

KONSTANTINOS SPANOUDAKIS

HESYCHIANA MINIMA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 130 (2000) 31–41

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## HESYCHIANA MINIMA\*

This paper attempts to suggest a possible context for some Hesychian glosses related (or conceivably related) to Philitas. It contains some of the possibilities which I shall raise in my new edition of the poetic and grammatical fragments of the Coan poet and scholar. The nature of these suggestions essentially contains a degree of speculation, but it may not be entirely fortuitous, as the glosses here attributed to Philitas' poetic works, other than their metrical form, fulfil three prerequisites, i.e. they have a Hellenistic/Callimachean ring, they can be related to a conceivable context in Philitas or his conceivable influence on Callimachus/Theocritus, and it is possible to identify the passage of Callimachus or Theocritus, in an ancient scholium of which the Philitan reference could survive. The idea for this article incurs an apparent debt to the contribution of A. S. Hollis, *Some neglected verse citations in Hesychius*, published in *ZPE* 123 (1998), 61 f.<sup>1</sup> It may not be extraneous to the aims of this paper to note my suspicion – and hope – that the future editors of Stephanus Byzantius may discover more verse citations than already noticed.

The last editor of Philitas noted of his author's presence in Hesychius that "in Hesychio si miraculo unaquaque glossa nomen inventoris recuperaret, Cuius certe passim resurgeret".<sup>2</sup> Among the many Hesychian entries pertaining to grammatical fragments of Philitas (one is discussed here as entry (h), three others are postulated in entries (c) and (e)), there is one that comes from a poetical work of his, namely θ 405 Θεσσαλαί· αἱ Κῶραι παρὰ Φιλίτην καὶ αἱ φαρμακίδες = *SH* 675C. Two others are transmitted anonymously in Hesychius, but from other sources we know that they come from the Coan, namely α 7862 ἄστλιγγας (M. Schmidt : ἄστιγνας cod.)· ἀυγάς (EtM α 1979 L.–L. : αἴγας cod.)· ἢ ἄστριγγας = *SH* 675B – the fragment is therefore to be edited in the accusative plural – and ν 552 νήχυτον (Mususus : -χιτον cod.)· πολὺ = *CA* 21. Double interpretation of the type 'x or/and y' would appear to be a feature in the exegesis of Philitan terminology. This speaks for an author employing some very oblique language. These anonymous entries suggest the possibility that other anonymous verse citations in Hesychius may be derived from Philitas, though their presence should not be imagined as widespread as that of e.g. Callimachus. The certain poetic fragments of the Coan in Hesychius indicate that the main sources supplying Philitan expressions or vocables to Diogenianus were the ancient commentaries on the great Hellenistic poets reproducing notes which would go back to Theon. All these fragments possibly come from *Demeter*, the poem which Callim. *Aet.* fr. 1.9 f. praises.<sup>3</sup> The entry

\* Hesychius α–ο is cited according to the numeration of K. Latte's edition (Copenhagen 1953/1966), π–ω according to that of M. Schmidt (Halle 1861/1862). Abbreviations of modern collections of fragments are as in P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *Liddell–Scott–Jones: A Greek–English Lexicon. Revised Supplement*, Oxford 1996, except of *Suppl. Hell.* = *SH*. Note also:

Bodson <i>Hiera zōia</i>	L. Bodson, <i>Hiera zōia: contribution à l'étude de la place de l'animal dans la religion grecque ancienne</i> , Brussels 1978.
<i>CA</i>	J. U. Powell, <i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i> , Oxford 1925.
Cook <i>Bee</i>	A. B. Cook, <i>The Bee in Greek Mythology</i> , <i>JHS</i> 15 (1895), 1–24.
Guhl <i>Theon</i>	C. Guhl, <i>Die Fragmente des alexandrinischen Grammatikers Theon</i> , Diss. Hamburg 1969.
Kambylis <i>Dichterweihe</i>	A. Kambylis, <i>Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik</i> , Heidelberg 1965.
Kuchenmüller	G. Kuchenmüller, <i>Philetai Coi reliquiae</i> , Diss. Berlin 1928.
<i>LSCG</i>	F. Sokolowski, <i>Lois sacrées des cités grecques</i> , Paris 1969.
Massimilla <i>Callimaco</i>	G. Massimilla, <i>Callimaco, Aitia. Libri primo e secondo</i> , Pisa 1996.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. before that *id.*, Three possible fragments of Callimachus' *Hecale* in Hesychius, *ZPE* 117 (1997), 47–9. Analogously, Chr. Theodoridis, *Bemerkungen zum Onomastikon des Pollux*, in: I. Vassis, *al.* (edd.), *Lesarten. Festschrift für Athanasios Kambylis*, Berlin–New York 1998, 45–52 on prose citations in Pollux which escaped the attention of Bethe.

<sup>2</sup> Kuchenmüller 115.

<sup>3</sup> A possibility outside *Demeter* may be the entry μ 699 Μελιγουνίς· οὕτως ἡ Λιπάρρα ἐκαλεῖτο νῆσος which is derived from a comment on Callim. *HyDian.* 47–8 νήσῳ ἐνὶ Λιπάρῃ (Λιπάρη νέον, ἀλλὰ τότε ἔσκεν / οὐνομά οἱ Μελιγουνίς). Parthenius *Erot. path.* 2 summarising an episode from Philitas' *Hermes* (*CA* 5) begins Ὀδυσσεὺς (δὲ)

Θεσσαλαί of Coan witches could have been mentioned in a comment on Theocr. 7 via the Thessalian pharmakis Mestra, the mother of the Coan king Eurypylos ([Hesiod] 'Hoiai fr. 43a.66 f. M.–W.). The entry ἄστλιγγας may come from a comment on Callim. *Aet.* fr. 7.12 Pf. (9.12 Massim.) ἄπ' ὄστλιγγων δ' αἰὲν ἄλειφα ῥέει, the entry νήχυτον from a comment on Apoll. Rhod. 3.530 νήχυτον ὕδωρ, which Guhl *Theon*, 57 (fr. \*63) attributed to Theon. Another Hesychian lemma, α 1363 ἄεμμα· τόξον (. . .), seems to reproduce ancient scholia on Callim. *HyAp.* 33 and in its original form it would go on to quote Philitas, as it becomes evident from a marginal comment on that line preserved in P.Oxy. 2258 A fr. 2 verso (s. p.C. VI/VII) (ἄεμμα:) τ[ὸ] τόξον κ(αὶ) Φιλί-| [τας ἐν] Δήμητρι· 'αυτα εγελ] [ . . . ] γυμνὸν ἄεμμα' ] . = SH 673. The Scholia on Nicander, on whom Theon wrote a commentary as well (Guhl *Theon*, 4–6), would be another possible source. Of a different derivation (Antig. Car. *Mir.* 8) is Hesychius κ 363 κάκτος· ἄκανθα ὕφ' ἧς ἐὰν πληγῆ νεβρός ἀχρεῖα ἴσχει τὰ ὄστᾶ εἰς ἀλόους, which discusses a paradox from Philitas (CA 16, discussed here in entry (a)).

a. ε 6569 ἕτερον πόδα· τὸν ἕνα πόδα {πόδα} τὸν εὐώνυμον

Schmidt (his entry ε 6585) unfortunately considered here Aristoph. *Wasps* 1164, but Latte put things right: “ominis vitandi causa dictum”.

