

## THE ORDER AND STRUCTURE OF CALLIMACHUS' *AETIA* 3

When Rudolf Pfeiffer edited the last four aetia of Callimachus' *Aetia* Book 3, he presented them in the following order: *Hospes Isindius* (fr. 78), *Diana Lucina* (fr. 79), *Phrygius et Pieria* (ffr. 80–3), *Euthycles Locrus* (ffr. 84–5). At the beginning of the book he noted: *Ordo fabularum in posteriore huius libri parte narratarum (fr. 63–85) certus est.*<sup>1</sup> Two of our primary witnesses for what remains of *Aetia* 3 are *POxy.* 2212 and 2213 (both early second century A.D. in date), and both are fragmentary and awkward to deal with, but we also have the ancient commentary known as the Milan Diegeseis (*P. Med.* 18, a late first-/early second-century A.D. papyrus from Tebtunis), whose extant remains cover, with almost perfect continuity, the last part of *Aetia* 3, *Aetia* 4, the Iambi, the Lyric poems, *Hecale* and Hymns 1 and 2. For *Aetia* 3 the extant Milan Diegeseis available to Pfeiffer began at fr. 67 while *POxy.* 2211 preserves the order of ffr. 63–7. A few years after Pfeiffer, in 1958, Trypanis followed Pfeiffer's text in his Loeb edition of the Callimachus fragments.<sup>2</sup>

However Pfeiffer's version of the last section of *Aetia* 3 is a bit less straightforward than that prefatory remark suggests, for the preserved parts of the Milan Diegeseis (a) have no mention of the Phrygius and Pieria aetion, and (b) unquestionably go straight from *Diana Lucina* to the last aetion of the book, *Euthycles Locrus*. The Phrygius and Pieria aetion stands between *Diana* and *Euthycles* in Pfeiffer's edition for the sole reason that Pfeiffer inserted it there, against the testimony of the Diegeseis, with the suggestion that the author of the Diegeseis simply omitted, or placed elsewhere, the Phrygius and Pieria aetion.<sup>3</sup>

On the surface of things Pfeiffer—who, after all, demonstrated over and over in his editorial work a remarkably productive combination of fine scholarly tact and caution with a powerfully creative sense of intuition—did seem to be on good ground here. His reason for reordering these aetia was a small fragment of text, *POxy.* 2212 fr.1 (b):

<sup>1</sup> R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, vol. 1, *Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1949), 60. Vol. 1 will hereafter be referred to as *Callimachus* 1; vol. 2, *Hymni et Epigrammata* (Oxford, 1953) will be referred to as *Callimachus* 2.

<sup>2</sup> C. A. Trypanis, *Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and other Fragments* (Loeb Classical Library: Cambridge, 1958, 1975 [printed with the addition of Musaeus]), 63–7, repeating Pfeiffer's assertion about the certainty of the order of the aetia in Book 3 on p. 42 (more mutedly in his English translation of Pfeiffer's Latin on p. 43, however!). That the order of *Aetia* 3 here was actually less certain than Pfeiffer suggested has been remarked on several times in passing by scholars discussing various aspects of the *Aetia* since Pfeiffer's edition, but the conclusion is usually that the Diegeseis and *POxy.* 2212 probably had different versions; see e.g. P. J. Parsons, 'Callimachus: Victoria Berenices', *ZPE* 25 (1977), 47, and, more recently, C. Gallazzi and L. Lehnus, 'Due nuovi frammenti delle Diegeseis. Approssimazioni al III libro degli *Aitia* di Callimaco', *ZPE* 137 (2001), 7–18 at 17 n. 44. The latter comment on the 'discrepancy' between *POxy.* 2212 (after noting the uncertainty of its reading in fr. 1 (b) 3) and the Milan Diegeseis and opt to follow the Diegeseis (in a way, not surprisingly, since it is newly discovered fragments of the Milan papyrus, and the value of the Diegeseis, that they are reporting on [see below]).

<sup>3</sup> *Callimachus* 1.87: *omisit igitur diegetes Pieriae fabulam aut potius alio loco post historiam Isind. inter fr.78 et 79 narravit.*

].[.].[  
 ].[ ]σιων.[  
 ]χιοσ[.].[.].πειε[  
 ]ησευ[.].λεεσανδρασε[ ]  
 ] [

The last legible line here (4) is definitely the opening of the Euthycles aetion, and with characteristic scholarly ingenuity Pfeiffer read the immediately preceding line (3) as containing the names of Phrygius and Pieria:

Φρῦ]χιος[τ]ε]ιμ[ε]ε]Πειε[ρ]ίην <sup>4</sup>

Pfeiffer was encouraged in this reading by the fact that *POxy.* 2212 fr.1 (a) [fr.82 in Pfeiffer's edition], which certainly came from the Phrygius and Pieria aetion,<sup>5</sup> was placed by Lobel, the *editor princeps* of the papyrus, in the same column as fr.1 (b),<sup>6</sup> as well as by Lobel's own re-examination of the papyrus.<sup>7</sup> There was thus no room, it seemed, in *POxy.* 2212 for *Diana Lucina* between the Phrygius and Pieria aetion and that of Euthycles, and Pfeiffer chose to follow this papyrus in preference to the apparently discrepant Milan Diegeseis.

