TEUTHIS AND CALLIMACHUS, *AETIA* BOOK 1
(Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* no. 276)

1]ης ἀντὶ γεωτομίης·
Γλαύ]κωι Λυκίωι, ὅτε ciφλὸc ἐπ̣ε̣ι̣[
ἀνθ' ἑκατομβοί]ων ἐννεάβοια λαβεῖν
c]μινύην πέλεκυν μετα.[
5 . .]υροφ.[]. . δήɹκτην ἀμφοτέρωι cτόματι
ὠ]c ἀντὶ cκαπαɹνῆος ὀροιτύπος ἐργάζη[
τ]ο̣ῖ̣ον ἐπεὶ κείνɹης ὀκριόειν ἔδαφος
γ]αίης· οὔτε βάλοɹις κεν ἐνὶ cπορὸν οὔτ'ἐν[ὶ κλῆμα,
δ]οιὰ Μεθυμναίοɹυ δῶρα κυθηγενέος·
10 ἀγρ̣[ι]ά̣δας δ' οὐκ ἄλλɹο carωνίδας οὐδας ε̣ν̣ε̣[
.ωι.φορον 'Αζάνωɹι̣ν̣ δαῖτα παλαιοτάτην·
τοῦδέ κοτ' 'Αργείοιciɹν ἐc Αὐλίδα [
κοίρανος· 'Ατρείδαιcɹ δ' εἰc ἔριν ἀντι.[
ἤγειρεν μέγα νεῖɹκος, ὃ καὶ πιa[
15 εἰc ἑόν, ἀλλ' ἔcτη⟨c⟩, παῖ Διὸc ἐμ.ɹ[
[ ]
]δεν[
]νι[
]εειc[
20].ο̣υ[

A most pleasing recent advance in our knowledge of Callimachus' fragmentary poems has been the recognition that an elegiac piece, part of which appeared as *P. Oxy.* vol. 1 no. 14, belongs to him and, one presumes, to the *Aetia*. Powell (*Collectanea Alexandrina*, p. 131) already thought of Callimachus as the author, others of Nicander (hence Gow–Scholfield doubtfully included the fragment in their edition, p. 220). Evidence that the author was of some standing is provided by the fact that a scholiast on Nicander, *Theriaca* 386 (*P. Oxy.* 2221 col. II, 17–20) quoted line 4 of the fragment[1] (though the additional letters at the start of the line have defied restoration and may be corrupt).[2] Great progress came with the publication by M. Gronewald (*ZPE* 15 [1974], 105 ff.) of *P. Mich.* 4761, which preserves, almost though not quite perfectly, the beginning of lines 5–15 (underlined on the accompanying text), wherein *P. Oxy.*

[1] No other verbal citations from this fragment seem to have survived. But familiarity with the piece can be credited with varying degrees of confidence to the following poets: (*a*) perhaps Nicander (proximity of ὀροιτύποι, *Ther.* 377, to σμινύοιο, *Ther.* 386); (*b*) probably Dionysius Periegetes (998 τοιή ἐπεὶ κείνης ἄροσις πέλει); (*c*) above all Maximus περὶ καταρχῶν, in his section περὶ γεωργίας. This would be particularly clear if the supplement (Henrichs) οὔτ' ἐνὶ κλῆμα is correct in line 8. Note Maximus 459–60 ἢ γύροις ἔνι κλῆμα Μεθυμναίου λελίησαι | κατθέμεναι, 470 σμινύῃσιν, 485–7 τότε σπόρον ὁπλίσσαιο | κριθῶν ἢ πυρῶν . . ἄλλο δὲ μή τι βάλοιο, 499 ἀμφὶ γεωτομίῃ (479 ἀμφὶ γεωπονίῃ), 500 θεῖναί τ' ἐνὶ κλήματα γύροις; (*d*) probably Honestus (*ap.* Geffcken, *Gr. Epigr.* 196 b 2 τί γὰρ Μούσαις εἰς ἔριν ἠντίασα; (*e*) perhaps Nonnus (*Dionysiaca* 47. 69 βαλεῖν τ' ἐνὶ κλήματα γύροις). Most of these parallels are given by Gronewald.