The scholium on Theocr. 7.5–9f (79.6 f. Wendel) says of the Coan princes Chalcon and Antagoras that οὔτοι δὲ εἰσιν . . . οἱ ὑποδεδεγμένοι τὴν Δήμητραν, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν περιήει τὴν Κόρην ζητοῦσα and it has long been recognised that the reference here is to Philitas' *Demeter*. ὑποδεδεγμένοι implies reception and entertainment in a house viz. palace and from such a scene may come the fragments *incertae sedis* CA 4 (discussed here in entry (f)), CA 19 δμῳίδες εἰς ταλάρους λευκὸν ἄγουσιν ἔρι (female slaves are a *sine qua non* of an insight in a royal house) and CA 16 γηρῦσαιτο δὲ νεβρός ἀπὸ ψυχῆν ὀλέσσασα / ὀξείης κάκτου τύμμα φυλαξαμένη. The last fragment is a request for the *aulos* to play, which is typical in banquets and very appropriate of aggrieved Demeter, cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1342 ff. This postulated hospitality banquet in Philitas may largely define Lycidas' experiences in Theocr. 7.63 ff. and the feast in Longus 2.35.1–2 with Philetas playing the pipes may be a reworking of it.

The Hesychian entry may preserve a detail from Demeter's entrance in Chalcon's palace, similar to the one described in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 188 ἡ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἔβη ποσί in Celeus' house (in Ovid *Fasti* 4.537 this is only *limen ut intravit*). In theoxenies the entrance of a god is often paid attention to and it would appear that Demeter made a prosperous step while crossing the threshold. Entrance with the good right foot is a lasting superstition in antiquity documented by Mayor on Juv. 10.5, who notes that “the gods are entreated to come *pede secundo* (i.e. Serv. Aen. viii 302 *omine prospero*) Aen. x 255”. Besides, such superstitions would be appropriate of a people, the Coans, whose religious practices led R. Herzog to characterise as ἄνθρωποι δεισιδαιμονέστατοι.<sup>4</sup> But ἕτερον, as Hesychius ε 6567 explains, can mean ἄλλον . . . ἢ ἐν τῶν δυοῖν. ἢ ἀριστερόν and the Hesychian entry suggests that Philitas might have used oblique terminology as to the foot with which Demeter actually straddled the threshold of the Coan palace. The expression would seem to toy with an ambiguity in the description of Thersites in *Il.* 2.217 χωλὸς δ' ἕτερον πόδα, where Schol. AbT (ex.; I.230 Erbse) note ἢ τὸν ἀριστερόν ἢ τὸν δεξιόν, Schol. D τῷ ἐν τῶν ποδῶν. Pindar *Pyth.* 3.34 and Callim. *Hec.* fr. 300 Pf. (51 Hollis) τις . . . δαίμων / τῶν ἐτέρων employ ἕτερος in the sense κακοποιός. The rendering in Hesychius with εὐώνυμον admirably preserves this ambiguity, see *LSJ* s.v. II.2 ‘prosperous’ and III.2 ‘ill-omened’ and contrast e.g. Pindar *Nem.* 8.47–8 (athletic victory) ἕκατι ποδῶν εὐώνυμων / . . . δυοῖν with [Aesch.] *Prom.* 489–90 (omens) οἵτινες τε δεξιοὶ φύσιν /

ἀλώμενος . . . ἀφίκετο πρὸς Αἴολον καὶ Μελιγουνίδα νῆσον, whence O. Schneider, *Nicandrea*, Leipzig 1856, 47 n. 2 suggested that (εἰς) Μελιγουνίδα νῆσον may be a phrase (clausular?) extracted from the Philitan prototype. If so, an early Scholiast of Callimachus may have noted his debt (and Euphorion's CA 51.8–9 ἢ που Μελιγουνίδι τοῖα / μαρμαρυγαί) to Philitas.

<sup>4</sup> *Koische Forschungen und Funde*, Leipzig 1899, 170.

εὐωνύμους τε. This speaks for a proficient source. The possible quotation from Philitas may have had a place in a hexameter with masculine caesura and bucolic diaeresis, as in the *Iliad l.c.* The two words, as Demeter's feet, would be nicely divided between the two halves of the verse.

It is not difficult to follow the impact of such an entrance. In Callim. *HyAp.* 3 καὶ δὴ που τὰ θύρετρα καλῶ ποδὶ Φοῖβος ἀράσσει Apollo, who at the end of the poem appears bound with a poetic alliance with Demeter, is said to be about to kick the door of the μέλαθρον (a term with both secular and religious applications) any minute now. As Williams *ad loc.* remarked, “the un-Homeric flavour of the phrase (combined with the short alpha of καλῶ) . . . suggest that here καλῶ is being used in its Attic sense ‘auspicious’”. Next, Propertius 3.1.5–6 *dicite, quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro? quove pede ingressi?*, in a reference which has long remained unaccounted, asks the shades of Callimachus and Philitas with which foot they entered their *nemus*. Here Propertius' intake of Philitas via Callimachus would become apparent. But Propertius' puzzlement as to the foot with which his two predecessors straddled the entrance of their grove may in fact hint at an actual interpretative question in Philitas.<sup>5</sup> Then a hint at the same ambiguity may come up in the description of Elegy, whom Ovid met in a very Callimachean, shady *vetus . . . silva* in *Am.* 3.1.7–8 *venit odoratos Elegia nexa capillos*, [*< Callim. HyAp. 38 f. < Philitas SH 675B ἄστλιγγας of Demeter? / et, puto, pes illi longior alter erat.* If Propertius knew the Philitan origin of Callim. *HyAp.* 3 from a comment on this line (to which the reference would owe its survival in Diogenianus), we may as well reckon with verbal loans of Callimachus from Philitas. Ironically, it is the same motif but the other foot with which Apollo kicks Phthonos in v. 107 τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδὶ τ' ἤλασεν.

**b. ι 60 ἰανοκρήδεμος ἰοῖς ὅμοιον τὸ ἐπικράνισμα . . .**

“Alexandrinus ni fallor poeta” remarked M. Schmidt = fr. anon. 175 Schneider. ἰανοκρήδεμος means ‘with a dark head-dress’, cf. Alcman *PMGF* 1.68–9 νεανίδων / ἰανογλήφάρων, Adesp. Pap. Hex. *SH* 906.13 ἰανόφρυν ~ Theocr. 3.18, *al.* κυανόφρυν and Quint. Sm. 4.381 (mourning Thetis) κυανοκρήδεμος.<sup>6</sup> The term is modelled on λιπαροκρήδεμος ‘with a bright head-band’, a Homeric hapax of Charis in *Il.* 18.382, cf. *Cypria EGF* 5.3 (of Nymphs and Charites wearing wreaths), 3x in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (2x of Hecate, 1x of Rhea). The meaning of the term and -κρήδεμος suggest that the adjective applies to a woman and the lemma seems to envisage a violet-coloured head-dress. ἰο-compounds such as ἰοειδής, ἰοίεις or ἰοδνεφής were normally interpreted as ‘dark- (μέλα-)’, i.e. violet-coloured. I might wonder whether this could be a novel attribute to mournful Demeter, who is 4x κυανόπεπλος in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and in deep sorrow decides to go around the world covered with a dark head-dress, vv. 41–2 κρήδεμνα δαΐζετο χερσὶ φίλησι / κυάνεον δὲ κάλυμμα κατ’ ἀμφοτέρων βάλετ’ ὤμων (see Richardson on v. 42) and on the way to Celeus' palace στείχε κατὰ κρήθεν κεκαλυμμένη, ἀμφὶ δὲ πέπλος / κυάνεος ῥαδινοῖσι θεᾶς ἐλελίζετο ποσσίν (vv.

