

A. S. HOLLIS

‘APULEIUS’ DE ORTHOGRAPHIA, CALLIMACHUS FR. [815] PF. AND  
EUPHORION 166 MEINEKE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 92 (1992) 109–114

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



'APULEIUS' DE ORTHOGRAPHIA, CALLIMACHUS FR. [815] PF.  
AND EUPHORION 166 MEINEKE

- (a) 'Aesacus habet  $\bar{a}\bar{e}$  diphthongum, pater Priami auctoribus Callimacho, Porphyrio,  
Nasone eiusque interprete'

(Callimachus fr. [815] Pf.).

Pfeiffer placed this firmly among his Spuria because of the ill repute of the sponsor, 'Apuleius' de Orthographia, commenting 'Falsum istum "Apuleium" opus esse impostoris Caelii Rhodigini<sup>1</sup> post Madvig (1829) in Opusc. acad. I (1843) p. 1 sqq ..... satis superque demonstravit O.Crusius Philol 47 (1889) 434; frustra oblocutus est S.Reinach, Rev.phil. 30 (1906), 276 sqq.'<sup>2</sup> Obviously he felt that appearance in 'Apuleius' de Orthographia (and nowhere else) was a reason for automatic disqualification, and that there was little need to consider the contents of the item. Yet the subject-matter is quite plausible in itself, provided that one views 'pater' as a simple mistake (of a not uncommon type) for 'filius'.<sup>3</sup> 'Nasone eiusque interprete' would then fall into place as Ovid. Met. 11, 749ff. and 'Lactantius Placidus' bk. XI, fab. 11.<sup>4</sup> The reference to Porphyrius is more intriguing; he could quite well be the neo-Platonist, whether in a lost part of his 'Ὀμηρικά ζητήματα',<sup>5</sup> or (very suitably) in the lost *Περὶ τῶν παραλελειμμένων τῶι ποιητῆι ὀνομάτων*. This latter work certainly contained comparable material: the identity of Priam's mother, the name of the herdsman who nurtured Paris, and a list of the poets (including Alexander of Aetolia, Euphorion and Lycophron) who made Hector a son of Apollo.<sup>6</sup> 'auctoribus Callimacho, Porphyrio' could mean that Porphyrius cited Callimachus as having mentioned Aesacus and his parentage. One might wonder whether a forger c. 1500 would be capable of such

<sup>1</sup> I.e. Lodovico Ricchieri of Rovigo, in Latin Ludovicus Caelius Rhodiginus, Professor at Ferrara A.D. 1508-1512.

<sup>2</sup> Lloyd-Jones and Parsons in *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (1983), 315, commenting on Parthenius, SH 665 (from 'Apuleius' fr. 64, which merely says 'Parthenius aliter' at the end of a section on the myth of Pasiphae, Theseus, Phaedra and Hippolytus) are more cautious. After noting Crusius' view 'omnia ipsum Caelium excogitasse Apuleiique nomen subdidisse', and the defence of Reinach, they add 'quae utcumque se habent, strenuissime dubitandum videtur utrum inter tot tantasque ineptias sanioris aliquid et antiquioris notae conservatum sit'. Indeed this reference to Parthenius is unimpressive, since nothing is said about the nature of his divergent version.

<sup>3</sup> Schneider (on his Call. fr.545<sup>a</sup>), while noting the untrustworthiness of 'Apuleius', considered emending 'pater' to 'patris', which would produce the same result; or we could read 'natus' as in n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> 'Aesacus natus Priami', p. 695 in H.Magnus' edition of the *Metamorphoses* (1914). Later I shall suggest that some of the material in 'Apuleius' may come from an ancient commentary on the *Metamorphoses* which was much more detailed than the surviving 'Lactantius'.

<sup>5</sup> The source of Call. fr. 383, 9-10 (= SH 254, 9-10), of fr. 427 (from the prose *Περὶ ὀρνέων*) and of a comment on the subject matter of fr. 588, 1. So I should modify what I said in ZPE 89, 1991, 28 n. 8 about Porphyrius' lack of interest in Hellenistic poetry.

<sup>6</sup> See H.Schrader, *Hermes* 14, 1879, 241.

recondite erudition. That Callimachus should have been interested in Priam's prophetic son whose warning about Hecuba's offspring was neglected is entirely reasonable; Aesacus appears also in Lycophron's *Alexandra* (224) and in Euphorion (fr. 55 Powell, cf. *Suppl Hell* 453 on Munippus whom Priam killed instead of Paris).

