

41 — The Divided Soul | 4 G-P

- Ἡμισὺ μευ ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἥμισυ δ' οὐκ οἶδ'
εἴτ' Ἔρος εἴτ' Αἵδης ἥρπασε, πλὴν ἀφανές.
ἥ ῥά τιν' ἐς παίδων πάλιν ὥχετο; καὶ μὲν ἀπεῖπον
πολλάκι “τὴν δρῆστιν μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε, νέοι”.
5 † ουκισυνηφισον· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἡ λιθόλευστος
κείνη καὶ δύσερως οἶδ' ὅτι που στρέφεται.

Sources: AP 12.73 Καλλιμάχου; Choeroboscus, περὶ ἀποθέσεως μέτρων 226.12–14 Consbruch παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ ἐν ἐπιγράμμασιν, ἥμισυ μοι...μερόπων. Not in Planudes.

1 μευ P μοι Choer. ἔτι P ἐπὶ Choer. (codex K) ἐστὶ (codex U) 2 ἔρος Choer. ἔρις P ἥρπασε, πλὴν ἀφανές P ἥρπασεν ἐκ μερόπων Choer. (μετώπων codex K) 4 μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε Hecker μὴ νυ δέχεσθε Meineke μὴ ὑπεχεσθε P μὴ ὑπόδεχθε Bentley 5 ουκισυνηφισον P οὐκ ἴσον ἔφη σον Scaliger ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ξυνέφησαν Buffière οὐκ εἰς Κηφισσόν Fabri...δίφησον Jacobs (vel -σω Gow) ...Θεῦτιμον Schneider

- Half of my soul is still a breathing thing, and half I know not
whether Love or Hades has snatched it, only that it vanished.
Indeed, has it gone again to one of the boys? And yet I forbade
them often “don’t take in the runaway, young men”.
5 [...] you search for...For there, deserving to be stoned,
and sick in love, I know that it is somewhere round and about.

This epigram explores the *topos* of the lover’s divided soul, the part that can still reason and the part that is driven solely and irrationally by erotic passion. The concept of the soul divided into various functions was much discussed in earlier philosophy, but Callimachus’ articulation seems especially close to that found in Plato’s *Phaedrus* (253–254), where in Socrates’ famous analogy the tripartite soul is likened to a chariot with yoked horses (the rational and the appetitive) that pull the charioteer in different directions. The appetitive horse often tries to run away with the team. Despite the rational part of the soul wanting to steer the course, the desiring part often acts on a compulsion to flee to a beloved object (253a5–6). Callimachus’ use of a plural νέοι suggests that the speaker, while aware of falling in love, is not yet sure who is the object of his desire. Or he does know but expresses himself disingenuously. In both cases his rational part struggles to be in control but that control seems to slip away as the epigram progresses. In Plato’s metaphor, as the two horses struggle for dominance, the rational horse calls the other a deserter (254c7–d2). Here Callimachus uses the image of a runaway slave and initially blames the young men (the objects of desire) as responsible for taking in the runaway. By blaming the

νέοι, the speaker deflects blame from the runaway half of his soul, though in the final line the two halves collapse as the speaker talks now of the feminine ἡ κείνη (ψυχή), not the neuter ἡμισυ (so Gutzwiller 2007: 326). The *topos* is not unique to Callimachus; the same idea occurs most probably earlier in Asclepiades (*AP* 12.166.1 = 17.1 G-P, Sens: ὅ τι μοι λοιπὸν ψυχῆς, “what is left of my soul”) and Theocritus, *id.* 29.5–6: τὸ γὰρ αἷμισυ τὰς ζοίας ἔχω...τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἀπώλετο (“half of my life I possess...the rest has perished”). In an epigram attributed to Plato, *AP* 5.78 (= 3 *FGE*), the soul wanders to a specific lover:

τὴν ψυχὴν Ἀγάθωνα φιλῶν ἐπὶ χεῖλεσιν ἔσχον·
ἦλθε γὰρ ἡ τλήμων ὥς διαβησομένη.

I had my soul on my lips when I was kissing Agathon.
Wretched soul, she came so that she might cross over to him.

Later, Meleager seems to imitate elements of Callimachus’ epigram in *AP* 12.52.1–2 (= 81.1–2 G-P): ὦ δυσέρωτες, | ἡμισύ μευ ψυχᾶς ἄρπασεν Ἀνδράγαθον (“O you who are lovesick, [the South wind] has carried off Andragathus, half of my soul”).

The epigram is also imitated by the Roman poet Q. Lutatius Catulus, who was born around 150 BCE, though in Catulus (fr. 1 Courtney) the Platonic resonances are missing, and the soul’s refuge is no longer generic but specific.

aufugit me animus; credo, ut solet, ad Theotimum
devenit. sic est; per fugium illud habet.
quid si non interdixem ne illunc fugitivum
mitteret ad se intro, sed magis eiceret?
5 ibimus quaesitum. verum, ne ipsi teneamur,
formido. quid ago? da, Venus, consilium.