<sup>5</sup> Ought one assume a similar ambiguity involved with its twin question *quamque bibistis aquam??* In Callim. *Aet.* fr. 3.6 Massim. Ἀγανίπη] and 7 Περμησσοῖ] appear the Heliconian spring Aganippe and the river Permessus, in fr. 4.1 Massim. Hippocrene. There is some confusion with regards to their identity as the Oxford Scholiast of Callimachus (p. 67, lemma 6 Massim.) seems to imply that Aganippe and Hippocrene are the same springs. Aganippe draws its waters on Permessus and its purity may be pointed out in fr. 3.7 παρθένος] (and fr. 3.8 Ἀοπίου). Later, Propertius 2.10.25 f. and 3.3.5 f. envisages Hippocrene as the spring of heroic verse, Aganippe as the one of erotic elegy, see Massimilla *Callimaco*, 236–7. In what may be a similar contrast, in Callim. *HyAp.* 108 f. the waters of the muddy Assyrian river and the trickles of Demeter's pure spring are contrasted. And Phoebus asks Propertius in 3.3.15–6 *quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te / carminis heroi tangere iussit opus?* before he leads him to a grotto of the Muses through a path, where Calliope moistens his lips with ‘Philitan water’ from a spring (vv. 51–2 *lymphisque a fonte petitis / ora Philitea nostra rigavit aqua*). The last two references may imply that the duality of contrasted waters may hark back to Philitas.

<sup>6</sup> Of Thetis, of whom λιπαροκρήδεμος occurs in two plus-verses in \**Il.* 16.867a and \**Od.* 12.133a. The adjective in Quintus is therefore a variation of Homeric λιπαροκρήδεμος, independent of ἰανοκρήδεμος. The derivation from ἰανός ‘thin garment’ in *LSJ* s.v. ἰανοκρήδεμος is false, but etymologies out of date are not corrected in the *LSJ Revised Supplement*, as stated there at p. vi.

182–3). This may derive support by the Scholiast’s explanation *ἰοῖς ὁμοιον*, as Demeter is closely associated with violets, see Richardson on *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 6 (Persephone gathering) *ἴα καλά* (add Ovid *Fasti* 4.437), and cf., in Sicily, Bacchyl. 3.2 *Δάματρα ἰοστέφανόν τε Κούραν*.

Such an explanation might have also been suggested by the context. Propertius 4.6.3 *serta*<sup>7</sup> *Philiteis certet Romana corymbis* seems to know about festive garlands in Philitas. Lycidas’ garland in Theocr. 7.64 *λευκοῖων στέφανον περὶ κρατὶ φυλάσσω* and *ἴα ἀμφότερα* featuring in Philetas’ garden in Longus 2.3.4 may suggest that violets appeared in Philitas’ *Demeter* as a garland-flower. Note that in Ovid *Fasti* 4.616 happy Ceres *imposuitque suae spiceaserta comae* and in Nonnus *Dion.* 6.44 during a feast held in her honour at the palace of her host Astraeus, the latter’s son Eosphoros *στεφάνους ἔπλεξεν . . . ἄνθεα δήσας / ὀρθρινοῖς κομῶντα δροσιζόμενοισι κορῦμβοις*. For Philitas’ interest in the subject cf. *Inc. sed. CA* 18, *Ataktoi Glossai* fr. 40, 42 (Lesbian ὑποθυμῖς consisting of ἴα) Kuch. The varying constituents of Demeter’s *στέμμα* (commonly called *εὐστέφανος*, *καλλιστέφανος* etc.) became an issue in antiquity, cf. Schol. Soph. *OC* 681 (36.6 f. de Marco) = Istrus *FGrH* 334 F 29. Salustius (on whom see here entry (d) *ad fin.*) wrote commentaries on both Sophocles, in which he introduced plenty of Callimachean material, and Callimachus.

#### c. ι 222 ἴδοι· ὀφθαλμοί

Latte placed the whole entry in *crucis* and (ingeniously) noted in his apparatus criticus “ἴδει· θάλλει (Hes. *Sc.* 397)”. M. Schmidt and others before him had tried various emendations of which it would suffice to mention *ἰλλοί* = *ὀφθαλμοί* on the strength of Pollux 2.54 (cf. also Hesych. ε 3109 s.v. *ἐνιλλώνω*), which is though hardly possible as it violates already with the second letter the strict alphabetical order in that part of Marcianus. This entry may in fact be a relic from Philitas’ argumentation on the interpretation of the Homeric phrase *ἀχρεῖον ἰδών*, cf. Schol. A (Ariston.) *Il.* 2.269c (I.242–3 Erbse) {ἀλγήσας δ’} *ἀχρεῖον ἰδών*: ὅτι Φιλητᾶς (-ιτᾶς A) τὸ ‘ἰδών’ περισπᾶ, οἶον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ἰδεῶν. οὐδέποτε δὲ Ὅμηρος ἰδέας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶπεν. ἔστιν οὖν τὸ ‘ἀχρεῖον ἰδών’ εὐτελῶς (R. van Bennekom *LFrE* I, 1779.9 : ἐντελῶς A) *σηματίσας*, cf. Schol. A<sup>i</sup> *ad loc.* (II.312.33 Dindorf) *ἰδών*: ὀξύνεται· μετοχὴ γὰρ ἔστι. This piece of information would be drawn on an ancient Homeric scholium of Aristarchean provenance, which eventually found a place in Apoll. Soph.’s entry on the Homeric expression in question (49.20 f. Bekker) > Hesychius α 8915, whence this lemma would be detached. So *ἴδοι* may be sound.

#### d. κ 1074 κατὰ δίψιον εἶδος· καύματος . . .

The entry was acknowledged as a verse citation in the form *καταδίψιον ἴδος / καύματος* by A. Meineke, *Philologus* 13 (1858), 557 = fr. anon. 180 Schneider (*SH* 1083); “epicus incertus” wrote M. Schmidt *ad loc.* *δίψιον* is Callimachean,<sup>8</sup> but the term in need for explanation here is *εἶδος* ‘heat’ (first in [Hesiod] *Sc.* 397 *ἴδει* (: *εἶδει* Wackernagel *Kl. Schr.* I, 746) *ἐν αἰνοτάτῳ* in a cicada-image, cf. Hesiod *WD* 414–5 *μένος ὀξέος ἠελίοιο / καύματος εἰδαλίμου*), which is normally glossed as *καύμα*, e.g. by Hesychius ε 750 *εἶδος*: *θάλλους, καύματος*. I might raise the possibility of this being a citation from Philitas, as king Chalcon, the host of Demeter at Cos (Schol. Theocr. 7.5–9f, partly quoted here in entry (a)), created Bourina (Theocr. 7.6–7 *Χάλκωνος, Βούριναν ὅς ἐκ ποδὸς ἄννε κράναν / εὖ ἐνερεισόμενος πέτρα γόνυ*) in circumstances which may have been similar to those implied in this anonymous fragment. The creation of the celebrated Coan spring by Chalcon may have been described in detail in a poem of Philitas (*Demeter?*), as the Scholia *ad loc.* (79.20 f. Wendel) quote

<sup>7</sup> *serta* Scaliger : *cera* codd., a corruption perhaps due to the following *certet*.

<sup>8</sup> *Aet. SH* 240.10 = 100.10 Massim., cf. Nic. *Ther.* 147, *ibid.* 436 *ἐπιδίψιον* and the Iliadic *unicum* 4.171 *πολυδίψιον* “*Ἀργος*, 12x in Nonnus *Dion.*”

a corrupt verse of his, which is published as CA 24 νάσσατο δ' ἐν προχοῆσι μελαμπέτροιο Βυρίνης. The refreshing reference to Bourina and its surroundings in Theocr. 7.6, shortly before Simichidas' meeting with divine Lycidas, comes as he and his friends walk in harsh midday-sun, 7.2, 21 (quoted ff.). It would appear that in the original treatment of Philitas the ardent thirst due to the Coan sun was the driving force behind the creation of Bourina. The motif is well known, cf. e.g. Heracles in Apoll. Rhod. 4.1441–42 ἄ τε χθόνα πεζὸς ὀδεύων / δίψη καρχαλέος seeking for water and welling out a spring from a rock, τὴν ὄ γ', ἐπιφρασθεῖς ἢ καὶ θεοῦ ἐννεσίησι, / λάξ ποδὶ τύπεν ἔνερθε· τὸ δ' ἀθρόον ἔβλυσεν ὕδωρ (vv. 1445–46), Rhea in Callim. *HyJov.* 15 f. or Hermes in the scholium on Lycophron 835 (261.31 f. Scheer) ἐν Αἰθιοπία Ἑρμῆς . . . διψήσας ἐλάκτισε τὴν γῆν καὶ ἀνέδωκεν ὕδωρ. Bourina's miraculous appearance (Theocr. *l.c.*) implies divine help and the Theocritean scholium 7.5–9ο (81.9 f. Wendel), which we now have in a Byzantine revision, says with regards to its creation that ἀνηγγέλθη τῷ βασιλεῖ [sc. to Chalcon] παρά τινος τῶν περὶ ταῦτα δεινῶν, ὅτι ὕδατος ὁ τόπος ἐκεῖνος ἐνδομυχεῖ.

