocused attention to what (the reader thinks) the text is doing.[44]

40 Cf. Massimilla (1996) 360–3.

41 Hera is responsible for sending the Nemean lion at Hes. *Th.* 327–31, and cf. Bacch. 9.4–9. Massimilla (2010) 246 notes that in Callimachus 'la responsabile dell'arrivo del leone fu la gelosa Era'.

42 On the foundation of the games in the *Victoria Berenices* cf. Fuhrer (1992) 78–85; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 83–5.

43 Cf. Σ N.10.31 for the identification of τελείᾳ . . . ματέρι with Hera.

44 The scholia's comments may also have been partially occasioned by the place of N.10 in the book of Nemean odes. N.1 presents the story of Hera's anger with Heracles and her attempt to kill him with the snakes, and ends with Heracles' marriage to Hebe (N.1.71–2) although without explicitly mentioning Hera's reconciliation to Heracles' apotheosis. The stress on Hera's anger in the scholia to N.10 may in part be a way of marking the difference

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A related comment is found at Σ N.10.12b, which records that Diomedes' deification by Athena was the result of her refusal to grant such honour to Tydeus because he had eaten Melanippus' flesh (οὐκ ἀπήλαυσε τῆς δωρεᾶς ἔτι διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρωπείων κρεῶν βρῶσιν· εἶτα ὡς αὐτὸς οὐκ ἠδυνήθη τῆς ἀθανασίας τυχεῖν, ἠξίωσε τὴν θεὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Διομήδην τὸ δῶρον μεταθεῖναι, 'he did not enjoy the gift because he ate men's flesh. Then, since he had not been able to gain immortality, the goddess decided to transfer the gift to Diomedes'), together with two lines from Euripides' *Meleager* describing Tydeus' act. This gruesome story again clashes with Pindar's terse presentation of Diomedes' apotheosis at N.10.7 (Διομήδεα δ' ἄμβροτον ξανθά ποτε Γλαυκῶπις ἔθηκε θεόν, 'The fair Grey-Eyed goddess once made Diomedes an immortal god'). These supplementations need not, however, be read as undermining the functions of Pindar's mythical catalogue.[45] Their cumulative effect might instead be formulated as exposing the tensions in the mythical corpus that Pindar's treatment works to erase. By focusing attention on epic and tragic treatments of these darker elements, the scholia increase awareness of the selectivity of Pindar's treatment and its glorificatory effects. At Σ N.10.1a we find the comment ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος ὅτε βούλοιτο ἐπαινεῖν τὰς πατρίδας τῶν νενικηκότων, ἀθροίζειν εἴωθε τὰ πεπραγμένα ταῖς πόλεσι περιφανῆ ('whenever Pindar wishes to praise the victors' ancestors, he is accustomed to gather together the cities' conspicuous deeds').[46] The scholia's focus on more problematic elements of Theban history help to throw τὰ πεπραγμένα . . . περιφανῆ into sharper relief.

The scholia on this passage resituate N.10 in an intertextual nexus, unforeseen by its composer, which at least potentially alters the kind of readings to which it is subject. A similar dynamic is at work in Σ N.5.25a–d, glossing the account of the death of Phocus (N.5.13–18):

> ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ, ὃν Ψαμάθεια τίκτ' ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πόντου.
> αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν
> ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον,
> πῶς δὴ λίπον εὐκλέα νᾶσον,
> καὶ τίς ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους
> δαίμων ἀπ' Οἰνώνας ἔλασεν.
> στάσομαι· οὔ τοι ἅπασα κερδίων

in the treatment of Hera in the two poems, emphasising the selectivity of Pindar's treatment there in contrast to N.1. However, the absence of any explicit comparison of the two poems in the scholia compels caution on this point.

45 Although from another angle we might wish to emphasise that the scholia's mythical expansions highlight the impossibility of writing a simple or straightforwardly positive account of, e.g., Theban mythical history, on the grounds that the subject contains elements inimical to such a presentation. Even if a text marginalises such events, they still remain part of the wider intellectual background that shapes readerly response: cf. Fowler (1995) 264.

46 περιφανής is often used of morally reprehensible actions (cf. Lys. 9.22; Dem. 27.38), but it is clearly being deployed here of Pindar's gathering of events that reflect positively on cities.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει' ἀτρεκές·
καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώ-
τατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι.

> . . . the god's son, whom Psamatheia bore on the seashore. I shrink from telling of a deed great but dared not in accordance with justice, how they left the famous island, and what destiny drove these mighty men from Oeone. I stand back. For not every precise truth is better for uncovering its face, and silence is often the wisest thing for a man to observe.

As well as offering a basic explanation of Pindar's rhetorical technique, Σ N.5.25a–b also give an account of the omitted story: Peleus and Telamon killed Phocus ἐν γυμνασίοις ('at exercises') and were forced to flee Aegina to avoid the pollution incurred by the murder. This supplementation functions differently from those given for N.10, in that N.10 does not mention Hera's anger or Tydeus' wrongdoing, whereas N.5.13, although it does not mention the killing explicitly, clearly alludes to it (μέγα . . . ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον). Whereas the N.10 scholia's supplementations resituate the text in a fashion unlicensed by the text itself, those of Σ N.5.25a–b enhance the resonance of N.5.13 by spelling out why the deed was μέγα . . . ἐν δίκᾳ τε μή. This exegetical strategy might seem to conflict with the dictum at N.5.17–18 about the wisdom of keeping silent, in that it brings to light the very details that Pindar's account supresses.[47] However, the distinction between text and metatext could also be felt to strenthen the erasure of αἰδέομαι . . . εἰπεῖν by broaching a contrast between the text's elliptical rhetoric and the scholia's fuller accounts, and by specifying the details of the supressed story.

