

P.OXY. 4711 AND THE POETRY OF PARTHENIUS*

Abstract: *P.Oxy.* 4711 (from a papyrus codex of the sixth century AD) contains elegiacs with at least three metamorphosis myths (Adonis, Asterie, Narcissus). In this article I argue against the suggestion by (among others) the first editor of this papyrus that the verses might be by Parthenius. I do so by examining the evidence for Parthenian authorship (especially the presumed imitations by Ovid and Gregory of Nazianus) and by comparing the style of the new piece with what we actually possess of Parthenian poetry (especially with *fr.* 28 Lightfoot, which might come from the *Metamorphoseis*). Instead I suggest a late date of composition and would regard the fragments as a collection of thematically arranged διηγήματα in verse which are related to the production of progymnasmata in schools.

P.Oxy. 4711 consists of one larger and three smaller fragments of a papyrus codex of the sixth century AD. On both sides of the main fragment (*fr.* 1) we find elegiacs which narrate at least three metamorphosis myths. On the ↓-side, in lines 1-7, we have the end of the story of Adonis. After that, and without any verbal link, a new story starts, namely that of Asterie, who was pursued by Zeus and became first a bird and then the island Delos on which her sister Leto gave birth to Artemis and Apollo. The →-side is much less legible, especially in its first part. So it is uncertain what the first lines contain. But at least from line 10, and perhaps from an earlier line (in line 8 θ]εοείκελον εἶ[δος is a plausible supplement),¹ the myth of Narcissus is told.

I provide the text (unless otherwise mentioned supplements are Henry's).²

I

P.Oxy. 4711, ↓ *fr.* 1

φ]ιλομειδ[
].. [.]οσελιξ[
....] . [.] . [. .] . [. .] . [. . .] αμοιβαι[
Κύπ]ριδι καὶ βλ . . [. . .] νειόθι Φερσε[φόνηι.
5 οὔ]νομα δ' αὖ ποτ[ά]μῳι τελε . . . π . [. . .]
αἶματι δ' ἀμβροσ[ί]ωι καλὸν ἔθαλ[λε] ρόδον.
Κοίου καὶ Φοίβης Τιτη[νί]δος ἐκ[γε]γαυῖα
Λητοῦς ἔσκε φίλ[η] σ γγονος Ἄστ[ε]ρίη.
τὴν δὲ Ζεὺς ποθέεσκεν, ἔφε[υ]γε δὲ
10 πρῶτα μὲν ἡερίων ὄρνις ὑπὲρ ν[ε]φέων,
δ[ε]ύτερον αὖ μεμαυῖα μέσῳι ἐνι . [- - -] πόντωι,
ἔ[π]τη δ' ἠύτε νηῦς εν[. .] . [. .] . . . [. . .]
καὶ δὴ οἱ ἴρει Ζεὺς ὑπ[ε]ρ
σ[ὐ]ν Φοίβῳι καλὴν Ἄρ[τε]μι
15] . δ' ἀμφιλ . [.] . . [.] . . [.]

4 καὶ Reed, βεβλέσ[θαι] Henry 5 τελε (Reed, Luppe) rather than γελε (Henry)
6 ρόδον Hutchinson, φυτόν Henry 15 cf. n.42 below.

*Earlier versions of this paper were given to the Cambridge Literary Seminar (organized by R.L. Hunter and M.D. Reeve) and to a conference on Parthenius in Nice (organized by A. Zucker) in May 2006. I should like to thank the organizers and the audiences on both occasions. I have profited much from the kindness and learning of G.O. Hutchinson, W.B. Henry and J.D. Reed who commented on later drafts. Any errors in this paper are of

course my own. I am grateful to G.O. Hutchinson, W. Luppe and J.D. Reed for allowing me to see their articles on *P.Oxy.* 4711 before publication.

¹ By Henry (2005).

² Henry (2005) 52 conjectures a *coronis* at the end of the Adonis section, but only on analogy with its appearance between the single stories in papyri of Call. *Aet.* 3-4. It should, however, be removed from the text.

