

A. S. HOLLIS

SUPPL. HELL. 1044 (EUPHORION?)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 95 (1993) 48–49

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## SUPPL. HELL. 1044 (EUPHORION?)

Κεκροπίης τευμήσατ' ἐπίκυρος Εὐρύκλεια

This was Callimachus fr. anon. 135 Schneider. But Pfeiffer (on his fr. 567) pointed out that the author can hardly be Callimachus, because of the elision after the third-foot trochee. He himself suggested Euphorion,<sup>1</sup> who does not object to elision at that point, as found in fr. 78 Powell δωροφόροι καλεοίαθ' ὑποφρίσσοντες ἄνακτας to which we can now add Suppl. Hell. 443,6 – ω]ων καὶ γούνατ' ἀναρδέα χειραίνονται.<sup>2</sup> Certainly this hexameter, with its spondaic fifth foot, has the flavour of Euphorion; every word, apart from the first, is a riddle in itself. τευμήσατ(ο) is glossed by Et.Gen. with παρεσκευάσατο, ἐτεχνήσατο; LSJ s.v. τευμάομαι translate 'fashioned'. The unique ἐπίκυρος means 'leader' (ἡγεμών, according to Et.Gen.).<sup>3</sup> No guidance is offered for Εὐρύκλεια, but the SH editors are likely to be right in suggesting that she is Athena, in which case the name would be used as a title, 'the lady of wide renown', somewhat in the style of Lycophron's Alexandra. Our poet, whoever he is, must have borrowed τευμήσατ(ο) from Antimachus of Colophon, and that point too would suit Euphorion.<sup>4</sup> No doubt he would bear in mind the context of τευμήσατο in Antimachus, who applied it to the cave which Zeus 'fashioned' for the concealment of Europa (fr. 3 Wyss):

οὐνεκά οἱ Κρονίδης ὅς (τε) μέγα πᾶσιν ἀνάσσει  
 ἄντρον ἐνὶ κτιόεν τευμήσατο, τόφρα κεν εἶη  
 Φοίνικος κούρη κεκυθημένη, ὥς ῥά ἐ μή τις  
 μηδὲ θεῶν ἄλλος γε παρ᾽ ἔξ φράσσαιτό κεν αὐτοῦ.

Zeus miraculously fashioned the cave for his own advantage; can we guess what Athena might have fashioned in SH 1044? There is one obvious possibility, which may receive some support from Nonnus. I suspect that the designation of Athena as Κεκροπίης ... ἐπίκυρος may be deliberately recalled in Dionysiaca 37,320, where Erectheus prays to the goddess as κοίρανε Κεκροπίης. As so often, we may be able to pick up from Nonnus a hint of the original context of the lines which he is imitating. Erectheus is engaged in a

<sup>1</sup> a suggestion noted with apparent approval by E.A.Barber, CR N.S. 9, 1959, 102; the editors of SH do not comment on the authorship.

<sup>2</sup> The ascription of P.Oxy. 2526 (SH 433-452) to Euphorion is not certain, but made probable by the general style and the apparent coincidence of subject matter between SH 443,10-11 and Euphorion fr. 115 Powell.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Hesychius s.v. ἐπίκυρος (vol. 2, p. 170 Latte), where the glosses offered are ἄρχων, βραβευτής, βοηθός, ἐπίσκοπος, ἔφορος, ἐπήκοος. One may doubt whether ἐπίκυρος has anything to do with the corrupt †ἐπικυρῶν† in Call. fr. 567, which Barber (CR 1959, 101) would emend to ἐπὶ κκύρωι.

<sup>4</sup> whose imitations of Antimachus were catalogued in B.Wyss' Berlin, 1936 edition of the latter (p. L).

closely-contested chariot race with Scelmis, son of Poseidon, and appeals to Athena ὡς δὲ τὴν Ποσειδάωνα τεῶν νίκης αὐτῶν (321). This comes in response to Scelmis' exaltation of his own parent (307-314), which includes derogatory remarks about Athena's olive (313-314). Perhaps therefore in SH 1044 Athena has fashioned the famous olive, which established her right to the lordship of Attica. This was thought to have been the first of all olives (cf. Herodotus 8,55, Call. fr. 194,66-68 Pf. τίς δ' εὖρ' ἐλαίην; Παλλάς ἡμὸς ἤριξε | τῶν φυκιοίκωι, κηδίκασεν ἀρχαίοις | ἀνὴρ ὄφρις τὰ νέρθεν ἀμφὶ τῆς Ἀκτῆς); accordingly there was a time when the olive grew nowhere else (Hdt. 5,82). Other details would then fall into place: it is appropriate that Athena should be called Κεκροπίης ... ἐπίκυρος, in the context of her struggle for that land with Poseidon, and appropriate that Attica should be called Κεκροπία, because Cecrops himself played a vital part in the outcome, whether as judge (Call. fr. 194,67-68 quoted above, Nonnus, Dion. 43,126) or as witness (Call. Hecale fr. 70,11 H. = fr. 260,26 Pf. = SH 288,26).

In view of the strong possibility that the author of SH 1044 was Euphorion, it is worth drawing attention to Euph. fr. 150 Powell, Εὐφορίων ὁ ποιητὴς ... εἶπεν τὴν ἐλαίαν γλαυκῶπιν. This too seems to be reflected in Nonnus (Dion. 3,98 γλαυκῶπὸν ὑπὸ σκέπας ἀβρὸν ἐλαίης).<sup>5</sup> If by chance Euphorion wrote γλαυκῶπιν ἐλαίην | Κεκροπίης τευμήσατ' ἐπίκυρος Εὐρύκλεια, the identity of the goddess, veiled by Εὐρύκλεια, would emerge from the epithet applied to her olive.

Oxford

A.S.Hollis

---

<sup>5</sup> the parallel with Euph. fr. 150 is noted both by Keydell and by Chuvin (in the Budé Nonnus, vol. 2, p. 138).