

P. OXY. 2463: LYCOPHRON AND CALLIMACHUS<sup>1</sup>

The present paper concludes that *P. Oxy.* 2463 contains remnants of a commentary on the *Aitia* of Callimachus. Identifying the commentary makes it possible to reconstruct the missing part of Heracles' conversation with Molorchus (*SH* 256–7), confirming its place in the *Victoria Berenices* and settling the latter's relationship to the *Aitia*. The argument takes its departure from a vexed passage in Lycophron.

For its first editor, John Rea,<sup>2</sup> *P. Oxy.* 2463 was a *hypomnema* on a poetic text that, although Hesiod, Pindar and Corinna were not wholly ruled out, could be identified in Lycophron, *Alexandra* 326–9:

ἦν εἰς βαθείαν λαιμίσσας ποιμανδρίαν  
στεφηφόρον βοὺν δεινὸς ἄρταμος δράκων  
ραίσει τριπάτρῳι φασγάνῳι Κανδάονος  
λύκοις τὸ πρωτόσφακτον ὄρκιον σχάσας.

In this context, the nonce word ποιμανδρία has troubled ancient and modern commentators. Scaliger recalled that *τανάγρα* may mean 'cauldron' and ingeniously suggested the same meaning for ποιμανδρία, evoking Poimander, the founder of Tanagra.<sup>3</sup> But it is by no means clear how these Boeotian details fit into the context, if Lycophron is alluding to the sacrifice of Polyxena, slaughtered by Neoptolemus on Achilles' tomb. Moreover, blood from sacrifices was poured not into a cauldron but into a trench dug in the earth.<sup>4</sup>

Credit for relating the passage not to Polyxena but to Iphigeneia, sacrificed by Agamemnon δράκων in Aulis, belongs to Wilamowitz.<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, however, in the context it seems unbearably forced to suppose both an ellipsis of τάφρον with βαθείαν and the joining of Ποιμανδρίαν with στεφηφόρον βοὺν.

Much more attractive, then, appears the solution offered by Rea and supported by Lloyd-Jones, citing Tzetzes *ad loc.*, *λείπει τὸ τάφρον* 'καὶ γὰρ τοῖς κατοικομένοις ἐν κοίλοις τόποις ἔθουν'. In their view, the term ποιμανδρία would in fact indicate the

<sup>1</sup> My thanks to Professor Hugh Lloyd-Jones, at whose invitation an enlarged version of this paper was read as the Gaisford Lecture at Christ Church, Oxford, in May 1987. *SH* throughout stands for H. Lloyd-Jones & P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin–New York, 1983). The English of this shorter version owes much to John Van Sickle, Brooklyn College and the Graduate School, City University of New York.

<sup>2</sup> *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XXVII (London, 1962), pp. 104–10; see the important complements by H. Lloyd-Jones, *Gnomon* 35 (1963), 449–50.

<sup>3</sup> Cited by L. Bachmann, *Lycophronis Alexandra* (Lipsiae, 1830), pp. 81, 466, who sees that Scaliger depends on Hesychius, s.v. *τανάγρα*, cf. below, p. 146), and Pollux 10.165 for his 'imaginific' translation: 'namque in capacis ventre mactans naviae / bovem infulatam draco cupencus inpius, / iugulae tripatrix caedet hanc clunaculo, / priora confedusta dans hirpis sacra.'

<sup>4</sup> This is ἐπιτύμβιον αἶμα (Triphiodorus 686, cf. Quintus Smyrnaeus 14.316–19): i.e. the blood was collected in a trench dug around Achilles' tomb, according to the normal practice in sacrifices for the dead. Here I would like to underline that the analogy, noted by Paul Maas, *CQ* 44 (1951), 94 [= *Kleine Schriften*, p. 421], between the sacrifice of Iphigeneia in Aeschylus, *Ag.* 231ff., and the sacrifice of Polyxena on an Attic amphora of 550 B.C. supports my argument that Lycophron superimposed these two myths.

