‘THEM HE CANNOT TAKE’

CALLAMICHUS’ EPIGRAM FOR HERACLITUS

Phiroze Vasunia

University College London

Susan Stephens taught me Hellenistic poetry during my studies at Stanford. She is an expert reader of Apollonius, Callimachus, and Theocritus, among others, and she opened my eyes to the sophistication of their verses. I offer this chapter to her in gratitude, and for her friendship, inspiration, and scholarly example.

Εἶπέ τις, Ἡράκλειτε, τεὸν μόρον, ἐς δέ με δάκρυ
ἤγαγεν· ἐμνήσθην δ’ ὁσσάκις ἀμφότεροι
ἠέλιον λέσχῃ κατεδύσαμεν. ἀλλὰ σὺ μέν που,
ξεῖν’ Ἁλικαρνησεῦ, τετράπαλαι σποδιή,
αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, ᾗσιν ὁ πάντων
ἁρπακτὴς Ἅϊδης οὐκ ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ.[1]
(*AP* 7.80, 34 GP, 2 Pf.)

They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead;
They brought me bitter news to hear and bitter tears to shed.
I wept, as I remembered, how often you and I
Had tired the sun with talking and sent him down the sky.

And now that thou art lying, my dear old Carian guest,

A handful of grey ashes, long long ago at rest,
Still are thy pleasant voices, thy nightingales, awake;
For Death, he taketh all away, but them he cannot take.[2]

William Johnson Cory's version is widely anthologized and disseminated, as it should be, since it is an accomplished and evocative poem. The eight lines of English hexameter and heptameter are no less effective in communicating the tenor of the poet's thought than the six lines of Greek elegiac verse. The emotional notes go deeper and resonate more feelingly in Cory's poem than in Callimachus' epigram. Cory's rendering has a Victorian sensibility to it, but the poem's popularity endures into our own time, perhaps because that sensibility still retains some of its charm.[3] Gildersleeve wrote, grudgingly, of 'the tender grace of Cory's version, as a poem a classic, as a translation a failure', and Lloyd-Jones said he found the translation 'so far removed from the spareness and tautness of the original'.[4] These remarks should not blind us to the English poem's many qualities. A. E. Stallings, herself a distinguished poet, says that while Callimachus' epigram is 'a perfect poem in Greek, in jewel-like elegiac couplets', Cory's poem is 'a faithful, accurate and instantly memorable translation'.[5] Her treatment of the English version analyses the form and structure of the poem and offers an appreciation of its virtues.

I.

Many readers have liked and admired Cory's version for its beauty and directness and for saying something profound about death and friendship. The poem, precisely because it is so polished and affecting, raises what is arguably an old question, how to mourn for the dead, how to pay tribute to the dead and be true to them. In particular, the poem, by its poetic virtues, raises the question of mourning in verse. Many cultures, ancient and less than

ancient, have traditions in which they commemorate the death of family or friends in song and verse. But inside or without such traditions, questions of versification, sincerity, and rhetoric remain. We can't help asking if Cory's poem is a little too perfected, if the last line, for example, is almost too accomplished in the manner in which it offers a note of hope in a situation of loss. Does the poet's virtuosity in this instance draw attention to itself and take away from the tribute being offered to the dead? Does the poem's rhetorical flourish detract from the act of mourning? Funerary verse, of course, need not only be read in antithetical terms: poetry that is accomplished, by its grace and elegance, can enhance or deepen the tribute being paid to the dead. Those who have lost a friend or loved one will draw a great deal of solace and comfort from words that are attractively arranged, chosen carefully, and harmonious. Perhaps all mourning is rhetorical, governed by genre and tradition? But poetic versatility and stylistic brilliance can get in the way of mourning. Elegiac skill may take readers away from grief to self-satisfaction or to a place where admiration of poetry takes precedence over condolence.

These are precisely the issues taken up in the finest English treatise on epitaphs, namely, Wordsworth's sequence, *Essays upon Epitaphs*, which he wrote in the early years of the nineteenth century. The essays quote from many epitaphs, some which the poet saw first-hand, some which he read in books, in order to explore the language and themes found in them. Wordsworth is concerned with propriety and decorum, the kind of arrangements and metres that are appropriate to these compositions, the types of sentiments that they evoke in readers, and the language and rhetoric of the verses. He is not against metaphor or ornament but insists that these be used in a way that is suitable to the genre. The poetic imagery in an epitaph must 'elevate, deepen, or refine the human passion, which it ought always to do or not to act at all'.[6] Epitaphs should express feelings and views that are so widely held as to be regarded as banal, because they are 'grounded upon the universal intellectual property of

man'. But when the writer of epitaphs conveys, as he must, truths about the human condition, he should do so 'with such accompaniment as shall imply that he has mounted to the sources of things—penetrated the dark cavern from which the River that murmurs in every one's ear has flowed from generation to generation'.[7] Needless to say, this is a standard that many writers fail to meet, and Wordsworth is severe in his condemnation of them.