Now in his presentation of the Milan Diegeseis to the aetion of the Isindian Guest (fr. 78), on p. 86, Pfeiffer did in fact consider the possibility that the Phrygius and Pieria aetion was included in the Milan Diegeseis edition, but in a different place from *POxy.* 2212, namely between *Hospes Isindius* and *Diana Lucina*. The extant remains of the Diegeseis to *Hospes Isindius* are very scrappy, consisting in the first part of the lemma and a few letters from three lines of commentary, followed by a lacuna of eleven lines, scraps of two lines, and then the lemma, and a short commentary, to *Diana Lucina*:

Dieg. 1.10	Ὀφελος οὐλοὸν ἐχ[ ]εῖς Ἰσίνδιον δ[ ].υπα ]σι[ ll. 14–24 <i>desunt</i>	fr. 78
25	].[.].[ οισφ[.]α Τεῦ δὲ χάριν[.]ο. [      ]κουσιν etc.	fr. 79

<sup>4</sup> Fr. 83.3 with supplementary note in *Callimachus* 1 Addenda (501).

<sup>5</sup> When Pfeiffer published the first volume of *Callimachus* this seemed extremely likely; shortly after that Barber and Maas demonstrated ('Callimachea', *CQ* 44 [1950], 96) that the fragment's contents were certain, by joining it to the end of fr. 80 (*POxy.* 2213 fr. 1), and Pfeiffer was able to report this in the Addendum to his second volume, p. 113 (Addenda 2).

<sup>6</sup> E. R. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 19 (London, 1948), 22: 'Frr. 1 (a), (b) appear to come from the same column but I cannot fix their relative positions with any precision. If (a) is rightly located above (b), their vertical relation is within narrow limits that shown above as fixed by both internal (metrical) and external indications. But the interval between them I see nothing to show.' It was Pfeiffer who saw that fr. 1 (a) probably came from the Phrygius and Pieria episode and prompted Lobel to re-edit the text, in conjunction with *POxy.* 2213 fr. 9 (see *Callimachus* 1.90; *Callimachus* 2.xiii–xiv).

<sup>7</sup> *Callimachus* 1.91 on fr. 83: *P iterum examinata L. vidit hoc fragmentum finem fabulae Pieriae esse posse coll. Aristaeneto*. Pfeiffer even speculated that there was only one line missing between fr. 82 and fr. 83, though Barber and Maas' reconstruction of fr. 80 + 82 alone made this quite unlikely.



*POxy.* 2212 fr. 1 (a) thus came very close to the end of the Phrygius and Pieria action. How close? Aristaenetus' penultimate sentence corresponds, essentially, to vv. 18–23 of Callimachus' account, and although its vocabulary raises the possibility that Callimachus' text extended over one more couplet than Barber and Maas suggested (i.e. vv. 24–5), that would seem to be the maximum needed to cover Aristaenetus; then came the conclusion expressed in Aristaenetus' last sentence, where Aristaenetus' brevity suggests that Callimachus had only one, or at the most two, couplets. We can reasonably conclude, then, that after *POxy.* 2212 fr. 1 (a) there were between four and eight lines of verse needed to complete the action.<sup>13</sup>

Now, if *Diana Lucina* follows on straight after *Phrygius et Pieria*, the next question that arises is, is there room in *POxy.* 2212 fr. 1, between (a) and (b), for the whole action? After all, Lobel declared firmly '(a) and (b) appear to come from the same column . . . by both internal (metrical) and external indications', and if *POxy.* 2212 fr. 1 (b) 1–3 (= Pfeiffer fr. 83) is not part of *Phrygius et Pieria* it will have to be the closing lines of *Diana Lucina* (since *P Oxy.* 2212 fr. 1 (b) 4 is the first line of *Euthycles Locrus* = Pfeiffer fr. 84). This leads directly to consideration of the physical characteristics of the papyrus: how much text has been lost between *POxy.* 2212 fr. 1 (a) and fr. 1 (b)? Nothing is known of the length of the columns in this particular papyrus, of which only small scraps remain, but other Callimachus papyrus rolls from within a century either side of this one are known which contain: thirty-five lines per column (*POxy.* 2214, late first cent. B.C.), about twenty-five lines (*POxy.* 1362, first A.D.), about twenty-one lines (*POxy.* 1793, first A.D.), twenty-five lines (*P. Berlin* 11521, second A.D.), forty-seven lines (*POxy.* 2080, second A.D.). If, as a test case, we make the most extreme assumptions about the relative positions of fr. 1 (a) and fr. 1 (b), namely that fr. 1 (a) stood at the top of the column, that fr. 1 (b) stood at the bottom of the column, and if we also assume that Phrygius and Pieria was complete in only four lines after fr. 1 (a), the following possibilities result for the length of the passage between the end of the Phrygius and Pieria action (*POxy.* 2212 fr. 1 (a) + 4) and the end of the Artemis action (*POxy.* 2212 fr. 1 (b) 3): if *POxy.* 2212 had short columns, a maximum of twelve lines, if it had very long columns, a maximum of thirty-eight lines, and if mid-length size columns (thirty-five lines), twenty-eight lines. These are very comfortable figures: we do not possess many aetia complete enough to know their lengths,<sup>14</sup> but among the shorter aetia were two from earlier in Book 3, the *Sepulcrum Simonidis* (fr. 64), of perhaps eighteen lines, and the immediately following *Fontes Argivi* (ffr. 65–6) which will have been about the same length.<sup>15</sup> A column

<sup>13</sup> We should not, of course, forget that although the narrative of the action might be complete the action itself could extend much further: the narrative of the love and marriage of Acontius and Cydippe (also recounted by Aristaenetus 1.10) was complete at fr. 75. 50 or 53, but the action continues for another twenty-seven (or twenty-four) lines as Callimachus describes his source Xenomedes and summarizes his work.