[2] E. Livrea (*ZPE* 34 (1979), 43–5) may be right in arguing that the letters δαντον belong to the commentary rather than the verse quotation. He suggests εὐκράδαντον, 'well poised, easily moved'.

14 had been deficient. The case for Callimachus strengthened. A. Henrichs (*ZPE* 16 [1976], 139 ff.) explained a difficulty in line 9, but the vital identification with a story attested for Callimachus (fr. 667 Pf.) had to wait for Professor B. M. W. Knox, published by Hugh Lloyd-Jones with some further ideas in *ZPE* 26 (1977), 55–6.

The story revealed (from Pausanias 8. 28. 4–6, credited to Callimachus by a scholiast on 8. 28. 6) tells how the Arcadian prince Teuthis (though some called him Ornytus) brought a contingent to Aulis but, when the sailing for Troy was delayed, he quarrelled with Agamemnon, and began to lead his force away. Athena, disguised as Melas, son of Ops, tried to deter him, but the enraged Teuthis struck her in the thigh, and continued homewards. After his return, he had a vision of the goddess wounded in the thigh; he himself was afflicted with a wasting disease, and his subjects found that nothing would grow. They consulted the oracle at Dodona, and were told to make a statue of Athena which displayed the wound in her thigh. According to the scholiast on Pausanias, Callimachus stated specifically that the cult had ceased before his day (for discontinued ceremonies in the *Aetia* see Pfeiffer on Diegesis 3.10 to fr. 91).

I would like to make a case, almost entirely circumstantial, for ascribing this story to book I of the *Aetia*, mainly on the ground of what seem to me striking similarities to the aetion of Leucadian Diana (fr. 31, b–e in Pfeiffer vol. II, *Addenda et Corrigenda*, pp. 108–11); long before it was realized that any original text of the Teuthis aetion had survived, Pfeiffer drew attention to one of these parallels (vol. II, p. 109 on fr. 31c. 4 ff.). But one must justify the notion that Callimachus regularly grouped together aetia of very similar subject matter, since he then might seem to run the risk of monotony. Without doubt he liked to interject brief comparisons; railing in the Anaphaean cult of Apollo is compared to similar χλευασμός at Eleusis (fr. 21.9–10), and the abuse of Heracles at Lindos to that which Peleus suffered for the murder of his brother (fr. 24. 20–1). The two questions in fr. 7. 19–20 are obviously linked by the theme of unseemly words in a ritual (though the stories thus introduced have nothing else in common): why, he asks, does *ἀνὴρ Ἀναφαῖος ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς | ἢ δ' ἐπὶ δυσφήμοις Λίνδος ἄγει θυσίην*? More to my present purpose, immediately after describing Heracles' encounter with the Lindian peasant, the poet goes on to his almost identical passage of arms with Thiodamas the Dryopian (cf. Schol. Flor., Pf. i. 31, 51 ff. *παρατίθεται δὲ καὶ ἄλλον μῦθον τῷ προειρημένῳ ὅμοιον vel sim.*). Some details are so close that later writers occasionally confused the two stories; it seems possible that a fragmentary *diegesis* treats them as together forming a single episode (Pfeiffer's note in ii. 107). Even in a case like this we may be sure that the poet's lively ingenuity saved the narrative from becoming monotonous. For one thing, I wonder whether Callimachus himself may have taken over the story of Thiodamas from the Muse, allowing his memory to be prompted by the parallel Lindian myth. The words of Schol. Flor. (above) do not rule this out; also the interjected *τῶν μηδὲν ἐμοὺς δι' ὀδόντας ὀλίσθοι* (fr. 24. 20) and perhaps the vocative *ὦνα* (fr. 24. 3) come more naturally from the poet, though not impossible from a Muse. Although the Muses held the stage in *Aetia* 1–2, Callimachus himself was not inactive, being prepared to volunteer information as well as ask questions (e.g. Schol. Flor. p. 13 line 32 *αὐτὸς προειπών*, cf. frr. 43–6 and 50 *οἶδα . . οἶδα*).

