

P. OXY. 2509: HESIOD'S *CATALOGUE* ON THE DEATH  
OF ACTAEON

R. JANKO

E. LOBEL, FIRST EDITOR IN 1964 of the second-century Oxyrhynchus papyrus 2509,<sup>1</sup> containing twenty-one largely complete hexameters, tentatively suggested that they derive from Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women*, and deal with the death of Actaeon. This identification is not accepted in the standard edition of the fragments by R. Merkelbach and M. L. West,<sup>2</sup> nor, despite new evidence, in the latest revision of the Oxford Classical Text of Hesiod (1983), but it was strongly supported in 1969 by A. Casanova.<sup>3</sup> Despite subsequent neglect,<sup>4</sup> the case for its inclusion among the fragments of the *Eoëae* is even better than Casanova indicated.

Lobel based his ascription to Hesiod on two grounds, there being then no direct evidence that the *Catalogue* referred to Actaeon. First, line 3 reads

Χείρων νηϊδ' ἔχων νύμφην, θυμαρέ' ἄκ[οι]τιν.

Whether Chiron's wife is actually said to be called Nais, or simply a Naiad (which is far more likely<sup>5</sup>), there is a striking parallel in the Scholia to Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.182 Drachmann, which report that, though usually called Chariclo, she was called Nais by Hesiod (*Cat.* fr. 42 M-W). In capitals the line could easily be read as saying precisely this. Second, Lobel noted that the verses display "the same Homeric or sub-Homeric tincture that is found in certainly attested pieces." We shall see that sub-Homeric is the better term.

There are now two testimonia that the *Catalogue* included Actaeon. First, a damaged passage of Philodemus *De pietate* (p. 60 Gomperz), termed "dubium" by Merkelbach and West (fr. 346), is now read by A. Henrichs

<sup>1</sup>*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 30, pages 4-7.

<sup>2</sup>*Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967, henceforth cited as M-W). Reviewing Lobel *op. cit.* in *CR* 16 (1966) 22, West remarks that this is "an incoherent epic pastiche . . . . The author of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* would turn in his grave if he knew that it had been attributed to him." The editors' decision was also presumably influenced by their assignation of fr. 42 on Chiron's wife to the story of Jason; apparently they so assigned it because fr. 42 is from the Scholia on Pindar's version of that story in *Pyth.* 4, while fr. 40 associates Jason with Chiron. But Chiron was mentioned elsewhere in the poem (fr. 204.87), and fr. 42 need not come from the story of Jason.

<sup>3</sup>"Il mito di Atteone nel Catalogo Esiodeo," *RFIC* 97 (1969) 31-46.

<sup>4</sup>The papyrus is not mentioned by W. D. Meier, *Die epische Formel im pseudohesiodischen Frauenkatalog* (diss. Zurich 1976), or I. M. Cohen, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (diss. Toronto 1983).

<sup>5</sup>Lobel cites the excellent parallels *Il.* 6.22, 14.444, 20.384.

as ]ς Ἀκταίων καὶ [γυν]αῖκα[ι] καθάπερ [ἐν] Ἡρία[ι]ς.<sup>6</sup> Secondly, a papyrus dictionary of metamorphoses, published by T. Renner in 1978, explicitly attests that the *Catalogue* narrated the transformation and death of Actaeon (*P. Mich.* inv. 1447 verso, col. ii 1–6).<sup>7</sup> The complete entry reads as follows:

Ἀκταίων ὁ Ἀρισταί[ο]ν καὶ Αὐ[τονόης, τῶν Σεμέ-]  
λης ἐφιέμενος γάμων αὐτ[ ca 14 ]  
το πρὸς τοῦ μητροπάτορος[ ca 6 μετεμορ-]  
φώθη εἰ[ς] ἐλάφου δόκησιν διὰ βο[υλὴν] Ἀρτέμ[ι-]  
δος καὶ διεσπαράσθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐ[α]ντ[οῦ] κυνῶν, ὧ[ς]  
φησιν Ἡσιόδου ἐν Γυναικῶν Κα[τ]ὰλ[ό]γωι.

This testimonium supplies the significant detail that Actaeon was punished for wooing Semele.