<sup>5</sup> Ποιμανδρία means *Aulidensem*, cf. 195 Γραῖαν: 'Die beiden Elektren', *Hermes* 18 (1883), 225–6. This interpretation can claim a precedent in the tradition of the Lycophron scholia, p. 130.30 Scheer. The doubts expressed by C. von Holzinger, *Lycophron Alexandra* (Leipzig, 1895), p. 21, will not bear critical scrutiny.

trench in which Polyxena's blood is to be collected. Against this, however, it can be objected that the use of *ποιμανδρία* (<τάφος>) as a common noun, cf. *θηρίκλειον*, sc. *ποτήριον*, would in any case presuppose a Boeotian link that would be out of place if Lycophron meant to allude to the myth of Polyxena.

In my view the passage in Lycophron can be interpreted only by supposing an oracular double meaning – a delight in alluding simultaneously both to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia (a) and to that of Polyxena (b). The ambivalence is confirmed by the insertion of Cilla πόρτις in the parallel section concerning Laodice (lines 315ff.). It depends on the ambiguous relative pronoun ἣν and is articulated as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *Oracular double meaning*

	Alluding to sacrifice of	
	Iphigeneia	Polyxena
<i>βαθεία ποιμανδρία</i>	<i>Αὐλὶς βαθεία</i> <sup>6</sup>	sacrificial trench
<i>στεφθήφορον βοῦν</i>	Iphigeneia <sup>7</sup>	Polyxena
<i>δεινὸς ἄρταμος δράκων</i>	Agamemnon <sup>8</sup>	Neoptolemus <sup>9</sup>
<i>τριπάτρῳ φασγάνῳ Κ.</i>	Tantalus' Sword <sup>10</sup>	Peleus' Sword <sup>11</sup>

The passage from Lycophron that now seems less dark does not, however, appear to be the text referred to by the *hypomnema* of *P. Oxy.* 2463. Against Rea's hypothesis, two insuperable objections arise: (1) the mention of Amphitryon (4), regardless of any link with Poimander, has no bearing whatsoever on the interpretation of Lycophron 326ff.; and (2), the ample genealogical development provided by the commentary seems to go far beyond the terms of explanation required by Lycophron's *ποιμανδρία* and to concentrate rather on obscure aspects of the mythic local history of Boeotia.

<sup>6</sup> Here naturally Lycophron translates the Homeric *βαθείαν...τάφρον* (*Il.* 7.341). On Aulis *βαθεία* see Oberhammer, *RE* 2.2409 (still today the two ports are called *Μικρὸ καὶ Μεγάλο Βαθύ*). It appears quite normal that Aulis should be felt to form a part of *Ταναγραία*, cf. the semantic link between *Αὐλὶς* and *Ποιμανδρία*. On the sea as *τάφος*, cf. Call. *Del.* 37 *βαθὺν ἡλαο τάφρον* with the comment of Mineur (pp. 84–5) and my remarks *RFIC* 115 (1987), 81.

<sup>7</sup> The garland recalls the nuptial destiny of the two heroines, both promised brides of Achilles, as well as the use of garlands in funeral sacrifice. Note how the image of the heifer evokes the animal metamorphosis of Iphigeneia.

<sup>8</sup> Agamemnon appears as *δράκων κάρα βεβροτωμένος ἄκρον* in Stesichorus, fr. 219 Page; even if agreement is lacking on the interpretation of Clytaemnestra's dream (J. Vürtheim, *Stesichorus* [Leiden, 1919], pp. 52–4), it is probable that Lycophron alludes to a less widespread version of the premonitory apparition.

<sup>9</sup> In Vergil, *Aen.* 2.471, Neoptolemus is compared to a 'coluber...mala gramina pastus'; perhaps the Virgilian simile depends on the same now lost material that suggested the serpent image to Lycophron.

<sup>10</sup> The sword with which Tantalus butchers his son Pelops and with which Atreus cuts the throats of Thyestes' sons; this weapon, handed down through the Atreid generations, very likely had in epic or tragedy a tradition of its own, like that of the sceptre inherited by Agamemnon (Paus. 3.40.11).