Turning now to Leucadian Diana (fr. 31b–e): the inhabitants of Epirus were plundering Leucas, and entered the shrine of Artemis, where they found the goddess' statue adorned with a golden crown. In mockery they substituted for this the mortar in which they had pounded garlic. Next day the Leucadians made another crown, but it fell off the goddess's head and had to be nailed back (*Diegesis* Pf. ii. 110–11). It seems further from the fragmentary fr. 31c (ii. 109) that the crown was three times

replaced, and three times fell off, until the people consulted Apollo, who replied that Artemis would prefer the mortar. One may note the following resemblances to the myth of Teuthis: in both cases a proud virgin goddess has a cult statue with a bizarre and seemingly undignified feature (a bandage round the thigh or a mortar on the head) which requires explanation, thus providing the basic point of the aetion.[3] We learn that both goddesses have been ill treated (Barber and Maas suspected that fr. 731 *τὴν θεὸν Ἄρτεμιν οἵ' ἔπαθεν* might have immediately followed the lemma of fr. 31 b, e.g. as Pfeiffer suggests *τὼς μὲν ἔφη· τὰς δ' εἶθαρ ἐμὸς πάλιν εἵρετο θυμός | [Λευκαδίῃ] τὴν θεὸν Ἄρτεμιν οἵ' ἔπαθεν*). Yet strangely enough an oracle reveals that both of them, far from wishing to forget their humiliation, desire to have it perpetuated in the cult. And since I have argued that the proximity of similar motifs may be important in *Aetia* 1, it is worth adding that Athena's wound might find a parallel in Deianira's wound during the Dryopian war. A scholiast (i. 32), presumably referring to this, has a note *μότα δὲ λεγέται τὰ λεπτὰ ῥάκη τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐπὶ τὰ ἕλκη*, and Pfeiffer conjectures that *ἔμμοτον* may have been in the text (fr. 23. 21). Tantalizingly, we may well have the Diegesis of the action which immediately followed Leucadian Diana (Pf. ii. 111–12). But it is so mutilated that Pfeiffer wisely says 'in re incertissima coniecturas proferre non audeo'.

If indeed the story of Teuthis came from *Aetia* 1, it may conceivably have left a trace among the fragments assigned to that book. Fr. 37 contains a splendid three-line description of the goddess Athena – to be precise the first line is attested as from *Aetia* 1, while the second and third, which turned up in a learned commentary on an undetermined poetic text (*P. Oxy.* 2260, col. 12, 15–18), were convincingly joined to it by Pfeiffer. Athena is apostrophized (line 3 *ἤλαο*) as she probably is in line 15 of the new Teuthis-fragment (*παῖ Διός*):

οἵη τε Τρίτωνος ἐφ' ὕδασιν Ἀσβύσταο
Ἡφαίστου λόχιον θηξαμένου πέλεκυν
βρέγματος ἐκ δίοιο σὺν ἔντεσιν ἤλαο πατρός

Apollonius imitates these lines (4. 1309–11); since he also takes the Argonauts to Libyan Triton (4. 1390, 1539 ff.) one might be tempted to place the fragment in the Argonautic parts of *Aetia* 1 (frs. 7–21), though we cannot be sure that Callimachus took the heroes to Libya. Pfeiffer also refers us to fr. 602 for 'Cyrenaean' matters. But consider *οἵη* in fr. 37. 1: '*in such guise as*... you jumped' (Trypanis). The poet seems to say that *on some other occasion* Athena appeared just as she had done at her birth by the waters of Libyan Triton. The point would presumably be that she is fully armed, resplendent (Ap. Rh. 4. 1310 *παμφαίνουσα*) and unmistakably herself. This figure would be most effective if the context of fr. 37 were quite unconnected with Libya. Compare, for example, the way Propertius describes Apollo coming to Actium (4. 6. 33–6) '*quali* aspexit Pelopeum Agamemnona vultu | egessitque avidis Dorica castra rogis, | aut *qualis* flexos soluit Pythona per orbes | serpentem, imbelles quem timuere deae'. To me the most natural reading of fr. 37 suggests either a manifestation or a cult-statue (picture) of the goddess. No doubt there are other possibilities; theoretically even a comparison with someone else 'like you, Athena, as you were when... you jumped...' could not be excluded, but this seems altogether less likely. Can one imagine these lines anywhere in the story of Teuthis as told by Pausanias? Certainly