<sup>14</sup> The action on the Sicilian cities, contained in fr. 43, seems to conclude at v. 83 and may have begun before v. 12; *Acontius et Cydippe* (ffr. 67–75) was more than 120 lines long (fr. 67 + fr. 75 + 18 verses required between fr. 74 and 75.1 by *POxy.* 2258 B fr. 1 [see E. R. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 20 (London, 1952), 70, 82, and *Callimachus* 1 [Addenda et corrigenda], 501); Catullus' version of the *Coma Berenices* (fr. 110) was ninety-four lines.

<sup>15</sup> See Pfeiffer on fr. 64.15. Note that the Simonides action and that following, *Fontes Argivi*, together amount to exactly the length of a third-century codex column: *POxy.* 2211 fr. 1 consists in a sheet, with remains of twenty-eight continuous verses on the verso and thirty-one continuous verses on the recto, from the top of the page down and with no indication of where the foot of the page came, with the Simonides action beginning at v. 10 of the verso, the action of Acontius and Cydippe (ffr. 67–75) at v. 10 of the recto. The column was probably not that much longer than what is preserved: see Lobel (n. 6), 15 and *Callimachus* 2.xx (Prolegomena ad fragmenta).

length of more than twenty-five lines for *POxy.* 2212 will give room for an Artemis aetion of eighteen lines or more, and without having to assume that fr. 1 (a) and fr. 1 (b) necessarily stood at the top and bottom of the column respectively. Since a column length of more than twenty-five lines is entirely average for a papyrus of this period, we can safely assume that *POxy.* 2212 could indeed have had the last aetia of Book 3 in the same order as the Milan Diegeseis.

Our two witnesses, then, *POxy.* 2212 and the Diegeseis, are entirely compatible with one another here, and all that remains as a basis for placing *Phrygius* and *Pieria* after, instead of before, *Diana Lucina*, is a very insecure reading of four indistinct letters in *POxy.* 2212 fr. 1 (b) 3, the last line of the aetion that preceded the final aetion of Book 3, *Euthycles Locrus*. Pfeiffer's reading here should surely be rejected as wishful thinking: the much more secure testimony of the Diegeseis can be allowed to stand, and what can actually be read of *POxy.* 2212 does in fact fit in with it.<sup>16</sup>

Once the order of the Diegeseis is restored to the modern edition of Callimachus *Aetia* 3 some interesting possibilities become evident, especially in the light of the recent publication of two new fragments of the Diegeseis, and we should turn now to the larger question of the structure of the whole of Book 3.

### THE STRUCTURE OF *AETIA* 3

In 2001 C. Gallazzi and L. Lehnus published two new fragments of the Milan Diegeseis, *P. Migl. Vogl. Inv.* 1006 and *P. Migl. Vogl. Inv.* 28b.<sup>17</sup> These fragments come from Book 3 of the *Aetia* and, though small in size, they provide a significant supplement to our knowledge of the book, thanks both to the content of the new fragments and also to their positioning in the papyrus roll of the Diegeseis relative to the previously published fragments. In particular (1) we now have one more, previously unknown, aetion added to the contents of *Aetia* 3, *Artemis Hegemone* (titled *Phalaeus Ambraciotes* by Gallazzi and Lehnus), and this aetion must have come earlier in Book 3 than the sequence of aetia that begins with fr. 63 *Thesmophoria Attica*, (2) in addition three (or possibly two) aetia (topics unknown) are now seen to have occurred between *Acontius et Cydippa* (ffr. 67–75) and *Eleorum ritus nuptialis* (previously ffr. 76–77a in Pfeiffer).<sup>18</sup> The sequence of aetia in Book 3 thus now runs as follows:

<sup>16</sup> It is worth noting that on the one hand Pfeiffer pressed for reading ]γιος[ as Φρύγιος in *POxy.* 2212 fr. 1 (b) 3, but, by contrast, in *POxy.* 2213 fr. 17.3 (Callimachus fr. 81.3), where he originally proposed that the more secure ]γιος be read as Φρύγιος, he later easily withdrew his placing of the whole fragment on the grounds that *supplementa incertissima* (Callimachus 2 [Addenda et Corrigenda], 114).

<sup>17</sup> C. Gallazzi and L. Lehnus, (n. 2), 7–18.