<sup>11</sup> The sword of Acastus, forged by Hephaestus and conveyed by Chiron to Peleus, hence inherited by Achilles and Neoptolemus, cf. Hes. fr. 209 Merkelbach–West; Pind. *N.* 4.59 (and schol. 3.80.23–81.5 Drachmann); schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 1063 Koster; schol. Ap.Rh. 1.224, p. 27.20–8.11 Wendel; Apollod. 3.1.13. Styling it *ἀμφίχρυσον*, Euripides, *Hec.* 543, also surely recalls this tradition. Along the same lines, *Κανδάων* would be Hephaestus *καίων καὶ δαίων*, see Holzinger, pp. 218–19. According to Wilamowitz, the 'wolves of Candaon' are instead the bellicose Greeks (938, 1410), which is not to rule out, if one wants to avoid the enjambement, that *Κανδάωνος* is the Boeotian epithet for Orion (schol. p. 130.19ff. Scheer), son of Irieus, with whose sword Diomedes sacrificed Polyxena (vers. b).

At this point it will be well to look at the text of *P. Oxy.* 2463, with the supplements of Lloyd-Jones at lines 18 and 29:

.ε[	
επε.[     ]. .πε[	
πακα[     ]. . . .[ύ-	
πὸ Ἀμφι[τρ]ύωνος αν[	
καταλογὴν ἑαυταῖς [	5
κτείνειαι. Ῥιανὸς δ' ἐν [τῇ	
τῆς Ἡρακλείας Ποῖ[μαν-	
δρόν φησι γῆμαι Στρ[ατο-	
νίκην τὴν Εὐωνύμου	
καὶ υἱοὺς μὲν γ' γην[νῆσαι	10
Ἀ.χιππον καὶ Ἐφιπ[πον καὶ	
Λεύκιππον, θυγατέρας δὲ β'	
Ῥηξιπύλην καὶ Ἀρχ[επτο-	
λέμην. Ἀριστοφάνης δ' ἐν	
τῇ α' πρώτῃ τῶν Βοιω[τι-	15
κῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς Ποι-	
μάνδρου τελευτήσαι[ι φη-	
σι τὸν Ἐφιππον τ[ὴν τάφρον	
ὑπερ[αλ]όμενον κ[αθά-	
περ ἢ πολλῇ δόξῃ· κ[αὶ	20
Τοξέα φησὶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πα-	
τρὸς Οἰνέως ἐπὶ τοῖς [αὐ-	
τοῖς τελευτήσαι· γ.[	
οὕτως· τὸν γὰρ Ποῖ[μαν-	
δρόν φησιν ὡς τῇ[ν τάφρον	25
τῇ πόλει περιεβ[ά]λετο,	
παῖδα αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἐφ[ιππον	
φάσκειν βραδύως ὑπερ-	
αλεῖσθαι τὴν τάφρον· οὐ	
φάσκοντος δὲ τοῦ Ποιμάν-	30
δρου τὸν μὲν Ἐφιππον	
διαπηδάν, τὸν δὲ [	

Since it seems necessary to seek a new candidate for the paternity of this *hypomnema*, we should remember that, according to Stephanus of Byzantium, *Τανάγρα* = *Ποιμανδρία* was mentioned also by Callimachus (fr. 711 Pf.). Its context in Callimachus could not be determined by Pfeiffer but now can be identified in *P. Lille* 76 col. II [= *SH* 257.1–8]:

εἰς ἔριν ηνικ[	
δῶκε ταναγ[ρα	
παιδὶ κασιγν[ητ-	
ὥς ἀέκων ε.[	
λητιαὶ Ταφιο[	5
λήνεα γούνα[	
πωτηθεῖσ' ἀν[	
κυπωθεῖς τα[	