P.Oxy. 4711, → *fr.* 1

] . [
] . ο . φ . . . [
] [
] . . . κερατη . . [
 5] [.] [
] [. ἄ] μ β ρ ο τ ὁ [ζ ἐ] σ τ ι ν . [
] ν . . . [. . .] . . . δ . . [. . .] . . . [
] [. θ] ε ο ρ ῖ κ ε λ ο ν ε . [
] [.] . [.] [
 10] ο ν ε ἶ χ ε ν , ἀ π ε χ θ α ἴ ρ ε σ κ ε δ ' ἅ π α ν τ α ς
 μ] ο ρ φ ῆ ς ἡ ρ ά σ α τ ο σ φ ε τ έ ρ η ς
] ρ π η γ ῆ ς [ὁ] λ ο φ ύ ρ α τ ο τ έ ρ ψ ι ν ὄ ν ε ἰ ρ ο υ
 κ λ α] ύ σ α τ ο δ ' ἀ γ λ α ἴ τ η ν
] . . . δ ῶ κ ε δ ἔ γ α ἰ ῆ τ ι
 15] . . . φ έ ρ ε ι ν
] [

4 *cf.* n.34 below.

In his editio princeps of this piece, W.B. Henry cautiously suggested Parthenius as the author of these verses, arguing that they might come from his *Metamorphoseis*.³ Shortly afterwards he was supported by G.O. Hutchinson,⁴ who drew attention to a possible imitation of the verses in Ovid, and by W. Luppe, who found the attribution to Parthenius even 'highly probable'.⁵ The only sceptical voice so far is that of J. Reed, who formulates the impression that the style of the fragment is simpler than 'Parthenius' ornate, *recherché* style' (Reed (2006) 76).

It seems needless to stress that if Henry's hypothesis were right, this would be an enormous advance for Parthenian scholarship, not only because it would give us a first insight into Parthenius' *Metamorphoseis*, but also because it would add a considerable number of new lines to our notoriously meagre collection of Parthenius' poetry.

In order to show that these lines are probably not by Parthenius, I would first like to examine the evidence for Parthenian authorship presented by Henry and Hutchinson. After having shown, as I hope, that this evidence is not convincing, I would like to compare the style of the new papyrus poem with *fr.* 28 Li., which is our only poetical fragment in which a metamorphosis is described. In that comparison it should become clear that we are concerned with different kinds of poetry which can hardly be by the same author.

The argument for ascribing the new verses to Parthenius runs as follows:⁶

(A) The verses have to be Hellenistic or earlier because

(a) elegiacs for long poems (that means except epigrams) fade in late antiquity, and these verses are not epigrams (because of their epic colour)⁷

(b) the verses are apparently imitated by Ovid.⁸

³ Henry (2005) 47.

⁴ Hutchinson (2006) 71. I would like to stress that Hutchinson too is very cautious in attributing the poem to Parthenius. The main part of his paper interprets *P.Oxy.* 4711 as a possible background to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Hutchinson's approach remains valuable even if *P.Oxy.* 4711 is not by Parthenius or another Hellenistic author,

because it is of course possible that metamorphosis poetry *of this kind* existed already in Hellenistic times, *cf.* below p. 13.

⁵ Luppe (2006a) 55.

⁶ Based on Henry (2005) 47 and Hutchinson (2006) 71.

⁷ This last point only at Hutchinson (2006) 75.

⁸ This point only maintained by Hutchinson (2006) 80.

(B) Given that hypothesis (A) is right, i.e. that the piece is by a pre-imperial author, the author has to be one of the more important writers, because otherwise it seems improbable that his verses

- (a) would appear in Egypt at this late time and
- (b) be imitated by Ovid and Gregory of Nazianzus.⁹

(C) If hypothesis B) is right the author is likely to be Parthenius because

(a) other known authors of metamorphosis poetry which could be in elegiacs were not famous enough to turn up in the sixth century.

(b) If it can be shown that Gregory of Nazianzus alludes to this poem (*cf.* (B, b)), Parthenian authorship becomes likely, because this allusion would happen just before Gregory's allusion to Parth. *fr.* 28 Li. (if *that* is really an allusion).

Let us examine the details of this argument:

On (A, a): The verses may in fact be epigrams¹⁰ (not only the examples of the learned poets Agathias and Paulus Silentiarius but also inscriptions¹¹ show that in epigram elegiacs were used in the sixth century). As Hutchinson (2006) 74-5 himself has shown, the single mythical sections of the papyrus are 'relatively short narratives' and 'formally unjoined'. Their epic colour as demonstrated by Hutchinson (2006) 75 n.9 is beyond question¹² and can be shown even in a more detailed way.¹³ But is this really enough to show that these pieces are not epigrams? For we should take into account that myths of metamorphosis were the subject of epic (Nestor of Laranda, Ovid). So, a stronger epic colour than in ordinary Hellenistic epigrams could be the result of content, as it is in those epigrams of the Palantine Anthology which are concerned with Homeric matters.¹⁴

To (A, b): I am not convinced that Ov. *Met.* 6.185-6 is an apparent allusion to ↓ *fr.* 1.7-8 as Hutchinson suggests:

P.Oxy. 4711 / *fr.* 1.7-8

Κοίου καὶ Φοίβης Τιτη[νί]δος ἐκ[γε]γαυῖα
 Λητοῦς ἔσκε φίλ[η] σύγγονος Ἀστ[ε]ρίη.