<sup>18</sup> The last seventy-seven lines of *Acontius et Cydippa* (= Pfeiffer fr. 75) are provided by *POxy.* 1011, and after the last line of that aetion the papyrus has three more lines. Pfeiffer had tentatively read line 78, before which there seem to be remains of a paragraphus in the margin (indicating that line 78 will be the first line of a new aetion) to match the lemma which the Milan Diegeseis give for the first line of the *Eleorum ritus nuptialis* aetion (see Pfeiffer fr. 76.1), thus proposing that *Acontius et Cydippa* was immediately followed by *Eleorum ritus nuptialis*. However, Gallazzi and Lehnus have shown, with the help of a re-examination of *POxy.* 1011 by Revel Coles, that line 78 is not the same as the opening line of *Eleorum ritus nuptialis*. We now have to take line 78 as the first line of an unknown aetion, and Pfeiffer's fr. 76 has to be decoupled from the *Eleorum ritus nuptialis* and, probably, from fr. 77.

Proem: *Victoria Berenices* (P. J. Parsons, *ZPE* 25 [1977], 1–50 = *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 254–268C)  
*Artemis Hegemone* (Gallazzi and Lehnus *ZPE* 137 (2001), 7–18)  
*Thesmophoria Attica* (fr. 63)  
*Sepulcrum Simonidis* (fr. 64)  
*Fontes Argivi* (fr. 65–6)  
*Acontius et Cydippa* (frr. 67–75)  
Unknown action (fr. 76 and Gallazzi and Lehnus)  
Unknown action (Gallazzi and Lehnus)  
Unknown action (Gallazzi and Lehnus)  
*Eleorum ritus nuptialis* (fr. 77)  
*Hospes Isindius* (fr. 78)  
*Phrygius et Pieria* (frr. 80–2)  
*Diana Lucina* (fr. 79 and fr. 83)<sup>19</sup>  
*Euthycles Locrus* (frr. 84–5)

The unbroken continuity of this sequence now seems assured from at least *Thesmophoria Attica* to the end, and, for reasons of spacing, it seems quite likely that *Artemis Hegemone* immediately preceded that action. Two unknowns remain: (1) did *Victoria Berenices* go straight on to *Artemis Hegemone*, or was there another action, or other aetia, in between? and (2) were there two or three aetia between *Acontius et Cydippa* and *Eleorum ritus nuptialis*, and what were they?

We should deal with the last question first.

#### *Fr. 114 and fr. 115*

When Pfeiffer published his edition, two of the aetia whose place in the *Aetia* collection remained unknown were fr. 114 *Statua Apollinis Delii* and fr. 115 *Onnes*. Both aetia are (fragmentarily) preserved in several different Oxyrhynchus papyri, some of whose other fragments contain aetia that can be placed in Book 1 and Book 3 of the *Aetia*, and this led Pfeiffer to advise that frr. 114 and 115 therefore could also well have come from Book 1 or Book 3. Furthermore, these two aetia belong together and in sequence, since one of our witnesses, *POxy.* 2211, has fr. 114 vv. 14–25 on its verso and fr. 115 vv. 11–21 on its recto. (What the physical order of recto and verso was in this papyrus volume cannot be determined.)

Pfeiffer published a masterful analysis of the content and nature of fr. 114 in 'The image of the Delian Apollo and Apolline ethics' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 15 (1952), 20–32 (= *Ausgewählte Schriften* 55–71), and in 1993 G. Massimilla suggested that fr. 115, about whose content Pfeiffer had been uncertain, dealt with the coming of the young Cabiri Onnes and Tottes who brought sacred Dionysiac objects from Phrygia to aid the people of Miletus and Assesus in their struggle against the tyrant Amphytrés (Amphytrés having assassinated Leodamas, the just and popular king of Miletus, by ambushing him while he was celebrating the feast of Apollo).<sup>20</sup> Then in 1995 G. B. D'Alessio argued that frr. 114 and 115 are much

<sup>19</sup> On the reassigning of fr. 83 see above.

<sup>20</sup> G. Massimilla, 'Callimaco fr. 115 Pf.', *ZPE* 95 (1993), 33–44. Pfeiffer had already pointed to the single surviving source, Nicolaus of Damascus (*FGrH* 90 F 52), that allows us to identify the Phrygians Onnes and Tottes, but had not extracted and brought to bear the full account that Nicolaus gives of the Milesians and their hardships under Amphytrés' tyranny. The sacred objects

more likely, for formal reasons, to have appeared in Book 3 than in Book 1 of the *Aetia*.<sup>21</sup> He also suggested that the order of fr. 114 and 115 might have been 115 followed by 114, since the subject matter of fr. 115 suited it to end with an address to Apollo, god of Didyma, which in turn would have made a good transition into the action of Apollo of Delos.<sup>22</sup> Pfeiffer had suggested that the last part of fr. 114, vv. 18–25, begins a new action, since the scraps of ends of lines that are preserved mention Argos, Thrace and Troy, items which have nothing (immediately obviously, at any rate) to do with Apollo and Delos but which are suggestive of the man-eating horses of Diomedes; D'Alessio reinforced this possibility.

When Gallazzi and Lehnus published the two new fragments of the Milan Diegeseis (p. 496 above), they went a step further and suggested, tentatively, that fr. 115 and 114, and the two or three aetia they may contain, could have appeared between the initial action of Book 3, the *Victoria Berenices*, and the action of the *Thesmophoria Attica*,<sup>23</sup> presumably before the *Artemis Hegemone*. (They do not specify this latter relationship, but the position of the *Artemis Hegemone* action in the roll would not seem to provide room for two or three aetia after the *Artemis Hegemone* action in addition to the sequence of fr. 63–75.)