(b) 'Azania est pars Arcadiae, ubi natum Iovem tradit Euphorion'.

This is Euphorion 166 in A.Meineke, *Analecta Alexandrina* (1843), 159-161. You will not find the testimonium in Powell's *Collectanea Alexandrina* or in Van Groningen's edition of Euphorion (1977).<sup>7</sup> The item has long troubled me, since it is substantial and, to my mind, extraordinarily plausible. What particularly appeals is the intricate relationship which it suggests between Euphorion and Callimachus (hymn 1) - something which, in general, we can appreciate with increasing clarity nowadays after a century of papyrological discoveries, but would not easily have been apparent to a forger in the period when Politian was making his first tentative steps towards recovering the fragmentary poems of Callimachus<sup>8</sup> (the fragments of Euphorion were always much more obscure). One could make this testimonium cohere with an undoubted fragment of Euphorion (170 Powell), and even see a possible reflection of it in a learned Latin poet (Stattius).

If there is a chance that Euph. 166 Meineke could be genuine, perhaps we should start by considering what form of the name 'Azania' Euphorion might have employed. The second α in Ἀζανία (from Ἀζάν, Ionic Ἀζήν) is long;<sup>9</sup> Ἀζᾶνιή or Ἀζηνιή could be accommodated in dactylic verse through correction (in the nominative and dative cases) or synzesis. But, as Mr. W.S.Barrett remarked to me, it would be unreasonable to demand that the Latin commentator should reproduce exactly what was in Euphorion; the commentator's primary concern may be that, according to Euphorion, Zeus was born in part of Arcadia, and not in Crete. The Greek poet could have written Ἀζανίς (very close to Call., hymn 1, 20 Ἀζηνίς) or a phrase, 'the land of the Azanes' (e.g. Ἀζάνων .... γαῖα), 'the Azanian land' (e.g. Ἀζανίδα<sup>10</sup> γαῖαν) vel sim..

That Zeus was born in Arcadia rather than Crete was of course very much a minority opinion, not at present attested before Callimachus, hymn 1; there Call. has a composite version in which Zeus is born in Arcadia but quickly transferred to Crete (42ff.). Ἀζανία as part of Arcadia is mentioned by Steph. Byz., who explains that Azania itself was divided into three parts, one of them being Parrhasia. So there need be no conflict between Call. hymn 1, 10 ἐν δέ γε Παρρασίη Πείη τέκεν and what is asserted for Euphorion; the former

<sup>7</sup> L.A. de Cuenca, *Euforión de Calcis* (1976), 323-324, prints Euph. 166 Meineke as dub. 3.1, quoting the words of F.Scheidweiler in his 1908 edition, p. 89, 'neque eis, quae Apuleius, quem dicunt, falsarius .... Euphorioni supposuit, locum dedi'.

<sup>8</sup> See Annette Harder, *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 9, 1989 = *Res Publica Litterarum* 12, 1989, 77-83.

<sup>9</sup> The Ἀζᾶνες are now attested in Callimachus (SH 276, 11 Ἀζάνων δαίτα παλαιότητην); cf. hymn 3, 235 οὔρεα .... Ἀζήνια.

<sup>10</sup> In H.H.Apollo 209 Ἀζανίδα [Martin] κούρην is quite a well-regarded conjecture.

would be using a more restricted term, the latter a wider one.<sup>11</sup> Lest anyone should think that Euphorion's Azania was suggested to a forger by Call. hymn 1, 20, it is important to remember that in A.D. 1500 nobody would have found Ἀζηνίς in the text of Callimachus. All his manuscripts read at this point Ἀρκαδίη, which stood in published editions as late as Wilamowitz<sup>4</sup> (1925). Ἀζηνίς had to be recovered from the scholia to Dionysius Periegetes 415; even there it does not shine out, since only μέλλεν δὲ μάλ' εὐδροσ καλέεσθαι is quoted continuously (no doubt the reason why Ἀζηνίς eluded recapture for so long).