An implicit contrast also arises between a situation of performance,[48] in which it may not be 'of benefit' (κερδίων) to the Aeginetan audience to hear about such a dark moment from their past or for a poet to draw attention to it, and the situations of reading brought about by the conjunction of text and metatext, where a broader archival engagement with the past is at issue. Many readers would have been aware of the myth without reading about it in the scholia, but the scholia's comments bring about a particular type of reading situation by bringing these details (back) to the reader's attention. The story was treated in the epic *Alcmaeonis*, of which fr. 1 B relates that Telamon struck Phocus with a discus, Peleus with

47 Cf. O.13.91 for the mention of Bellerophon's fate, with Σ O.13.130b–c. On this issue cf. Finglass (2007) 74: his statement that '[w]e cannot interpret [a] poem in terms of matters which lie outside it and to which no allusion is made' does not take account of intertextual complexities. We might not wish to use matters extraneous to a poem as the basis for claims about the intentions of an author, but we cannot discount their role in shaping the responses of readers. In the case of the scholia being examined here, the mention of details outside the poem forces the reader to go through the process of adjudicating the interpretative relevance of these data, a process which thus becomes part of a response to the main text.

48 An awareness of the physicality of performance is referenced by στάσομαι, which as well as metaphorising the narrator's 'standing back' from the Phocus story (cf. O.1.52), references the physical presence of the chorus (cf. e.g. σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ | στᾶμεν, 'you must today stand beside a dear man', P.4.1–2). On the importance of dance, and the physicality of the chorus in general cf. Mullen (1982).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an axe (ἔνθα μιν ἀντίθεος Τελαμὼν τροχοειδέι δίσκωι | πλῆξε κάρη, Πηλεὺς δὲ θοῶς ἐνὶ χειρὶ τινάξας | ἀξίνην ἐύχαλκον ἐπεπλήγει μέσα νῶτα, 'then godlike Telamon struck him in the back with a curved discus, and Peleus swiftly brandishing a well-made bronze axe in his hand struck him in the middle of the back'). Σ N.25a attributes the weapons differently (φασὶ γὰρ Πηλέα καὶ Τελαμῶνα ἐν γυμνασίοις ἀνελόντας Φῶκον, τὸν μὲν δίσκῳ τύψαντα, τὸν Πηλέα, τὸν δὲ Τελαμῶνα σιδήρῳ τὰ μετάφρενα, 'they say that Peleus and Telamon killed Phocus while at exercise, Peleus striking him with a discus, and Telamon striking him in the back with an iron [sword/axe]'), which may be a consequence of an imperfect recall of the *Alcmaeonis* passage, or indicate use of a different source. In either case, the account of the details of the story are likely to prompt recall of or recourse to the *Alcmaeonis*, a text which was likely not as well known in the Hellenistic period as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. As in the case of N.10, the scholia's citations allow for an increased awareness of Pindar's rhetorical strategies in comparison with other texts.

Σ N.5.25b cites Callimachus *Aetia* fr. 26.20–1 M (ἔκλυε <—>, τῶν μηδὲν ἐμοὺς δι' ὀδόντας ὀλίσθοι, | Πηλεύς, 'Peleus heard … of which may nothing slip through my teeth') as a comparandum for Pindar's elliptical reference, but they note that 'Pindar knows about Phocus' death, but shies away from mentioning it' (οἶδεν οὖν ὁ Πίνδαρος τὸν Φώκου θάνατον, ἀλλ' ἐκτρέπεται εἰπεῖν), and that the structural parallel is inexact: μήποτε δὲ καὶ τὸ παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ [fr. 26.20–1 M] οὕτως ἀποδοτέον, ὅτι αἱ γυναῖκες ὠνείδιζον αὐτῷ τὸν Φώκου θάνατον ('Callimachus' version should not be understood in these terms, because [there] the women berated him about Phocus' death'). Although the lines referred to by this last phrase do not survive, it is clear that Callimachus' account involved the women of Aegina lambasting (ὠνείδιζον) Peleus for his deed, and was consequently less elliptical than Pindar's treatment; whereas Pindar omits a narrative of the killing altogether, Callimachus' text includes the women's reactions to its aftermath, whether in direct or indirect speech, to which the narrator's silence (μηδὲν ἐμοὺς δι' ὀδόντας ὀλίσθοι) is contrasted.[49] The fact that the scholium registers the difference between the two authors' use of the figure encourages the reader to consider the difference more closely. Whereas in Pindar's text the ellipse is enunciated by the primary narrator, Callimachus' treatment plays on the difference between the primary narrator, who refuses to mention the abuse directed at Peleus, and the secondary narrator, the Aeginetan women responsible for it. This distinction is obviously a construct of Callimachus' text, and the primary narrator is being disingenuous, because he, as the figure responsible for the narrative, has mentioned the women's abuse. The comparison enabled by the citation highlights the greater complexity of Callimachus' passage, which appropriates the moralising tone of the Pindaric narrator but also subtly undermines it by integrating it into a multi-narrator/focaliser structure. As well as bringing about an intertextual supplementation of the N.5.13–18, the scholia on the passage also bring the receptive dynamics of the Callimachus passage to readers' attention.

