

A. S. HOLLIS

TEUTHIS IN CALLIMACHUS' AETIA (P. MICH. INV. 6235)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 92 (1992) 115–117

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

TEUTHIS IN CALLIMACHUS' AETIA (P.MICH.INV. 6235)

I find very convincing the contention of L.Koenen, Wolfgang Luppe and Victoria Pagán (henceforth KLP) in ZPE 88, 1991, 157-164, that fr. 1 lines 9-24 of P.Mich. inv. 6235 narrate the rare myth of Teuthis, which occurred in Callimachus, no doubt Aetia (Suppl. Hell. 276, cf. fr. 667 Pf.). These lines, from the right-hand part of a column, seem to begin the narrative of Teuthis; immediately before them, line 8 is vacant, and before that (lines 1-7) there is almost certainly the ending of another aetion in which Apollo played a significant part, since he is probably mentioned in both line 3 and line 5. One may wonder whether this papyrus represents a complete and systematic exposition of the Aetia (like the Diegeses,¹ which quote the first line of each aetion as a lemma, summarize the narrative, and occasionally mention the poet's source). In CQ NS 32, 1982, 117-120² I tentatively suggested that Teuthis might find a place in Aetia bk. 1, associated in some way with Leucadian Diana (fr. 31b-e, in Pfeiffer vol. II pp. 108-111), the two stories have many features in common.

My concern here is with lines 8-10:

8]	
]ν αθηνης εχον
10]]λατος απο αιτι-

KLP note (p. 159) that in line 10 a possible alternative reading is]ματαο (which I will take up). Line 9, with the epic form 'Αθήνης but no punctuation mark or blank space (as in the Diegeses) to mark a transition from poetry to prose explanation, is puzzling. KLP suggest that a lemma has been syntactically integrated with a comment, proposing (p. 162) that the general sense of the quoted hexameter was 'the Arcadians made a statue of Athene', followed by e.g. ἔχον|[τες ἀκαρπίαν· φοθορὰ γὰρ ἦν θεή]λατος. But such integration of the lemma with following comment would be, to my mind, surprising, and is not

¹ E.Lobel on P.Oxy. 2263 (vol. XX, 1952, 125) suggests that that papyrus (which includes the Diegesis of Leucadian Diana) comes basically from the same commentary on Callimachus which is reflected in the Milan Diegeses (P.Med. 18) and the Florentine Scholia on Aetia bk. 1 (PSI 1219), even though the three papyri differ slightly in style and may not be true copies of their original. P.Mich.Inv. 6235 could be another member of the same family (W.S.Barrett); the commentary seems to be on quite a generous scale (perhaps like the Diegesis on the Acontius and Cydippe episode, on which Pfeiffer, vol. I p. 71, commented 'Diegesis huius fabulae celeberrimae multo longior fuisse videtur quam reliquorum Aetiorum enarrationes'). Professor Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones wonders whether the Milan Diegeses represent for the most part an abbreviation of a more ample original.

² An article not mentioned by KLP. Professor Luigi Lehnus (ZPE 91, 1992, 20) has now taken up this idea, and suggested that the episode which seems to reach its conclusion in P.Mich.Inv. 6235 is indeed that of Leucadian Diana. It is worth noting that P.Oxy. 2263 fr. 1 col. iii (reproduced as Call. fr. 31f in Pf vol. II pp. 111-12) contains remnants of Diegesis on either the next or (perhaps more probably) the next but one aetion after Leucadian Diana.

paralleled in the Diegeses of the Aetia. Also surprising would be KLP's idea (p. 164) that the lemma ending Ἀθήνης has been taken from the conclusion of the episode, since the apparent high stop at the end of line 7 in the papyrus, the vacancy of line 8, and the words ἀπὸ αἰτί-
[λας τοιαύτης (lines 10-11) all suggest that lines 9ff. belong to the beginning of a new narration.