⁹ Points (a) and (b) only at Hutchinson (2006) 71 (on the alleged imitation by Ovid 80). Henry (2005) 53 had already drawn attention to the similarities between *P.Oxy.* 4711 and Gregory, but doubts a direct influence.

¹⁰ Guidorizzi (1984) gives a survey of the papyrus epigrams of the imperial period. According to him the most frequent type is the thematically arranged anthology. At this point one should remember that the distinction between epigram and elegy was never sharp, as has become clear especially after the discovery of the Milan roll of Posidippus which contains some epigrams of 14 lines, *cf.* Hutchinson (2002) 7-8.

¹¹ I add a list of elegiac inscriptions of the sixth century AD found in *SGO* 1: 01/10/03, 01/20/20, 02/09/18, 02/09/23, 03/02/20, 03/02/22, 03/02/50, 03/02/51.

¹² But μεμαυῖα can be found in epigram not only in *AP* 9.17.2 = *FGE* 2095 (Germanicus), but also in anon. *AP* 7.148.3; to Hutchinson's examples (only to second century AD) of ἀγλαίη (→ *fr.* 1.13) in epigrams add *SGO* 01/20/20, 2.

¹³ In addition to Hutchinson's list of words with epic colour it might be interesting that μεμαυῖα (↓ *fr.* 1.11, already identified as an epic word by Hutchinson) is used in Homer when a goddess moves down from Olympus (*Il.* 7.24, 14.298), that is in an action similar to Asterie's leap into the sea; in *Il.* 15.83 and 172, where it goes with διέπτατο, the subjects are Hera or Iris. Other elements of epic colour are the frequent use of iterativa (↓ *fr.* 1.8 ἔσκεν; 9 ποθέεσκεν; → *fr.* 1.10 ἀπεχθαίρεσκε (*hapax*)), the application of φίλος to relatives (↓ *fr.* 1.8 φίλ[η] σύγγονος). πρῶτα μὲν ... δ[ε]ύτερον αὖ (↓ *fr.* 1.10-11) comes five times in Homer; for → *fr.* 1.14 δῶκε δὲ γαίη|| *cf.* *Od.* 21.31 δῶκε δὲ τόξον|| and *Od.* 24.73 δῶκε δὲ μήτηρ||.

¹⁴ I refer only to the use of the 'epic' μεμαυῖα (*cf.* nn.12-13) in *AP* 7.148 which is an epitaph on Aias; for more material, *cf.* Gow and Page on *HE* 948-9 (Asclepiades) and especially on Archias, *GP* XVI = *AP* 7.147.

Ov. *Met.* 6.184-7 (Niobe speaking)

*quaerite nunc, habeat quam nostra superbia laudem
nescioquoque audete satam Titanida Coeo
Latonam praeferre mihi, cui maxima quondam
exiguam sedem pariturae terra negavit.*

Hutchinson (2006) 80 stresses the density of this ‘statement of family’ in both texts, unexpected in Ovid. But this density has a clear function in Niobe’s speech and cannot be seen as the result of allusion to a source. The verses function as a counterpart to Niobe’s own more splendid genealogy from Zeus (174-6, unlike Latona who is descended from a Titan). It is rhetorically consistent that Niobe presents her own genealogy more explicitly and Latona’s as briefly as possible. The combination of all three names in both texts is remarkable indeed, but at the same time we should be aware of the differences: apart from the different order, Τιτη[ví]δος in *P.Oxy.* 4711 is connected with Φοίβης, whereas in Ovid *Titanida* goes with *Latonam*. The position of Λητούς or *Latonam* at the beginning of the verse could be influenced by Hes. *Theog.* 18.406, 918, in both cases independently.¹⁵

Although I have not found a poetic parallel for the combination of all three names, one should be aware that a mythographic account of Asterie’s genealogy is quite likely to contain all three names in some way, cf. e.g.:

[Apoll.] 1.2.2: ἐγένοντο δὲ Τιτάνων ἔκγονοι Ὀκεανοῦ μὲν καὶ Τηθύος Ὀκεανίδες, Ἀσία Στύξ Ἡλέκτρα Δωρὶς Εὐρυνομὴ [Ἀμφιτρίτη] Μῆτις, Κοίου δὲ καὶ Φοίβης Ἀστερία καὶ Λητώ, ...