My soul flees from me; I think, as usual, to Theotimus
it has gone. So it is; it has a refuge there.
What if I hadn’t forbidden him to admit the fugitive
into his house but rather to throw him out?
5 We shall go to find him. But I am afraid that we too
will be caught. What am I to do? Venus, advise me.

Catulus’ imitation has prompted various conjectures for repairing the textual damage in Callimachus’ epigram. Catulus’ rendering of the opening of Callimachus’ line 5 as *ibimus quaesitum* prompted Jacobs to resolve the last half of the disputed letters as δίφρησον (imperative from διφράω) “probe” or “seek out”. This emendation is generally accepted, and the second person imperative must be addressed to the rational part of the soul, “you search for”. But Catulus has made the defection personal; the soul, no longer divided, flees not to τιν’ ἐς παῖδων, but *ad Theotimum*.

This led Schneider to conjecture that the opening of line 5 also concealed a name, which he restored as *Θεύτιμον*. But the plurals elsewhere would seem to militate against the introduction of a specific person.

1. *ἡμισὺ μὲν ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον*: the rational part of the soul is the “healthy” or still breathing part; the condition of the other half is in doubt. Horace may be imitating the opening of the line at *Odes* 1.3.8: *animae dimidium meae* (said of Vergil), but quite possibly via Meleager as a window allusion (see the discussion of *fr.* 6).

οἶδ': the elision of α at the end of the hexameter is not otherwise attested. Given the topic, the omission may be intended to replicate the distraction of the speaker as he searches for his other half. Note the absence of elision in the opening of the first hexameter, but four elisions—*ἡμισυ δ' οὐκ οἶδ' | εἴτ' Ἔρος εἴτ' Αἰδης ἥρπασε*—as he imagines the other half of his soul snatched away; or as Sens (2002: 378) suggests: “like the speaker’s bipartite soul, the disyllabic *οἶδ'* is missing one of its halves. The unusual treatment of *οἶδα* thus amounts to a grammatical joke.” *ἄφανές* which sits directly below it in the next line would emphasize the point as would *Αἰδης*, etymologized as “he who makes unseen”. G-P suggest that the elision reflects Callimachus’ position on a dispute about the presence or absence of elision at *Iliad* 8.206 (i.e., *ζῆν* or *ζῆν'* at line end); this matter is discussed by Choeroboscus in his commentary on Hephaestion cited above, in which he notes the passage from Callimachus. The opening *οὐκ οἶδ'* is answered by *οἶδ' ὅτι* in the final line.

2. *εἴτ' Ἔρος εἴτ' Αἰδης*: this dichotomy coincides with a saying that sets out contrasting pairs that know no boundaries (*adunata*): *ἄδης καὶ ἔρως γυναικὸς καὶ τάρταρος καὶ γῆ οὐκ ἐμπιπλαμένη ὕδατος καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ οὐ μὴ εἴπωσιν Ἀρκεῖ* (“Hades and a woman’s desire, Tartarus and earth that is not filled with water, and water and fire, they will not say ‘it is enough’”). It occurs in the Septuagint, *Proverbs* 30.16 and was probably in common use.

Ἔρος: poetic for *Ἔρως*. This spelling is used only here in Callimachus, though frequent in Archaic poetry and used by Theocritus in his pederastic *Idylls* (29.22, 30.2 and 26).

πλήν ἄφανές: Choeroboscus’ manuscripts replace these words with two variants: the earlier, *ἐκ μερόπων* (“from the living”), looks like an explanatory gloss that displaced Callimachus’ original text; the second, *ἐκ μετώπων* (“from my forehead”), was a copyist’s mistaking of -PO- for -TΩ-.

3. *ἦ ῥα* = *ἄρα* (see 30 n.3).

τιν' ἐς παίδων (sc. *ἐξ τινα παίδων*): the anastrophe *ἐς*, followed by the genitive *παίδων*, is used only here and in an epigram attributed to Simonides on the death of

Anacreon, “who composed songs breathing of the Graces, breathing of Loves, on the sweet desire for boys” (ὃς Χαρίτων πνείοντα μέλη, πνείοντα δ’ Ἐρώτων | τὸν γλυκὺν ἐς παίδων ἥμερον ἡρμόσατο, *AP* 7.25.3–4 = ‘Simonides’ 4.3–4 G-P = 67.3–4 *FGE* = 101 S.3–4 Sider). Although unlikely to be by Simonides, it might belong to the fourth-century collection known as *Simonidea*. More likely it is later than Callimachus and in part borrowing his language. The phrase ἐς παίδων occupies the same metrical position in both epigrams; there is the language of breathing (= desire); and lines 5–10 of the Simonidean epigram develop a tension between Eros and Hades.

ἀπεῖπον: one expects the speaker to forbid the desiring part of his soul to run away to the boys, not the boys from accepting its affections. This may be an expression of wishful thinking, namely, that the wandering soul will always find a willing object of desire, or exculpatory—it is not the appetitive soul’s fault, but the attractive boys.