Wordsworth appears to be even more concerned with the destructive power of language than with the poet manqué who turns out sepulchral inscriptions in country church-yards. Never shy at reproaching others for their misuse of images or figures, he has recourse to them himself in one of his most memorable passages:

> Words are too awful an instrument for good and evil to be trifled with: they hold above all other external powers a dominion over thoughts. If words be not (recurring to a metaphor before used) an incarnation of the thought but only a clothing for it, then surely will they prove an ill gift; such a one as those poisoned vestments, read of in the stories of superstitious times, which had power to consume and to alienate from his right mind the victim who put them on. Language, if it do not uphold, and feed, and leave in quiet, like the power of gravitation or the air we breathe, is a counter-spirit, unremittingly and noiselessly at work to derange, to subvert, to lay waste, to vitiate, and to dissolve.[8]

Wordsworth had said a little earlier that the language of epitaphs should be 'not what the garb is to the body but what the body is to the soul', and he returns now to that image with the help of allusions to the story of Heracles, Deianeira, and the coat of Nessus, or to the poisoned garment sent by Medea to Jason's new bride.[9] Language can be dangerous, poisonous and violent; and Wordsworth's own language here is notably hard and aggressive, as if to drive home the point. The distinction Wordsworth draws is between 'incarnation' and

'clothing', and his striking turns of phrase have caught the eye of readers, from De Quincey to Geoffrey Hartman to Paul de Man and many others.[10] We are reminded by this body of commentary that Wordsworth's concern is with metaphor and with the appropriate use of figural language in general (and indirectly, perhaps, with literature as a whole). He scarcely denounces 'the language of metaphor', but it is clear, from the essays on epitaphs at least, that he worries figural language can be misused or handled recklessly when a writer is commemorating the dead. It may seem like an act of love, as with Deianeira's shirt, but end up inflicting pain and suffering on the beloved. He is anxious about prosopopoeia (προσωποποιία) on the grounds that it is, when deployed by a lesser writer, overly sentimental and insufficiently pensive, solemn, or reflective. The gravestone that speaks about the corpse that lies beneath the marble needs to address its readers in a voice that is natural, sincere, and free of extravagance.[11] Metaphors and prosopopoeia have their place in epitaphs, but they need to be crafted with care, discernment, and sensitivity.

Wordsworth in his essays explores the words that people use to share their sadness and commemorate the dead. His writings weigh the language of the sepulchre and mark out the bounds of acceptance. He is not afraid to cast judgement on self-pity, to censure a maudlin thought, or approve this or that piece of epitaphic verse. In the process, he considers the language in which people mourn, and he asks, explicitly, what are good and bad ways to grieve, show bereavement, and express sorrow. Some of us, at a distance of more than two hundred years from Wordsworth's *Essays*, are inclined to say that grief and mourning should be left to an individual's sense of propriety, that people should be allowed to mourn in whatever ways they wish to mourn, and that they should surely not be made to feel the fear of literary reproach when they set about composing an inscription for a grave.

The poet's themes are close to questions which contemporary critics and philosophers have analysed, such as the nature of mourning, the relationship between mourning and

language, and whether 'true' mourning is possible. For many thinkers, as we suggested earlier, language and rhetoric make it difficult to arrive at an understanding of mourning. The prosopopoeia of the stone is 'the fiction of the voice-from-beyond-grave', and as such it participates in modes of rhetoric and literariness that complicate mourning.[12] Metaphor and allegory, in epitaphs and eulogies for the dead, run the risk of saying something else, of transferring meaning to another place, or of making mourning do something in addition to mourning. Of 'true "mourning"' (he places 'mourning' in inverted commas), de Man writes that 'The most *it* can do is to allow for non-comprehension . . .' and he is suspicious of its ability to be expressed in a language that is poetic, lyrical, elegiac, or celebratory, or even anthropomorphic.[13] To describe mourning in this way gives the impression that no one can truly mourn and comes close to insinuating that many, if not most, people are not mourning even when they are in a deep state of grief and think they are doing so. Perhaps for this reason, Jacques Derrida, in what might serve as his epitaph for de Man, speaks of 'the impossible affirmation of mourning' and adds that 'this impossible affirmation must be possible'.[14] We mourn the dead in and through language, despite the limitations of the human tongue; we mourn them out of love and out of a need to affirm and recall our love. Implicit in Derrida's insistence is the acknowledgement that even 'true mourning' has a place for rhetoric.

