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ON P. OXY. LXI 4096, MYTHOGRAPHUS HOMERICUS

A few immediate notes on the newly published fragments of this curious work.¹

Fr. 16, unplaced by Schubert, may be identified as a historia of Καλλικολόνη, attached to Il. 20.53. The beginning will be:

>— [vac.]

αλλ]{οτε παρεμεντι θεων επι
κα[λλικολονη (Il. 20.53).

The one-line gap beneath the forked paragraphos indicates that we have here not just a new entry, but the first entry of a new Homeric book: cf. fr. 11.8, as distinct from fr. 1.11, fr. 10.10, fr. 36.4. The book number (or rather letter) will have stood in the intervening line, as in frr. 7 and 11.² There is no historia attached to this verse in the D-scholia, but there is one attached to verse 3, Τρω[ες δι αυθ[εν επι θρακμων πεδιον, and since that concerns the name Καλλικολόνη, we may safely presume that it is the same historia, shifted in the D-scholia to the earlier place. I do not venture a full reconstruction of the historia in the papyrus, but the scanty remains – beginnings of eight more lines – confirm the identification: 5 λοφ[ον, 6 lost (not “vac.”), 8 ιλιον or ιλιε[ον, 9 κω[η[ε, 10 ει|μο[υτοκ or ποτα|μο[υ.

Fr. 24, also unplaced by Schubert, may be identified as having the beginning of a historia attached to Il. 22.126, ου μεν ποκ νον εκτιν απο δρυς ουδε οπο περιον. To judge from the plate (plate VI), the fragment has line ends. Schubert transcribes 2 η δι[ορία πι[αρα, but his πι looks to me like a filler sign (cf. fr. 2.7–8). παρα X will then have occupied the beginning of the next line (the papyrus is vacant beneath ορία). Then if 4 δρυ (the first line of the succeeding entry) is line end, as the plate certainly suggests, it is in just the right position for the lemma ου μεν ποκ νον εκτιν απ[ο δρυ|ος κτλ. (the trace before δρυ is described as “bottom part of curve”). The identification is bolstered by the fact that this verse has a historia (from Didymus, interestingly) attached to it in the D-scholia. As for the preceding historia, terminated in lines 1–3: if it was the same with the papyrus as it is with the D-scholia, the ending will have been παρα Ερωτοςθενει, with


² Schubert proposes τόμοι χ (for “bk.22”) at fr.7.2, but τόμοι would be anomalous; της ραφωδίωσ, perhaps? At fr.11.8 we have the beginning of the bk.24 heading, τι[ε], the trace being described as “perhaps the right part of an α, prolonged by a tail-like curving stroke”: τ[ης ρ[αφωδίωσ ω? Or just της χ in fr. 7 and τ[ης ω in fr. 11? PSI 1173 offers οδ[ομετος μ, PSI 1000 (ostracon) της ν.
reference to a multiple catasterism attached to II. 22.29 (the beginning of this historia is very probably to be recognized at fr. 7, see below); but that must remain unconfirmed pending further placements.

Fr. 3. Lines 2ff., as Schubert recognizes, have the beginning of the historia attached to II. 20.403–404. So line 1 will be the end of the preceding historia, or rather the standard terminal reference to its source. What remains is ὅ – not much, but enough to give assurance that the papyrus text did not here (as it does in bk.18) have a historia not preserved by the D-scholia. The preceding historia in the D-scholia, attached to v. 307, is παρὰ Ἀκούσιλάω: which forcibly suggests η δ ἱστορία παρὰ αὐξ[ίλαω for the papyrus (the trace after ὅ is described as a “low speck”, and it looks very good for c on the plate).

Incidentally, the lemma of line 2 fixes the position of the line beginnings (in this manuscript the lemmas are not put in ecthesis), and the divisions of the succeeding lines should be adjusted accordingly.

Frr. 5–6. At fr. 5.14–15 we have, as Schubert recognizes, a quotation, ὧρησες μὲν πρῶτον ἐπιμένετο | καὶ κυνάς ἀργοὺς – II. 1.50 – just as in the corresponding version in the D-scholia. What follows, transcribed as 15 ἐπεξεργάζεται, 16 ἔφη, is evidently a continuation of the quote: σορταρ εἰς ἔφη[τ] οὔπω ἐπεξεργάζεται τὸν βελὸς εἰς ἐπεξεργάζεται ἐφείσε. And fr. 6.1, transcribed ἡ[ν][β] | ἔφη, evidently joins fr. 5.16, to give us ἐφείσε βαζὴλ(ε), the appropriate point for the quotation to end. (It is not clear from the plate that βαζ is cancelled; if it is, the scribe must have decided to commence the word on the next line instead.)