In what part of the work was the story told? Actaeon's parents Aristaeus and Autonoe appear at *Theogony* 975 ff. An *Eoea* devoted to the daughters of Cadmus is unattested, and in any case would rightly belong in the *Heroogonia* at the end of the *Theogony*, which forms the seamless transition to the *Catalogue*, since Cadmus' wife Harmonia was the daughter of Aphrodite. Nonetheless Casanova favours the possibility of such an *Eoea*. The alternative is to suppose that Actaeon was introduced as a descendant of his other grandmother Cyrene, whose *Eoea* occupies frs. 215 ff. M.-W. Her son Aristaeus appears in frs. 216 f., and the editors suggest that the damaged end of fr. 217 may have concerned Autonoe; the most important fact about the latter must have been her son's grisly end.<sup>8</sup> Already in 1911 L. Malten hypothesized that the peculiar version of his demise in Stesichorus (*PMG* 236) and Acusilaus (Jacoby, *FGrHist* 2 F 33) had as common source this *Eoea*:<sup>9</sup> Actaeon perished "so that he might not take Semele to wife" (Stes. *ap.* Paus. 9.2.3), or "because he wooed Semele" (Acus. *ap.* [Apollod.] 3.4.4), not because he wooed Artemis or saw her bathing or boasted that he was a better hunter than she.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Cf. "Towards a New Edition of Philodemus' Treatise *On Piety*," *GRBS* 13 (1972) 67 n. 2. I am grateful to Dr Cohen for bringing this to my attention.

<sup>7</sup>"A Papyrus Dictionary of Metamorphoses," *HSCP* 82 (1978) 277–293, esp. 282–287. This was not cross-listed under Hesiod in *L'Année Philologique*, but is quoted in the revised OCT of Hesiod (1983) as fr. 217(a).

<sup>8</sup>The inclusion of a grandson is after the *Catalogue*'s manner, cf. Casanova, *RFIC* 95 (1967) 31 ff., e.g., fr. 33(a) M.-W. But, as one of this journal's readers remarks, nobody has suggested how the end of fr. 217 can be restored to include Autonoe's story. The mentions of Argeione (Hera?), gifts to someone alone, and the glorious work, presumably of Athene, accord best with a passage where goddesses compensate a girl with divine gifts upon a parent's demise, cf. *Od.* 20.67 ff.

<sup>9</sup>*Kyrene* (Berlin 1911) 18 ff.

<sup>10</sup>On the evidence for the myth see Renner, (above, n. 7) 283 ff., and E. R. Dodds, *Euripides: Bacchae* (Oxford 1969) on line 329.

Now it is striking that *POxy 2509* contains a reference to Semele, which Lobel could not explain, as well as part of the story of Actaeon. The text below is based on Lobel's:

ἔστυμένως δ' ἤϊξε δι' αἰθέρος ἀτρυνέτοι[ο·]  
Χείρωνος δ' ἴκανε μέγα σπέος· ἐνθα δ' ἓνα[ιε  
Χείρων νηιδ' ἔχων νύμφην, θυμαρὲ ἄκ[οιτιν.  
ἐνθα δὲ Φιλλυρίδην ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·  
5 "Χ[ε]ίρων, οἶσθα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁμῶς μα[κ]άρεσσι θεοῖ[σιν]  
ὥς ἔσται Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος ἀγλαὸς υἱός  
καὶ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο, Διώνυσος πολυγηθ[ή]ς,  
ὃς ποτε τοῖσδε κ[ύ]νεσσιν ὅρος κάτα [.]...[...][  
τ[έρ]ψεται ἔχων· ὅτε δ' αὐτε πατήρ ἀνδ[ρ]ῶν τε θε[ῶ]ν τε  
10 αὐ[τ]ὸν ἄγχι μετὰ φύλ[α] θεῶν αἰειγενετάων,  
ἐς χώρον πάλιν αὐτίς ἐλεύσονται κ[.]...οι.[  
.ο[...].[...]ῆματα πάντα διαμπερές αι.[...]."  
ὥς] ἔφατ' αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς κόρυη μεγ[άλαιοι·  
...[προεω]ν δε[...].[...] ]...[ ] εἵλετο λύσσα[  
15 μ]ὲν ἔβη πρὸς [᾽Ολυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐ]ρνοδεί[ς]  
ἄγων μετὰ [φύλα θεῶν αἰειγεν]ετάρ[ω]ν·  
...[.].. ἄχος Ἀκτα[ί] ...[.]...[.]...[.]  
δ]εσπότωεω ..[.]...ωσανθε[  
ώ]ρυχμοῖο δὲ πᾶς πλη[  
20 π]οσσὶ κόνιε χέοντι[  
κ]λαγγ[γ]ῆς θεσπεσίης χ[