The midday meeting of Lycidas with Simichidas may reproduce the circumstances in which Chalcon and Demeter met in Cos in Philitas' poem, i.e. at midday and close to a well, which can not be any other than Bourina. Note that in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 100 the goddess sits to rest near the well Parthenios ἐν σκιῇ under the shade of an olive-tree (in Callim. *HyDem.* 16 at the well Callichoros ἀυσταλέα ἀποτός τε) and Celeus' daughters in *ibid.* 106–7 meet Demeter ἐρχόμενα μεθ' ὕδωρ εὐήρυτον ὄφρα φέροιεν / κάλπισι χαλκείησι φίλα πρὸς δώματα πατρός. Wells are conventional meeting points (cf. esp. *Od.* 17.212 f.), while the midday is the usual time for epiphanies and the burning glare of the sun is often pointed out in such contexts, cf. *Od.* 4.400, Apoll. Rhod. 4.1312–13 ἔνδιον ἡμῶν ἔην, περὶ δ' ὀξύταται θέρον αὐγαί / ἡελίου, Callim. *HyPal.* 73. Note that in Longus 2.4.1 Philetas meets Eros in his garden ἀμφὶ μέσην ἡμέραν.

καύματος should be part of the explanation, and it is suitable to imply the burning midday sun-heat, as e.g. in Soph. *Ant.* 417, Plato *Phaedr.* 242a, Theocr. 10.51. The genitive might be a puzzling remnant of the interpretation (e.g. <ὑπὸ> καύματος <ἰσχυροῦ, δίψαν ἐμποιοῦντος>), unless we assume that it is due to the other poetic citation of εἶδος 'heat' in Hesychius ε 751 εἶδος ἐνδίωιο· καύματος μεσημβρινοῦ from Callim. *Hec.* fr. 304.3 Pf. (46.3 Hollis), where the Scholiast might have referred to this verse citation as a parallel (even more so, if the citation is from Philitas), which was then detached into a separate lemma. Meineke proposed to read καῦμα in the comment. A verb describing painful walking such as <(/) εἶρπον> or <(/) στειχόν> may be expected near such a phrase, as in Theocr. 7.2 /εἶρπομες ἐκ πόλιος, 7.21 τὸ (: τὸ ν.λ.) μεσομέριον πόδας ἔλκεις/, both of Simichidas.

The Suidas entries referring to Callim. *Hec. l.c.* may suggest that Salustius, on whose commentary on *Hecale* Suidas drew,<sup>9</sup> discussed the term. The undated Salustius (4th/5th cent. AD?) disposed of information on Philitas which is meanwhile lost, as a marginal scholium on Callim. *HyAp.* 33 ἄμμα quoting a verse of Philitas (*SH* 673) shows (in P.Oxy. 2258A of the 6th/7th cent. AD, attributed to Salustius by Pfeiffer *Callimachus* II, xxix).

ε. μ 886 μέροπες· . . . ἢ ἀπὸ Μέροπος, τοῦ πατρὸς Φαέθοντος, Κῶου. λέγονται δὲ καὶ Κῶοι Μέροπες

The suggestion that Cos was named Meropis after its indigenous leader Merops (Steph. Byz. p. 402.13 Meineke ἀπὸ γηγενοῦς Μέροπος, Schol. Pindar *Isth.* 4.42a (III.70 Drachmann) δοκοῦσι γὰρ εἶναι γηγενεῖς) and the fact that its inhabitants identified themselves and were identified by others as Meropes are both well attested. The Hesychian entry is though the only evidence of the fact that some would derive the Homeric adjective μέροπες from the legendary Coan king Merops, the father of

<sup>9</sup> See R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* I, Oxford 1949, 228, A. W. Bulloch, *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*, Cambridge 1985, 78, A. S. Hollis, *Callimachus Hecale*, Oxford 1990, 37.

Phaethon.<sup>10</sup> The origins of this derivation are to be sought in a Coan ambience. In a fragment from the Athenian comic poet Strato, which presents a Homericising cook uttering *καινὰ ῥήματα, μέροπες* occurs three times in three consequent verses, first in the sense ‘people, men’, then misunderstood by the cook’s master as Meropes ‘Coans’, 1.6–8 K.–A.:

‘ἴπόσους κέκλιηκας μέροπας ἐπὶ δείπνοιν; λέγε.’  
 ‘ἐγὼ κέκλιηκα Μέροπας ἐπὶ δείπνοιν; χολᾶς.  
 τοὺς δὲ Μέροπας τούτους με γινώσκειν δοκεῖς;’

Strato’s fragment contains a reference to Philitas’ *Ataktoi Glossai*, which the cook’s master needs to take in hand to comprehend his servant’s vocabulary, vv. 42–4 ὥστ’ ἔδει / τὰ τοῦ Φιλίτα λαμβάνοντα βυβλία / σκοπεῖν ἕκαστον τί δύναται τῶν ῥημάτων. Mr A. S. Hollis *privatim* wondered whether the erudite cook’s insistence on *μέροπες*/*Μέροπες* harbours an entry of the *Ataktoi Glossai*, which would explain the application of this term to Philitas’ homeland. I would think that this evidence corroborated constitutes a basis for postulating a Philitan entry on Homeric *μέροπες* as deriving from Coan *Μέροψ*. H. Koller, *Glotta* 46 (1968), 23 f. has in fact argued for the possibility that a specifically Coan, ‘oral’ formula *Κόως . . . πόλις Μερόπων ἀνθρώπων* now attested only in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 42, may have been misunderstood early enough as being capable of applying to all mortal people. The impetus of *μέροπες* in Hellenistic verse (Callim. *Hec. fr.* 298 Pf. (115 Hollis), *Apoll. Rhod.* 4.536) may partly be due to this conceivable entry in *Ataktoi Glossai*.

Two further remarks may be made with regards to the above suggestion. First, the fact that a similar suspicion has been raised for the controversial Homeric *πηγός*,<sup>11</sup> which in Strato’s fragment v. 36 *πηγός πάρεστι*; comes up as ‘salt’. The derivation of this usage was excellently explained by V. Schmidt *apud* K.–A. *ad loc.* (*PCG* VII, pp. 619–20) from *Od.* 5.388–9 *κύματι πηγῶ / πλάζετο = εἶν ἄλι*, whence *πηγός = ἄλις*, cf. Euphor. *CA* 127 *πολύτροφα δάκρυα βύνης = τοὺς ἄλας*. The origin of this *κατὰ μεταφορὰν* application could hardly be attributed to Strato, so here we might have to do with a detail from Philitas’ conceivable discussion of *πηγός*.

Secondly, there may be noted a reference in the Homeric Scholia whose origin may be traced back to a Coan milieu (I do not imply Philitas), namely the alleged Coan parentage of the Homeric physician Machaon from Merops’ daughter Epione in Schol. *AD Il.* 4.195 *Μαχάων δὲ οὗτος υἱὸς Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ Ἀρσινόης ἢ Κορωνίδος, κατὰ δὲ τινὰς Ἠπιόνης τῆς Μέροπος, κατὰ δὲ Ἡσίοδον* (fr. 53 M.–W.) *Ξάνθης*.<sup>12</sup> For the Coan tendency to appropriate the literary tradition cf. Herodas 2.98 *κῆτικτε Λητοῦν ὧδε τεῦ χάριν Φοίβη* on the basis of a misinterpretation of Hesiod *Theog.* 404, where Leto’s father Coeus is mentioned.