49 Cf. Massimilla (1996) 298. Cf. also Cameron (1995) 21–2 and Harder (2002) 200, 202 for Callimachus' use of the Pindaric break-off topos.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Interpreting receptions

So far I have been examining citations that can be broadly understood as supplementary, their primary role being to provide information additional to that of the text in order to aid the reader's understanding. I now want to consider some cases of citations aimed at establishing a more general conceptual connection between the main text and the cited text. The first is Σ N.4.10a, which glosses a reflection on poetry's immortalising power being dependent on the Graces (ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει, | ὅ τι κε σὺν Χαρίτων τύχᾳ | γλῶσσα φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας, 'a discourse lives for a longer time than deeds, which a tongue seizes from the mind's depths with the Graces' favour', N.4.6–8):

> παντὸς ἔργου χρονιώτερόν ἐστι τὸ ῥῆμα, τουτέστιν ὁ ὕμνος· οἷον τὰ λεγόμενα πάντα ἢ γραφόμενα χρονιώτερά ἐστι τῶν ἔργων. τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἔργα τῷ γεγονέναι παρήκει, τὰ δὲ γραφόμενα αἰώνια παραδίδοται. ποῖα δέ; ἃ ἂν μετὰ τῆς ἐκ Χαρίτων τύχης τεχθῇ καὶ προαιρεθῇ ἐκ τῆς γλώττης ἑκάστῳ· ὡς ἐάν γε χωρὶς Χαρίτων γράφηται ὁ ὕμνος, ἀπόλωλε καὶ ἔσβεσται, ἐὰν δὲ μετὰ Χαρίτων, μένει πρὸς αἰῶνα εὔδια. καὶ Καλλίμαχος (= fr. 9.13–14 M)·
>
> ἔλλατε νῦν, ἐλέγοισι δ' ἐνιψήσασθε λιπώσας
> χεῖρας ἐμοῖς, ἵνα μοι πολὺ μένουσιν ἔτος.
>
> The utterance, that is, the hymn, lasts for longer than a deed. All spoken or written things last longer than deeds. For deeds are co-extensive with their happening, but writings are given an immortal existence. Which things? Those which are created and produced with the Graces' favour from each man's tongue. For if a hymn is written without the Graces, it perishes and is extinguished, but if written with them, it abides clearly for all time. And Callimachus says: 'Come now, wipe your shining hands on my elegies, so that they may abide for many a year.'

The citation is drawn from an account of the Graces now fragmentary, our main source for which is the set of scholia on the passage (*Scholia Florentina ad Call. fr.* 5–9[18] M), which inform us that after giving an *aetion* for the Parian sacrifices to the Graces and explaining why these were conducted without music (frr. 5–7 M with scholia) Callimachus presented various accounts of the Graces' birth; according to some, they were the daughters of Zeus and Hera, or Zeus and Eurynome, or Zeus and Euanthe.[50] After the primary narrator has catalogued these accounts, the scholia tell us Clio informed the narrator that the Graces were actually the children of Dionysus and Coronis, a Naxian nymph. The background to the citation of fr. 9.13–14 M is therefore complex. By offering different accounts of their birth, Callimachus' foregrounds the Graces both as divinities and as constructs of various

50 Cf. in general Massimilla (1996) 246–55.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

types of poetic and scholarly discourse.[51] Moreover, there is a contrast between the invocation of N.4.6–8, which leaves the Graces uncontextualised, and Callimachus' account of the various stories of their birth.[52] In the light of the differences between Callimachus' treatment of the Graces and their invocation in N.4, the scholium alerts the reader to the Graces' status as a textual figure open to rewriting.

The differentiation which emerges from the citation feeds into the scholium's wider function. The exegesis elaborates the conditions implied by the text for a poem being ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον, providing a purely internal account of the meaning of the glossed phrase. And yet the process of commentary is itself part of the text's status as ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον, participating in and affecting its dissemination. The act of commentary is symptomatic of literary value, fulfilling a need for exegesis which presupposes interest in the text concerned, but also itself implicitly validating the text it comments on by marking it as worthy of scholarly attention. Although it does not explicitly spell out such a line of thinking, the scholium's stress on writing also points the reader in this direction, a suggestion strengthened by the movement from referring to the role of 'spoken' and 'written' discourses in a poem's dissemination (τὰ λεγόμενα πάντα ἢ γραφόμενα χρονιώτερά ἐστι τῶν ἔργων) to emphasising writing alone (τὰ δὲ γραφόμενα αἰώνια παραδίδοται). This focus on writing draws attention to the form of the poem as a material document, and the contextual shifts attendant on this form. A tension emerges between what the scholium says about the Graces and its function in supplementing the text.

The exegesis generates different ways of thinking about literary value. The scholium articulates that values as bestowed by the Graces in the process of composition (ὡς ἐάν γε χωρὶς Χαρίτων γράφηται ὁ ὕμνος, ἀπόλωλε καὶ ἔσβεσται, ἐὰν δὲ μετὰ Χαρίτων, μένει πρὸς αἰῶνα εὔδια). Yet the gloss also highlights the importance of the processes of reading and scholarly supplementation in reproducing and affirming a poem's value. Both these positions are anti-essentialist, seeing the literary as regulated by extratextual forces, and there is no reason for them not to be seen as complementary. We might suggest, for instance, that the latter process partakes of and extends the former; on this reading, the scholia's supplementation is dependent on the original act of composition μετὰ Χαρίτων. It is notable, however, that the scholium leaves open what the Graces mean or how they operate, an openness which corresponds to the invocational structure of Pindar's text, which does not confirm its own status as σὺν Χαρίτων τύχᾳ, expressing rather a wish for their assistance (N.4.6–9, followed by τό μοι θέμεν … ὕμνου προκώμιον εἴη, 'may I set forth a prelude to a hymn', 9–11). This refusal to appropriate the Graces or to express certainty about their function is picked up by the scholium's articulation of the positive and negative possibilities attendant on the poetic composition

51 *Scholia Florentina* 35–6 inform us that Callimachus has 'taken' the *aetion* of the Parian sacrifice from Agias and Dercylus' *Argolica* (= *FGrH* 305 F 8).

52 Even in O.14, Pindar's most extensive engagement with the Graces, he does not provide an account of their origins. For the role of the Graces in O.14 cf. e.g. Alden Smith (1999); Athanassaki (2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(ἐάν γε χωρὶς Χαρίτων . . . ἐὰν δὲ μετὰ Χαρίτων), as well as by the absence of a definition of the Graces. The scholium's reflections reinforce the Graces' powerful inscrutability.

