

MICHAEL HASLAM

ON P. OXY. LXI 4096, MYTHOGRAPHUS HOMERICUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 110 (1996) 115–117

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

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 Καλλικολώνη, attached to *Il.* 20.53. The beginning will be:

.
 >— [
 vac. [
 ἀλλ[οτε παρ τιμοεντι θεων επι
 κα[λλικολωνη (*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 fr. 7 and 11.² There is no *historia* attached to this verse in the D-scholia, but there is one attached to verse 3, Τρῶες δ' ἀὖθ' ἑτέρωθεν ἐπὶ θρωακῶι πεδίοιο, and since that concerns the name Καλλικολώνη, 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 ιλιω or ιλιε[ων, 9 κω]μη[ε, 10 ci]μο[υντος 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, οὐ μὲν πῶς νῦν ἔστιν ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης. To judge from the plate (plate VI), the fragment has line ends. Schubert transcribes 2 ἢ δ' ἵετ]ορία π[αρά, but his π[looks to me like a filler sign (cf. fr. 2.7–8). παρὰ 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 πως νυν εστιν 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 παρὰ Ἐρατοκθένει, with

¹ For general comments and major bibliography on the Mythographus Homericus, see *BASP* 27 (1990) 31–36. Now add F. Montanari in *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*, ed. J. G. J. Abbenes et al., 135–172 (but I hold to the view expressed in art. cit. n. 2).

² Schubert proposes τόμο]ε χ (for “bk.22”) at fr.7.2, but τόμος would be anomalous; τῆε ῥαψωδία]ε, perhaps? At fr.11.8 we have the beginning of the bk.24 heading, τ[...] [, the trace being described as “perhaps the right part of an α, prolonged by a tail-like curving stroke”: τ[ῆε ῥ]αψ[ωδίαε ω? Or just τῆ]ε χ in fr. 7 and τ[ῆε] ω in fr. 11? PSI 1173 offers οδ(υκκειαε) μ, *PSI* 1000 (ostrakon)]... της ν.

reference to a multiple catasterism attached to *Il.* 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 *Il.* 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]ου [– 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 Ἀκουσιλάφ: which forcibly suggests η δ ιστορια παρα ακ]ουζ[ιλαω for the papyrus (the trace after ου 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.

Fr. 5–6. At fr. 5.14–15 we have, as Schubert recognizes, a quotation, ουρηαc μεν πρω]τον [επ]ωχετο [και κυναc αργουc – *Il.* 1.50 – just as in the corresponding version in the D-scholia. What follows, transcribed as 15] ε εταυ, 16]φ [, is evidently a continuation of the quote: αυτ]αρ επε[ι]τ αυ[ι]τοιcι βελoc εχεπευκεc ε]φι[ειc. And fr. 6.1, transcribed]ηc[β]], evidently joins fr. 5.16, to give us ε]φιcιc βα[λλ(ε), the appropriate point for the quotation to end. (It is not clear from the plate that βα 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 φοιβε cυ δ ειλιποδ]αc ελ[ικα]c β[ουc (*Il.* 21.448). Then 6 τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα νό]μιον ὄν[ομ]άζ[ει]cθαι?

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, ὄν τε κόν' Ὠρίωνoc, but (Schubert says) the remains in the papyrus do not accord with that. It seems to me that they do. They are transcribed as] ηω [. May we not read ον τε κον' ω]ρειων[oc? This reading looks good on the plate (Plate V), and the spelling -ει- rather than -ι- would be in accordance with expectation (cf. e.g. fr. 10.15 ερεινωc).

Fr. 61.1]ηδ[, 2] vac. [, 3] αcα[: 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 [ιστορια παρα 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 *Il.* 23.141, cταc ἀπάνευθε πυρηc ξανθην ἀπεκείρατο χαίτην: which invites us to recognize c]ταc α[πανευθε (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 *historiai* at 23.92, represented by fr. 8, and 23.141, for fr. 8.10–12 and fr. 61 (on the

assumption of 3]ακα[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 ιστορια 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]κτρων? In light of Μεροπη[ν and the probable Αλκυο]νην in the previous line, it looks as if all seven daughters were named.

17 τη]ς μητρ]ος.

Fr. 2.13 κατ]ητέριεν very doubtful.

Fr. 4. If κέρα]ς may be read for ερδ] in 2, Schubert's identification with the *historia* attached to *Il.* 21.194 is strengthened. But the identification seems rather insecure.

Fr. 6.4 (-)ἐρρω]μένα.

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]ος, 9/10 Θετ]αλικά.

It is notable that in the papyrus' version the whole account is in *oratio obliqua*. Introduced by φ]ασι at the outset (13)?

Schubert most acutely recognizes Τιλ]φω]λαιης (corrected from -αιης) before τῆς Ἐρεινύος – the D-scholia have only Ἐριννύος –, comparing Callimachus fr. 652, in kindred context (. . . Ἐρινύι Τιλφωαίῃ). The spelling Τιλφω- rather than Θελπου- is Boeotian, but historians used Τιλφώλαιον (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 τη]αίοθε [suggests -τῆσαι· ὄθεν: aetiological, as often in the conclusion of these *historiai*. 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 ζῶμα but giving some only tangentially related story. It may or may not have been hung from verse 683. 3]ζωμα could itself be e. g. περι]ζωμα.

Fr. 18.10 ρ]α, whether ρ]α or σφύρον (cf. *Il.* 22.397?).

Fr. 20.4 περι]πυκτικ]ης? ad *Il.* 23.660? 2 εβ]αζετο?

Fr. 50.3 Ο]ρ η δ ιστορια παρ]α Γ]α- or Π]α-.