

ADRIAN S. HOLLIS

THREE POSSIBLE FRAGMENTS OF CALLIMACHUS' HECALE IN HESYCHIUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 117 (1997) 47–49

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THREE POSSIBLE FRAGMENTS OF CALLIMACHUS' HECALE IN HESYCHIUS

These are presented in alphabetical order, which is also an order of diminishing confidence:

(a) Hesych. α 4132 Latte, ἀμφὶ τεοῖο· περὶ σοῦ. This genitive of the pronoun is found in Iliad 8,37 = 8,468 ὀδυσσαμένοιο τεοῖο, and has proved controversial in both ancient and modern times. Leaf (on Iliad 8,37) described it as ‘a quite impossible form’; perhaps the same reason made Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus athetize 8,37.¹ G. S. Kirk, however, writes² of ὀδυσσαμένοιο τεοῖο ‘The phrase, although strange and awkward, is rhetorically forceful, and has some claim to be accepted as Homeric.’ The parallel form τεοῦ = σοῦ, though not in Homer, occurs several times elsewhere, e.g. in Antimachus of Colophon fr. 191 dub. Matthews.³ Compare the pronoun of the third person: Zenodotus championed ἐοῦ in Iliad 2,239 and 19,384; no doubt on that basis Apollonius Rhodius created ἐοῖο (1,1032 and four other occurrences). Pronouns in particular provided material for unending arguments among the docti.

It would be typical of a learned Hellenistic poet to take up the controversial Homeric rarity τεοῖο. Since the form is clearly epic, my mind turned to Callimachus' Hecale, and it seemed worth asking Dr. Dirk Obbink whether he saw any chance of restoring ἀμφὶ τεοῖο in Hecale fr. 17,1 H. = Call. fr. 238,1 Pfeiffer. My hopes were not high, since E. Lobel, in the original publication of P. Oxy. 2216,⁴ was prepared to allow αμφ...[, but added that the letter after φ was prima facie not iota (nor omicron). Dr. Obbink replied: ‘I have examined closely the papyrus in the Ashmolean Museum, and can report that the alpha and mu fit very well (virtually certain, I would say), and the iota too (contra Lobel); it descends, as is constant in this hand, below the bowl of phi, though not so low as the bottom of phi's vertical descender – a fact which, I think, misled Lobel to his conclusion “prima facie not φι..., φο..”. Sometimes iota in this hand has a broad flat bottom as in 11 νιζ, sometimes it curves off a bit at the bottom to the left, as in 11 πιον or 4 χοιο, leaving a rather more pointed than flat base; our iota would be of the latter type. Likewise the space between this putative iota and the following trace suggests a broad letter, thus good for your tau (πι would be broader), with a trace of its upright descending slightly below the line, as it does in 2 μηποτ and 12 ποτνια. There are, however, problems with the following trace, apparently the foot of an upright . . . But it may be noted that the scribe regularly makes his epsilons with a sharp curve to the right at the bottom, almost as though a serif on the base of an upright rather than as a rounded bowl. See in 2 κελευεδε especially the last epsilon. Epsilon in line 1 is compatible with the trace, even if perhaps uncomfortably close to the tau which precedes. In short, on my judgment, your reading could stand.’

Dr. Obbink also reconsidered the first traces in fr. 17,1 H. (which Lobel saw as perhaps νισπε) and is prepared to sanction].[.νισπε. Although perhaps one ought not to claim that the papyrus traces definitely confirm the restoration of ἀμφὶ τεοῖο, it seems probable enough for fr. 17,1 to be printed as follows:

].[ξ]νισπε μὲν ἀμφὶ τε[οῖο].

Let us now incorporate this new reading into fr. 17,1–4 H. and consider the implications:

¹ Zenodotus simply omitted Il. 8,37.

² The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. II, Cambridge, 1990, p. 333, on 8,468.

³ = fr. 156 Wyss = Suppl. Hell. 1002 = Call. fr. anon. 262 Schneider. In my opinion the author is more likely to be Antimachus than Callimachus.

⁴ The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. 19, London, 1948, p. 42, on fr. 1 Recto, line 1. There is a photograph of the crucial area in P. Oxy. vol. 19, plate III.

].[ἔ]νισπε μὲν ἀμφὶ τεοῖο
]κέλευε δὲ μήποτ' ἐλέγξα[ι
]νε.η δ' ὑπὸ πάντας ἀέθλου[ς
 τῶι (ῥα), πάτερ, μεθίει με·] σόον δέ κεν αἰὺθι δέχοιο.