Schol. Nic. *Ther.* 13 b: Τ ι τ η ν ἰ ς δὲ ἢ Ἄρτεμις, ἢ Λητούς θυγάτηρ καὶ Κοίου τοῦ Τιτάνος.

Since both poets wanted to write (for different reasons) in a mythographical way, we should keep in mind the possibility that Ovid and the author of the papyrus poem could have drawn on some mythographical source independently.

Now to point (B, b) and the alleged imitation by Gregory of Nazianzus, which seems all the more impressive because it immediately precedes a passage that some scholars regard as an imitation of just that fragment of Parthenius which describes a metamorphosis in elegiacs. As for *fr.* 28 Li. = *SH* 640 (cited above) and Greg. Naz. 1.2.29.157-60 (*PG* 37.896 Migne):

Ἄλλη δ’ αὖ ποταμοῖο καλοῖς ἐπεμήνατο ρεῖθοις,
μαίνεται, οὐδ’ ὄχθας ἤγ’ ἀπέλειπε φίλας·
λάπτεν ὕδωρ, χεῖρεσσιν ἀφύσσετο, ἀφρὸν ἔμαρπτεν·
ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ὡς πυρόεις ὕδασι λῆγε πόθος.

Some kind of influence, either direct¹⁶ or at least indirect, through a lost common source,¹⁷ cannot be denied. Although the description of drinking the water of the beloved river is not in Parthenius¹⁸ and we cannot be sure whether the nameless heroine in Gregory was not Comaetho

¹⁵ Cf. also Ap. Rhod. 2.710: ||Λητὼ Κοιογένεια φίλαις ἐνὶ χερσὶν ἀφάσσει.

¹⁶ Lightfoot (1999) 178-9; Hutchinson (2006) 71.

¹⁷ Lefherz (1958) 45-6 thinks that Gregory imitates not Parthenius, but a lost Hellenistic model. Others thought that an imperial text stands between Parthenius and Gregory, for instance Keydell (1960) 123 (Nestor of Laranda’s *Metamorphoseis*); cf. the useful survey in Wyß (1983) 853.

¹⁸ I cannot follow Meineke and Lightfoot (1999) 180, who argue for a missing couplet between lines 3 and 4. Hollis (1976) 149 misses a description of Byblis’ crying, which would explain her transformation into a spring. The mention of weeping would destroy the parallelism described above: Kypris both sets her on fire and transforms her into water. Note that Parthenius also springs from Byblis, as she puts the noose round her neck, to the Milesian maidens tearing their robes in *fr.* 33.5 Li.

but Tyro,¹⁹ the use of ἐπιμαίνεσθαι, the echo of the rare imperfect of that compound verb²⁰ in Gregory's μαίνετο and the fire/water imagery (although itself widespread and used in slightly different ways in both texts) remains impressive.

The similarities between *P.Oxy.* 4711 and Gregory mainly consist in the description of Narcissus' self-love:

→ *fr.* 1.11: μ]ορφῆς ἠράσσατο σφετέρης

Greg. Naz. 1.2.29.155 (*PG* 37.895): μορφῆς τις ἔης ποτ' ἐράσσατο (= 2.2.3.52 (*PG* 37.1484), also of Narcissus).

I would agree with Henry (2005) 53, who found the similarities 'hardly so distinctive as to suggest that Gregory knew our text'. First, it should be noted that also in this case Gregory seems to follow another version of the Narcissus myth from his alleged source, for – unlike the papyrus poem – he lets Narcissus drown, which seems to imply the Neoplatonist version of the myth²¹ (it would not be difficult, however, to explain such a modification by a Christian author). Secondly, the linguistic similarities. The connection of μορφῆς and ἐρᾶν can be found in Xen. *Symp.* 8.29,²² although rarely anywhere else.²³ But I have found at least one instance of μορφῆς governed by ἔρωσ, also in a mythological context.²⁴ In other accounts of the myth the idea of Narcissus loving himself²⁵ can be found as well as the use of μορφή combined with a possessive.²⁶ Finally, the combination μορφῆς ... ἔης does not have to be inspired by μορφῆς ... σφετέρης of the papyrus,²⁷ as Gregory uses it also in other contexts, e.g. Χριστὸς ἔην μορφὴν ἡμετέρη κεράσας (1.2.14.90 (*PG* 37.762)). Later, Nonnos has it quite often, also in the context