Elsewhere I have shown that in this fragment Heracles, while a guest in Molorchus' humble hut before killing the Nemean lion, reminds his Argive host of the Argive origin of Heracles' own father, Amphitryon, and rapidly sketches Amphitryon's migration to Boeotia:<sup>12</sup>

Amphitryon's unintentional killing of his father-in-law, Electryon (2–4),  
his flight to Thebes (6),  
his campaign against the Taphians (5),  
the betrayal of Comaetho and the death of Pterelaus (7–8),

<sup>12</sup> *Gnomon* 57 (1985), 593; cf. 'Callimaco e la Beozia', *ZPE* 67 (1987), 31–3.

all are clearly recognizable in the papyrus, which in addition associates Amphitryon with Tanagra.

The latter association, which clearly troubled Rea, can now be explained by the following reasons:

(a) both Amphitryon and Poimander, the eponymous hero of Tanagra, had killed a close relative: Amphitryon his father-in-law Electryon, and Poimander his son Ehippus;<sup>13</sup>

(b) cattle, which caused Amphitryon to move to Boeotia, are well known as a distinguishing mark of Tanagra (cf. *Αὐλῖς*) and appear to be connected with its founder, Poimander;<sup>14</sup>

(c) the last exploit of Amphitryon is the killing of the Euboean invader Chalcodon in the territory of Tanagra (Paus. 8.15.6, 9.17.3, 9.19.3);

(d) Poimander's son, Ehippus, asks his kinsman Tlepolemus, son of Heracles, for aid in freeing Tanagra from the Achaeans:<sup>15</sup>

*Ποίμανδρος τοῖνυν, ὁ Ἐφίππου πατήρ, ἔτι τῆς Ταναγκρῆς κατὰ κώμας οἰκουμένης ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ Στέφοντι πολιορκούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι συστρατεύειν, ἐξέλιπε τὸ χωρίον ἐκείνο νύκτωρ καὶ τὴν Ποιμανδρίαν ἐτείχισε. παρῶν δὲ Πολύκριτος ὁ ἀρχιτέκτων διαφανίζων τὰ ἔργα καὶ καταγελῶν υπερήλατο τὴν τάφρον. ὀργισθεὶς ὁ Ποίμανδρος ὥρμησε λίθον ἐμβαλεῖν αὐτῷ μέγαν, ὃς ἦν αὐτόθι κεκρυμμένος ἐκ παλαιού, “νυκτελίοις ἱεροῖς ἐπικείμενος”· τοῦτον ἀνασπάσας ὑπὸ ἀγνοίας ὁ Ποίμανδρος ἔβαλε, καὶ τοῦ μὲν Πολυκρίτου διήμαρτε, Λεύκιππον δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ἀπέκτεινε. ἔδει μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἐκ τῆς Βοιωτίας μεταστῆναι, ἐφέστιον καὶ ἰκέτην ξένον γενόμενον· οὐκ ἦν δὲ ράδιον, ἐμβεβληκότων εἰς τὴν Ταναγκρῆν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν. ἐπεμψεν οὖν Ἐφίππον τὸν υἱὸν Ἀχιλλέως δεησόμενον. ὁ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον εἰσάγει πείσας καὶ Τληπόλεμον τὸν Ἡρακλέους καὶ Πηνέλεων τὸν Ἰππάλκμου, συγγενεῖς αἰτῷ ὄντας· ὕφ’ ὧν ὁ Ποίμανδρος εἰς Χαλκίδα συνεκπεμφθεὶς*