In the poem for Heraclitus, Callimachus avoids prosopopoeia. This is not a poem in which the tombstone or the deceased address the reader or the passer-by, which is what one regularly finds in funerary epigram. A Greek example taken at random can be found in the elegiac distich recorded in an inscription of uncertain date and found near Thespiae: 'I am the monument set up by Osthilos to his son Oligeidas, who brought him grief by his loss' (μνᾶμ′ ἐπ′ Ὀλιγε[ί]δαι μ′ ὁ πατὴρ ἐπέθηκε θανόντι | Ὀσθίλος, ὃς πένθος θῆκεν ἀποφθίμενος).[15] Examples from Callimachus include: 'Here sleeps his holy sleep, Saon of Acanthus, son of

Dicon' (*AP* 7.451), or, famously, 'Whoever you are who walk past my tomb, know that I am son and father of Callimachus . . .' (*AP* 7.525). Callimachus wrote many sepulchral epigrams—about twenty-five or twenty-six epitaphic epigrams (*epitumbia*) are ascribed to the poet in the standard collections—in which he deployed prosopopoeia or prosopopoeia combined with apostrophe.[16] But Callimachus also liked to work variations on the sepulchral epigram, and here he is playing and experimenting with the tradition. What the epigram presents in this case is apostrophe without prosopopoeia. The biographical or 'autobiographical' details are presented to the reader through an address to the deceased poet, and the apostrophe takes the form of a shared memory or reminiscence of time spent together in the past. The address is not directed to the living by one who is dead—which is the presumption of many funerary epigrams—but directed to the dead by one who is living.

The apostrophe to Heraclitus is part of a poem that is extraordinarily alert to figurative language. Callimachus' composition takes de Man's claim that 'language, as trope, is always privative' and virtually turns it on its head.[17] Figures may be privative in the sense that they take us away from 'the thing itself', but if so, the epigram uses figurative language to complicate the idea that we live in 'a world accessible only in the privative way of understanding'.[18] The thrust of the epigram's ending is to say that the poems of Heraclitus are not subject to privation and that his verses shall remain among his friends and readers forever. The rejection of Hades—i.e. the rejection of the logic that joins figure to privation—offers a basis for consolation; it stakes a claim for poetic immortality and for restoration. If Heraclitus' verses or 'nightingales' will thwart the rapacious violence of Hades, then the friend's death, announced so dramatically in the first line, is countered by the bold declaration made in the last. Callimachus is blunt about the finality of death, but in this epigram he holds out the promise of literary immortality. Negation is transformed into affirmation, and this is accomplished by a versatile language, by metaphor, lexical choice,

and literary style. Of these, metaphor seems to me the most powerful of the devices through which Callimachus resolves the string of antinomies—'past and present, presence and absence, light and darkness, loss and preservation'—which form the scaffolding of the poem.[19]

II.

Consider Callimachus' handling of the Homeric expression ἠέλιον λέσχῃ κατεδύσαμεν. Where the verb is intransitive in Homer, Callimachus uses the transitive form in his poem and makes the expression metaphorical: 'we brought the sun down in conversation'. In Homer, the expression ἠέλιον . . . κατεδύσαμεν has a literal or semi-literal connotation and refers to people participating in an activity (conversing, mourning, weeping) together for a long period, until the sun goes down, that is, until sunset.[20] The familiar Homeric words καὶ νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδυ φάος ἠελίοιο, 'and now the light of the sun would have gone down on their weeping', occur in both epics and, as Hunter says, 'evoke memory, friendship and loss'.[21] The causal, transitive form of the verb καταδύω is attested, but not very frequently: Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristophanes, and Pherecrates use it, in history and comedy, when people or things are making ships sink or disabling sea-faring vessels.[22] In order to find examples of a metaphorical use of the verb *kataduomai* with the noun for the 'sun', one has to go to authors who come well after Callimachus. Dio Chrysostom, Aelian, and Aristaenetus 'make the sun go down', with the verb in its causal sense. [23]

MacQueen emphasizes the allusions to Homer and points out that the verb *kataduomai* is also used in connection with 'going down to the house of Hades' in the *Odyssey*. The 'transitive turnaround' of the verb evokes death and indicates that the two

friends dispatched the sun to the underworld of Hades.[24] The narrator evidently intends a contrast between the light of the sun and the supposed darkness of the death-world below. In the past, the poet and his friend enjoyed long hours of conversation and companionship, into the darkness, after the setting of the sun. Now the sun has set, and the light of life has been extinguished, but Heraclitus' words and poems endure.