Lobel identified this as from the myth of Actaeon because of the ending: the scrap of his name in line 17, the reference to dogs and madness, and their tremendous howling in connexion with their master all support his case. But what are we to make of the opening, a goddess's special journey to Chiron's cave to convey the portentous but *prima facie* irrelevant news that Zeus and Semele will have a son, Dionysus? Casanova<sup>11</sup> made the vital link—she is explaining to Chiron why Actaeon, his beloved pupil in venery, had to fall victim to his own dogs. She proffers a double consolation—Dionysus will be “rich in joys,” and, apparently, the dogs will return to Chiron. Semele belongs to Zeus, not, it is implied, to Actaeon; she is, after all, his maternal aunt! No doubt it was the element of incest, as well as the desire to make the crime fit the punishment, which led to the later submergence of such versions of his death by those involving Artemis as the offended party.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup>(above, n. 3) 38 f.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. above, n. 10. It would not surprise me if the story of Semele "wooded" by Actaeon originally held to the same pattern as that of Coronis, who slept with Ischys "though she carried the pure seed of the God" Apollo (cf. Pindar, *Pyth.* 3). If Semele, already pregnant

Who is the goddess who acts as messenger? Is it Artemis, as Casanova suggests? The standard formulae of line 13 accord far better with Athene, as Lobel remarks; unlike Artemis, she often acts as her father's courier, since she has especial access to his secret counsels. It is appropriate too that so wise a goddess should tell Chiron, himself famed for wisdom and prophecy (e.g., Bacchyl. *Od.* 27.34–38 Snell). A close thematic parallel in Pindar supports Athene's claim, and also reinforces the suggestion that the passage comes from the *Eoea* of Cyrene. Our goddess tells Chiron that he knows as well as do the gods themselves that Semele will bear Dionysus to Zeus. In *Pythian* 9 Chiron tells Apollo (43 ff.) that he need not have asked him about the nymph Cyrene, as he is omniscient; nonetheless the centaur proceeds to predict his marriage to her and the birth of Aristaeus, with the blessings he will bring.<sup>13</sup> The Scholia on *Pyth.* 9.6 (fr. 215 M-W) tell us that in this poem Pindar used as a major source the *Eoea* of Cyrene. Exactly how Pindar used it, and how it is to be reconstructed, remain obscure problems: it is certainly possible that the "annunciation" of Aristaeus occurred there, just as in Pindar. But two "annunciations" seem excessive for a single *Eoea*, and it seems equally likely that Pindar adopted from this passage the idea of an "annunciation" to someone who ought to know the future anyway, and has employed it with his usual consummate art. If so, he has achieved three goals at once: the rescue of Chiron from his unexplained silence and lack of foresight here; the humour in Apollo's pretended ignorance about Cyrene; and, above all, resounding praise of the god's wisdom and prophetic powers from Chiron, himself an unimpeachable authority.<sup>14</sup> In *Pythian* 3 we can certainly see Pindar treating his sources with such freedom, so as to lay an equally heavy stress on Apollo's omniscience: in following the *Eoea* of Coronis (fr. 60 M-W), he suppresses the motif of the crow who reported Coronis' infidelity to the god, who learns of it "with his all-knowing mind" (28).<sup>15</sup>

by Zeus, was actually seduced by Actaeon, we can explain Zeus' slaying her with the thunderbolt, an action whose motivation, in Euripides and later versions, has always seemed to me inadequate. Zeus' conduct would then resemble Apollo's towards the adulterous Coronis—the mother is destroyed, but the unborn child, with all the blessings he will bring (wine from Dionysus, healing from Asclepius), is snatched away to safety from the flames.