The reconfigurative potential of literary and scholarly receptions is also at issue in the scholia's citation of the final lines of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* (H.1.95–6). This passage is cited twice, firstly to gloss the reflections on the correct use of wealth at O.2.53–6:

> ὁ μὰν πλοῦτος ἀρεταῖς δεδαιδαλμένος
> φέρει τῶν τε καὶ τῶν
> καιρὸν βαθεῖαν ὑπέχων μέριμναν ἀγροτέραν,
> ἀστὴρ ἀρίζηλος, ἐτυμώτατον
> ἀνδρὶ φέγγος·

Indeed wealth embellished with excellences brings opportunity of this and that, supporting deep and wild ambition, a brilliant star, a man's truest light.

The citation occurs in the following scholium (Σ O.2.96f):

> ὁ μὰν πλοῦτος: ὁ νοῦς· ὁ δὲ πλοῦτος οὐ μόνος ὢν καθ' ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρετῇ κεκοσμημένος, καιρίως τῶν τε ἑαυτοῦ ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπολαύει, συνετὴν ἔχων τὴν φροντίδα πρὸς τὸ ἀγρεύειν τὰ καλά. τούτων γὰρ τὸ ἕτερον καθ' ἑαυτὸ οὐχ ἡδύ· ὡς καὶ Καλλίμαχος·
>
> > οὔτ' ἀρετῆς ἄτερ ὄλβος ἐπίσταται ἄνδρας ἀέξειν,
> > οὔτ' ἀρετὴ ἀφένοιο· δίδου δ' ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον.
>
> καὶ ἡ Σαπφώ· πλοῦτος ἄνευ ἀρετῆς οὐκ ἀσινὴς πάροικος. ἡ δὲ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων κρᾶσις εὐδαιμονίας ἔχει τὸ ἄκρον. τοῦτο προσεῖναι τῷ Θήρωνι μαρτυρεῖ.
>
> 'Wealth indeed'. The meaning is: wealth does not have the opportune benefit of its own blessings and excellence alone and of itself, but when it is furnished with excellence, having a mind which understands the accrual of good things. Either of these things by itself is not pleasant. Thus Callimachus: 'For prosperity without excellence does not understand how to exalt men, nor excellence without wealth. May you give excellence and prosperity.' And Sappho: 'Wealth without excellence is a harmful neighbour.' The blending of both brings the highest happiness. This, he states, belongs to Theron.

Callimachus' lines are cited again at Σ P.5.1a, glossing the opening lines of the poem:

> ὁ πλοῦτος εὐρυσθενής,
> ὅταν τις ἀρετᾷ κεκραμένον καθαρᾷ
> βροτήσιος ἀνὴρ πότμου παραδόντος αὐτὸν ἀνάγῃ
> πολύφιλον ἐπέταν.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Wealth has wide strength, whenever a mortal man, given it blended with pure excellence by fate, bears it as a companion that wins many friends.

The two glosses are evidently related, as demonstrated by the citation of Sappho common to both:

> τὸν μετὰ ἀρετῆς πλοῦτόν φησιν εὐρυσθενῆ εἶναι. τὸ γὰρ ἕτερον ἄνευ τοῦ ἑτέρου οὐκ ἀσφαλὲς, ὡς καὶ Καλλίμαχος· [citation of οὔτ' ἀρετῆς . . . ἀφένοιο] καὶ ἡ Σαπφώ· [as in the scholium quoted above].
>
> He says that wealth with excellence has wide strength. The one without the other is insecure, as Callimachus says . . . and Sappho . . .

In both cases, the Callimachean citation serves to exemplify the principle that wealth and excellence need to be conjoined in order to bring prosperity; one without the other is οὐχ ἡδύ and οὐκ ἀσφαλές. It is notable, however, that the citation decontextualises the quoted verses completely, saying nothing about their wider context. I shall return to this decontextualisation below.

The topos of the importance of wealth to a man's life is very frequent in Greek literature from the archaic period onwards, but while we should not assume that Callimachus is working with Pindar's use of the topos exclusively,[53] the juxtaposition of the two passages invites a reading of them in relation to each other. Callimachus notably eschews the bold metaphors of ἀστὴρ ἀρίζηλος, ἐτυμώτατον | ἀνδρὶ φέγγος and ὁ μὰν πλοῦτος ἀρεταῖς δεδαιδαλμένος, and we might read his use of ἄνδρας ἀέξειν as a gloss on the complex phrasing of O.2.53–4, the act of paring down Pindaric complexity an aesthetically significant move. The negative phrasing (οὔτ' . . . οὔτ') also differentiates it from the Pindaric model. These small-scale differences operate against a wider intertextual backdrop: while the poem's construction of comportment towards a ruler brings Pindaric filiations into play, the greater prominence of Hesiodic and hymnic intertexts, as well as metre, situate Pindar as a less prominent model. Pindar's narrative of the gods' division of the earth at O.7.54–68 is also one of the targets of the rationalising revision at 54–63, a passage which distinguishes Callimachus' mythopoeia from that of his models.

The cited lines occur in a passage which forges a connection between Zeus' rule on Olympus and Ptolemy's rule of Egypt:

> 'ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες', ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων
> θειότερον· τῷ καί σφε τεὴν ἐκρίναο λάξιν.
> δῶκας δὲ πτολίεθρα φυλασσέμεν, ἵζεο δ' αὐτός
> ἄκρῃσ' ἐν πολίεσσιν, ἐπόψιος οἵ τε δίκῃσι
> λαὸν ὑπὸ σκολιῇσ' οἵ τ' ἔμπαλιν ἰθύνουσιν·

