

A. S. HOLLIS

CALLIMACHUS AETIA FR. 75.58–59 PF.

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 86 (1991) 11–13

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

CALLIMACHUS AETIA FR. 75.58-59 PF.

56 ἄρχμενος ὡς νύμφησι[ν] εἰναίετο Κωρυκίησιν,
 τὰς ἀπὸ Παρνησσοῦ λίς ἐδίωξε μέγας,
 58 Ὑδροῦσσαν τῶ καὶ μιν ἐφήμισαν, ὥς τε Κιρώ[δης]
 .]ρ.. θυς[.]το.. ᾤκεεν ἐν Καρύαις·

58 τω ρ: τω Hu.: τω Platt litterae post *σαν* incertae, in fine ω satis prob.: *ωστεικρω*...
 Hu.:] . [.] . [P.Oxy. 2213 prima litt. fort. κ, post lacunam vestigia accentus supra litt.:
 e.g. suppl. G. Murray ap. Hu. coll. *Κιροάδας* AP xvi 6, 3, cf. *Κιρωνίδου* IG vii 385, 1
 (Oropus)

'Who it was who lived at Caryae and what this has to do with Cean tradition remains a problem' (A.S. Hunt on P.Oxy. 1011, vol.VII, 1910, 66). Since no place of that name is known on Ceos itself, we are apparently looking for someone connected with the early history of Ceos who left the island¹ to settle elsewhere in one of the places called Caryae; towns of that name are attested in Arcadia, Laconia and Lycia. Pfeiffer (1949) printed Gilbert Murray's Κιρώ[δης, which may fit the traces.² Although no mythical Cirodes appears in any other source, the founders of the Cean tetrapolis (lines 70ff.) were likewise unknown to us until this passage of Callimachus turned up.³

Surely, however, it is worth bringing back into play a familiar figure who would fit well into the chronological sequence. Aristaeus might be recognized here if one could read Κυρή[νης | υἱ]ό[ς] (rather υἱό[ς])⁴ in lines 58-59. This restoration was proposed by Karl Chr. Storck, *Die ältesten Sagen der Insel Keos* (Diss. Giessen, Mainz 1912, 7).⁵ Aristaeus was much the most famous person connected with the mythical history of Ceos, and his total absence from Callimachus' summary of Xenomedes' Chronicle would be surprising. That he should be mentioned here only for his departure from Ceos and designated by a periphrasis ('the son of Cyrene'), is appropriate enough, since twenty-five lines earlier Callimachus named him (fr. 75,33 Ἀρισταίου) and described the ritual which he introduced

¹ Though Pfeiffer wrote in 1923 (*Call. Frag. Nuper Reperta*, 37) 'qui antea Caryas (Arcadiae urbem?) habitabat'.

² See below. Wilamowitz tried Κάρυ[ς]τος (the founder of Carystus in Euboea) which 'is not to be read' (Hunt). We also have faint traces of the final word in P.Oxy. 2213 fr. 11 (c), 9, but they hardly provide any additional help: 'the top of a tall upright, presumably K, followed at an interval of one or two letters by a dot level with the tips of the letters, having a trace, presumably an accent, above' (Lobel in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XIX, 1948, 33).

³ They all have more conventional names, though only Aphrastus (line 74) is textually secure in the Callimachus papyrus.

⁴ See below for the traces at the beginning of line 59.

⁵ Also (more allusively) by Ph.G. Gunning, *De Ceorum Fabulis Antiquissimis Quaestiones Selectae* I, 1912, 13. The same idea occurred to me independently.

to save the Ceans from plague. As for his move from Ceos to Caryae, if Caryae were the town in Arcadia (or even the better-known town on the boundary between Laconia and Arcadia) we could cite Servius on Virgil, *Georgics* 1,14 'Pindarus (fr. 251 Snell-Maehler) ... eum [sc. Aristaeum] ait de Cea insula in Arcadium migrasse, ibique vitam coluisse'. Aristaeus' place in Cean history immediately after the Corycian nymphs might perhaps be supported from Heracleides (Müller, FHG II, 214 = Heraclidis Lembi *Excerpta Politiarum*, ed. Mervin R. Dilts, 1971, 22-24) 'Αρισταίων δέ φασι μαθεῖν παρὰ μὲν Νυμφῶν τὴν προβάτων καὶ βοῶν ἐπιτήμην, where one naturally takes the nymphs to be those just mentioned as earliest inhabitants of Ceos (ibid., λέγονται δὲ οἰκῆσαι Νύμφαι πρότερον αὐτήν).⁶