In referring to Heraclitus' poems as 'nightingales', Callimachus allusively complicates the sense of loss and desolation that come with the darkness. As Sens writes, 'Nightingales were thought not to need sleep (Hes. fr. 312, *Suda* α 651), and the word thus has a special significance for poems that live on after their writer's death.'[25] A verse inscription on a tomb from the Roman period also brings together the immortality of the nightingale's song in the face of death (εἴης χῶρον ἐς Ἠλύσιον· ζωούσας ἔλιπες γὰρ ἀηδόνας, ἃς Ἀιδωνεὺς οὐδέποθ' αἱρήσει τῇ φθονερῇ παλάμῃ).[26] But the evocation of the nightingale's song is complicated by the possibility that Callimachus uses the figure of the nightingale to explore his own innovative aesthetics and poetic programme. He appears to be the first person writing in Greek to use the word 'nightingale' (ἀηδών) to refer to a poem (the sense 'poet' is attested much earlier); later uses of the word in this sense seem to find their inspiration in his work.[27] He arguably uses a form of the word ἀηδών in the *Aitia* and could well be referring to 'poems' in that text as well.[28] In the epigram that we have been discussing, the word ἀηδόνες 'nightingales' may be a pun and allude to supposed etymological connections to song (ᾠδή), on the one hand, and to knowing (οἶδα), on the other.[29] By speaking of Heraclitus' poems as nightingales, Callimachus expresses his sense of sadness at the death of the poet and affirms that his verses will live on after him; recalls a long literary tradition in which both he and Heraclitus were lately participants; and refers to

the distinctive poetics which he is exploring and in which Heraclitus is loosely perceived as a kind of ally.

Callimachus' assertion that the poems of Heraclitus will endure after his death is expressed through a sequence of figures that involves the sun, the nightingales, and, lastly, Hades the robber. The final verse of the epigram contains a new metaphor, or perhaps extends, through enjambment, the metaphor of the nightingales that has begun already in the preceding line since it is these very nightingales that Hades will not steal away. Even if the sentiment ('Hades the thief') is not new, the metaphor is striking, for 'ἁρπάζω and its cognates and compounds are often used of sudden death'.[30] The poet further draws attention to the metaphor by a novel lexical form (ἁρπακτής), which is a variation on the Homeric ἁρπακτήρ and which seems to occur for the first time in Greek literature in this poem. With that word, the last line of the poem interestingly begins with a spondee rather than a dactyl: the spondees are regularly in the second metron in the epigram.[31] The vividness of the metaphor is underscored by the way in which the poet prises open, through tmesis, the closing verb/word (ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ).[32] Diction, syntax, and figuration work together beautifully to give the poem a stirring and uplifting ending.

Susan Stephens has reminded us that Callimachus' poetic flair and craft should be appreciated in the light of Ptolemaic and Hellenistic socio-political frameworks. The reference to Halicarnassus in Callimachus' poem is interesting: the phrase ξεῖν' Ἁλικαρνησεῦ is not 'a line-filler', as MacQueen noted, and conveys something important, namely, that Heraclitus was a friend of the narrator (the one received hospitality from the other) and that he was from Halicarnassus.[33] The point is impressed upon the reader with the help of the vocative form of Halicarnassus, a form which seems to occur only here in all of extant Greek literature. The other vocative expression in the poem is part of the address to Callimachus'

friend in the first line, and so the poet presents us with Heraclitus, the guest-friend from Halicarnassus, or, as it were, Heraclitus of Halicarnassus. In his translation, Cory writes 'Carian' rather than 'Halicarnassian' and obscures the specificity of Callimachus' Greek. The substitution vexed Gildersleeve, but Stallings thinks that the shorter word is 'metrically useful' and that there may be 'some vague hint to the ear here of "carrion"'—which is entirely plausible in this context.[34]