After washing and wrapping her infant, Rhea in Callimachus (33ff.) hands Zeus over to the nymph Νέδη, and, as a reward for her care, calls an Arcadian river Νέδη after her. Steph. Byz. s.v. Νέδη writes πόλις Ἀρκαδίας, ἀπὸ νύμφης Νέδης· Εὐφορίων δὲ [fr. 170 Powell] Νεδέην αὐτήν φησι. Nothing is said about the context in Euphorion; on the other hand the nymph Νέδη was famous only for her nursing of the infant Zeus. So, if Euphorion 166 Meineke were genuine, one would be tempted to link it with fr. 170 Powell. Meineke (Analecta Alexandrina p. 139, on his Euph. 119 = 170 Powell) approved the change of πόλις to ποταμός, since we do not hear of a town called Νέδη elsewhere. But poets are often cavalier about such matters,<sup>12</sup> and so, if the πόλις comes from Euphorion (this is not clear), I would be inclined to let it stand in the text of Steph. Byz.

Finally, in Callimachus the Cretan Couretes dance and clash their arms so that Cronos should not hear the infant cries of Zeus (hymn 1, 52-54). Very much more speculatively I wonder whether Euphorion had a counterpart to this scene, but set still in Arcadia rather than Crete. In a most learned catalogue of Arcadians Statius writes (Theb. 4, 292):

venit et Idaeis ululatus aemulus Azan

This is the only occurrence of 'Azan' (or related words) in Latin poetry; could it be inspired by Euphorion's Azania? Although the purpose of the 'ululatus' is not stated, 'Idaeis ..... aemulus' naturally makes one think that they have the same intention as the war-dances of the Cretan Couretes, and so Statius' scholiast understood the phrase.<sup>13</sup> These words could even suggest literary polemic of a Callimachean type ('the drowning of Zeus' cries took place not in Crete, as others have stated, but in Azania').

Bringing the above points together, we may adumbrate a passage (not necessarily long) in Euphorion which had the following similarities to, and differences from, Callimachus' First Hymn. In both poets Zeus is born in Arcadia rather than Crete; to describe the region of his birth Callimachus used a more circumscribed term (Parrhasia), Euphorion a wider one (Azania, ? Ἀζανίς) which, in its form, may deliberately vary Callimachus' Ἀζηνίς (20). In both poets the nymph Νέδη receives the infant - but, again, Euphorion varies her name to Νεδέη. Both poets reward her for her care, Callimachus by naming a river, Euphorion

<sup>11</sup> Likewise in Call. hymn 1, it seems that ἄρακα | Ἀζηνίς (19-20) includes Parrhasia.

<sup>12</sup> In SH 430, 31-32 Euphorion, by referring to a river Neris, embarrasses a commentator who has to admit that he knows of no such river. Cf. on Callimachus, Hecale fr. 175 inc sed Hollis (fr. 684 Pf.).

<sup>13</sup> ad loc. on Azan, 'apud Arcades Curetes hoc nomen habent, de monte Azanio'.

(perhaps) a town, after her. In Callimachus Zeus is immediately transferred to Crete, where the Couretes by their war-dances ensure that Cronos does not hear the infant's crying; in Euphorion perhaps he stays longer in Arcadia, and the local people raise 'ululatus' to protect him.

The above examples of imitation combined with variation would be characteristic of Euphorion's approach to Callimachus, as we can see from the papyrus discoveries of the past century.<sup>14</sup> Could a forger c. A.D. 1500 have appreciated this? If he knew about Euphorion on Νεδέη (fr. 170 Powell) and hoped that this would give colour to his fabrication on Azania, he was an uncommonly erudite forger. He must in any case have been very lucky, since he could hardly know the correct reading Ἀζηνίς in Call. hymn 1, 20, which was not disinterred from the scholia to Dionysius Periegetes until the twentieth century. The alternative is to believe that, from whatever sources (we shall return to this), 'Apuleius' has preserved a genuine testimony to Euphorion which has not survived elsewhere; I confess that I find this alternative less implausible.<sup>15</sup>

Having made a *prima facie* case for the authenticity of Callimachus fr. [815] Pfeiffer and Euphorion 166 Meineke, I must now face up to the general nature of 'Apuleius' de Orthographia. A large element of deliberate fiction seems undeniable; this mainly involves Latin poets mentioned in Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 4, 16 and in Quintilian's survey of Roman poetry (10, 1, 85ff.).<sup>16</sup> As a result the whole has an air of demented fantasy, reminiscent of the scholia to Ovid's *Ibis* (though lacking such a profusion of spurious verses).<sup>17</sup> But even the forger of a literary work<sup>18</sup> need not invent the complete contents out of his own head; indeed he would do better to interweave older and genuine material among his own fabrications. To view the matter from a different angle, the work of an honest scholar who had access to rare sources could have been expanded by a forger to produce a curious hybrid. We have seen two items in 'Apuleius' which are certainly 'sanioris' and arguably 'antiquioris notae' (to quote the editors on SH 665); there are plenty more, several of which breathe the world of learned mythological poetry. For example, the account of Rhoeo,<sup>19</sup> mother of Anius, in fr.