#### f. v 354 νεοστεφέος· νεοκράτου

This entry was singled out as a dactylic verse citation by A. S. Hollis, *ZPE* 123 (1998), 68. *νεοστεφής* is a scholarly coinage glancing at the ancient dispute on Homeric *κρητήρας ἐπιστεφέας οἴνοιο* / ‘filled to the brim’ or ‘crowned’, see Erbse (I.131) on Schol. *Il.* 1.470b, Thomas on Virg. *Georg.* 2.528. The comment *νεοκράτου* brings this lemma into association with Hesychius ε 5241 *ἐπιστεφέες· πλήρες, κεκραμένον, ε 5239 ἐπιστέφει· κεραυννύει* (cf. *id.* υ 243 *νεοφύρτου· νεοκράτου*). This is a rare interpretation<sup>13</sup> which to a Hellenistic scholar may have been suggested by an approximation of *Il.*

<sup>10</sup> See Wilamowitz, *Kl. Schr.* I, 144, J. Diggle, *Euripides, Phaethon*, Cambridge 1970, 7 n. 1.

<sup>11</sup> By F. Bornmann on Callim. *HyArt.* 90, cf. A. Rengakos, *ZPE* 94 (1992), 24 f., Massimilla *Callimaco*, 242 on Callim. *Aet.* fr. 3.13. On the word in general see J. Chadwick, *BICS* 39 (1994), 3.

<sup>12</sup> On Machaon’s Thessalian/Coan associations see U. von Wilamowitz, *Isyllos von Epidaurus*, Berlin 1886, 48 f.

<sup>13</sup> (ἐπι)στέφω = κεραυννύω, other than here, only in Hesychius σ 1804 *στέψαι· πληρώσαι. στεφανώσαι. κεράσαι. κυκλώσαι*, cf. Scholia Theocr. *l.s.*



1.470 κρητήρας ἐπεστέψαντο with expressions such as *Od.* 3.393 κρητήρα κεράσσατο and the like.

The term seems to refer to wine,<sup>14</sup> of which there may have been word in Philitas *CA* 4 (*Demeter?*) Φλιοῦς γὰρ πόλις ἐστὶ, Διωνύσου φίλος υἱός / Φλιοῦς ἦν αὐτὸς δείματο λευκολόφος (Steph. Byz. p. 667.20 f. Meineke s.v. Φλιοῦς, but originally drawn on a scholium on Apoll. Rhod. 1.115). Mixing of wine in Philetas may be suggested by Theoc. 7.154–5. Note also of Lycidas in Theocr. 7.65 οἶνον ἀπὸ κρατήρος ἀφυξῶ. Wine was averted by Demeter (*Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 206–8 τῇ δὲ δέπας Μετάνειρα δίδου μελιηδέος οἴνου / πλήσασ', ἢ δ' ἀνένευσ'· οὐ γὰρ θεμιτόν οἱ ἔφασκε / πίνειν οἶνον ἐρυθρόν), but it was a regular offering to her in Cos, *LSCG* 151A.60–1 (4th cent. BC) κύλικες κ[αί]||ν[α]ὶ δύο δίδονται· θύει ἱερεὺς [καὶ ἱερ]ᾶ παρέχει. In the explanation νεοκράτου there may be a religious hint, as the term is employed of wine used in a symposium for libations to the gods after the proper meal, see Kassel–Austin on Plato *Com.* fr. 71.8, Eratosth. *apud* Athenaeus 11.482a.

For the lurking metaphor 'head' and 'head of wine-jar' cf. Theocr. 7.147 τετράενον (P. von der Mühl : -ενες codd., see K. Latte, *Gnomon* 23 (1951), 250) δὲ πίθων ἀπελύετο κρατὸς ἄλειφαρ with Theocritus' commentator Amarantus (2nd cent. AD or later) on Theocr. 7.154 (wine) πῶμα διεκρανώσατε *apud* EtG (AB; in Wendel, *Schol. Theocr. vet.* p. 114.9 n.) s.v. διεκρανώσατε· διεκαρᾶνώσατε . . . δοκεῖ γὰρ τῶν πίθων ἢ καλυφῆ (cod. Voss. : ἀλοιφή AB) κάρᾶ εἶναι.<sup>15</sup>

The conceivable reference to Philitas might have once stood in a more complete form of Schol. Theocr. 3.21 (122.15 f. Wendel) τὸν στέφανον τίλαι· . . . στεφάνοις γὰρ ἐχρῶντο ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ, ὡς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης (fr. 101 Rose), εὐετηρίαν καὶ ἀφθονίαν αἰνιττομένοι τροφῶν· στέψαι γὰρ τὸ πληρῶσαι, ὡς Ὅμηρος· 'κοῦροι δὲ κρητήρας ἐπεστέψαντο' (*Il.* 1.470). The superstitious symbolism of the garland referred to in the Scholia may suggest a context which would be in favour of the proposed ascription to the Coan. On the ancient habit of crowning the mixing bowl in a symposium see Arnott on Alexis fr. 124.5–6, of crowning the cups Kassel–Austin on Aristoph. fr. 395.

**g.** ο 1275 ὀροδεμνιάδες· νύμφαι, καὶ αἱ μέλιτται. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους (καὶ) τῶν δεμνίων· ἐπεὶ ἐκεῖ κοιτάζονται. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀροδάμων, οἱ εἰσι κλάδοι

Μέλιτται? Latte κοπάζονται cod. : corr. Guyet

Of the two explanations advanced in the lemma the first is easily comprehensible. The ending -(τ)άδες is appropriate of Nymphs and ὀροδεμνιάδες would refer to their habitat (> ὄρος + δέμνιον). Subsequently, the term would appear to be an exquisite variation of the Homeric hapax *Il.* 6.420 (Nymphs) ὀρεστιάδες.<sup>16</sup> The application to bees, on the other hand, is not readily intelligible. But if, as the second explanation supplied in the lemma asserts, the term is taken to be derived from ὀρόδαμος, it could apply to bees following an ancient etymology of the word μέλισσα recorded in Schol. Theocr. 3.13b (120.12 Wendel),<sup>17</sup> according to which μέλισσα derives its name παρόσον ἐπὶ τῶν μῆλων ἰζάνει· μῆλα δὲ πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῶν δένδρων = ὀροδαμνίδες, cf. Schol. Theocr. 7.138a (110.15

<sup>14</sup> Hollis suggests νεοστεφέος (οἶνοιο/) by analogy with Nic. *Ther.* 591 παλαισταγέος οἶνοιο/, which is a rare rhythm in Callimachean terms (Hollis on [*Hecale*] fr. 166), attested though in an elegiac hexameter in Philitas *Demeter CA* 2.3 κορεσσάμενος κλαυθυμοίο/.

<sup>15</sup> The motif is older, cf. Soph. *OC* 473 (κρατήρες) ὦν κρᾶτ' ἔρεπον, Eubulus fr. 56.6 K.–A. (κρατήρ) κισσῶ κάρᾶ βρύουσαν. Note also the metaphoric κρήδεμνον as 'stopper (of a wine-jar)' in *Od.* 3.392.

<sup>16</sup> Occurring also in the *Homeric Hymn* 19.19, cf. Bion *Epit. Adon.* 19 ὀρειάδες with Reed *ad loc.* ("nymphs were generically 'of the mountains' . . . and were given any adj. deriving from ὄρος"), H. Herter, *RE* XVII.2 (1937), 1539.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. also Orion *Theb.* 102.29 Sturz > EtGud. 385.55 Sturz, EtM 577.35 Gaisf. The appeal to *Il.* 9.542 (the Calydonian boar destroying many trees) καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀνθεσι μῆλων in the entries of the ancient lexica advancing such an etymology of μέλισσα, indicates that this was incorporated in the discussion on the disputed Homeric μῆλα.