I suggest that there is one other obvious possibility, namely that fr. 115 and 114 could be placed, not between the *Victoria Berenices* and the *Thesmophoria Attica*, but in the section where the new *P. Mil. Vogl. inv. 28b* fragment exhibits the remains of two or three new diegeseis between *Acontius et Cydippa* and *Eliorum ritus nuptialis* (in the section of the papyrus called column Z). In addition to the obvious theoretical possibility that the two or three aetia concerning Delian Apollo, Onnes and Tottes, and (if it was an action) the Horses of Diomedes, might have stood here, there is one slender practical thread to consider grasping. In line 37 of column Z of the newly expanded Milan Diegeseis (Gallazzi and Lehnus [n. 2], 15, 16), that is, in the second of the three aetia diegeseis of which we now have remains in this section of the papyrus, we read ] . τιμήμα. Now Nicolaus of Damascus reports that one of the key steps that the Milesians took in the sequence of events was that, when the two young men arrived at the Miletus region just as the Milesians were trying to deal with the crisis of the oppressive usurper Amphitres, the Milesians promised to accord a sanctuary and festival worship to Onnes and Tottes in return for the latter's help in defeating their enemy:

οἱ δὲ ταῦτα ἀκούοντες ὁ πᾶς δῆμος ἐν χαρᾷ ἦσαν . . . ὑπέσχοντό τε τὰ ἱερὰ ἰδρύσειν παρὰ σφίσιν καὶ τιμῆσειν, εἰ ταῦτα γένοιτο.

Nicolaus (and probably his source) here uses the standard vocabulary for 'worship', 'cult honors' etc.: τιμή-. Thus the *Onnes et Tottes* action could well have taken as its starting or finishing point the typically Callimachean question of why it was that at Miletus, or possibly Didyma, the two young Cabeiroi were worshipped in connection with Apollo. The answer was that they played a major role in resolving the terrible

that Onnes and Tottes brought were the genitals of Dionysus, in a chest/box/basket. The evidence for the cult of the Megaloi Theoi Cabeiroi at Didyma, including the account of Nicolaus of Damascus, is discussed in J. Fontenrose, *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult and Companions* (Berkeley, CA, 1988), 152–4.

<sup>21</sup> G. B. D'Alessio, 'Apollo Delio, I Cabiri Milesii e le Cavalle di Tracis: osservazioni su Callimaco fr. 114–115 PF', *ZPE* 106 (1995), 5–21.

<sup>22</sup> D'Alessio (n. 21), 14–16.

<sup>23</sup> Gallazzi and Lehnus (n. 2), 17, n. 43.

situation caused by the assassination of the king of Miletus and the subsequent attack on the king's sons and their supporters by the usurper tyrant Amphitres.<sup>24</sup>

As mentioned above, Gallazzi and Lehnus' reconstruction of column Z of the papyrus shows traces of three Diegeseis: if the *Onnes et Tottes* aetion was in the section which includes line 37 of column Z, the second of the three, then there was one more aetion between it and *Eliorum ritus nuptialis*. If fr. 114, the *Statua Apollinis Delii*, followed fr. 115 *Onnes et Tottes*, and comprised this third Diegesis, then it cannot have had yet another aetion such as the Horses of Diomedes following it, and Pfeiffer will have been wrong in seeing another aetion beginning at fr. 114.18. This should make us proceed with caution in placing fr. 115 as I am suggesting, but there are other factors which do argue in favour of such a positioning, as we will now see.

### *Thematic patterns*

Thematic structure, so popular a topic in the critical literature on other authors, is not something that modern critics generally like to discuss when writing on the *Aetia*;<sup>25</sup> not only is this work still very fragmentary, but Callimachus as an author is wayward and mercurial, so that most scholarly attempts to predict what his text may have been, or what train of thought he may have developed, at any given point where 100 per cent evidence is lacking, all too often turn out to be excursions into folly. The true text, when it materializes, regularly turns out to be something that no one had remotely anticipated. But speculation can still prompt productive lines of enquiry even when it turns out to be wrong in itself, and I offer what follows in that spirit.

The sequence of aetia in Book 3 as outlined above, supplemented with the Onnes–Tottes and Delian Apollo aetia, when taken as a whole seems to me to display some distinct structural features that are worth scrutinizing. Let us consider first the chiasitic arrangement of the book, then the linear structure and thematic connections. Here is the sequence with frr. 114 and 115 (in reverse order) tentatively inserted in the middle:

1. Zeus and a victor at Nemea	<i>Victoria Berenices</i>
2. Artemis	<i>Artemis Hegemone</i>
3. A maiden and Demeter	<i>Thesmophoria Attica</i>
4. Violation of hospitality	<i>Sepulcrum Simonidis</i>
5. Things bridal and Hera at Argos	<i>Fontes Argivi</i>
6. Delos	<i>Acontius et Cydippa</i>
7.	Unknown aetion (or no aetion)
7.	<i>Onnes et Tottes</i>
6. Delos	<i>Statua Apollinis Delii</i>
5. Things bridal and Hera at Elis	<i>Eleorum ritus nuptialis</i>
4. Violation of hospitality	<i>Hospes Isindius</i>
3. Artemis and Aphrodite	<i>Phrygius et Pieria</i>
2. Artemis	<i>Diana Lucina</i>
1. Zeus and a victor at Olympia	<i>Euthycles Locrus</i>

<sup>24</sup> For a detailed analysis of the structure of the Miletus–Didyma myth-ritual see the Appendix at the end of this article.