53 Cf. McLennan (1977) 133–4 for parallels. For Pindar's use of the topos cf. Gentili *et al.* (1995) 512.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ἐν δὲ ῥυηφενίην ἔβαλές σφισιν, ἐν δ' ἅλις ὄλβον·
πᾶσι μέν, οὐ μάλα δ' ἶσον. ἔοικε δὲ τεκμήρασθαι
ἡμετέρῳ μεδέοντι· περιπρὸ γὰρ εὐρὺ βέβηκεν.
ἐσπέριος κεῖνός γε τελεῖ τά κεν ἦρι νοήσῃ·
ἐσπέριος τὰ μέγιστα, τὰ μείονα δ', εὖτε νοήσῃ.
οἱ δὲ τὰ μὲν πλειῶνι, τὰ δ' οὐχ ἑνί, τῶν δ' ἀπὸ πάμπαν
αὐτὸς ἄνην ἐκόλουσας, ἐνέκλασσας δὲ μενοινήν.
χαῖρε μέγα, Κρονίδη πανυπέρτατε, δῶτορ ἐάων,
δῶτορ ἀπημονίης. τεὰ δ' ἔργματα τίς κεν ἀείδοι;
οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ' ἀείσει;
χαῖρε, πάτερ, χαῖρ' αὖθι· δίδου δ' ἀρετήν τ' ἄφενός τε.
οὔτ' ἀρετῆς ἄτερ ὄλβος ἐπίσταται ἄνδρας ἀέξειν
οὔτ' ἀρετὴ ἀφένοιο· δίδου δ' ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον.

'Kings are from Zeus', since nothing is more divine than Zeus' rulers. You apportioned them your own lot. You gave them to guard cities, and you sat yourself on the cities' heights, watching who guide their people with crooked judgements, and who did otherwise. You bestowed prosperity and sufficient wealth upon them, on all but not equally. One can measure this by our ruler, as he greatly exceeds others. At evening he accomplishes what he conceives in the morning; in the evening the greatest things, and the lesser things whenever he conceives them. Some achieve things in a year, others not in one, and you yourself frustrate the fulfilment of others and thwart their desire. Hail most, Cronus' song highest of all, giver of blessings, giver of safety. Who could sing your deeds? There was, and will be, no-one. Who shall sing Zeus' deeds? Hail, father, hail again. May you give excellence and wealth. For prosperity without excellence does not understand how to exalt men, nor excellence without wealth. May you give excellence and prosperity.

As scholars have noted, this passage draws on Hesiod's depiction of the just city in the *Works and Days* and on the connection between kings and the Muses elaborated in the *Theogony*.[54] At 85–6, Ptolemy is made to exemplify the fact that Zeus does not apportion power equally, as his power exceeds that of other monarchs (περιπρὸ γὰρ εὐρὺ βέβηκεν), a comparison which brings about an equivalence between Ptolemy and Zeus as pre-eminent powers in their respective realms.[55] The figuration of Ptolemy as a (semi)divine being is particularly evident at 87–8, where the identity of thought and action recalls the frequent use of this

54 Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 353. It should be noted that the scholia's juxtaposition of Callimachus with Pindar, and the relations thus highlighted, abstract Callimachus' lines from their richly overdetermined intertextual context. The multiplicity of intertextual relations in the *Hymn to Zeus* is one of the chief ways in which Callimachus' poem is differentiated from previous texts, and the process of making Pindar into one model amongst others central to the relations between the texts here analysed.

55 For the difficulties of such an equivalence cf. Hunter and Fuhrer (2002) 169. On the connection between gods and monarchs in the Hellenistic period cf. Versnel (1990) 72–83 with further references.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

topos of gods in earlier literature.[56] Considered in the light of the Pindaric intertexts foregrounded by the above citations, the connection of Zeus and Ptolemy functions as a rupturing of previous modes of discourse, as Ptolemy's power is marked as exceeding the categories of action depicted in Pindar's texts. For all their political and cultural authority, the recipients of O.2 and P.5, Theron and Arcesilas, are not connected so overtly as Ptolemy with the divine, and this differentiation is sharpened by the Hesiodic intertexts and the generic figuration of Ptolemy as the secondary subject of a hymn. However, the intertextual overdetermination of the passage and the generic and historical transplantability of the οὔτ' ἀρετῆς ἄτερ ὄλβος topos also work to situate Ptolemy more closely in the very tradition he exceeds, as the regrafting of these discourses entails approaching them through their generic and intertextual relations. The scholia's citations of Callimachus also have the effect, at least provisionally, of privileging Pindar as a model for Callimachus' use of the topos, although this effect would doubtless have been mediated by readers' sensitivity to the hymn's Homeric and Hesiodic filiations.

One consequence of this differentiation is a recalibration of the reader's understanding of these categories, and the Pindaric models of the idealised ruler. Callimachus' stress on the unequal division of wealth among rulers (πᾶσι μέν, οὐ μάλα δ' ἶσον, 84) and his exceeding of other rulers' power, while doubtless primarily directed at pointing up Ptolemy's superiority to his contemporaries, also implicitly sets him above the rulers of the past. Reading Pindar alongside Callimachus entails an awareness of the historical contingency of the categories employed to understand the poetry of the past, and of the various ways in which the discourses of 'classic' poetry have been repositioned by their modern receptions.[57] As in the case of the Graces at N.4.6–9 and Σ N.4.10a, the cited text's reconstruction of its subject matter sensitises the reader to shifts in the workings of the Pindaric corpus contingent on the processes of dissemination. By foregrounding the status of the Pindaric texts as literary models, the citations alert the reader to the fact that in the situations of reading and scholarly commentary elements such as addresses and advice to the victor are not, as in a performance, sets of communications between living people, however stylised, but textual figures removed from the historical circumstances in which they originally functioned.[58] While the move of seeing Pindar's texts as traces of performances and historical situations is always open to the reader, and indeed encouraged by the conversational nature of addresses such as those of O.2 and P.5, the literary and scholarly appropriations just examined highlight Arcesilas' and Theron's status as idealised textual figures and literary

56 McLennan (1977) 124 cites e.g. *Il.* 19.242; A. *Supp.* 598–9; *h.Merc.* 46, and also notes (p. 123) that he use of τελεῖ at 87 recalls Zeus at 57 (ἐφράσσαο πάντα τέλεια, 'you devised all things complete').