The first half of line 4, recovered by K. Nickau from a Byzantine lexicon,⁵ reveals that the speaker is Theseus, trying to persuade his father Aegeus to let him go out against the Marathonian bull. That being so, it seems highly probable (if not quite certain)⁶ that τεοῖο⁷ in line 1 refers to Aegeus. There is, perhaps, an increasing likelihood that ἔ]νισπε and]κέλευε are indicatives⁸ rather than imperatives. Who could be the subject of these verbs? The most promising idea may be that of Gregory Hutchinson,⁹ who guessed that lines 2–3 might have run something like ‘My grandfather used to bid me never shame¹⁰ my family, but to endure all labours.’¹¹ We know that Callimachus mentioned Pittheus’ education of his grandson in Troezen (Hecale fr. 12 H. = 237 Pf.). Another possible subject for the two verbs is Theseus’ mother Aethra, who, in the usual form of the legend,¹² passes on instructions from Aegeus to her son.¹³ So the subject ‘told [no doubt ‘me’, sc. Theseus] . . . about you [sc. Aegeus]’. The first half of line 2 could have contained an object for ἔνισπε (e.g. ‘glorious things’, ‘many things’, ‘few things’, or even ‘nothing’). Conceivably, however, ἔνισπε μὲν ἀμφὶ τεοῖο stood by itself, ‘told <me> about you’. Twice in the Homeric Hymns ἐν(ν)έπω is followed by ἀμφί + accusative (19,1 Ἀμφί μοι Ἑρμείαιο φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε Μοῦσα and 33,1 Ἀμφί Διὸς κούρους ἑλικώπιδες ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι), while in Od. 8,266–267 we find αἰεῖδεν with ἀμφί + genitive = ‘to sing about’ (καλὸν αἰεῖδεν | ἀμφ’ Ἄρεος φιλόττος ἔϋστεράνου τ’ Ἀφροδίτης).¹⁴

(b) δ 412 δεδυμένη· κεκακωμένη. Another entry which has a Callimachean ring. The adjective δυερός was a variant for διερός in Odyssey 6,201.¹⁵ The noun δύη¹⁶ is relatively common in Homer, but the verb δυάω occurs uniquely in Od. 20,195; otherwise (as noted by J. Russo ad loc.) it is known solely from this gloss in Hesychius. Callimachus has δύη in Hecale fr. 131 H., δυερός in the Aetia (Suppl.

⁵ Philologus 111, 1967, 126–129, whence Suppl. Hell. 281. τῶι (ῥα) is due to Professor Kassel (Nickau had restored (νυ)).

⁶ Supposing that ἔνισπε and κέλευε were imperatives rather than indicatives, one might imagine that Theseus is passing on (verbatim) instructions to Aegeus from some other person: ‘tell him [sc. Aegeus] . . . about yourself [sc. Theseus], and bid him never to . . .’

⁷ Note that Hesychius also has an entry τεοῖο· σοῦ (τ 489 Schmidt), probably from our fragment (though conceivably from Iliad 8,37 = 8,468). I suspect that Hesych. α 4124 Latte ἀμφὶ τεοῦ· περὶ τοῦ σοῦ is not a genuinely independent citation, but manufactured from α 4132 to illustrate an alleged distinction (not of course valid) between τεοῦ from σός (τεός) and τεοῖο from σύ.

⁸ In which case ἐ]κέλευε, as in Call. fr. 75,2 and 553,2 Pf. seems at least as probable as κέλευε in line 2.

⁹ Hellenistic Poetry, Oxford, 1988, p. 62 n. 71.

¹⁰ There are several other possible meanings for ἐλέγξαι in line 2.

¹¹ The first four letters in line 3 remain baffling, and there must be a strong suspicion of scribal error.

¹² E.g. Plutarch, Theseus 6,2 (and other texts cited by Pfeiffer on his fr. 236).

¹³ In CQ N.S. 32, 1982, 470 I suggested that fr. 17,1–3 might refer to a promise of help in all his labours given to Theseus by Athena, which could be the basis of his confidence in line 4 (‘Therefore, father, let me go, and you would later receive me back safe’). That idea now seems to me rather less attractive, though ἐν(ν)έπω would suit the solemn utterance of a deity (see M. A. Harder, in Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos s.v.).

¹⁴ For ἀμφί + genitive = ‘about, concerning’ in Callimachus, cf. Hecale fr. 74,19 H. Φλεγῶα Κορωνίδος ἀμφὶ θυγατρός.

¹⁵ Whence probably Hesych. δ 2477 δυερός· ἐπίπονος, τολμηρός.

¹⁶ Cf. Hesych. δ 2479.