The most striking aetiological element in this story (see fr. 667 Pf.) is the paradoxical statue³ of Athena with a bandage round its thigh, and this seems most likely to have featured at the start of the commentator's narrative. The Diegesis of Leucadian Diana (another paradoxical statue), after quoting the first line τὸς μὲν ἔφη· τὰς δ' εἶθαρ ἐμὸς πάλιν εἶρετο θυμὸς (fr. 31b, Pf. vol. II p. 108), continues τῆς ἐν Λευκαδίαι Ἀρτέμιδος τὸ ξόανον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς θυεῖαν ἔχει δι' αἰτίαν ταύτην,⁴ and that is the general sense which I would have expected in the corresponding part of the new papyrus, e.g. 'in Teuthis in Arcadia there is a statue of Athena having around its thigh a bandage over a wound, for the following reason ...' Perhaps, therefore, εχον in the papyrus (line 9) is a complete word, and furthermore is the neuter participle, agreeing with e.g. ξόανον (cf. Leucadian Diana, quoted above, τὸ ξόανον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς θυεῖαν ἔχει, Pausanias 8,28,6 ἄγαλμα ἐποιήσαντο Ἀθηναῖς ἔχον τραῦμα ἐπὶ τοῦ μηροῦ). In line 10]ματος (KLP's alternative reading) could be part of τραύματος.

Mr. W.S.Barrett has suggested to me that, if one postulated an extraordinarily wide column,⁵ and a lemma ἐν ἐκθέσει projecting by about two letters to the left (as with Leucadian Diana), there might even have been room for a complete hexameter (the opening line of the aetion) to have been quoted in line 8, e.g.:

8 [first line ἐν ἐκθέσει, up to c. 35 letters]
 |ὅτι ἐν Τευθίδι τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ξόανόν ἐστι]ν Ἀθήνης, ἔχον
10 |περὶ τῷ μηρῷ τελαμῶνα ὡς περ ἐπὶ τραύ]ματος, ἀπὸ αἰτί-
 |λας τοιαύτης·

(letters lost: in 9, 33; in 10, 32; in 8, if it projected two letters to the left, maximum 34-35).

³ For another aetion which started from a cult-statue with paradoxical adornment, requiring explanation, cf. fr. 101 Pf. (Samian Juno, from book 4). The Aetia contained yet another story in which (as on Leucas) a cult-statue of Artemis was apparently dishonoured: that of Artemis Ἀπαγχομένη in Arcadia (fr. 187 Pf.). Barber and Maas wished to connect fr. 731 Pf. τὴν θεὸν Ἄρτεμιν οἱ ἔπαθεν with Leucadian Diana (fr. 31b, see Pfeiffer vol. II p. 108); fr. 731 could, however, cohere as well (or even better) with fr. 187.

⁴ Lobel on P.Oxy. 2263 (vol XX, 1952, 125) observes of the introductory formulae used in the Diegeses of Aetia bk. 1 that sometimes they are framed to show the poet's question (Schol. Flor. 22 in Pf. vol. I p. 13, ζητεῖ διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν, the same phrase restored by Pfeiffer, vol. II p. 108 for P.Oxy. 2263 fr. 1 col. i lines 21-22), sometimes the Muses' reply (δι' αἰτίαν ταύτην for Leucadian Diana, cf. ἀπὸ αἰτίας τοιαύτης vel sim. for Teuthis, if that aetion belongs to bk. 1). We cannot be sure that every aetion in bk. 1 started with a question to the Muses, since sometimes the poet volunteered information (CQ NS 32, 1982, 118).

⁵ Mr.Barrett adds 'especially in this hand (c. 44 letters = c. 220 mm); the widest tragic ones which I know are P.Oxy. 3653 (Sophocles, c. 40 letters = c. 115 mm (the photograph in Recherches de Papyrologie 3, 1964, pl. II is enlarged, x 1.4)'.

If this were so, and if the first line ended Ἄθηνης,⁶ it would make the misspelling Ἄθηνης for Ἄθηνῶς in line 9 easier to account for.⁷

Oxford

A.S.Hollis

⁶ There is little point in trying to reconstruct the sense of the line, which would probably not be straightforward.

⁷ If Barrett's idea of the extraordinarily wide column (see n. 5 above), about which he himself has doubts, were not correct, one could produce a more concise restoration of lines 9-10, giving a similar sense with a narrower column, but it might then be necessary to abandon the idea that line 8 of the papyrus (at present vacant) contained a complete hexameter quoted as a lemma.

I am grateful to Mr. Barrett and to Professor Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones for comments and encouragement.