<sup>13</sup>On this scene see L. Woodbury, "Apollo's first Love: Pindar, *Pyth.* 9.26 ff.," *TAPA* 103 (1972) 561–573, and on the ode as a whole E. Robbins, "The Myth of Pindar's Ninth Pythian," *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 91–104; Woodbury, "Cyrene and the TEAEYTA of Marriage in Pindar's Ninth Pythian Ode," *TAPA* 112 (1982) 245–258; C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York 1981) 65 ff.

<sup>14</sup>On Pindar's use of sources in this poem see Carey (above, n. 13) 74. The reconstruction of the *Eoea* is the object of continuing dispute. For a recent statement of the usual view that, in having Apollo convey Cyrene to Libya, Pindar is following the *Eoea*, which must therefore postdate the foundation of Cyrene from Thera, see Cohen, (above, n. 4) 388 ff.; *contra*, see R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns* (Cambridge 1982) 248.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford 1962) 84.

Athene is also more suitable from a practical point of view. Artemis must be acting as Zeus' agent in killing Actaeon; it seems odd that she should have to return to Olympus, in order to take a message back down to Chiron, if Actaeon is already dead; better, surely, to have Zeus dispatch first Artemis, and then Athene. In fact it is clear that Actaeon is dead. Lobel, reading ]εἶλετο λύσσα[ in 14, believed that at this moment Actaeon's hounds were seized by madness, and that the rending of their master ensued. He interpreted the lines following as narrating the fulfilment of the prophecy about Dionysus, restoring 15 f. as:

χῶ μ]έν ἔβη πρὸς [᾽Ολυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὖ]ρνοδείη[ς  
αὐτόν] ἄγων μετὰ [φύλα θεῶν αἰείγειν]ετά[ων].

This is superficially attractive, because 16 seemed to repeat 10, and the poet seems unafraid of repetition. But it will not do, since (i) the change of scene is too abrupt; we need to see the goddess leave, after her arrival was so fully described; (ii) the lapse of time assumed, for Dionysus to be born, grow up, and hunt with the dogs before eventually being elevated to Olympus, is far too great not to have been indicated; (iii) at 17 ff. the dogs seem to be grieving for Actaeon their master (note ἄχος in 17), not tearing him apart: but if they are mad, how can they recognize their master and grieve for him?

Casanova found a more convincing interpretation of these lines by comparing Apollodorus' version of the story (*loc. cit.*):

ἀπολομένου δέ ᾽Ακταίωνος οἱ κύνες ἐπιζητοῦντες τὸν δεσπότην κατωρύνοντο, καὶ ζήτησιν ποιούμενοι παρεγένοντο ἐπὶ τὸ τοῦ Χείρωνος ἄντρον, ὃς εἰδὼλον κατεσκεύασεν ᾽Ακταίωνος, ὃ καὶ τὴν λύπην αὐτῶν ἔπασσε.

First, noting that the end of the line is torn away, he proposes ἐξ]εἶλετο λύσσα[ν in 14: the goddess removes the dogs' madness, and the whole pack starts to howl and lament their master, who is evidently already deceased (incidentally, Athene is certainly the goddess best qualified to restore sanity).<sup>16</sup> He restores 15 f. as follows:

χῇ μ]έν ἔβη πρὸς [᾽Ολυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὖ]ρνοδείη[ς  
ἀθοαν]άτων μετὰ [φύλα θεῶν αἰείγειν]ετά[ων].

These restorations match the traces, and permit the deity to leave trailing as many epic clichés as on her entry, in accord with the leisurely pace of this scene. It may be assumed that the healer Chiron eventually found some cure for the hounds' terrible grief, but whether Hesiod had him fabricate a statue of Actaeon, as in Apollodorus, lies beyond our knowledge.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. *Il.* 18.311; 22.222 ff., 296 ff., where she takes away men's wits; and further M. Detienne and J. P. Vernant, *Les ruses de l'intelligence: la MHTIS des Grecs* (Paris 1974) 167 ff., 176 ff.