<sup>14</sup> Some examples, relating to Callimachus' *Hecale*, are discussed in my edition of that poem, 1990, 28-29.

<sup>15</sup> At the least, Euphorion 166 Meineke surely has a stronger claim to be taken seriously than Parthenius, SH 665.

<sup>16</sup> Tantalizing delicacies such as 'Ovidius in *Medea*', 'Cornelius Severus in *Bello Siculo*' are dangled before us and then withdrawn.

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion of a spurious fragment of Ennius (spur. xiv in O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, 1985) given by 'Apuleius', see O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana*, 1968, 41ff. Even the *Ibis* scholia have some genuine material among the shameless fabrications, as was demonstrated by the recovery of *Diegeses* to Callimachus' *Aetia* (cf. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* vol II, 1953, 136 *Index Rerum Notabilium* s.v. *Ovid. Ibis*).

<sup>18</sup> Whether, in this case, Caelius Rhodiginus or (as I would guess) an unknown, somewhat older, figure. R. Ellis in his edition of the *Ibis*, 1881, *Praefatio* p. vii wrote of 'Apuleius', 'fragmenta ista ante finem saec. xv conflata crediderim'.

<sup>19</sup> R. Merkel, *Prolus. ad Ov. Ibin* believed that Caelius Rhodiginus had used as sources for his fabrication two works by Iacobus Constantius Fanensis, viz. *Collectaneorum Hecatostys Prima* (1507) and *In Ibin*

4. Anius and his family were treated by Callimachus (fr. 188), Lycophron (Alexandra 570ff.) and Euphorion (fr. 2) as well as by Virgil and Ovid.

It may be possible to suggest an origin for such material which might cover both Call. fr. [815] and Euph. 165 Meineke. Several entries in 'Apuleius' seem designed to explain obscurities in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. F.Bömer's Commentary has no enlightenment to offer on Met. 6, 125 'Liber ut Erigonen falsa deceperit uva', but the context virtually demands that Bacchus should have made love to Erigone, daughter of Icarius, by a trick.<sup>20</sup> In 'Apuleius' fr. 12 we read of Staphylus 'fuit filius Bacchi .... vel ex Erigone Icarii filia'. Surely an attempt to explain Met. 6, 125.<sup>21</sup> Just as obviously 'Apuleius' fr. 52 'Isse filia Macarei ..... cuius amore pavit armenta in Arcadia Apollo'<sup>22</sup> is directed at the otherwise inexplicable Met. 6, 124<sup>23</sup> (of Apollo) 'ut pastor Macareida luserit Issen'. Although Issa is elsewhere connected with Lesbos,<sup>24</sup> there was indeed an Arcadian Macareus.<sup>25</sup> So far so good; at this point fantasy takes over, 'Ovidius ait mandato Iovis id factum; quo tempore Mercurius ex Pierio agro boves illi rapuit ....'

These explanations may, of course, be not what Ovid intended. But I suspect that they are much older than A.D. 1500. It seems likely that in late antiquity there was a detailed and learned commentary which accompanied the text of the *Metamorphoses*;<sup>26</sup> our surviving *Argumenta* or *Narrationes* of the so-called Lactantius Placidus may sometimes reflect it,

---

Ovidii Sarritiones (1508). Ellis, Ovidii Nasonis Ibis, 1881, Praef. vii, rightly rejected this view. The work of 'Apuleius' and Const.Fan. have much in common (particularly their interest in Ovid's *Ibis* and *Metamorphoses*); Const.Fan. has a discussion of the birth-place of Zeus (Hecat. xlii), but with nothing about Azania or Euphorion. In the case of Rhoeo, note that 'Apuleius' gets her name right, whereas Const.Fan. calls her Rhea (Hecat. vi). A remark by Const.Fan. in his Ovidii *Metamorphoses Assumenta* on Met. 7, 383 'Ophias effugit natorum vulnera Combe', 'Qui "Iambe" legunt an recte legant ipsi viderint' looks like a comment on a fragment of 'Apuleius' which has not come down to us in the *de Orthographia*, but was discussed by Caelius Rhodiginus in his *Antiquarum Lectionum Commentarii*, Venice, 1516, xix, 10; see S.Reinach, *Revue de Philologie* 30, 1906, 280. So I suspect that Const.Fan. draws on 'Apuleius' rather than vice versa. See further n. 21.