There is a possibility, while retaining the reference to Aristaeus, of identifying Callimachus' Caryae with Carystus in Euboea. The remarkable 'epyllion' in [Oppian] *Cynegetica* 4 definitely places Aristaeus in Euboea (265-266, 276).⁷ In the Loeb Oppian (ed. A.W. Mair, 1928, 182-183), line 267 reads ὄθ' ὑπατον μὲν ἔβαιεν ὄρος Καρύητιν ὑπ' ἄντροι ('who dwelt in a cave at the top of a mountain at Caryae', Mair). Καρύητιν was Mair's own conjecture, not far from the manuscript reading (καὶ ῥύητιν CDEF: καὶ ροῦητιν GLM). He based this conjecture upon our lines of the *Aetia*, without, however, seeming to consider that Aristaeus might be the subject in Callimachus too. In Heracleides the motif of a migration from Ceos to Euboea occurs in a different form: the lion chases the nymphs not from Parnassus to Ceos, but from Ceos to Carystus (FHG II, 214 φοβήσαντος δὲ αὐτὰς λέοντος, εἰς Κάρυστον διαβῆναι).

Supposing that the restoration Κυρή[νης] | υἱό[ς] were correct, one would wonder about the next word in line 59, probably an epithet agreeing with Καρύητις. Most convenient might be an epithet derived from a geographical proper name, helping to make clear which Caryae the poet had in mind. No illumination has come to me. My only other idea was an epithet starting ἐϋ-.⁸ Poets freely coin new epithets in ἐϋ-, and in any case Professor Parsons's account of the area of papyrus after the initial traces ('everything is confused') further discourages hopes of success.

Storck's Κυρήνης | υἱός was mentioned by Pfeiffer in 1923 (*Callimachi Fragmenta Nuper Reperta*, 37) and also by Jacoby (when editing *Xenomedes*, F.Gr.Hist. 442). But in 1949 Pfeiffer surprisingly left it out. Perhaps this was the result of his own inspection of P.Oxy. 1011 (*Callimachus* II, 1953, xxiii 'papyri fol. 1 iterum collato'), though in

⁶ Heracleides, however, placed Aristaeus after the hero Ceos, Xenomedes/Callimachus (if this restoration were correct) before Ceos, who is mentioned in line 63. Also, as we shall see, Heracleides had a different account of the Nymphs and the lion.

⁷ Note that some made Aristaeus a son of Carystus rather than of Apollo (schol. Ap.Rh. 2,498). In Ap.Rh. 4,1131ff. it is Aristaeus' daughter Macris who nurses the infant Dionysus on Euboea.

⁸ Of course the need to lengthen the epsilon would impose metrical restrictions on the choice of subsequent letters. In his *Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge 1988, 19) Neil Hopkinson prints ἥρος εὐείτοις] (Barber) at the start of line 59.

Philologus 93, 1938, 66-69 he said nothing about these particular lines. I am most grateful to Professor P.J.Parsons for grappling afresh with this very difficult papyrus in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. He examined it by natural, artificial and ultraviolet light; the results did not differ.

Concerning the letters at the end of line 58, which Hunt and Pfeiffer print as ιρω[, Professor Parsons reports: '1. "There seems to be no alternative to" iota (Hunt). Certainly what one sees is a solid upright of ink, which ends well above the feet of kappa before and rho after. Iota suits very well; the only doubt is some possible ink a little to the right, near the top of rho. I have wondered whether that could be the remains of the right-hand branch of upsilon. But, against upsilon, (a) no trace of the left-hand branch, and not clear that the surface is damaged there; (b) the descender of upsilon would normally go further down; here again no clear sign of a damaged surface. 2. Omega "very doubtful" (Hunt). What one can see is ink in the middle third of the line, which might belong to omega. The two upright sides which are visible could indeed belong to eta; but then they should have extended both further up and further down, and though there is some damage it may not be enough to explain the loss of all four extremities. Thus strict observation seems to be against ΥΡΗ[. But, given the normal irregularities of a script, and the widespread fading and damage in this papyrus, it could not be called impossible.'

Concerning the start of line 59: 'The plate⁹ does not look quite like the original here. I see three traces; presumably Hunt took the first two together, as the top of omicron with a (narrow) letter lost before it. I am not sure that, if the first trace is not an illusion, it could not be taken as the right-hand branch of upsilon, then the second trace as the top of iota and the third as top of omicron; then everything is confused. The objection is that, to judge from other initial upsilons, one would expect it to be wider.'

So, with the reservation about the width of Y, it seems that ΥΙΟ[at the start of line 59 is not ruled out.

Oxford

A.S.Hollis

Postscript: for Aristaeus as 'son of Cyrene' (without addition of his own name) cf. Nonnus, Dionysiaca 19,228 υίει Κυρήνης and 37,587 υῖα Κυρήνης. I should have noticed earlier that Κυρήνης | υίός was commended also by George Huxley in GRBS 6,1965,237-238. As for the elusive epithet in line 59 ἐϋ[εί]τοις (Barber, see note 8 above, though he intended εὐείτοις) could at least fit the space if the scribe wrote a single, rather than double, sigma (as regularly happens in the case of ἐύκελμος).

⁹ The Oxyrhynchus Papyri VII, 1910, plate ii.