<sup>25</sup> Although he raises the question of *universam librorum dispositionem*, Pfeiffer himself has very little to say on the subject, beyond brief references to the influence on Ovid and Propertius in a paragraph on thematic technicalities (Prolegomena ad fragmenta in *Callimachus* 2.xxxv–vi). Trypanis (n. 2), 2–3) repeats Pfeiffer's references, appending a general remark on the 'variety' and 'lively personal and realistic touches' of the *Aetia*.

The ring-composition patterning here is quite striking, in some of the details as well as in the primary themes.

1. At the beginning and end of the Book, two of the four Panhellenic festivals. At each a victor who returns home. A crisis and affliction, from enforced famine (the Nemean Lion), and from a blight (the victor Euthycles wrongly accused); hospitality given to a heroic male; gifts; commemoration in cult of a figure who offers significant hospitality (Molorchus) and of a local hero (Euthycles) whose reception in hospitality was a central issue. Mules play a significant role.
2. Artemis and her associations with mothers and offspring. As Hegemone, linked with a lioness protecting her cub; as 'Lucina' called upon by mothers in difficult labour, recollecting the role of Artemis in helping Leto giving birth to Apollo.
3. Narrative accounts involving a maiden and marriage. In Athens a story with themes of conflict and anger, a virgin and the realm of Demeter, and the prerequisite of married status for the Thesmophoria; in Asia Minor a conflict between two cities, and how it was resolved by love and passage from the domain of the virgin Artemis to the world of Aphrodite.
4. Violators of the sacred, and their punishment. Simonides' tomb defiled and his rescue by divine intervention from the palace of Scopas, a notorious violator of hospitality who was about to be punished; Aethalon of Isindus punished for killing a guest. Gods of the sea: Castor and Polydeuces, rescuers of sailors in distress, and Poseidon, whose Panionian festival Aethalon's descendants were banned from.
5. Hera the bride. Famous water-sources of Argos, associated with cleansing and with the ritual of the Sacred Marriage; the cleansing of Elis, by the (diverted) river. The ritual weaving of the robe offered at Argos to Hera by maidens (doubtless before marriage); the ritual presence of the armed warrior at wedding ceremonies at Elis-Olympia, where Hera has a significant temple and presence, and where a robe was woven for her by the local girls (Pausanias 5.16.6).
6. Delos and Apollo (and Artemis). The island where Acontius, an archer, met Cydippe and was pierced by an arrow from the bow of Eros; also the island where the statue of the archer Apollo holds his bow in his left hand. The girdle of Cydippe: the belt of Apollo. The sanctuary of the Graces on Ceos: the Graces in Apollo's right hand.
7. At the centre, either by itself in central focus, or paired with another action, as yet unknown, Miletus-Didyma, its famous sanctuary and festival of Apollo, and the presence of the transforming Dionysus introduced by two young outsiders.

We note how well fr. 114, and the motif of Apollo and Delos, fits into the overall schema of this whole sequence. And we may also note how well it suits this schema if the *Artemis Hegemone* action follows directly on the *Victoria Berenices* without any break, and is followed immediately by the *Thesmophoria Attica* without break. These are strong arguments for placing these aetia in these positions, unless and until new and contradictory evidence appears.

#### *Linear connections*

If we turn now to the linear sequence of Book 3, and consider how each action may have fitted into the simple progression through the book, we find a logic that underlies the connections between the aetia which is nearly as striking as the thematic ring-composition.

The predatory lion of Nemea of the *Victoria Berenices*, hunted and defeated by Heracles, leads to the (by a nice reversal) protective lioness of the *Artemis Hegemone*, where the prey becomes the tyrant Phalaecus while out on a hunt. Heracles' defeat of the lion results in the salvation of the region of Nemea and the establishing of a cult, while the lioness' defeat of Phalaecus results in the salvation of Ambracia and the dedication of statues of Artemis and the lioness (and doubtless an annual ceremony). The lioness protecting her cub in the *Artemis Hegemone* leads nicely into the *Thesmophoria Attica*, with its emphasis on motherhood and offspring.

The narrative focus of the *Thesmophoria Attica* is still quite obscure to us, but it seems to have involved issues of intrusion and protection, and definition of sacred boundaries (at least of membership); the *Sepulcrum Simonidis*, the opening fourteen lines of which are well preserved, sets out the theme of hospitality (the reception in Sicily's Acragas of Simonides from Ceos) and the intrusion (by the otherwise unknown general Phoenix) into the sanctity of the poet's tomb.

The end of the *Sepulcrum Simonidis* and the beginning of the *Fontes Argivi* are missing, and, even though we probably lack at most thirty lines,<sup>26</sup> the connection between these two aetia is unclear. But at least both are similar in that they concern the sacredness of place.

Thematic connections between the *Fontes Argivi* and *Acontius et Cydippa* are easy to spot. The last part of the *Fontes*, contained in fr. 66, turned to look at the girls who wove the robe for Hera, and we think immediately of the ritual bathing of Hera which took place in the region each year for the Hieros Gamos (Pausanias 2.38.2–3); that forms an easy transition into the topic of the meeting of Acontius and Cydippe at another major religious festival, on Delos, and their coming together in marriage.