<sup>20</sup> This does not fit easily with what we know of Eratosthenes' Erigone, in which the girl hangs herself after her father's death.

<sup>21</sup> Even more clearly in Const.Fan. Hecat. vi '.... vel, ut aliis placet [a reference to 'Apuleius' ?] ex Erigone Icari filia in uvae speciem ad hoc deo mutato compressa legitur. Ovidius sexto *Metamorphoseon* "Liber ut Erigonen falsa deceperit uva". unde eorum filio nomen impositum Staphylus'.

<sup>22</sup> The resemblance to the myth of Apollo and Admetus is apparent.

<sup>23</sup> Note that this immediately precedes the line on Erigone, discussed above. Could someone at some time have been quarrying a detailed commentary on Met. 6? This time there is no parallel in Const.Fan.

<sup>24</sup> e.g. in Parthenius, SH 631.

<sup>25</sup> Pausanias 8, 3, 2, founder of Macaria.

<sup>26</sup> Brooks Otis, HSCP 47, 1936, 140. In his list of places where 'Lactantius' goes beyond what is found in the text of Ovid, Otis omits the example of Misme (Liber V, fab. 5, p. 655 Magnus), who is anonymous in Met. 5, 449 but given this name by 'Lactantius' (presumably from the Heteroeumena of Nicander, fr. 56). On the other hand, the naming by 'Lactantius' (p. 656 Magnus) of Misme's son as 'Steles' looks like a misunderstanding of the text of Ovid (in Nicander he was Ascalabus).

quoting a recondite source, e.g. 'Phanocles in Cupidinibus',<sup>27</sup> or even (as a parallel) a Latin hexameter fragment of unknown authorship.<sup>28</sup> It does not seem inconceivable that a few tit-bits from such a commentary could have ended up in 'Apuleius' *de Orthographia*. So I wonder whether the entirely sober reference to Zeus' Arcadian birth in Euphorion 166 Meineke could derive from a detailed commentary on *Met.* 2, 405-406 'Arcadiae ....| ...suae'. There is perhaps just enough in the surviving 'Lactantius' to give colour to this idea (*Lib. II, fab. 6, p. 638 Magnus*):

Iuppiter .... cum circa Nonacrinum montem Arcadiae, *in quo*<sup>29</sup> *genitus existimatur,*  
vagaretur ....

The unusual learning of the commentator would be shown by his citation of Euphorion, rather than Callimachus' First Hymn, as an authority for Zeus' Arcadian birth.<sup>30</sup>

Oxford

A.S.Hollis<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> fr. 6 Powell, our only evidence that Phanocles treated the myth of Cygnus and Phaethon.

<sup>28</sup> Morel, *FPL* p. 173, incert. 10.

<sup>29</sup> Of course Ovid does not specify that Jupiter was born on this mountain.

<sup>30</sup> For another sign, which has survived outside 'Lactantius', of ancient research into the *Metamorphoses*' more recondite models, cf. 'Probus' on Virgil, *Georgics* 1, 399 *dilectae Thetidi alcyones*] *'varia est opinio harum volucrum originis. itaque in altera sequitur Ovidius Nicandrum, in altera Theodorum.'* As Gow and Scholfield observe (*Nicander*, 1953, 208), this should mean that the fuller version in *Met.* 11, 410ff. comes from Nicander's *Heteroeumena* (fr. 64), and the passing allusion in *Met.* 7, 401 from the *Metamorphoses* of Theodorus (SH 750).

<sup>31</sup> Professor M.D.Reeve kindly drew my attention to two recent works by Anthony Grafton: his book *Forgers and Critics* (1990), and his essay on the forger Annius of Viterbo in Anthony Grafton and Ann Blair (edd.), *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 1990, 8-38. While neither work mentions 'Apuleius' *de Orthographia*, the essay in particular illustrates the flourishing industry of fabrication in this period. But I am left with even stronger doubts as to whether such a forger would have been capable of producing Euphorion 166 Meineke.