Our first literary impulse would be to associate Halicarnassus with Herodotus, who was, already in antiquity, the native most famously associated with the place. An Hellenistic inscription from Salmakis begins by asking the question '. . . what is it that brings honour to Halicarnassus?' The inscription goes on to say that among those who assuredly bring honour to Halicarnassus is 'Herodotus, the prose Homer in the realm of history'; and it is Herodotus who leads the list of mortals mentioned in the inscribed poem.[35] Heraclitus' name appears not to be mentioned at all in the inscribed elegiacs. In his *Geography*, Strabo refers to Herodotus, first, and then Heraclitus and Dionysius as famous natives of Halicarnassus. Again, Herodotus comes first in the triad; and the reference to Heraclitus, in Strabo, may well be based on Callimachus' poem.[36] There is a good precedent for finding echoes of Herodotus of Halicarnassus in Callimachus' work. Susan Stephens is among those scholars who have shown how Callimachus draws on Herodotus' account of Egypt and deftly explores Herodotean themes and motifs in his poetic compositions. Behind the reference to Heraclitus of Halicarnassus, one sees an allusion to a more famous and accomplished writer.

The place name assumes additional connotations in the context of the third century BCE since it was an area over which the Ptolemies were exercising their influence and perhaps their sovereignty.[37] Halicarnassus began to come under the sway of the Ptolemies from about the 280s BCE and it even housed a Ptolemaic garrison under the control of Callias of Sphettos.[38] An inscription from Halicarnassus may 'contain a list of mercenaries

and members of the Ptolemaic garrison'.[39] Scholars have discussed the place of Halicarnassus in Ptolemaic networks from 280 to 260 BCE, an important period in Callimachus' literary career. The historical record shows that citizens of Halicarnassus were involved in transactions with the League of Islanders (*Nesiotai*), which was supported by Ptolemy II Philadelphus. The city also granted honours to Sostratos of Cnidus, who helped with the construction of the Lighthouse in Alexandria and served as a diplomat for Ptolemy I. Jan-Mathieu Carbon and Signe Isager make a robust case for thinking of Halicarnassus as 'a key strategic asset of the Ptolemies' and as 'closely connected with the high affairs of the Ptolemaic empire'.[40] Was Heraclitus, the addressee and poet, a notable resident of Halicarnassus? Wilfried Swinnen suggests that the addressee is the same as one Heraclitus of Halicarnassus, the son of Asclepiades, who is named in three *proxenos* inscriptions.[41] Perhaps this is the very man who composed the one epigram ascribed to Heraclitus in the Anthology. Perhaps so: the perils of biographical criticism are many. The archaeological and epigraphic evidence indicates, at any rate, that Halicarnassus was strategically important to Ptolemaic diplomatic, military, and naval activities in the Mediterranean in the years from about 280 to 260 BCE.

III.

'They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead.' Cory emphasizes the apostrophe at the beginning of Callimachus' epigram: the latter's expression ('Someone told me', Εἶπέ τις) is doubled and pluralized, as if to draw attention to the figure with which the poem begins.[42] Liddell and Scott define *apostrophe* (ἀποστροφή) as 'when one turns away from all others to one, and addresses him specially'. That recalls the Latin of Quintilian, who says that speech can be 'remarkably effective' (*mire movet*) in a forensic context when it is turned away (*aversus*) from the judge and addresses some other person or law or the natural

world in an apostrophe.[43] With Callimachus' epigram, as in older lyric poetry, the text begins with an apostrophe in which the narrator does not explicitly turn away from anything, unless there is an implied audience when the poem commences—but the direct address is remarkably effective. The mention of Heraclitus' name in the initial vocative at the beginning (Ἡράκλειτε) sparks the emotional charge which enlivens the rest of the verses, through the second vocative (ξεῖν' Ἁλικαρνησεῦ), to the sentiment at the very end. The apostrophe enhances the poem's affective and psychological depth, its pathos, and thus conforms to the prescriptions laid down by ancient writers, from Quintilian and Longinus to the scholia on Homer.[44]

The apostrophe gives voice to the relationship that joins together the narrator and Heraclitus. Wordsworth, for de Man, writes of a similar structure in his essays, but in terms that seem portentous, sinister, and morbid.[45] In the circuit that connects the narrator and the addressee, the apostrophe in Callimachus' epigram gives a specificity and vividness to the ties that bind the two poets together. The epigram works through *energeia* and *enargeia* (Quintilian discusses the latter in proximity to apostrophe), but also through what some modern critics have termed 'animation'.[46] It is as if the narrator summons up the shade of Heraclitus and animates him with his direct address, so that, in the time of the epigram, he might hear or receive the tribute to his friendship and his poetry. The narrator assures the dead poet that his poetic 'nightingales' survive and will continue to be read in the world of the living and delivers this assurance in verse, as one poet to another, to heighten the homage, and, in so doing, the narrator, not incidentally, also inscribes himself into the tribute.[47] The delivery of the tribute, the remembrance of Heraclitus' poetic achievement, the narrator's role in celebrating the other's excellence in verse, and the narrator's own poetic craft are marked, recalled, and animated in every reading of the epigram.