57 Cf. Hunter (2003) 45 on Theocritus' use of Pindaric discourses in *Id.* 16, which constitute an 'ironic acknowledgement that the language of patronage has been preserved, but its meaning irretrievably altered in the march of time and circumstance: the attempt to recreate the archaic relationship of Pindar and Hiero I must always remain an imaginative, literary *mimesis*.'

58 It is, however, important not to downplay the complexity of how these 'communications' may have functioned in a performance situation, where elements such as the mediation of the narrator's voice by a chorus would have played an important role.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

exempla as well as historical individuals. The poems' disseminatory situation shifts the significance of these idealisations, the present tenses of which, for instance (e.g ὁ μὰν πλοῦτος ... φέρει τῶν τε καὶ τῶν | καιρόν, O.2.53–4; σὲ δ' ἐρχόμενον ἐν δίκᾳ πολὺς ὄλβος ἀμφινέμεται, 'great prosperity attends you as you move in justice', P.5.14), can also be read as having a generalising force which elevates their subjects and makes them into transhistorical models.[59] Callimachus' appropriation of the trope of the ruler's use of wealth both validates and recontextualises the exemplary status of the Pindaric *laudandi* to which it applies.

The citation of Callimachus H.1.95–6 and the relations thus opened up with Pindar's poems draws together many of the issues of literary and scholarly reception on which I have focused, but the textual/metatextual totality constituted by the citational gloss also broaches a distinctive concern with the equation of wealth and excellence, and with the nature of political power. The Pindaric and Callimachean texts both dramatise the differences between power as actually exercised by historical individuals and its specifically textual form, and their respective textualities problematise the critical move of seeing textual figurations as mimetic of actual power relations. The slippage between subject and text, in which writing about power is itself an exercise of cultural authority, and the connections between textual figurations of power and receptive situations, make such passages charged sites of literary negotiation. In Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*, as discussed above, the representation of power functions by staging power's ineffability. At 92–3, the narrator's confession of the difficulty of singing about Zeus' power (τεὰ δ' ἔργματα τίς κεν ἀείδοι; | οὐ γένετ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ' ἀείσει;) both ironically undermines his own previous treatment of Zeus' deeds, and in pointing towards a fabula (τεὰ δ' ἔργματα) which exceeds representational capacities creates a vivid sense of the god's power. This undermining of representational modes picks up on the stress on the poem's fictionality and the role of the reader/audience at 64 (ψευδοίμην, ἀίοντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν, 'when I make fictions, may they be such as persuade the listener's ear'). A contrast emerges between the textual figuration of Zeus' deeds and the deeds themselves, of which texts will only ever be, on this account, an imperfect, fictive representation. The extension of this analysis to past poets (οὐ γένετ', 93) underscores the fictionality of their accounts: previous poetic treatments are figured simultaneously as privileged models and fictions to be contested.[60]

The citations at Σ O.2.96f and Σ P.5.1a can be read as indicating Callimachus' indebtedness to and difference from Pindar, but they also serve to highlight the specifically textual nature of Pindar's subjects. It is important to recognise, however, that

59 This mode of referentiality contrasts with, and functions in addition to, other modes of immortalisation at work in the poems, such as the description of the Isles of the Blessed at O.2.56–83.

60 This process has precedents in classical and archaic poetry; Call. H.1.65 references the Muses' famous statement about truth and falsehood/fiction at Hes. *Th.* 27–8 (ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, | ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι, 'we know how to say many false things like to the true, and we know when we wish how to say true things'), and the agonistic rewriting of poetic models recalls e.g. Pindar's approach in N.7 to Homer's account of Odysseus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this process is already at work in Pindar's texts; even in the situation of performance the *laudandus* is not only an individual to whom the text is directed but a textual figure in the process of being constructed and idealised. This process is particularly notable in P.5, where Arcesilas is made to correspond to the supra-individual ideal articulated by means of the anonymous τις at P.5.2, and by the generalising comments about wise men at 12–13 (σοφοὶ δέ τοι κάλλιον | φέροντι καὶ τὰν θεόσδοτον δύναμιν, 'wise men bear better the power given by the gods'). 'Arcesilas' as a textual construct emerges in the movement from these generalisations to the explicit praise of his achievements at 14–23, as well as from the praise itself. A central part of his status is the way in which he corresponds to the generalised models enunciated by the narrator. His status as a figure being constructed as well as an addressee is articulated by the paraenesis at 23–5 (τῶ σε μὴ λαθέτω ... παντὶ μὲν θεὸν αἴτιον ὑπερτιθέμεν, 'so do not forget ... to set god over all as cause') the rhetoric of which marks its subject as (in part) a projection of the text by subordinating him to the ethical force of the injunction. This ethical force, moreover, should not be restricted in its operation to Arcesilas, as it also applies through the textualised Arcesilas to the wider community.[61] These microtextual effects are reinforced by the poem's wider intertextual filiations; the opening remarks about wealth, for instance, operate against the backdrop of the highly conflicted representation of wealth in archaic aristocratic discourses, particularly the poetry of Theognis, where it is often represented as socially destabilising.[62] As well as implicitly responding to such discourses by articulating an idealised convergence of wealth and excellence, Pindar's treatment also figures Arcesilas as a specifically (inter)textual figure which operates in relation to the (often anonymous) addressees of archaic sympotic discourse.