Hell. 257,24) and perhaps also the Hecale.¹⁷ Could he have described the heroine of his epyllion, who suffered so many disasters, as δεδουμένη?¹⁸

(c) ε 4137 ἐπ' ἄλλοδαπῆς· ἐπὶ ξένης. My reason for even thinking of Callimachus' Hecale rests on the hypothesis that this entry might be connected with the anonymous papyrus fragment Suppl. Hell. 948–949, which in ZPE 100, 1994, 17–21 I very tentatively ascribed to the Hecale.¹⁹ Two other Hesychian entries have been no less tentatively linked with the same papyrus,²⁰ which contains commentary mixed in with lemmata from what seems a high-class poem, almost certainly in hexameters (though conceivably elegiac). In SH 948,5 we find ἐπὶ ξένης as part of the commentary, precisely the explanation which Hesychius offers for ἐπ' ἄλλοδαπῆς.²¹ Given the tendency for scholiasts and lexicographers to develop standard explanations for words and phrases, it seems possible that, also in SH 948,5, ἐπὶ ξένης is meant to explain ἐπ' ἄλλοδαπῆς in the verse text.²² Two lines above (SH 948,3), the letters οἰκον, perhaps from a lemma,²³ occur; these might suggest an antithesis between 'home' and 'abroad'.²⁴

Keble College, Oxford

Adrian S. Hollis

¹⁷ See my Oxford 1990 edition, p. 359, Appendix V(b), where Suid. δυερόν· βλαβερόν, ἐπιβλαβές is suggested for the Hecale in accordance with Hecker's Law; two other occurrences of δυερός are noted there.

¹⁸ If δεδουμένη is Callimachus, a metrical point would arise. Correption of final -η (or -ηι) in the second syllable of a dactyl is apparently confined to the first foot of a Callimachean hexameter (with the restored εἰ μὴ ἐφέ]ρπει in fr. 43,62 Pf. a possible, but doubtful, exception), but in the third syllable of a dactyl it is not so restricted: e.g. in the fourth foot Hecale fr. 137 H., epigram 63,3 Pf. (but many doubt whether that poem is by Call.); in the fifth foot hymn 3,149 and 4,156. So δεδουμένη (whether ending in the fourth or the fifth foot) would be acceptable, at least in a hexameter poem. One might also feel that the vowels ε-η-ε-η in δεδουμένη demonstrate the 'accumulationem eorundem vocalium, Hecalae propriae' which Pfeiffer noted on his fr. 323 (cf. his Index Rerum Notabilium s.v. vocalium consecutio).

¹⁹ Since then the papyrus has been discussed by J. Reed in ZPE 106, 1995, 94–95, who suggests that SH 949,i,12 may have been imitated by Virgil in Aeneid 4,138–139 (the SH editors had compared other lines of Virgil and Statius).

²⁰ Lobel mentioned Hesych. μ 1471 Latte μίσχη· πιλίματα κτλ. in connexion with SH 949,i,5, and in ZPE 100, 1994, 20–21 I discussed Hesych. α 18 ἀνέξ· οὐ τελεσθησόμενον, since the letters αανεξ occur twice, in SH 948, lines 2 and 3.

²¹ It is tempting to try to strengthen the argument for Callimachus' Hecale by pointing out that Michael Choniates (probable possessor of the last complete copy of the Hecale, c. A.D. 1200) several times uses the phrase ἐπ' ἄλλοδαπῆς: in the edition of S. P. Lambros, Athens 1879–1880, vol. 1 p. 348, line 16; 2,112,26–27; 2,176,3–4 and 8 (coupled with ἐπὶ ξένης, *ibid.* line 6). But nothing else in these passages seems to suggest that Michael is making a poetic allusion. While ἄλλοδαπός is markedly poetical in earlier Greek, it occurs in Xenophon and in the prose of later antiquity (see Stephanus' Thesaurus). Michael may have regarded it as a relatively normal word.

²² This point is worth considering whether or not one believes that Hesych. ε 4137 is connected with Suppl. Hell. 948,5 (or entertains any thoughts about Callimachus' Hecale).

²³ See ZPE 100, 1994, 21 with n. 27.

²⁴ I am extremely grateful to Dr. Dirk Obbink of Christ Church, Oxford, for the minute care which he took in re-examining P. Oxy. 2216. These three Hesychian entries have been extracted from a list of more than 40 from the same source which (to me) suggest Hellenistic poetry, but which do not appear among the Fragmenta Anonyma of O. Schneider's Callimachea, vol. I, Leipzig, 1870, or the Fragmenta Incerti Auctoris of R. Pfeiffer's Callimachus, vol. I, Oxford, 1949, or the Frustula Adespota ex Auctoribus in Supplementum Hellenisticum, Berlin/New York, 1983. I hope to publish and discuss the longer list in due course.