Wendel) ὀροδαμνίδας δὲ παντὸς δένδρου τοὺς κλάδους λέγουσι. Such an association may have been facilitated by the image of bees nesting in hollow trees, which was widespread in didactic poetry.<sup>18</sup> ὀρόδαμνος is glossed by Hesychius ο 1273 as κλώνες, κλάδοι, βλαστήματα, ὄρηκες. The word originally appears as a botanical term in Theophr. *Hist. plant.* 9.16.3, where it applies to the big twigs of δίκταμον ‘dittany’, a plant occurring, as nowadays, mostly in Crete. It is subsequently introduced into poetry and appears in Callim. *Inc. sed.* fr. 655, whence perhaps Antip. Thess. *GPh* 35.3, 106.3, and Nic. *Ther.* 863, *Alex.* 603, used of various trees or plants. In Theocr. 7.138 ὀροδαμνίσιν the term occurs as an hapax in the elsewhere unattested -ις form (Doric coloured?, see Bulloch on Callim. *HyPal.* 94).

From its formulation it would seem that the lemma envisages the term ὀροδεμνιάδες as comprising at the same time (i.e. in a single passage) meanings suitable as attributes to both Nymphs and bees. The word then seems to be of Nymphs Melissai (Cook *Bee*, 19).<sup>19</sup> In *ZPE* 121 (1998), 60 f. I argued that the association of basic constituents of an Ithacan *locus amoenus* (including its Nymphs) in *Od.* 17.205 f. with Demeter’s precinct in Callim. *HyDem.* 37–8 and with the farm of Thalysia-celebrating Phrasidamus in Theocr. 7.136–7, is to be referred to Philitas’ *Demeter*, and that these may be the Nymphs which appear in Theocr. 7.92 and possibly in Callim. *Aet.* fr. 1.11–2 as performing a didactic task traditionally assigned to the Muses. These Coan Nymphs, who conceivably featured in a Philitan *locus amoenus*, could suitably comprise the notions of ‘Nymphs’ and ‘bees’ and therefore be specified as Melissai, so as to point out their association with Demeter.<sup>20</sup> It is also conceivable that the details about the Nymph whom Demeter entrusts for a mission to Hunger in the Erysichthon episode in Ovid *Met.* 8.786–7 *montani numinis unam / . . . agrestem . . . oreada* may be indebted to scholiastic information about the Nymphs dallying in Demeter’s grove in Callim. *HyDem.* 38. Attention to the Nymphs’ habitat would accord with a similar preoccupation of Callimachus, and Cos’ former name *Nymphaea* (Pliny *NH* 5.134) suggests that in mythical times the island was believed to be frequented by such creatures. Hesychius’ source here may draw on an ancient comment on Theocr. 7.138, which would elucidate the Philitan context and would suggest dependence of the Theocritan term on Philitas.

A word of such a form is redolent of a Hellenistic, Callimachean aroma.<sup>21</sup> Its metrical shape would strongly suggest that it covers the second hemistich of a pentameter, preceded by a long monosyllable.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Hesiod *WD* 232–3 οὔρεσι δὲ δρυὶς / ἄκρη μὲν τε φέρει βαλάνους, μέσση δὲ μελίσσας, see Cook *Bee*, 8, West on Hesiod *Theog.* 594. On the association of Nymphs with μέλι cf. also Mnaseas of Patara *apud* Schol. Pindar *Pyth.* 4.106a (II.112–3 Drachmann) κατέπαυσαν αὐτοὶ [sc. the Nymphs Melissai] σαρκοφογούντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πείσασα τῇ ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων χρῆσθαι τροφῇ, Eustathius *Comm. Od.* p. 1963.39 f., F. Díez-Platas, *LIMC* VI.1, 445 no 1 for an Attic cylix of the 5th cent. BC representing two Nymphs close to a tree, one of whom holds an apple and the other bears the name ΜΕΛΙΣΣΑ, the Nymphs Μηλιάδες, Μηλίδες etc. So were apparently perceived the Hamadryads in Sicily, cf. Hesychius α 3387 (~ Phot. a 1096 Theod.) ἀμάδρυα: κοκκύμηλα. Σικυώνιοι. See further on apples/fruits and Nymphs H. Herter, *RE* XVII.2 (1937), 1543.

<sup>19</sup> The association of Nymphs with bees (therefore = Melissai) is very old, cf. *Od.* 13.104 ff. and see Cook *Bee*, 15–6, Roscher, *Myth. Lex.* II.2, 2637–38. In [Opp.] *Cyn.* 4.275 and Dion. Per. 327 the Nymphs are said to be protectors of bees.

<sup>20</sup> Demeter’s initiates and priestesses were called μέλισσαι and although priestesses of other deities could be called by the same name, the term seems to have applied mostly to the devotees of Demeter, cf. Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 4.106c (II.113 Drachmann) μελίσσας δὲ τὰς ἱερείας κυρίως μὲν τὰς τῆς Δήμητρος, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὰς πάσας, διὰ τὸ τοῦ ζῶου καθαρὸν, Hesychius μ 719 μέλισσαι· αἱ τῆς Δήμητρος μύστιδες, Schol. Theocr. 15.94/5a (313.16 Wendel), Porph. *Antr. Nymph.* 18 and in poetry cf. Callim. *HyAp.* 110, Philicus *SH* 680.52, Adesp. Pap. Misc. *SH* 990.2 (ὕμνον Δήμη[τρ]ος) | κλαπακούσατε, . . . μέλισσαι. On Demeter’s association with bees cf. in particular Schol. Pindar *Pyth.* 4.106a = Pindar fr. 158 Maehler (Demeter) τὰς ἱεραῖσ(ι) μελίσσαις τέρεται and see Cook *Bee*, 14 f., Gow on Theocr. 15.94, Bodson *Hiera zōia*, 25 f. (“Présence de l’abeille dans le culte de Déméter”). On her devotees as Melissai see W. Robert-Tornow, *De apium mellisque apud veteres significatione et symbolica et mythologica*, Berlin 1893, 92, Roscher *Myth. Lex.* II.2, 2639–40, S. Lavecchia, Pindaro e le μέλισσαι di Paro, *Hermes* 124 (1996), 504–6.

<sup>21</sup> “Call. uti solet huiusmodi formis, v. Ἀκτιάδες, Πελασιγιάδες etc.” noted Pfeiffer on *Aetia* fr. 185, see also F. Lapp, *De Callimachi Cyrenaei tropis et figuris*, Diss. Bonn 1965, 146. For full documentation see E. J. Kenney, *CQ* n.s. 99 (1999), 330–2 who concludes: “With the exception of a few such as Ἐλικωνιάδες, Ὀλυμπιάδες, and Πληϊάδες, names formed in this way were evidently not especially favoured before the Hellenistic period. [. . .] Callimachus and Apollonius provide most of the Greek examples . . . in him [sc. Callimachus] and Apollonius it verges on a mannerism.”

This is a common pentameter clausula at all times<sup>22</sup> and a favourite placing of Nymphs' attributes in Hellenistic pentameters, cf. Theocr. *HE* 5.2 (~ Antip. Sid. *HE* 8.8) ἑλικωνιάσιν/, Theodor. *HE* 2.2 (κούραις) ἑλικωνιόσιν/, Alex. Aet. *CA* 3.22 (Νύμφας) ἑλικωνιόσιν/, Plato' *FGE* 16.6, p. 175 Νύμφαι ἀμαδρυάδες/, Anon. (4th cent. BC) *FGE* 125.2, p. 432 = Lobo Arg. *SH* 520.2 Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες/ and Callim. *Aet.* fr. 43.49 Pf. (50.49 Massim.) ἑλικωνιόσιν/, further *Aet.* fr. 66.9 Pf. = *HyPal.* 4 ἑλικωνιόσιν/, fr. 75.41 Pf. ἑλικωνιόσιν/. The second hemistich of a pentameter in Parth. *SH* 626.3 survives as ἑλικωνιόσιν. This would tally with Philitas' elegiac *Demeter*.