What is striking about Callimachus' epigram is how it denies or defers the potential of loss contained in apostrophe. If apostrophe holds out the promise of animation with every reading, it implies nonetheless that the addressee returns to the dead and to oblivion after the epigram has concluded. There can be no animation without the reading of the apostrophe, no chance for Heraclitus to hear what his friend thinks of his compositions or what he remembers of their camaraderie outside of the time of the poem. But this epigram says that the poems of the guest friend from Halicarnassus shall outlive the structural logic of its master figure. The nightingales of Heraclitus are such that not even the end of the apostrophe can silence them.[48]

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, B. (2019) 'Callimachus on the Death of a Friend: A Short Study of Callimachean Epigram', in C. Henriksén, ed., *A Companion to Ancient Epigram* (Wiley Blackwell), 319–35.

Acosta-Hughes, B., and S. A. Stephens (2012) *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Acosta-Hughes, B., and S. A. Stephens, eds. (forthcoming) *Callimachus. The Epigrams.* Gruyter.

Alpers, P. (2013) 'Apostrophe and the Rhetoric of Renaissance Lyric', *Representations* 122, 1: 1–22.

Bing, P., and R. Höschele, eds. (2014) *Aristaenetus, Erotic Letters*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World, vol. 32. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Budelmann, F. (2020) 'Metalepsis and Readerly Investment in Fictional Characters', in S. Matzner and G. Trimble, eds., *Metalepsis: Ancient Texts, New Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 59–78.

Carbon, J.-M., and S. Isager (2021) 'Early Ptolemaic Halikarnassos (ca. 280–260 BC) and its network of interactions', In B. Poulsen, P. Pedersen, and J. Lund, eds., *Karia and the Dodekanese: Cultural Interrelations in the Southeast Aegean II Early Hellenistic to Early Byzantine* (Oxbow Books), 109–124.

Culler J. (2001) *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. New edn. London and New York: Routledge.

Cory, William Johnson (1858) *Ionica*. London: Smith, Elder and Co.

de Man, P. (1984) *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Derrida, J. (1986) *Mémoires: for Paul de Man.* Translated by C. Lindsay, J. Culler, and E. Cadava. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fantuzzi, M., and R. Hunter (2004) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Originally published in Italian as *Muse e modelli: la poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto* (2002). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Friedländer, P. with H. B. Hoffleit (1948) *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gagné, R. (2006) 'What is the Pride of Halicarnassus?', *Classical Antiquity* 25, 1: 1–33.

Goldhill, S. (2017) 'The Limits of the Case Study: Exemplarity and the Reception of Classical Literature', *New Literary History* 48, 3: 415–435.

Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page (1965) *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gutzwiller, K. J. (1998) *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Harder, A., ed. (2012) *Callimachus:* Aetia*. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heath, M. (2002) 'Porphyry's Rhetoric: Text and Translation', *Leeds International Classical Studies* 1.5: 1–38.

Hunter, R. L. (1992) 'Callimachus and Heraclitus', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 28: 113–23.

Isager, S. (1998) 'The Pride of Halikarnassos. Editio Princeps of an Inscription from Salmakis', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 123: 1–23.

Johnson, B. (1986) 'Apostrophe, Animation, and Abortion', *Diacritics* 16, 1: 29–47.

Klooster, J. (2013) 'Apostrophe in Homer, Apollonius and Callimachus', in U. E. Eisen and P. von Möllendorff, *Über die Grenze: Metalepse in Text- und Bildmedien des Altertums* (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter), 151–73.

Lausberg, H. (1998) *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Foreword by G. A. Kennedy ; translated by M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen, and D. E. Orton ; edited by D. E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson. Brill.

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1999) 'The Pride of Halicarnassus', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 124: 1–14.

MacQueen, J. G. (1982) 'Death and Immortality: A Study of the Heraclitus Epigram of Callimachus', *Ramus* 11: 48–56.