<sup>13</sup> Already Rea, p. 107, had observed that Amphitryon appears in Hyginus 161, in a chapter devoted to those ‘qui suos cognatos occiderunt’. From a comparison between Apollodorus 2.4.5 (see my article cited above) and Plutarch. *Quaest. Gr.* (cited below) a clear parallelism emerges between the destiny of Amphitryon and that of Poimander: (a) unintentional manslaughter (*SH* 257.4 *ὡς ἀέκων*, cf. Pherecydes, *FGrHist* 3 F 13 *ἀκουσίως* ~ Plutarch *ὑπὸ ἀγνοίας*); (b) exile and supplication, *SH* 257.6 *λῆνεα*? ~ Plutarch *ἐφέστιον καὶ ἰκέτην*; (c) purification, performed for Amphitryon by Creon, for Poimander by Elpenor; see R. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 378 and 390; (d) founding exploit (of Amphitryon against the Teleboians, of Poimander against the Achaeans at Tanagra just after its founding). It all suggests that the local, Tanagran, version of the Theban Amphitryon was Poimander, who was later connected with the Theban founder by means of genealogy and myth (the same myth taken up by Callimachus in *SH* 256–7). The fragments of cantharoi found at Tanagra bear the inscription *ΗΙΑΡΟΣ* and/or *ΗΕΡΑΚΛΕΟΥΣ* (A. Andreiomenou, *ADelt* 32 [1977: 1984], B’ 1.97; cf. A. Schachter, *The Cults of Boiotia*, 11 [London, 1986], p. 12).

<sup>14</sup> In the Hellenistic age, *Αὐλῖς* is treated as a *κώμη Ταναγραίων* (Strabo 9.403, Paus. 9.19.8). Poimander's figure appears to be attested no earlier than the fourth century B.C., see Schachter, op.cit., pp. 204–5, with the timely note that ‘if Poimandros is to be associated with any historical event, it might be with one during the period when parts of the Tanagraia... were brought finally under Tanagran control’; and to this period might be traced the process of relating him to Amphitryon and Heracles. How Callimachus came to mention Tanagra in the verses now lost may perhaps be imagined with the aid of two inscriptions from Delos, *I. Delos* 2552 *Ποιμανδρίαν γαίαν*, *IG* vii.580 *Ποιμάδρον... γαῖα*, 581 *Ποιμάνδρον [γ]ενεή*. Callimachus must have found a further hint to connect Poimander and Amphitryon the Cowherd in the most important Tanagran cult, that of Hermes *Κριοφόρος* (Fiehn, s.v. ‘Tanagra’, *RE* 4.a, 2159).

<sup>15</sup> The decisive aid of Hermes in the war against the Eretrians was recalled in a local legend, reported by Paus. 9.23 (cf. also Strabo 9.404, Steph. Byz. s.v. *Γέφυρα*): cf. Herodot. 5.57, Plut. *De Herod. mal.* 23.

καὶ καθαρθεὶς παρ' Ἐλεφήνορι τὸν φόνον, ἐτίμησε τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ τεμένην πᾶσιν ἐξείλεν ὧν τὸ Ἀχιλλέως καὶ τοῦνομα διατετήρηκεν. (Plutarch, *Quaest. Gr.* 37)<sup>16</sup>

The convergence of all these elements lends strong credence to the hypothesis that *P. Oxy.* 2463 contains a commentary on Callimachus, *Victoria Berenices*, *SH* 256–7. Not a single citation from the text appears to survive in the commentary, but the connection between Tanagra-Poimandria and Amphitryon relates the poem of *P. Lille* 76 col. I to the *hypomnema* of *P. Oxy.* 2463 and makes the proposed linkage hard to resist.

A strong confirmation comes from the fact that ] καταλέγει in *P. Lille* 76 col. I [= *SH* 256.32] corresponds to καταλογὴν in *P. Oxy.* 2463. The terms, in the two different scholia, evidently referred to the same interpretative difficulty in Callimachus – no doubt in the genealogy that Heracles was recounting to his host, Molorchus.<sup>17</sup> Callimachus in his characteristic manner compressed into a few verses (that began surely in the last part of *P. Lille* 76 col. I [= *SH* 256]) material that was told at length in the *Ἡράκλεια* of Rhianus of Crete (*SH* 715) and that appeared in a partly analogous form in the *Θράιξ* of Euphorion (*SH* 415 col. II.14–19), which can provide us with a telling example of the incisive speed of such allusions:<sup>18</sup>