After *Acontius et Cydippa* we may have a gap of one action whose subject matter is completely unknown. But if the Diegesis of which the last few lines are preserved in the first lines of the new fragment (*P. Mil. Vogl. inv. 28b*) which Gallazzi and Lehnus have added to the Milan Diegesis column Z, is not a new Diegesis but simply the continuation of the *Acontius et Cydippa* Diegesis, then *Acontius et Cydippa* is followed directly by *Onnes et Tottes*. Not only are links easy to see here, since both aetia concern major sanctuaries of Apollo (on Delos and at Miletus–Didyma), but we would have a whole cluster of three aetia all of which would concern Apollo, who would be placed at the very centre of Book 3.

From the *Statua Apollinis Delii* to the *Elorum ritus nuptialis* no links are immediately obvious (not too surprising considering how little we have of the *Statua* action in fr. 114). But both the *Elorum ritus nuptialis* and the *Hospes Isindius* involve treacherous hosts, for each of whom there is retribution, as well as major sanctuaries and festivals (Olympia and the Olympic games, whether for Zeus or Hera, and the Panionian for Zeus' brother Poseidon).

The *Hospes Isindius* concerns the joint Panionian festival held by Ionians, while the *Phrygius et Pieria* concerned another Ionian community festival, for Artemis at Miletus.

<sup>26</sup> Fr. 64 the *Sepulcrum Simonidis*, is contained in the verso of *POxy.* 2211 fr. 1, which has twenty-eight lines (plus three in the upper margin) starting at the top of a column of text, of which the bottom is missing—the Simonides action begins at v. 10 of the papyrus. On the other side, the recto, are thirty-one lines, of which the first nine are the end of the *Fontes Argivi* = fr. 66. We do not know how long the columns were in *POxy.* 2211, but there cannot be more than thirty lines missing (and probably much fewer than that) from the verso, and somewhere in that missing section the *Sepulcrum Simonidis* ended and the *Fontes Argivi* began.

Artemis links *Phrygius et Pieria* and *Diana Lucina*, and in addition the motif of marriage of two young lovers in the former is quite suitably followed by that of childbirth in the latter.

Finally, *Diana Lucina* and *Euthycles Locrus*. Too little is left of the Diana aetion in particular to reconstruct possible thematic connections between these aetia, but at the least we may note that in *Diana Lucina* both Artemis and her twin brother Apollo featured, while in *Euthycles Locrus* Apollo played a significant role as patron of the oracle which, in a familiar pattern, showed the Locrians how to resolve the plague that afflicted them and return to orderly and pious ways of worship.

### *The larger context*

It is not just internal literary structure that the new evidence for *Aetia* 3 illuminates; it also sheds light on the larger picture, the external political context, and the question to what extent Callimachean, and Alexandrian, poetry was essentially literary in its focus and disdainful, even, of any sense of 'relevance'. What we glimpse in Book 3, it could be argued, is a poetry that was particularly engaged with contemporary events, even if its outward stance was that of the refined and sardonic sensibility.

First, it does not seem too fanciful to observe that almost every aetion in Book 3, other than the first and the last which frame the book, and the two that deal with hospitality (*Sepulcrum Simonidis* and *Hospes Isindius*), concerns either marriage or childbirth. Peter Parsons, building on a suggestion of Rudolf Pfeiffer before him, already pointed out<sup>27</sup> that, as Berenice came from Cyrene to Alexandria, and soon found her new husband, Ptolemy Euergetes, called away to war almost as soon as he acceded to the throne, Callimachus wrote two new books<sup>28</sup> of the *Aetia*, with the first aetion of Book 3 and the last of Book 4 forming a frame designed to encourage and console the Egyptian queen on the temporary loss of her husband. Now we can see that, in addition, Book 3 focused as a whole on themes intended to be reassuring and sympathetic, themes of young love, marriage, children, and even hospitality.

Secondly, several of the topics that feature in Book 3 resonate quite closely with issues that had long been close to the heart of Ptolemaic imperial policy, and that for a while preoccupied the Egyptian political agenda almost as soon as Ptolemy Euergetes came to the throne. Four aetia in particular are involved. The *Artemis Hegemone* aetion dealt with the topic of a repressive tyrant and the events that liberated a people from his rule; the *Onnes et Tottes* aetion concerned rival political parties in Miletus–Didyma, assassination of a popular leader, and a people's success in resisting the imposition of a tyrant. The *Phrygius et Pieria* aetion is set in the same region of Asia Minor, Miletus and the neighbouring city of Myus, and has as its background dissension between those two cities; the *Hospes Isindius* concerns the great regional Panionian festival set on Mt Mycale close to Miletus and Ephesus. The region of Ephesus–Miletus had been part of the Ptolemaic empire for about fifteen years before Euergetes came to the throne; in both cities there had been revolts against Ptolemaic rule, and the area seems to have returned to being part of the Seleucid

<sup>27</sup> (n. 2), 48–50.