Casanova's elucidation of this papyrus may have been neglected because *L'Année Philologique*, summarizing his article, notes that he assigns the fragment to "an augmented version of the *Catalogue*," dating to late sixth-century Boeotia. In fact he means the *Catalogue* itself, composed at the late date and in the agglutinative manner implausibly hypothesized by J. Schwartz.<sup>17</sup> I see no reason to dissociate this piece from the bulk of the *Eoëae* as we know it. Casanova asserts that the word *δεσπότης* (18) could not have been used by Hesiod himself, since *δεσπότης* first occurs in Archilochus (fr. 3 West). Whether or not the *Catalogue* is by Hesiod, *do-po-ta* for *δεσπότης* already occurs in Linear B.<sup>18</sup> Vocabulary and oddities of this sort are unreliable as a dating criterion, even for much larger pieces than this.<sup>19</sup> However, examination of the formulaic diction reveals many phrases absent from Homer, which are found in Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns*. To Lobel's parallels with Homer we can compare the following in the rest of the epic corpus (\* denotes that the parallel occurs at the same metrical place in the line, † that there is no Homeric parallel for the phrase):

- |        |   |   |
|--------|---|---|
| 1      | ἐσσυμένως δ' ἤϊξε<br>δι' αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτοιο                                     | †* <i>h. Dem.</i> 449, <i>h. Herm.</i> 215<br>* <i>Cat.</i> fr. 150.35, <i>h. Dem.</i> 67,<br>457   |
| 3      | θυμαρέ' ἄκ[οιτιν]   | <i>Cat.</i> 43.20: ἄλοχον θυμαρέ'   |
| 5      | οἶσθα καὶ αὐτός<br>μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν  | <i>Aspis</i> 355, <i>h. Herm.</i> 382<br>* <i>Cat.</i> 14.6, 30.4, 136.9, 176.4,<br><i>h. Del. Ap.</i> 86   |
| 6      | Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος ἀγλαὸς<br>υἱὸς  | †* <i>h.</i> 26.2 (to Dionysus: modified<br>to the accusative); <i>h.</i> 7.1:<br>Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος υἱόν  |
| 7      | Διώνυσος πολυγηθῆς  | †* <i>Th.</i> 941 (accusative, modified<br>with contraction); <i>Erga</i> 614<br>(genitive, contracted)   |
| 9      | τ[έρ]ψεται ἔχων<br>πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε                                      | †* <i>Aspis</i> 273: τέρψιν ἔχων<br>* <i>Cat.</i> 30.8 (and 16x Hesiod and<br><i>Hymns</i> )  |
| 10, 16 | ἀθαν[άτων] μετὰ φύλα<br><br>μετὰ φύλα θεῶν<br>αἰειγενετάων<br>θεῶν αἰειγενετάων | †* <i>Erga</i> 199 (φύλον); <i>h. Aphr.</i><br>129 (φύλ')<br>†* <i>h. Dem.</i> 36 (καὶ φύλα), 322<br>* <i>Th.</i> 548, 893, 993, <i>h. Herm.</i><br>537 |
| 11     | πάλιν αὖτις   | †* <i>h. Dem.</i> 398 (restored)  |

<sup>17</sup>*Pseudo-Hesioda* (Leiden 1960). Cf. below, n. 20.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. A. Morpurgo (Davies), *Mycenaeae Graecitatis Lexicon* (Rome 1963) s.v.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. Janko, (above, n. 14) 10, 104 ff.

- 12 ἡματα πάντα διαμπερές *h. Pyth. Ap.* 485, *h. Aphr.* 209:  
 δ. ἡ. π.  
 15 πρὸς [ἽΟλυμπον ἀπὸ χθονός *†\*Erga* 197, *h. Pyth. Ap.* 186  
 εὐ]ρυοδείη[ς] (om. εὐρυοδείης)

The general impression is of diction drawing heavily on the overflowing resources of post-Homeric epic language, with plenty of formulaic modification and adaptation (e.g., the unique blend of formulae in 13). It seems to be at a similar linguistic stage to that of the other *Catalogue*-fragments: the formula Διώνυσος πολυγηθής in 7 is in fact at an older stage than its other occurrences at *Th.* 941 or *Erga* 614.<sup>20</sup> Subjectively speaking, I find the style, with its heavy use of ornamental epithets, not at all different from that of the *Catalogue*. For the use of direct speech (8 lines), cf. fr. 75.13 ff. (13+ lines), 76.9–13 (5 lines?), 165.1–4 (4+ lines?, a god?), 211.7 ff. (7+ lines); the fulness of the episode is comparable to that of Hippomenes and Atalanta, for example.

