

LUIGI LEHNUS

P. MAAS AND THE CRUX IN CALLIMACHUS' HYMN TO DELOS 41

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 131 (2000) 25–26

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

P. MAAS AND THE CRUX IN CALLIMACHUS' HYMN TO DELOS 41

Some twenty years ago H. Lloyd-Jones published a note by Paul Maas giving what still seems to be the best solution for the crux in Callimachus' Hymn to Delos v. 1.¹

Otherwise, that in a life-long career as a Callimachean scholar Maas would let untouched the further corruption at v. 41 in the same hymn

πολλάκι σε Τροιζήνιος ἀπὸ †ξάνθοιο πολίχνης

was scarcely believable.

In fact, at least three editions of Callimachus' hymns annotated by Maas survive. In the first one, that is the Schneideriana of 1870,² he has nothing to say on the point. In the second one, which is a copy of Wilamowitz³ 1907, he simply records what was to be Wilamowitz' final choice of⁴ 1924, i. e. Meineke's conjecture ζαθέοιο.³ Before we move on to the third one, a few words may be devoted to the textual problem itself.

As Ψ's reading with the accent on α denotes a nomen proprium (see Pfeiffer's apparatus), solutions involving 'fair-haired Troezen' are excluded.⁴ There is indeed the commendable ἀπέξ ἼΑνθαο (vel ἼΑνθοιο) by Schneider⁵ – but it happened to be ignored both by Wilamowitz, who had committed himself to flava Troezen,⁶ and (after Wilamowitz?) by Pfeiffer: ἀπέξ seemed awkward and, despite Call. fr. 703 Pf., Anthes never was the founder of Troezen.⁷ But was the Wilamowitz–Pfeiffer damnatio justified?

Two close friends of Paul Maas openly protested against it. E. A. Barber writes: «At iv. 41 ἀπέξ ἼΑνθαο (Schneider) certainly deserves mention (cf. fr. 703) even though ἀπέκ is a dubious form»;⁸ more explicitly C. A. Trypanis observed that «This [ἀπέξ] incidentally points to the fact that Callimachus must have known the version of the Homeric hymn to Apollo which has in line 110 ἀπέκ».⁹

My own attention was attracted to this passage while reading with members of the classical seminar in Milan that segment of the new Salmakis elegy¹⁰ where, according to the necessary supplement already suggested by Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones,

ἼΑνθης τ' ἐκ Τροιζήνιος ἰὼν Ποσιδ[ί]ωνιος υἱός
ῶικι]εν ἼΑνθεάδας

(vv. 31–32).¹¹ Not only did Anthes «come from Troezen» (to Halikarnassos) as Steph. Byz. s. v. ἸΑλικαρνασσός reports as having been said by Callimachus (fr. 703 Pf.), but the wording itself in

¹ Τὴν ἱερὴν, ᾧ θυμέ, τίνα χρόνον εἰπὸν ἀτίττεις, cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, *Kallimachos, Hy. 4.1*, *Hermes* 110, 1982, 118.

² Private possession of the writer.

³ See below note 15.

⁴ See for instance A. W. Mair's Loeb translation, and cf. general discussions in Mineur and Gigante Lanzara ad loc.

⁵ O. Schneider defended this in a long and sensible excursus in his *Callimachea*, I, Lipsiae 1870, 263–65.

⁶ *Parerga* 9, *Hermes* 14, 1879, 166 = *KS IV*, Berlin 1962, 3–4.

⁷ Cf. G. Giangrande, *Zwei kallimacheische Probleme*, *Hermes* 94, 1966, 427.

⁸ *CR NS* 4, 1954, 229.

⁹ Ψ, rejected by Allen but accepted by Càssola. Cf. C. A. Trypanis, *JHS* 74, 1954, 203.

¹⁰ Ed. S. Isager, *The Pride of Halikarnassos*, *ZPE* 123, 1998, 1ff. = R. Merkelbach – J. Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, I, Leipzig 1998, 38ff.

¹¹ Cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Pride of Halikarnassos*, *ZPE* 124, 1999, 8–9 (ῶικι]εν is by C. Austin, *ZPE* 126, 1999, 92), and already ap. Isager, art. cit., 10. I am obliged to Ms. Eugenia Fantone, Milan, for first adverting me of the apparent link between the two passages.

Stephanus (Ἄνθης ἐκ Τροιζῆνος μετώκησε λαβὼν τὴν Δύμαιναν φυλὴν ὡς Καλλίμαχος) aptly overlaps with the poetical text of an author – the anonym from Salmakis – who was very apparently influenced by Callimachus.¹²

I accordingly surmise that Schneider's emendation will deserve to feature not just in the apparatus but in the text:

πολλάκι σε Τροιζῆνος ἀπέξ Ἄνθαο πολίχνης.¹³

By 1953, when Pfeiffer's second volume was issued,¹⁴ P. Maas had definitely made up his mind. The copy which belonged to him survives along with that of the third edition of Wilamowitz.¹⁵ At v. 41 Maas bluntly deletes ἀπὸ Ἰξάνθοιο and adds in margin «ἀπέξ Ἄνθοιο (scr. Ἄνθαο?) O. Schn.»;¹⁶ he even mentions Quint. Smyrn. 4.540 for use of *ἀπέκ. He subsequently jotted in red ink «so also Tryp(anis) and Barber», and one is left with a hint that there had been some collusion within the three.

Finally, one more query. Did Sir Hugh, besides considering (as he himself records) fr. 703,¹⁷ have in mind also Schneider's correction to Del. 41 when he so brilliantly supplemented line 31 of the Salmakis epigram? That would require a nearly superhuman memory. But one cannot avoid wondering.

Milan

Luigi Lehnus

¹² Comparison of vv. 5–42 with fr. 75 Pf. would repay close scrutiny.

¹³ So also M. L. Fleming, *A Commentary on Callimachus' «Fourth Hymn: To Delos»*, Diss. Univ. of Texas at Austin 1981, 68–70.

¹⁴ Callimachus, ed. R. Pfeiffer, II, Oxonii 1953.

¹⁵ Both volumes belong to the special collections of the Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità of the Università degli Studi di Milano. I should like to thank its Director, Prof. Violetta de Angelis, for owner's permission to quote freely from them.

¹⁶ Idem at p. 146 s. v. Ἄνθης.

¹⁷ See above note 11.