[3] Note also fr. 187. For cult-statues in the *Aetia*, cf. fr. 7. 11–12 (Graces), frs. 100 and 101 (Hera), fr. 114 (Delian Apollo), and for reflections of the same technique in Roman aetiological poetry see Propertius 4. 2 (the various adornments of Vertumnus) and Ovid, *Fasti* 6. 569–624 (the veiled statue which must not be unwrapped). It is interesting to compare Call. fr. 100 with Prop. 4. 2. 59 ff.

not at the first encounter between Athena and the prince, for then she was disguised as Melas son of Ops, and, even if Callimachus had a different version, enough traces remain to show that fr. 37 could not possibly stand after the couplet ending ἀλλ' ἔστη⟨ς⟩, παῖ Διός, ἐμ.[(line 15). More promising would be the vision of Athena which came to Teuthis after his return: τὴν θεὸν ἔδοξεν αὐτὴν τετρωμένην φανῆναί οἱ τὸν μηρόν. In spite of her paradoxical wound, Athena must have been instantly recognizable, while on the previous occasion she was disguised, and Teuthis may not even have realized whom he had attacked. Equally possible would be the cult statue (ἄγαλμα ἐποιήσαντο Ἀθηνᾶς ἔχον τραῦμα ἐπὶ τοῦ μηροῦ), in which case fr. 37 could stand either near the end of the aetion (cf. fr. 7. 9–12 on the Graces) or near the beginning. There might be an effective contrast between the martial appearance of the goddess and the strange wound in her side.

Finally one must try to say something about the first eleven lines of the fragment, which contain much that mystifies me. Lloyd-Jones (*ZPE* 26 (1977), 55) summarizes: 'someone appears to be telling someone else that considering the stony nature of the ground owned by the person addressed he will be a fool if he does not give up attempting agriculture and concentrate on forestry. A mention of acorns as the ancient diet of Arcadia does not prove that the person addressed is an Arcadian; but line 12 f. makes it clear enough that this is the case.' Such a summary might suggest *Aetia* books 3–4[4] rather than 1–2 (where one expects conversation to be between the poet and a Muse). But I do not think the addressee need necessarily be a landowner in Arcadia, or even an Arcadian. This could still be a dialogue between a Muse and the poet. Or else the poet might be speaking – the Muses did not do all the talking in *Aetia* 1–2 (see above). The second-person verbs ἐργάζη[αι (probable in 6) and βάλοις (8) could well be generalizing. I do not fully understand the relevance of Glaucus (2–3); the point about him was that he already possessed something better, and foolishly gave it up for something worse. Perhaps he might be quoted to someone who was offered a choice between two alternatives and seemed inclined to choose the worse. In line 4, could it be a case of abandoning the σμινύη (suitable for agriculture) and taking instead the πέλεκυς (suitable for wood-cutting)? The trouble is that the σμινύη is also sometimes associated with wood-cutting.

Another problem concerns the relation of lines 1–11 to the aetiological story which starts in line 12. It would be surprising if the infertility of Arcadia (producing only oak trees, hopeless for crops or vine) did not have some connection with the tale of Teuthis beyond the fact that he ruled there. The only idea occurring to me is as follows: one consequence of Teuthis' sin was that for his subjects οὐκ ἀπεδίδου καρπὸν οὐδένα ἡ γῆ. Now according to the scholiast on Pausanias 8. 28. 6 Callimachus made a point of stating that the cult of the wounded Athena had ceased before his day. Is it possible that Callimachus presented the discontinuance of the ceremony as culpable, and fancifully[5] argued that it had reactivated the punishment of Teuthis, thus making the region once more infertile?[6]

A. S. HOLLIS

Keble College, Oxford

[4] But the existence of Diegeses from fr. 67 onwards seems to leave open only the earlier part of Book 3 (cf. Parsons, *ZPE* 25 (1977), 47–8).

[5] One would have to neglect the point that the discontinuance of the cult was (presumably) quite recent, but the infertility of Arcadia age-old.

[6] I am most grateful to Professor Lloyd-Jones and Mr Parsons for appropriately sceptical comments and for permission to reproduce their text (which should be published by the time this article appears).