In Pindar's case, dissemination and its concomitant immortalisation of the victor further instantiates the figuration already at work in the texts, as the historical power of a living individual is exchanged for a virtualised immortality and literary exemplarity. Likewise literary appropriations: the dynamic of validation and supersession explored above in Callimachus' use of Pindar picks up on the virtualisation of power already at work in the

61 Cf. Gerber (1982) 174 on O.1.114 (μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον, 'no longer look further') he argues that the phrase is not genuinely paraenetic, but 'is intended to reveal how Hiero does not act rather than to warn [him] how not to act' and furthers the contrast between Hiero and Tantalus. As well as discarding the force of the imperative, this reading neglects the distinction between Hiero as an historical and a textual figure. *Qua* the latter, the injunction has the double effect of marking the incompleteness of Hiero's conduct by opening onto an unspecified future, and of figuring him as an ethical ideal for the reader/listener.

62 On the representation of wealth in the Theognidean corpus cf. e.g. Donlan (1985) 240–3; Seaford (2004) 89, 161. Anxieties about wealth are frequent: cf. 183–96, which describes the capacity of wealth to invert social relations, and 683–6. 315–18 contrasts the instability of wealth and stability of virtue: cf. 145–8, 155–8; 319–22. At 718, wealth 'has the greatest power' (ὡς πλοῦτος πλείστην πᾶσιν ἔχει δύναμιν). Theognis 903–30 deals with the moral problematics of expenditure; wealth brings pleasure, but also risks incurring disrepute, and similarly at 1157–8 wealth brings an insatiable desire for further enrichment (πλοῦτος καὶ σοφίη θνητοῖσ' ἀμαχώτατον αἰεί·| οὔτε γὰρ ἂν πλούτου θυμὸν ὑπερκορέσαις, 'wealth and wisdom are the most irresistible things for mortals, for the heart is never sated by wealth': cf. 227–32, 596. 719–28). However, wealth can also be represented more positively; cf. e.g. 523–6 for an idealising connection of wealth and nobility, and 1067, which opposes πλοῦτός τε καὶ αἰδώς ('wealth and propriety') to the pleasures of youth.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

text. Moreover, the Callimachean citations at Σ O.2.96f and Σ P.5.1a themselves form a particular site of the operations of such intertextual and appropriative dynamics. We can now see more clearly that in these cases the Pindaric texts are, rather paradoxically, glossed with mention of a text which claims to exceed their own representations of power. This glossing functions, as mentioned above, through the decontextualising effects of the citations. Callimachus' ironised representation of power and intertextual overdetermination is erased, and H.1.95–6 made to exemplify a transhistorical and extratextual principle (τὸν μετὰ ἀρετῆς πλοῦτόν φησιν εὐρυσθενῆ εἶναι. τὸ γὰρ ἕτερον ἄνευ τοῦ ἑτέρου οὐκ ἀσφαλὲς), an operation particularly ironic in the light Callimachus' focus at H.1.79–90 on the historical and contextual specificities of political authority. The citations also involve a notable shift in the configuration of the speaking voice, as the self-ironising Callimachean narrator with his emphasis on fictionality and uncertainty, is substituted for the decontextualised, and implicitly authoritative, utterance of the commentary.

Conclusions

With its capacity to recontextualise utterances, transform the textual voice and open up different ways of associating texts, citation can be seen as a miniaturised form of receptive processes, albeit one driven by scholarly rather than poetic principles. Like authorship, citation is an act of authority, in this case subordinating the Callimachean quotations to the text they are made to explain. Yet this authority is pluralised, deriving not only from the action of the commentator, but also from the Callimachean narrator whose voice is transposed into a new context. The citations also open up an intertextual field which problematises this subordination by pointing the reader towards a fuller juxtaposition of Pindar and Callimachus; the minimal scholarly determination of these relations leaves the reader considerable leeway in negotiating them. The citations of the *Hymn to Zeus* are in this sense particularly marked examples of dynamics that can be seen at work in all of the citations I have looked at. Their appropriative power to reconfigure both cited and glossed texts recapitulates in miniature the appropriative dynamics of the wider literary economy, and their repositioning of the narratorial structure and the referentiality of the cited text plays on texts' openness to appropriation in a manner parallel to literary receptions. The cases of Σ O.2.96f and Σ P.5.1a exemplify the complexities of the citational mode, which functions to enable and clarify understanding of texts and to exercise interpretative authority, and yet also involves a deformational troping of both cited text and glossed text which complicates how this authority might operate. Poetic authority emerges both from the performative capacities of texts to project the grounds on which they are to be understood, and from the openness of these grounds to reconfiguration by other textual projects.

The above readings go some way to outlining the multiple significances of Callimachean citations in Pindaric commentaries of the Hellenistic period. Their juxtaposition of particular texts makes them a marked site for the comparison of the two authors' styles and treatments

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of literary topoi, and has numerous wider consequences for how Pindar and Callimachus might be read, both individually and in relation to each other. The citations are a conduit for the construction of Callimachus' cultural authority; citing him as a comparandum for transhistorical ethical positions and poetological statements serves as a form of canonisation, equating his status with that of the 'classic' Pindar. The use of poems such as the *Aetia* as a source for information about cultural practices and historical realia reinforces the archival function of these poems and the authority of the Callimachean persona as a purveyor of knowledge. Similarly, the interpretative consequences of such citations for Pindar's texts go well beyond the simply exegetical. As we have seen, the use of Callimachus to gloss Pindar's epinicians feeds into the wider processes by which the poems are recontextualised. The archival aspect of commentaries is significant in this respect. Their gathering of mythical and historical information inflects the reading process, bringing about a situation wherein the Pindaric texts function, in conjunction with their metatexts, as sites for the preservation and supplementation of the past. These archival operations extend the commemorative function of the poems as testaments to the achievements of individual *laudandi*, but also reposition the primary texts in new material and intertextual contexts; the explication of the Graces in N.4 draws attention to the material form of the poem as part of a book, while the glosses on N.5 and N.10 prompt readings of the primary text within specific intertextual fields. We have also seen that the connections between wealth and ethical conduct in O.2 and P.5 take on new significances in the light of the citations used to explain them, and against the backdrop of the historical and literary developments within which the citations operate: while Callimachean appropriations, and the scholia's citation of them, highlight Pindar's literary historical significance, they also open up the possibility of contrasting Pindar's *laundandi* with later historical figures. Common to all these processes is the dynamism of textual interactions; in citing Callimachus to explain Pindar, the scholia both testify to the capacity of later texts to influence readers' understanding of earlier ones, and create a particular space within which this influence can operate.