Thus Casanova's interpretation of this fragment, and his argument for its Hesiodic origin, are especially attractive in the light of the Michigan papyrus, as Renner remarks, and of the other evidence. Far from being "an incoherent epic pastiche," *POxy* 2509 has a strong claim to represent one of the more extended tales in the *Catalogue*, and ought to be included as fr. 217(b).<sup>21</sup>

Malten<sup>22</sup> also proposed that eleven corrupt hexameters, giving a glimpse of Actaeon's rending and the names of his hounds, and preserved as an interpolation in Apollodorus' version of the story (3.4.4), derive from this same *Eoea*. His suggestion, not featured in Merkelbach and West, was taken up by Casanova, and, independently, Gallavotti;<sup>23</sup> J. U. Powell<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup>On the linguistic dating of epic diction cf. *ibid.*, esp. 85 ff., 222 ff. on the language of the *Catalogue* and its relation to Hesiod. The passage is too brief for the application of statistical techniques.

<sup>21</sup>I am very grateful to Mr P. J. Parsons for reinspecting the papyrus and commenting on several readings, especially the extensive restorations proposed by Casanova. He remarks that in line 8 the traces match μ[η]ρ[ο]φύλακον (Lobel) better than Π[α]ρ[υ]νήσιο (Casanova); in 11 κύνης οἶδ[ε] is possible; in 12 σο[ι] is not right, as sigma is impossible, but αἰε[ν] εἰσο[ν]ται is possible; in 14 λυσσ[η]ρέων cannot be confirmed, but κυμ[ῶ]ν is not excluded; in 16 ἀθαν[ά]των, tau is as possible as Lobel's gamma. In view of the sense, Casanova must be right here.

<sup>22</sup>(above, n. 9) 20 ff.

<sup>23</sup>Casanova (above, n. 3) 40 ff.; Gallavotti, "I cani di Atteone in Ovidio e Igino e nell' epica greca," *Boll. del Comitato per la prep. dell'ed. naz. dei classici gr. e lat.* 17 (1969) 81–91. For other lists of the canine names cf. Aeschylus' *Toxotides* fr. 423a Mette (from Pollux 5.47: read Λυκόπτας for Λυκόπτας?), Ovid *Met.* 3.232 ff., Hyginus 181, and *P. Med.* inv. 123 (late second century, published by S. Daris in D. Samuel, ed., *Proc. Twelfth Intern. Congr. of Papyrology* [Toronto 1970] 97 ff.). I have been unable to consult A. Colonna, "I cani di Atteone in Esiodo," *Sileno* 1 (1975) 297–300.

<sup>24</sup>*Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford 1925) 71.

thought the lines Hellenistic, and he is followed by A. Grilli.<sup>25</sup> However, the parallels with Ovid detected by the latter are not close, and his arguments for Hellenistic style not very convincing; yet the parallels with early epic, though present,<sup>26</sup> are not as compelling as in the case of *POxy* 2509. The following considerations occur to me in support of Malten's position:

(i) The entire *Bibliotheca* contains but four verse quotations—an oracle, certainly part of the original text, at 3.15.6, and three proven interpolations: "Hesiod," *Aspis* 223 f. at 2.4.2; this passage; and "Hesiod," *Melampodia* fr. 275 M-W at 3.6.7. Did the interpolator cull this from "Hesiod" also? Casanova suggested that he once introduced it with the words ἐκ τῶν <'Hoίων> οὕτω, and that the omission of the work's title can readily be explained by later scribes' incomprehension of it.