<sup>28</sup> It remains uncertain whether Callimachus wrote two new books of the *Aetia* around the time when Berenice and Ptolemy Euergetes came to the throne, or perhaps rewrote, or recompiled, some existing works. If I am right in associating the thematic preoccupation of Book 3 with the circumstances of the accession, it is much more likely that these two books were written afresh, and are to be dated among the last works written by Callimachus.

empire around 258 B.C. Part of the political dealings over this region between Egypt and Syria seems to have involved the marriage of Ptolemy Euergetes' sister, Berenice, to Antiochus II, who repudiated his previous wife Laodice in the process. Antiochus II died the same year as Ptolemy Philadelphus: at the time he was in Ephesus, with his former wife Laodice, who now claimed the Syrian empire for her son, while Berenice in Syria claimed the throne for her son. Berenice appealed for help to her brother Ptolemy Euergetes, who had just succeeded their father to the throne of Egypt. Euergetes set off for Syria and Asia Minor in what is now known as the Third Syrian War, and Egypt became once more deeply involved militarily in Syria and Asia Minor. Even though Berenice and her son were soon murdered, and even though Euergetes had to return to Egypt to deal with a local revolt, Egypt continued to maintain a military presence in Asia Minor, and seems to have secured the area of Ephesus and Miletus again as part of its sphere of influence. Our sources for all this are scattered and difficult, and we are unable to reconstruct in any detail the course of events, let alone the local history of a particular community such as Miletus or Ephesus at this time, but the numerous thematic and geographic similarities with at least four of Callimachus' aetia in Book 3 are obvious and striking. We doubtless miss a lot of significant correlations, nuances and interplay between the course of contemporary events and the long-ago myth-historical events and characters presented in the aetia, but it is almost impossible not to conclude that in writing Book 3 Callimachus had contemporary events and Egyptian concerns very much in mind, from the accession of a Cyrenaic queen to the throne in Alexandria, to the tangled world of overseas influence and power-play in western Asia Minor, in which the Ptolemaic family had a very strong personal involvement with very high stakes, all part of the legacy of the new Ptolemy's father, Philadelphus, and more than fifty years of imperial ambitions in the eastern Aegean.

#### APPENDIX: THE STRUCTURE OF THE MILETUS-DIDYMA MYTH-RITUAL CALLIMACHUS *AETIA* FR. 115

The Onnes-Tottes account in Nicolaus of Damascus (whose source was probably a local Miletus historian) contains a number of familiar archetypal features that are to be found in other rituals elsewhere in Greece. Thus the situation at Miletus begins with a crisis (brought about by the assassination of the good king Leodamas and the flight of his sons and their supporters); this leads to consultation of the oracle (whether at Delphi or the more local Didyma is unknown) and a response that seems puzzling ('help will come from Phrygia'), followed by the arrival from abroad of two unlikely characters, the boys Onnes and Tottes who are bearing a container (a box or a basket). The boys have also been given an oracle, which turns out to be reciprocal to the pronouncement made to the Milesians, and so the two parties come together, to carry out their now joint destiny; the contents of the box confound the enemies of Miletus, the crisis is resolved, and the cult of the Cabeiroi boys is established. (Thus the annual ritual of the present day is an act of commemoration, marking for all time the significance of the original events that are recounted in the 'aetiological' myth.)

This account is identical in overall structure, as well as in many of its specific components, to an annual cult practised in honour of Apollo's sister Artemis on the Greek mainland. The sanctuary and festival of Artemis Laphria, originally located in Calydon but transferred by the emperor Augustus to Patras, are documented for us by

Pausanias (7.18.8ff.), and they begin with a crisis, caused in this case by the priestess of Artemis (Comaitho) making love in the sanctuary and thereby defiling it, and having to be executed (sacrificed to the goddess) along with her lover; the crisis becomes an extended one by the goddess requiring that the sacrifice of two young people be continued as an annual event. Into this situation comes a third party from outside [Dionysus always comes from outside], one Eurypylus, who bears a chest or basket containing a statue of Dionysus. The two parties each have oracles which turn out to be reciprocal (the worshippers of Artemis that their human sacrifice will be resolved by a king who comes from outside, Eurypylus that the bouts of madness that he experiences will be cured when he encounters in his wanderings a people offering a strange sacrifice): the arrival of the god in the chest transforms the human sacrifice into a procession of celebration of young people, and the bearer of the instrument that resolves the crisis, Eurypylus, receives a hero-shrine (a tomb) in the Artemis sanctuary, along with annual worship at the time of the Dionysus festival.

The parallels here are obvious. In particular the transformational role of the common component Dionysus is striking. And, as seems usually to be the case with those who introduce a god (and especially Dionysus), the bearer(s) of the precious chest/basket will be honoured in perpetuity. (We may think also, of course, of the daughters of Cecrops in Athens, who receive the box containing Erechthonius from Athena: as with the contents of the chests in Miletus and Calydon–Patras, the Athenian chest will both cause madness and result in its bearers receiving shrines and worship ever after.) As is appropriate in the worship of the virginal Artemis and the epehebe Apollo, the key role in the introduction of the transforming object is played by young people, and an important component in the whole affair is sex and/or sexuality. We may also wonder if Onnes and Tottes experienced any madness in playing out their role; and we may be certain that they were honoured at Miletus (or Didyma) with burial as heroes.

*University of California, Berkeley*

ANTHONY BULLOCH  
 abulloch@berkeley.edu