Owen, W. J. B., and J. W. Smyser, eds. (1974) *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth*, 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Peek, W. (1955) *Griechische Vers*-Inschriften, vol. 1: *Grab-Epigramme*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Pfeiffer, R., ed. (1949–1953) *Callimachus*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sens, A. 2020. *Hellenistic Epigrams: A Selection*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selden, D. L. (1998) 'Alibis', *Classical Antiquity* 17, 2: 289–412.

Snell, B. (1958) 'Die Klangfiguren im 2. Epigramm des Kallimachos', *Glotta* 37 (1/2): 1–4.

Stallings, A. E. (2010) 'Literary Friendships, Part II', Poetry Foundation, at: https://www.poetryfoundation.org/harriet-books/2010/04/literary-friendships-part-ii Last retrieved on 25 October 2022.

Steiner, D. (2015) 'The Poetics of Sound: Callimachus' Rereading of Pindar Fragment 70B S.-M.', *Classical Philology* 110, 2: 99–123.

Steiner, D. (2021) *Choral Constructions in Greek Culture: The Idea of the Chorus in the Poetry, Art and Social Practices of the Archaic and Early Classical Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stephens, S. A. (2003) *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Swinnen, W. (1970) 'Herakleitos of Halikarnassos, An Alexandrian Poet and Diplomat?' *Ancient Society* 1: 39–52.

Thompson, D. W. (1936) *A Glossary of Greek Birds*. New edn. London: Humphrey Wilford, Oxford University Press.

Walsh, G. B. (1990) 'Surprised by Self: Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry', *Classical Philology* 85, 1: 1–21.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von (1924) *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

[1] Pfeiffer 1949–1953, 2. 80-99.

[2] In *Ionica* (1858), 7.

[3] Goldhill 2017, 429–31, offers a brilliant exposition of Cory's poem and the 'exemplary' place it occupies in the classical tradition. Acosta-Hughes 2019 is a stimulating analysis.

[4] Basil L. Gildersleeve, in *American Journal of Philology* 33, no. 1 (1912) 112 ('Brief Mention'), and Lloyd-Jones 1999, 13.

[5] Stallings 2010.

[6] In Owen and Smyser 1974, 2. 76.

[7] Owen and Smyser 1974, 2. 78–79.

[8] Owen and Smyser 1974, 2. 84–85.

[9] Owen and Smyser 1974, 2. 84.

[10] The idea is vaguely reminiscent of comments made in Porphyry's rhetorical writings: see fragments F4a, 4b, and 4c in Heath 2002.

[11] See Owen and Smyser 1974, 2. 73.

[12] de Man 1984, 77.

[13] de Man, *The Rhetoric of Romanticism* (1984), 262.

[14] Derrrida 1986, 32.

[15] Text and translation from Friedländer 1948, no. 61, which departs slightly from the Greek in *IG* VII 1880.

[16] See Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 306–328, for a discussion of the range of styles in Callimachus' epigrams; cf. Gutzwiller 1998.

[17] de Man 1984, 80.

[18] de Man 1984, 80, 81.

[19] Sens 2020, 131.

[20] The interest of Roman poets in the image is explored in the commentary on this epigram in Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (forthcoming).

[21] *Iliad* 23.154, *Odyssey* 16.220 and 21.226. Hunter 1992, 122.

[22] LSJ, s.v. καταδύω, II.

[23] Dio Chrysostom 10.21: 'I grant that, Diogenes,' he said; 'but you are letting the sun go down with all your questions.' 'And is it not better,' he said, 'to let the sun go down if one is listening to useful words than to go on a futile journey?' (Συγχωρῶ, ἔφη, ὦ Διόγενες· ἀλλὰ καταδύεις τὸν ἥλιον περὶ πάντων ἐπερωτῶν. Καὶ πότερον ἄμεινον, εἶπεν, ἀκούοντα ὧν χρὴ καταδῦσαι τὸν ἥλιον ἢ βαδίζοντα μάτην;). Aelian, *NA* 6.58: 'And the priests are obliged to give way and confess that they devote their time 'to putting the sun to rest with their talk'; but they do not know as much as birds' (οἱ δέ, θύειν ἀνάγκη αὐτοὺς καὶ ὁμολογεῖν ὅτι τὸν μὲν ἥλιον ἐν ταῖς λέσχαις καταδύειν ἄγουσι σχολήν, οὐκ ἴσασι δὲ ὅσα ὄρνιθες); text & translation, LCL. The erotic letters of Aristaenetus are dated to the fifth or sixth century CE: 'That was the song they sang almost till cockcrow, and if I wanted to recount each detail, I think I would bring the sun down and still not be finished talking' (. . . καταδύσειν μοι δοκῶ τὸν ἡλιον ἐπι᾽τῷ μηκει τοῦ᾽λογου, 1.24); text and translation adapted from Bing and Höschele 2014.