(ii) The name Actaeon occurs here in the known bye-form Ἀκταῖος, which should not be emended away. If Hesiod spoke of Actaeus, it is perhaps surprising that neither a scholiast nor the writer of the Michigan papyrus tells us so: yet the same form of his name may be needed in line 17 of *POxy* 2509, if the verse is to have a medial caesura, e.g.,

τοῦ[ς] δ' ἄχος Ἀκτα[ίου κύνας ἔλλαβε . . . ] | [δ]εσπότηω. . . .

Omission of the third-foot caesura is not particularly common in the *Catalogue*.<sup>27</sup>

(iii) The details of the story, so far as they can be ascertained, seem similar. First, in line 7 Actaeon is said to die Διὸς ἐννεσίῃσιν, "by the will of Zeus." This accords with all attested pre-Euripidean versions of the myth, in which Artemis acts on Zeus' behalf, as Renner has shown.<sup>28</sup> Versions after Euripides, so far as we know them, use only the tale in which it is Artemis who is angry. Secondly, the last lines of the passage read:

τοὺς δέ μέτ' ἄλλοι πάντες ἐπέσσυθεν ἔμμεμαῶτες  
ἀργαλέων ὁδυνῶν ἄκος ἔμμεναι ἀνθρώποισιν.

We are transferred with astonishing abruptness from the dogs, rushing up to tear the slain Actaeon and lap his blood, to something that is to be a cure for dire pains to mortals. Casanova supposes, in the interest of preserving the integrity of the passage, that the last line belongs here—the dogs thought

<sup>25</sup>I cani d'Atteone: Igino e il *P. Med.* inv. 123—la tradizione poetica," *PP* 26 (1971) 354–367, esp. 361 ff.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. Casanova (above, n. 3) 40; Gallavotti, (above, n. 23) 91; Grilli (above, n. 25) 361–363, notes.

<sup>27</sup>For statistics see Janko (above, n. 14) 37.

<sup>28</sup>(above, n. 7) 283 ff.; Grilli wishes to avoid this by reading <κούρης> Διὸς (above, n. 25, 364 n. 27, after Schmidt). One can imagine a tragic version in which Artemis was reluctant to execute her father's will, and grieves for Actaeon as she would for Hippolytus.



they were destroying a monster. Surely most editors have been right to regard it as a detached fragment. Bergk<sup>29</sup> implausibly referred it to the troubles after Actaeon's demise and the need to placate his ghost, about which we learn from Pausanias (9.38.5). R. Wagner<sup>30</sup> referred it to Chiron, M. Schmidt,<sup>31</sup> more convincingly, to Dionysus or wine; he assigned it to Panyassis, cf. frs. 5 and 12–14 Matthews. But there are equally good parallels in Hesiod, cf. frs. 238–239 on Maron and the effects of wine, and *Aspis* 400. Thus, just as in *POxy* 2509, so too here Dionysus and his joys may be near at hand. Could the line come from a speech of Zeus after the death of Actaeon, telling Athene to explain to Chiron about Dionysus' birth and its beneficial consequence, wine, "to be a remedy for mankind's dire pains"?<sup>32</sup>

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

#### ADDENDUM

It turns out that Colonna (above, n. 23) argues against a Hesiodic origin for *POxy*. 2509 and the lines in Apollodorus, but the Michigan papyrus disproves his arguments. He does point out (299) that Dionysus favours Actaeon's dogs because they vindicated his mother's honour. My conclusions are shared by C. C. Schlam, "Diana and Actaeon: Metamorphoses of a myth," *Classical Antiquity* 3 (1984) 82–109, esp. 83 f. But see also West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985, forthcoming). On the text of Apollodorus' fragment see also G. Salanitro, *Helikon* 7 (1967) 428–432; F. Vian, *REG* 82 (1969) 227; Salanitro, *Sileno* 1 (1975) 301–306.

<sup>29</sup>*Poetae Lyrici Graeci*<sup>5</sup> (Berlin 1914) Adesp. fr. 33 (his attempt to turn the corrupt hexameters into lyric has not won acceptance).

<sup>30</sup>*Apollodori Bibliotheca* (Leipzig 1904) *ad loc.*

<sup>31</sup>*RhM* 6 (1848) 405, cf. Casanova (above, n. 3) 42.

<sup>32</sup>I wish to thank two anonymous readers for helpful comments, and a seminar audience at Columbia University.