οὐ γάρ κεν νήσοισιν Ἐχινά[σ]ιν ἐσκήμψαντο  
οἱ [. . .]νεον Κεφάλαιο καὶ Ἀμφιτρύωνος αμο[  
ἐκ [δὲ τ]ρίχα χρυσέην κόρσης ὤλοψε Κομ[αιθῷ  
πα[τρ]ὸς εἰού – ὡς δὴ ῥ' ἄταφος τάφος εἰο πέλοιτο –  
εἰ μὴ ληΐδιῃσι γῆρας ἐτάμοντο βόεσσι  
Τηλεβόαι διὰ πόντον ἀπ' Ἀρσίνοιο μο[λόντες]. 15

<sup>16</sup> The new Callimachean evidence can now be added to the magisterial discussion of the Plutarchan *quaestio* in W. R. Halliday, *The Greek Questions of Plutarch* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 159–64. The copious genealogies furnished by the commentary in *P. Oxy.* 2463 are meant precisely to point out the family connection between Amphitryon and Poimander, unfortunately lost also in the poetic text that prompted the scholiastic digression. This part of the poem might also have contained, too, a hexameter fragment *νυκτελίοις ἱεροῖς ἐπικείμενος (ἀποκείμενος* con. Wyttenbach) that found its way into Plutarch, if the excellent conjecture of A. D. Nock, mentioned by Halliday, p. 160, is confirmed by my reconstruction.

<sup>17</sup> Therefore it seems impossible to accept the meaning registered for καταλογὴ by Rea, p. 107 ('conscription' Dio Chrys. 43.10; 'respect' Polyb. 22.12.10, Phryn. p. 398 Rutherford and perhaps Hesych. κ 1244 Latte; Dittenberger 328.8, 334.3, *P. Oxy.* 787, etc; Preisigke-Kießling, *Wörterbuch* s.v.) or to consider the expression equivalent to πρὸς χάριν ἑαυταῖς with Lloyd-Jones, p. 449. Rather recall the use of καταλέγειν for 'mention, cite, include' in the scholiastic tradition (H. Erbse, *Sch. Gr. in Hom. Il.* vi.378), particularly suited then to the discussion of Heracles' genealogy. But here I would like to suggest also another possibility, [ρόπαλον ῥιφθέν]... ὑπὸ Ἀμφι[τρ]ύωνος ἀν[ὰ τὴν] καταλογὴν ἑαυταῖς [... ..] κτείνειν *scilicet* Ἥλεκτρυῶνα, comparing, for the roundup of the cattle, Apollodorus 2.4.6 ἀπολαμβάνοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τὰς βόας, μῖας ἐκθορούσης Ἀμφιτρύων ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἀφήκεν ὁ μετὰ χεῖρας εἶχε ρόπαλον, τὸ δὲ ἀποκρουσθὲν ἀπὸ τῶν κεράτων εἰς τὴν Ἥλεκτρυῶνος κεφαλὴν ἐλθὼν ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν.

<sup>18</sup> In recalling that the *Ταναγραῖοι οὐκ ἐστράτευσαν*, schol. *b* ad *Hom. Il.* 2.498 (i. 293.2–4 Erbse) cites a verse of Euphorion, οἱ πλόον ἡρνήσαντο καὶ ὄρκιον Αἰγιαλῶν (fr. 59 Powell = 64 van Groningen), for which one would like to know the context, which certainly offered an explanation of the famous refusal by the Tanagrans to take part in the Trojan War. In *Oropos und die Graer* (*Kl. Schr.* v. 1, p. 16), Wilamowitz suggested an appropriation of Graia by the Tanagrans, eager at any cost to get into the 'Catalogue of Ships'. This hypothesis seems now to be confirmed by the allusive play of Callimachus, who in *SH* 257.2 and 14 writes *Ταναργ[-/σκάλος* clearly echoing *Il.* 2.497–8 Σκῳλὸν τε... Γραῖάν τε. The Homeric scholion recalls Graia as the mother of Leucippus, who was called son of Poimander both in *P. Oxy.* 2463 and in Paus. 9.20.1, Plut. *Q. Gr.* 37.