If Philitas *CA* 22 (> Antig. Car. *Mir.* 19.2) βουγενέας φθάμενος προσεβήσαο μακρὰ μελίσσας is, as it is possible, a fragment from *Demeter*, βουγενέας, hinting at bugony (the spontaneous generation of bees from the putrefying corpse of an ox), would have a distinguishing power too: these are the oxen-born bees. The possible appearance of real bees does not speak against the featuring of Nymphs Melissai, as *Demeter*'s presence could provoke the appearance of creatures which were associated with her – and with Cos. In Charon Lamps. *FGrH* 262 F 12 a bee is said to herald the appearance of a Nymph, see further Bühler on Zenobius 2.32 σειρήν μὲν φίλον ἀγγέλει, ξεῖνον δὲ μέλισσα.

The considerations set out here would provide a foothold for elucidating the background of the reference to *Demeter*'s bees in Callim. *HyAp.* 110–2, where they are contrasted to the λύματα of the Assyrian river:

Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,  
ἀλλ' ἦτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει  
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον.

The Hesychian entry would supply a piece of evidence supporting Pfeiffer's suggestion that in these lines an image from Philitas' *Demeter* is at work.<sup>23</sup> It would in fact point to a passage in which the ambiguity of μέλισσαι as 'Nymphs/initiates of *Demeter*' and 'bees' featuring in Callim. *HyAp.* 110–2 prefigured in Philitas.

If this hypothesis is correct, there would be two immediate repercussions for the *Aetia*-prologue. First, the Nymphs/Melissai (if the allusion is to them) teaching that Mimnermus is γλυκὺς would make a honey-sweet point. Cf., perhaps, Theocr. 7.80 f. (of Comatas) αἶ σιμαὶ . . . φέρβον . . . / . . . μέλισσαι, / οὐνεκά οἱ γλυκὸν Μοῖσα κατὰ στόματος χέει νέκταρ. Secondly, another latent correspondence between the first and the second *Aetia*-prologues<sup>24</sup> would emerge with the reference to Nymphs/Melissai in fr. 1.11–2 and fr. 2.2 Pf. (4.2 Massim.) Μουσέων ἑσμῶς, cf. Philicus *SH* 680.52 γυναικῶν . . . ἑσμῶς of *Demeter*'s initiates.

<sup>22</sup> The occurrences of a hexasyllabic word of the form  $\cup\cup-\cup\cup\times$  as a pentameter clausula are overwhelming (not least so in Callimachus). Such a formation could find a place in a Hellenistic hexameter, either before the masculine caesura preceded by a monosyllable (Callim. *HyDel.* 152, Theocr. 7.7, 23, Apoll. Rhod. 1.821, 2.794, 4.560, *al.*), or, if inconveniently (see McLennan on Callim. *HyJov.* 58) after it (Callim. *HyJov.* 58 and Apoll. Rhod. 4.268 are due to Antim. *SH* 52.7 = fr. 41.a.7 Matthews, cf. then Apoll. Rhod. 3.76, Nic. *Ther.* 318). But this seems a less likely possibility.

<sup>23</sup> In an *Excursus in History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968, 284 (which he then described as a "rather rash suggestion"). C. W. Müller, *Erysichthon. Der Mythos als narrative Metapher im Demeterhymnos des Kallimachos*, Mainz 1987, 40–1 (cf. *id.*, in: P. Steinmetz (ed.), *Beiträge zur hellenistischen Literatur und ihrer Rezeption in Rom*, Stuttgart 1990, 28) from a rather different point of view claimed that the Callimachean lines "scheinen geradezu ein Philitas-Zitat zu sein". Another point of possible influence of Philitas on Callimachus *HyAp.* 3 is discussed here as entry (a).

<sup>24</sup> For correspondences between the two prologues see Kambylis *Dichterweihe*, 89 f., Cl. Meillier, Callimaque, *Aitia*, fr. 1, v. 7, et l'unité probable des fragments 1 (Invective) et 2 (Songe), *REG* 92 (1979), 164 f. (= *ZPE* 33 (1979), 39 f.), E. Livrea, Callimaco, fr. 114 Pf., il *Somnium* ed il *Prologo* degli 'Aitia', *Hermes* 123 (1995), 47–62, A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton 1995, 129 f. (the *Prologue* not a later addition, but an original "action of the *Aetia*"), Massimilla *Callimaco*, 237. A closer examination of the two passages may yield more information on Philitas, but this will have to be the subject of a separate study.

The discussion of the present entry may come to an end by raising a last possibility. Another dactylic gloss in Hesychius μ 1294 runs μητροπόλους· τὰς πάλαι Μελίσσας for which Latte refers to gloss μ 719 μέλισσαι· αἱ τῆς Δήμητρος μύστιδες. Bodson *Hiera zōia*, 35 n. 162 suggests a Thes-morphic context. μητροπόλος (a Pindaric rarity, ‘tending mothers’ in *Pyth.* 3.9 ματροπόλω σὺν Ἐλειθυίᾳ) may suggest a relation of immediate parentage (cf. *LSJ* s.v. μητρόπολις). If Philitas named his Coan Nymphs Melissa and accorded to them poetological duties with which they were able to teach their precepts in Theocr. 7.92 and possibly in Callim. *Aet.* fr. 1.11–2, he might have hinted at their parentage from the Heliconian Nymphs/Muses, i.e. τὰς πάλαι Μελίσσας.<sup>25</sup> In broad lines, all Nymphs with a poetic tinge can be conceived as drawing their origin from Parnassus, but this assumption gains particular support by the invocation to the Castalian Nymphs, to whom the inspiration of two poetic themes is attributed, in a firmly Coan environment in Theocr. 7.148 Νύμφαι Κασταλίδες Παρνάσιον αἶπος ἔχουσαι, side by side with their Coan counterparts appearing in vv. 92 and 136–7. Cf. Posidippus’ *SH* 705.1 f. Μοῦσαι πολιήτιδες being taught Παρνησοῦ νιφόεντος ἀγὰ πτύχ[α]ς and, further, the Cean Nymphs once expelled from Parnassus in Callim. *Aet.* fr. 75.56–7 Pf. These πάλαι Μέλισσαι are perhaps to be identified as the daughters of the Heliconian king Melisseus,<sup>26</sup> who features in a recondite tradition referred to in Nic. *Ther.* 11–2 Ἄσκραϊος μυχάτοιο Μελισσήεντος ἐπ’ ὄχθαις / Ἡσιόδου . . . παρ’ ὕδασι Περμησσοῖο, where Scholia 11c (39.6 f. Crugnola) explain Μελισσήεντα δὲ φησιν τὸν τόπον τοῦ Ἑλικῶνος, ἐν ᾧ εὔρε τὰς Μούσας, ὅς οὕτως ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ Μελισσέως βασιλεύσαντος τοῦ τόπου. Callim. *Aet.* fr. 2.2 Pf. (4.2 Massim.) Ἡσιόδῳ Μουσέων ἐσμὸς ὅτ’ ἦντίασεν may hint at this version.

