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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 άθηνης εξον
10  ]λατος απο αιτι-

KLP note (p. 159) that in line 10 a possible alternative reading is ]ματος (which I will take up). Line 9, with the epic form 'Αθηνης 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. εξον[τες άκαρπιον· φθορα γαρ ἤν 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 fuisset 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 KPL. Professor Luigi Lehnsus (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 'Αθήνης 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-λ [ας τοιαυτής (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 τῶς μὲν ἔφη· τάς δ’ εἴθηρ ἐμὸς πάλιν εἴρετο θυμός (fr. 31b, Pf. vol. II p. 108), continues τὴς ἐν Λευκαδίαι 'Αρτέμιδος τὸ ζώον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς θυεῖαν ἔχει δὲ αἰτίαν τεύτην,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, ἔχον in the papyrus (line 9) is a complete word, and furthermore is the neuter participle, agreeing with e.g. ἴπου (cf. Leucadian Diana, quoted above, τὸ ζώον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς θυεῖαν ἔχει. Pausanias 8,28,6 ἄγαλμα ἐποιήσαντο 'Αθηνάς ἔχον τραύμα ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰμιροῦ). 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 ἔκθέζει 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 action) to have been quoted in line 8, e.g.:

8 |first line ἐν ἔκθέζει, up to c. 35 letters|
   |λύτι ἐν Τευθίθι τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ζώον ἔπτι]ν Ἀθήνης, ἔχον
10 |περι τῶι μηροὶ τελαμῶνα ὀκπερ ἐπὶ τραύματος, 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 action 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 'Ἀπαχμομένη in Arcadia (fr. 187 Pf.). Barber and Maas wished to connect fr. 731 Pf. τὴν θεὸν Ἀρτεμίν εἶ ἐποθέν 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 (δ’ αἰτίαν ταύτην for Leucadian Diana, cf. ἀπὸ αἰτίας τοιαύτης vel sim. for Teuthis, if that action belongs to bk. 1). We cannot be sure that every action 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, it would make the misspelling Ἄθηνης for Ἄθηνας in line 9 easier to account for.  
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