But there is more. My reconstruction of the contents of *SH* 257 makes it possible at least to place correctly the fragment of a Callimachean scholion contained in *P. Oxy.* 2258 B fr. 2.<sup>19</sup> One side (r) of this scrap contains verses 4–6 of fr. 177 Pf. [= *SH* 259] together with scholia. On the other side (v) some scholia can be read that belonged to the lower margin of the page. If (r) came before (v), the scholia of (v) ought to refer to a section of the ‘Mousetraps’, but this seems to be ruled out by content. If rather, as now seems certain, (v) came before (r), the scholia of (v) ought to cast light on a section of the *Victoria Berenices* that precedes verses 4–6 of *SH* 259 by no less than 23 verses and no more than 46 verses. This clearly takes us back into the midst of *SH* 256–7 – into the fragment that contains the conversation between Heracles and Molorchus. Thus the hypothesis recently advanced, that the scholia of *P. Oxy.* 2258 B fr. 2<sup>v</sup> must refer ‘to verses at the very beginning of 257’,<sup>20</sup> can now be fully confirmed by comparing verses 1–8 of *SH* 257 with the scholia that commented on them:

. . . [	
] λωσατρ[	
] . ποιγαροιθε. [	
] . αυτα . . . ιπ[	
] εντωτρεχε. [	5
] . ν. τονμελ. [	
] ξενος . λα . [	
] . ινευμεγεθη. [	
] . . σεω[ . ] . νεπ . λ. [	
] . [ . ] ν . [ . ] χαλκ. [	10
] . [ . . ] δρ[ . ] αντα[ . ] . [	
] . [ . ] . [ . ] ταδ[	

In fact, if we examine the scholia line by line, we find

**Line 5:** ἐν τῷ τρέχειν alluding to the Nemean race won by Berenice, who therefore was mentioned in the lost part of *SH* 256 as well as in the last part of *SH* 255;

**Line 6:** τὸν μέλλοντα describing Heracles as he girds up for his Nemean exploit; the shift from Berenice to the hero's Argive feat could have been rather abrupt, in the Pindaric manner (‘... Heracles too was a guest in Argos...’);

**Line 8:** εὐμεγεθη. [ perhaps a citation from the text, alluding in a typically witty fashion to the hugeness of the hero, who will not fail to enjoy the feast laid on for him by Molorchus;

**Line 10:** χαλκε[ apparently explaining the gloss τανάγρα, ‘cauldron’, *SH* 257.2, cf. Hesych. τ 116 Schmidt τανάγρα · ἄγγειον χαλκοῦν, ἐν ᾧ ἤρτυον τὰ κρέα;

**Line 11:** here one had best exorcise the dangerous ghost of the ‘bronze statue’ and read now ποι[μ]αν]δρ[ί]αν, which consequently must have been found in the text of Callimachus from which Lycophron borrowed it.

This interpretation of the scholiastic fragment has extraordinarily important

<sup>19</sup> For a description of this sumptuous Callimachean codex in coptic uncials, see E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1971), p. 67 n. 47. The scholia at the foot of the page may refer to a text much higher up, in our case up to 46 lines before *SH* 259.4. Calculating that *SH* 257 contains the remnants of about 40 lines (the last can be scholia), one can infer that the scholia of *P. Oxy.* 2258 B fr. 2<sup>v</sup> pertain to a section of Callimachean text between the end of *SH* 256 (wholly absent from *P. Lille* 76 col. I, where only some letters survive at the end of the line) and the beginning of *SH* 257. That in this section Heracles tells of his own genealogy and episodes of his family history is confirmed by a comparison with the *Hecale*: see, for instance, the tale of the sword of Aegeus told by Theseus in fr. 235–6 Pf.