**h.** υ 262 ὑπ’ ἀννήν· παρ’ Ἐκαταίῳ· Φιλίτας (fr. 51 Kuch.).

fort. ὑπ’ ἀνλήν, cf. υ 260 παρεκατέω cod. : corr. Musurus (*FGrH* 1 F 365)

“Glossam non expedio” despaired M. Schmidt and all attempts to sanate the corruption are seriously hampered by the loss of the explication. Almost every word of the entry has been suspected as corrupt. Jacoby on Hecataeus *l.c.* pondered an emendation of Philitas’ name into φιλήτης, a synonymous gloss of which would lurk in the corrupt lemma. *LSJ* s.v. ἀννή considered establishing ὑπ’ Ἀχνην with reference to Philitas *SH* 675D Ἀχναί = Steph. Byz. p. 342.18 Meineke s.v. Ἰχναί. Likelier seems the course of corruption proposed by Kuchenmüller 107 who saw this entry as a detached resumption of υ 260 ὑπ’ ἀνλήν· ὑπ’ οἶκον and tentatively fused them into ὑπ’ ἀνλήν· ὑπ’ οἶκον, παρ’ Ἐκαταίῳ, Φιλίτας. Before him ὑπαυλίην was conjectured by Toup, ὑπαύλια by Voss. The lemma contains a term or phrase which Philitas seems to have picked from Hecataeus of Miletus. Little though we know of *Ataktoi Glossai*, this would be the only existing entry of it drawing on an author of prose. Alternatively, R. Tosi<sup>27</sup> accepted ὑπ’ ἀνλήν, but would favour a reference to ἐκάτατον, an apotropaic statuette of Hecate set at road junctions or outside house doors.<sup>28</sup>

Kuchenmüller’s treatment of this entry derives support from the possibility of the question involved being Homeric, as some interpreted ἀνλή as οἶκος and others, such as Aristarchus, as ὑπαίθριος

<sup>25</sup> On the original *Verschmelzung* of the Parnassian Nymphs with the Muses (initially residing in Olympus) see Kambylis *Dichterweihe*, 38–9, 46–7.

<sup>26</sup> The name is typical of a king with daughters-Nymphs, cf. Melisseus in Crete in Theog. cycl. *Arg.* p. 10 Bernabé, Melissos in Paros in Apollodorus of Athens *FGrH* 244 F 89.

<sup>27</sup> In *MCr* 25–8 (1990–93), 297 and in F. Montanari (ed.), *La philologie grecque à l’époque grecque et romaine* (Entr. Fond. Hardt 40), Vandœuvres–Genève 1994 [1993], 147 n. 5. The idea is old, see C. Ph. Kayser, *Philetæ Coi fragmenta quæ reperiuntur*, Göttingen 1793, 82.

<sup>28</sup> On ἐκάτατον (or ἐκαταῖον) cf. Hesychius ε 1258 ἐκάτατα· τὰ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν Ἐκάτης ἀγάλματα. τινὲς δὲ τὰ ἐν τρίδοις. On Hecate προθυραία or πρόδομος see S. I. Johnston, *Hecate Soteira*, Atlanta 1990, 23 f., *id.*, *ZPE* 88 (1991), 217–24, Dover on Aristoph. *Frogs* 366, G. Tzifopoulos, *Horos* 10–2 (1992–98), 251 f.

τόπος.<sup>29</sup> Philitas, in contrast to Aristarchus, apparently opined that Homeric ἀύλη can denote a covered space in a residence. Such a misunderstanding would be facilitated by passages such as *Il.* 6.247–8 ἔνδοθεν ἀύλης / δώδεκ' ἔσαν τέγροι θάλαμοι cf. *Od.* 1.425, or the formula *Il.* 9.472, *al.* ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ εὐερκέος ἀύλης/ (on which see Fernández-Galiano on *Od.* 21.389), where Aristarchus proposed to eliminate ὑπ' for ἐν. Hecataeus could have used this word (12x in Herodotus, 'house' in 5.92γ.2) and Philitas may have adduced him to support his view. Ionian logographers, as shown by Herodotus, had a lively interest in dialect and foreign glosses (see K. Latte, *Kl. Schr.*, 649–50), and all-searching Philitas would be expected to take their works into account. As an Ionian-prose authority, Hecataeus in particular was often adduced to assist – or, for some, to impede – Homeric exegesis, but, as a matter of principle, he was disregarded in this respect by Aristarchus, cf. Schol. T (ex.) *Il.* 24.228b<sup>1</sup> (V.559 Erbse) {καὶ} φωριαμῶν: φωριαμός: . . . Ἀρίσταρχος δέ φησι τὴν κιβωτὸν λέξιν νεωτέρων εἶναι· ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ὅτι Σιμωνίδης (*PMG* 623) καὶ Ἑκαταῖος (*FGrH* 1 F 368) μέμνηται αὐτῆς.<sup>30</sup> His language became a point of attention by Callimachus, cf. EtG (AB) γέγειος· ὁ ἀρχαῖος . . . εἴρηται παρ' Ἑκαταίῳ (*FGrH* 1 F 362) καὶ Καλλιμάχῳ followed by *Inc. sed.* fr. 510 Pf. and *Hec.* fr. 277 Pf. = 102 Hollis (the last only in cod. B), next Hecataeus *FGrH* 363 F 1 ἔπισσαι ~ [Callim.] *Fr. inc. auct.* 735 Pf. = [*Aet.*] fr. 140 Massim.<sup>31</sup>

All extant references to Philitas' interpretations in the Homeric Scholia seem to be due to Aristarchus' monograph Πρὸς Φιλίταν 'Against Philitas' (Schol. A (Did.) *Il.* 1.524c (I.142 Erbse) and 2.111b (I.202 Erbse)). This gloss in Hesychius may have been derived from a now lost note of a Homeric commentary, ultimately drawing on Aristarchus' polemic against Philitas' conceivable interpretation (and method of approaching the νεώτεροι) from that same source. For information possibly coming from Πρὸς Φιλίταν in Hesychius (< Didymus?), cf. σ 893 σκεῖρος· ῥύπος. καὶ ὁ δρυμὸς τυρός. καὶ ἄλσος καὶ δρυμὸς (Aristarchus ad *Il.* 23.332–3). Φιλητᾶς δὲ (fr. 49 Kuch.) τὴν ῥυπῶδη (Meineke : πυρρῶδη cod.) γῆν and possibly τ 222 discussed here as entry (c).

Rethymno

Konstantinos Spanoudakis

<sup>29</sup> Aristarchus read in *Od.* 4.74 Ζηγός που τοιήδε γ' Ὀλυμπίου ἔνδοθεν ἀύλη and deemed that Homer τὴν ἀύλην αἰεὶ τάττει ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπαίθρων τόπων, Athenaeus 5.189e, see A. Ludwich, *Aristarchs homerische Textkritik* I, Leipzig 1884, 538. In the ancient Scholia there is only Schol. b *Il.* 6.136a<sup>2</sup> ἀύλη, ὃ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐξώτερον, *sc.* τοῦ οἰκῆματος, cf. also EtG (AB) α 1399 L.–L. (EtM α 2083) ὁ περιτετειχισμένος καὶ ὑπαίθριος τόπος. Seleucus Hom. fr. 22 Müller *apud* Athenaeus 5.189b rejected this reading as allegedly equating ἀύλη to οἶκος (cf. Eustathius *Comm. Od.* p. 1483.39 (< Athenaeus *l.l.*) τῷ τῆς ἀύλης ὀνόματι τὰ δώματα δηλοῖ) arguing *inter alia* that ἐτι τοίνυν οὐδ' ἡ ἀύλη ἀρμόττει ἐπὶ τοῦ οἴκου. ὁ γὰρ διαπνεόμενος τόπος ἀύλη λέγεται etc.

<sup>30</sup> Hecataeus became so often involved in Homeric questions because, as it seems, in several cases he essayed to refute information supplied by the Homeric poems. His polemic in *FGrH* 1 F 1 οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοὶ τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσὶ is likely to include Homer, see Jacoby, *FGrH* <sup>2</sup>Ia, Nachträge 535.26 f.

<sup>31</sup> Massimilla *Callimaco*, 41 notes that the quotation can hardly be by Callimachus, as it seems to violate Hilberg's law.