Incidentally, it looks as if the entry begins at i 5, to be restored φοὺβε σῦ ἐν ἀκλόδης εἰς Ἰκανὸς βίου (II. 21.448). Then 6 τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα νῦν ὅμων ὑ[ν]ιοῦ ὑ[κ]ρα[θα]?

Fr. 7. Schubert tentatively recognizes the heading of bk.22 (cf. n.2 above) in line 2, but notes an impediment: the first historia of bk.22 in the D-scholia is attached to v. 29, ὅν τε κὺν’ Ὄριονος, but (Schubert says) the remains in the papyrus do not accord with that. It seems to me that they do. They are transcribed as ἡ ὅ. May we not read ὅν τε κὺν’ ω[ν] ὑποτευο[ν]ος? This reading looks good on the plate (Plate V), and the spelling -εινος rather than -νος would be in accordance with expectation (cf. e.g. fr. 10.15 ἔφεισενος).

Fr. 61.1 ἡ[δ][, 2 vac. [, 3 ] ἄκα[ν]: clearly the ending of one historia and the beginning of the next. We should not take the space as indicating a junction between one book of Homer and the next, as Schubert suggests, for η δ ἱστορία παρὰ X could well spill over to occupy the earlier part of line 2. So line 3 will indeed be a lemma, but not necessarily of the earliest verse of a book to have a historia attached to it. The D-scholia offer a historia at II. 23.141, κτὼς ἀπάνευθε πυρῆς ξονθὴν ἀπεκείρατο χαίτην: which invites us to recognize κτὼς αἰ[πανευθῆ (the initial trace is described as a “high trace”). If that is right, however, a historia not represented in the D-scholia must have intervened in the papyrus text between the historiarias at 23.92, represented by fr. 8, and 23.141, for fr. 8.10–12 and fr. 61 (on the
assumption of 3 lcπακ) are mutually incompatible. There would be nothing too surprising about that, but it does mean that the proposed placement lacks confirmation.

Fr. 41.3 ]ακα[, 4 ] vac. [: again, the end of a historia: surely η δ ιτορια παρ]α κα[-, probably Callimachus. Il. 17.54 and 18.487 (cf. fr. 2) are prima facie possibilities; upgrading from possibility must await further placements.

I append some smaller notes.

Fr. 1.15 Ηλε]κτρεν? In light of Μεροπη and the probable Αλκωνην in the previous line, it looks as if all seven daughters were named.

Fr. 2.13 κοτητητετιτεν very doubtful.

Fr. 4. If κέραζ[α may be read for θφή] in 2, Schubert’s identification with the historia attached to Il. 21.194 is strengthened. But the identification seems rather insecure.

Fr. 6.4 (-ερφο[μ]ένα.

Fr. 10 The lineation needs adjustment. We have the beginnings of lines 14–18, 11/12 and 12/13 evidently divided at διον and ιππον]οι, 9/10 Θεττα[λικα.

It is notable that in the papyrus’ version the whole account is in oratio obliqua. Introduced by φαιν at the outset (13)?

Schubert most acutely recognizes Τιλ[φω]ειτη πε[αντον παρα]μεταξυ[οικοι]ειτη αν]αι, before της Έρεινυος – the D-scholia have only Έρεινυος –, comparing Callimachus fr. 652, in kindred context (. . . Έρεινυ Τιλφωκαεη). The spelling Τιλφω- rather than Θελπον- is Boeotian, but historians used Τιλφωκαεη (Pfeiffer on Call. l.c.), and evidently this spelling was standard in such developed applications of the adjective (neither the plate nor Schubert’s description of the traces inspires confidence in τιλ, but θελ does seem excluded). In the historia at least it is clearly used as a name (Callimachus is more equivocal); and the papyrus gives no warrant for making the equation with Demeter, adopted by Schubert.

Fr. 11.4 τιςαίωθε [ suggests -τιςαί· οθεν: aetiological, as often in the conclusion of these historias. Since it is hard to accommodate the remains to the historia at Il. 23.660 (or to that at 821), it does look as if this is a historia not preserved in the D-scholia, as Schubert suggests. But if it is true to form it will not be explaining the word ζώηα but giving some only tangentially related story. It may or may not have been hung from verse 683. 3 ζω[α] could itself be e. g. περιζωα.

Fr. 18.10 ωφυρα-, whether ωφυρα or σφυρον (cf. Il. 22.397?).

Fr. 20.4 περι πυκτικης? ad Il. 23.660? 2 εβιταζετο?

Fr. 50.3 Ορ η δ ιτορια παρα]α η[- or Π[-.
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