4. δρήστιν: apparently a feminine form of δρήστης; it does not occur elsewhere, but Hesychius (δ 2333) glosses δρᾶσθαι as δραπεῖται, and at δ 2324 glosses δραπετήσ as φυγὰς, “runaway”. Callimachus may have coined it to align with the feminine ψυχή.

μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε: the text is uncertain, but the sense of the prohibition must be “do not take in” or “receive”. P has μὴ ὑπέχεσθε, but this form of ὑπέχω is not found elsewhere and its range of meanings does not quite fit the context. The most successful and generally accepted emendation is that of Hecker, who proposed μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε. Metrically, it assumes the coalescence of the vowels η and υ, as in *hAthena* 52: μὴ οὐκ ἐθέλων τὰν βασιλείαν ἰδῆς. Though that example is unique, the context is very similar: it is an admonition to Pelasgian men to avert their eyes “lest inadvertently you look upon the queen”. Bentley’s μὴ ὑποδέχθε assumes hiatus, though after μὴ hiatus does not occur elsewhere in Callimachus; Meineke suggests μὴ νυ δέχεσθε.

νέοι: in Greek culture the most obvious place to find young men in the aggregate, as the address implies, was the gymnasium where they trained as ephebes. In fact, νέοι distinguished a class of such youth (see LSJ I 1). The dynamics of such interactions can be seen in the openings of Plato’s *Charmides* and *Lysis*.

5. †ουκισυνιφησον: the reading of P. Most editors print the opening of the line as damaged and do not resolve the opening letters, though Pagonari accepts Schneider’s conjecture of a missing name, Θεύτιμον; Fabri proposed Κηφισσόν; Lumb proposed Ἀγχίσην. Although it does not account for all of the opening letters, Jacobs’ δίφησον is generally accepted. Mair in his Loeb restores the entire opening as οὗ τις συνδιφήσον and translates “There help me, someone, to search”. Buffière (1977: 97)

suggests ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ ξυνέφησαν (“but they did not agree”), citing Plato, *Symposium* 177e7: οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἄρα συνέφασαν. While attractive it is perhaps too radical a solution.

λιθόλευστος: this rare adjective describes persons who have been stoned or are in danger of being stoned, usually to death (see, e.g., Sophocles, *Ajax* 254 and Diodorus Siculus 3.47); here the sense is anticipatory, the wandering half of the soul is “worthy to be stoned”. Stoning was practiced as a purification ritual, often annual, in which a victim was chosen by the city, feted, then led to an area outside of the walls and stoned until driven away. Callimachus narrates such a practice by the Abderites in *Aetia*, book 4. The *Diegesis* (II 35–40 = fr. 90a Harder) says that after the individual is chosen and fed, “then outside the walls he goes around in a circle, thus purifying the city [Abdera], and then is stoned by the king and the others, until he is driven from their territory” (εἴτ’ ἔξω τοῦ τείχους περίεισι κύκλῳ περικαθαίρων αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τότε ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων λιθοβολεῖται, ἕως ἐξελασθῇ τῶν ὀρίων). The implication for this epigram is that the soul should be driven away forcibly, rather than taken in. λιθόλευστος also occurs in a fragment of Alexander the Aetolian (c. 280 BCE) about adulterous passion gone wrong (3 CA = Parthenius XIV Antheus 11–12 Lightfoot). Cleoboea, the wife of Phobius, is driven mad by her desire for a young visitor, Antheus. When he rejects her, she persuades him to climb down a well, where she drops a stone upon him. Alexander’s use of the adjective indirectly alludes to stoning as the traditional punishment for adultery (Magnelli 1999: 159). In this epigram the choice of λιθόλευστος may also imply that the runaway portion of the soul is akin to an adulterer.

6. δύσερως: commonly used by Theocritus, especially in *id.* 1.85 of Daphnis and *id.* 6.7 of Polyphemus, to express the inability to obtain the objects of desire, hence “hopelessly in love”. In the *Palatine Anthology* it is used most frequently by Meleager in book 12, see, e.g., 12.23.1 (= 99.1 G-P), 12.49.1 (= 113.1 G-P), 12.125.7 (= 97.7 G-P), and 12.137.1 (= 98.1 G-P) and see examples above.

Acosta-Hughes (2015) 14.

Bousquet (1955) 121–123.

Cataudella (1967) 359–360 = (1972) 213–215.

Daly (1975) 399–402.

Dornseiff (1953) 27–29.

Fraser (1972) 2. 836 n.275.

Gärtner (2010) 438–444.

Gutzwiller (1998) 214–215 and (2007) 325–326.

Hutchinson (1988) 75–76.

Livrea (1996) 66–72.

Luck (1968) 394–399.

McKay (1970) 46 and (1991) 377–385.

Mülke (2004) 192–193.

Schwyzer (1926) 447–448.

Sens (2002b) 378–379.

Tueller (2008) 129–130.

Walsh (1990) 13–14.