Works cited

Acosta-Hughes, B. (2011) *Arion's lyre: Archaic lyric into Hellenistic poetry*, Princeton.

Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S. (2002) 'Rereading Callimachus' *Aetia Fragment 1*' *CP* 97.3, 238–255.

Alden Smith, R. (1999) 'Pindar's *Ol.* 14: A Literal and Literary Homecoming', *Hermes* 127, 257–62.

Asper, M. (1997) *Onomata allotria: zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*, Stuttgart.

Athanassaki, L. (2003) 'A divine audience for the celebration of Asopichus' victory in Pindar's *Fourteenth Olympian Ode*', in G. Bakewell and J. Sickinger (eds.) *Gestures: essays in ancient history, literature, and philosophy presented to Alan L. Boegehold*, Oxford, 3–15.

Calame, C. (2009) 'Les scholies aux *Épinicies* de Pindare: pourquoi?', in David *et al.*, 13–17.

Cameron, A. (1995) *Callimachus and his critics*, Princeton.

Clayman, D. (1980) *Callimachus' 'Iambi'*, Leiden.

D'Alessio, G. B. (1992) 'Pindaro, peana VIIb (fr. 52 h Sn.–M.)', in *Proceedings of the XIX International Congress of Papyrology*, vol. I, Cairo, 353–73.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1995) 'Una via lontana del cammino degli uomini (Parm. frr. 1 + 6 D.–K.; Pind. *Ol.* VI 22–27; *Pae.* VIIb 10–12', *SIFC* 13, 143–81.
David, S., Daude, C., Geny, E. and Muckensturm-Poulle, C. (eds.) (2009) *Traduire les scholies de Pindare . . . I: De la traduction au commentaire: problèmes de méthode*, Franche-Comté.
Deas, H. T., (1931) 'The scholia vetera to Pindar', *HSCP* 42, 1–78.
Donlan, W. (1985) 'Pistos philos hetairos', in T. Figueira and G. Nagy (eds.) *Theognis of Megara: poetry and the polis*, Baltimore, 223–244.
Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2004) *Tradition and innovation in Hellenistic poetry*, Cambridge.
Finglass, P. (2007) *Pindar 'Pythian 11'*, Cambridge.
Fowler, D. (1995) 'Horace and the aesthetics of politics', in S. J. Harrison (ed.) *Homage to Horace*, Oxford.
(2000) *Roman constructions: readings in postmodern Latin*, Oxford.
Fuhrer, T. (1992) *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos*, Basel.
Gentili, B. *et al.* (1995) *Le Pitiche: Pindaro, introduzione, testo critico e traduzione di Bruno Gentili; commento a cura di Paola Angeli Bernardini . . . et al.*, Milan.
Gerber, D. (1982) *Pindar's 'Olympian One': a commentary*, Toronto.
Harder, A. (2002) 'Intertextuality in Callimachus' *Aetia*', in Montanari and Lehnus (eds.), 189–223.
(2012) *Callimachus 'Aetia'*, vol. II: *Commentary*, Oxford.
Hunter, R. (2003) *Theocritus' encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Berkeley.
Hunter, R. and Fuhrer, T. (2002) 'Imaginary gods? Poetic theology in the *Hymns* of Callimachus', in Montanari and Lehnus (eds.), 143–175
Irigoin, J. (1952) *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, Paris.
Kerkhecker, A. (1999) *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*, Oxford.
Lefkowitz, M. (1985) 'The Pindar scholia', *AJP* 106, 269–82.
Massimilla, G. (1996) *Aitia: libri primo e secondo*, Pisa.
(2010) *Aitia: libri terzo e quarto*, Pisa.
McLennan, G. (1977) *Callimachus 'Hymn to Zeus'*, Rome.
Montanari, F. (1993) 'L'erudizione, la filologia e la grammatica', *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* I.2, 235–81.
(2002) 'Callimaco e la filologia', in Montanari and Lehnus (eds.), 59–92.
Montanari, F. and Lehnus, L. (2002) *Callimaque: sept exposés suivis de discussions*, Vandœuvres-Genève.
Morrison, A. (2007) *The Narrator in archaic Greek and Hellenistic poetry*, Cambridge.
Muckensturm-Poulle, C. (2009) 'L'énonciation dans les scholies de la *Sixième Olympique*', in David *et al.*, 77–91.
Mullen, W. (1982) *Choreia: Pindar and dance*, Princeton.
Negri, M. (2004) *Pindaro ad Alessandria*, Brescia.
Pfeiffer, R., (1968) *History of Classical scholarship*, vol. I, Oxford.
Poliakoff, M. (1980) 'Nectar, springs, and the sea: critical terminology in Pindar and Callimachus', *ZPE* 39, 41–7.
Rengakos, A. (2000) 'Aristarchus and the Hellenistic poets', *SemRom* 3.2, 325–335.
Richardson, N. (1986) 'Pindar and later literary criticism in antiquity', *PLLS* 5, 383–401.
Rutherford, I. (2001) *Pindar's 'Paeans'*, Oxford.
Seaford, R. (2004) *Money and the early Greek mind*, Cambridge.
Stephens, S. (2002) 'Egyptian Callimachus', in Montanari and Lehnus (eds.) 235–62.
Vassilaki, E. (2009) 'Aristarque interprète des odes siciliennes de Pindare: explication interne et explication externe', in David *et al.*, 121–45.
Versnel, H. (1990) *Ter unus: Isis, Dionysos, Hermes: three studies in henotheism*, Leiden.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270513000018 Published online by Cambridge University Press