[24] MacQueen 1982, 50.

[25] Sens 2020, 132.

[26] Peek 1924, 52 (also in *IGUR* III 1336), cited in part by Gow and Page 1965, 192; and cf. *IK* Kios 79, *IGUR* III 1305 and 1342.

[27] See e.g. *AP* 9.184. The symbolic use of the nightingale in Greek literature is discussed in A. Steier, *RE* 13, 2 (1927), s.v. 'Luscinia', at cols. 1864–1865; and see Thompson 1936, 22, for the meanings 'poet' and 'poetry'.

[28] Harder 2012, 2.48, on *Aetia* 1.16.

[29] See Hesychius α 1498, s.v. ἀηδόνα, and cf. α 1500, with Steiner 2015, 111–112.

[30] Sens 2020, 132–33.

[31] Snell 1958.

[32] Snell 1958. Sens 2020, 131, reminds us further that Hades 'was interpreted to mean "he who makes invisible"'and refers to Callimachus, *Epigram* 41.1–2 (Pf.). On Hades and invisibility, see e.g. *Iliad* 5.845.

[33] MacQueen 1982, 51.

[34] Gildersleeve, in *The American Journal of Philology* 33, no. 4 (1912) 486.

[35] Isager 1998, Lloyd-Jones 1999, and Gagné 2006.

[36] Strabo 14.656; cf. Diogenes Laertius 9.17.

[37] Selden 1998, 319.

[38] *IG* II^3 911, lines 70–72.

[39] Carbon and Isager 2021, 112, referring to a forthcoming publication by Isager.

[40] Carbon and Isager 2021, 117.

[41] The addressee Heraclitus himself can be glossed only somewhat hesitantly, though he may well be the person whom Swinnen 1970 has identified. Strabo refers to a person of that name as a native of Halicarnassus, as we saw, but Strabo is probably taking his cue from Callimachus. Heraclitus is said to be the author of an epigram which was collected by Meleager in his *Garland* and which survives in the Anthology, and so 'only one of Herakleitos' nightingales was actually able to reach safety in the foliage of Melagros' garland' (Swinnen 1970, 41). On the basis of this poem, Wilamowitz 1924, 2.122, thought

that Callimachus' high estimate of Heraclitus' poetry was understandable because the verses indeed were 'something very special'. That poem may or may not be by Heraclitus: the manuscripts ascribe it to Ἡράκλητος or Ἡρακλείδης, and it was Hecker who emended the name to 'Herakleitos' (Ἡράκλειτος).

[42] The best recent discussions of apostrophe are Johnson 1986; Culler 2001, ch. 7; and Alpers 2013.

[43] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 9.2.38–39. As noted in LSJ, other relevant sources include Longinus, *On the sublime* 16.2; Phoebammon, *On Figures* (*De figuris*, Περὶ σχημάτων ῥητορικῶν) 1.1 (Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 3, 45); Alexander, *On Figures* (*De figuris*, Περὶ σχημάτων) 1.20 = Περὶ ἀποστροφῆς (Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 3, 23–24); and Hermogenes, *On Invention* (*De inventione*, Περὶ εὑρέσεως) 4.4 (Rabe, p. 187). The reference in LSJ under this heading to Philodemus, *On Frank Criticism* (*De libertate dicendi*, Περὶ παρρησίας) fr. 21 (Olivieri, p. 11) is enigmatic.

[44] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 4.1.63–70, 9.2.38–39, 9.3.24–26; Longinus, *On the sublime* 16.2 (with D. A. Russell's commentary ad loc.); bT scholia at *Iliad* 16.787 (with Klooster 2013, 153–54, and Budelmann 2020, 64–65); *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.15.22; Lausberg 1998, nos. 762–65.

[45] de Man 1984, 78.

[46] Quintilian and *enargeia*: Steiner 2021, 643–44; animation: Johnson 1986.

[47] For a slightly different reading, see Walsh 1990.

[48] I am deeply grateful to Dan Selden and to members of a seminar at the Institute of Advanced Studies at UCL for their valuable comments on a draft of this chapter.