<sup>20</sup> N. Krevans, ‘*P. Oxy.* 2258 B fr. 2: a Scholion to Callimachus’ *Victoria Berenices*’, *ZPE* 65 (1986), 37–8, who does not, however, seek to reconstruct the beginning of *SH* 257, which she styles ‘unclear’.

consequences for reconstructing the architecture of the *Victoria Berenices*. It fully confirms the sequence brilliantly suggested by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *SH* 256–257–258–259. At the same time it rules out a recent attempt by A. S. Hollis.<sup>21</sup> Following Pfeiffer, Hollis saw in *P. Oxy.* 2258 B fr. 2<sup>v</sup> an allusion to the *aition* of Euthycles of Locri [= fr. 84–5 Pf.]. Consequently Hollis had to think up a different location for the ‘Mousetraps’ – at the beginning of the Molorchus episode. Indeed he even had to suppose that the Molorchus *aition* had come into place twice, first as an autonomous piece at the end of *Aitia* III and then as a part of the *Victoria Berenices* in the *epekdomis*, when Callimachus set the two great Berenice pieces respectively at the beginning of *Aitia* III and end of *Aitia* IV.

But already the Florentine *diegesis* left no room for Molorchus between Euthycles (fr. 84–5 Pf.) at the end of *Aitia* III and *Daphnephoria Delphica* at the beginning of *Aitia* IV; nor was there any reason to suppose that the *Victoria Berenices* had been copied in *P. Oxy.* 2258 (sixth century) in anything but the form we know.

Thus we hardly need emphasize that the scholion of *P. Oxy.* 2258 B fr. 2<sup>v</sup>, now, if it has been interpreted aright, quite categorically rules out putting *SH* 259 before 256 to make the Molorchus scene begin with the ‘Mousetraps’.

The daring hypothesis that the *Victoria Berenices* came out twice, without and with the ‘Mousetraps’, thus proves to be unnecessary. The issue differs completely from that of the *Coma Berenices*, which was a new poem added to the end of *Aitia* IV in the *epekdomis*. For the *Victoria*, one had to suppose that Callimachus, in the second edition of the *Aitia*, added his epinician poem to the beginning of Book III and while doing so stitched into it an *aition* removed from the end of the same book. For such a complicated manoeuvre, no proof whatever exists.

If the arguments made here hit the mark, we shall have reached a threefold, unforeseen, goal: (1) attributed *P. Oxy.* 2463 to a Callimachean *hypomnema*;<sup>22</sup> (2) reconstructed the lost part of the colloquy between Heracles and Molorchus in *SH* 256–7, as well as correctly relating the colloquy to the structure of the *Victoria Berenices* and the *Victoria* to the composition of the *Aitia*; (3) clarified an especially dark place in Lycophron. The probable identification of a further fragment of Callimachus *νυκτελίοις ἱεροῖς ἐπικείμενος* is of great interest (could this be reflected in Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.567 *Nycteliumque patrem nocturnaque sacra*?).<sup>23</sup>

Università di Firenze

ENRICO LIVREA

<sup>21</sup> A. S. Hollis, ‘The Composition of Callimachus’ Aetia in the Light of *P. Oxy.* 2258’, *CQ* 36 (1986), 467–71. His entire ingenious reconstruction has been undone by the fact that [ἀν]δρ[ι]άνα, suggested by Lobel for *P. Oxy.* 2258 B fr. 2<sup>v</sup>. 10–11, appears only as one among the possible supplements (see already Parsons, mentioned in Krevans, art. cit. p. 37<sup>2</sup>), and by the fact that mentions of statues are rather frequent in Callimachus and do not therefore imply a reference to the Euthycles *aition* (e.g. fr. 99, 114, 384.44ff. etc.: for other contexts, see R. F. Thomas, ‘Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices* and Roman Poetry’, *CQ* 33 [1983], 96–7).

<sup>22</sup> In all likelihood the author of the *hypomnema* will have been Theon, discussed by Pfeiffer ii.xxvii. That Theon did write a commentary on the *Victoria Berenices* is known in any case from *Etym. Gen.* A s.v. ἀρμυοί, cf. Pfeiffer on fr. 383.4.

<sup>23</sup> This parallel was suggested to me by the Editors.