¹⁹ Cf. Gregory's καλοῖς ... ρεῖθροις (157) with καλὰ ρέεθρα in Hom. *Od.* 11.240 and [Hes.] *fr.* 30.35 M.-W., both in connection with Tyro. In no version of the myth does Tyro actually *drink* the water of Enipeus, but neither does Comaetho in Parthenius, and it would be a plausible extension of her notorious madness of love as described, e.g., in Lucian, *DMar.* 13. It may be noted, however, that in his commentary on Gregory's verse, Cosmas Hierosolymitanus (*PG* 38.517 Migne) says that the heroine is Hera and adduces the Tyro myth, including the detail of drinking water from the river. Lefherz (1958) 44-5, however, doubts that this version of the Tyro myth is based on an older version. Slight evidence for Comaetho may be seen in the fact that Gregory's other examples (Echo and Pan, Daphnis) are connected with metamorphosis. Demoen (1996) 393 draws attention to Greg. Naz. 2.1.1.91 = *PG* 37.977, where Gregory uses a similar expression (παλάμαις μάρπτοντα παραίссοντα ρέεθρα) to describe the desire for political power. Demoen does not want to see here an allusion to the Comaetho myth. It seems remarkable, however, that two verses before (2.1.1.89) Gregory uses the image of enjoying idle dreams, τερπόμενον ψεύστησι καὶ ἀδρανέεσσιν ὄνειροις, and a verse later (92) the grasping of the mirror image, ἢ σκιὰν ἐν χεῖρεσσιν ἔχειν, ἢ ἀχλὺν ἀφάσσειν. With τερπόμενον ... ὄνειροις now compare *P.Oxy.* 4711, → *fr.* 1.12 τέρψιν ὄνειρου; cf. also Greg. Naz. *PG* 35.636 ὄνειρώδους τέρψεως.

²⁰ Cf. the evidence given by Lightfoot (1999) *ad loc.*

²¹ Knecht (1972) on 155-6; Henry (2005) 53.

²² Hutchinson (2006) 71 n.2.

²³ I agree with Hutchinson (2006) 71 n.2 that Greg. Naz. 1.2.2.665 (*PG* 37.630) Χριστὸν ἔχοις μορφῆς ἐρικυδέος ἐσθλὸν ἐραστὴν could also be derived from *P.Oxy.* 4711. But cf. also [Lib.] *Characteres epistolici* 91 (vol. IX.9-11 Foerster): Ἐρῶ, ἐρῶ, νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς, τῆς σῆς εὐπρεποῦς τε καὶ ἐρωτικῆς μορφῆς καὶ ἐρῶν οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι.

²⁴ Hippolytus (third century AD), *Refutatio omnium haeresium* 5.7.12 (p.146.2-3 Marcovich): ἐὰν δὲ ἡ Σελήνη Ἐνδυμίωνος εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν ἔλθῃ καὶ ἔρωτα μορφῆς.

²⁵ Cf. ἐαυτοῦ γίνεται ἄτοπος ἐραστής in the quotation from Conon given in n.26.

²⁶ *GDRK* VI.3, col. II, 8-9: ναρκισσο[/ μορφῆν ἰδίαν [; Conon 24: Ὁ δὲ Νάρκισσος ἰδὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὄψιν καὶ τὴν μορφῆν ἐπὶ κρήνης ἰνδαλλομένην τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ μόνος καὶ πρῶτος ἐαυτοῦ γίνεται ἄτοπος ἐραστής; *Suda* π 1934: τὴν οἰκείαν μορφῆν. For later times, cf. Gregorius Cyprus, *Paroemiographi Graeci* 2.85.3 Leutsch-Schneidewin, where Narcissus is actually 'loving' his μορφή: τὴν οἰκείαν ποθοῦντα μορφῆν. Philostr. *Imag.* 23.1 has ἐρᾶν with a synonym of μορφή (about Narcissus) ἐρῶν τῆς ἐαυτοῦ ὄρας. Similarly an inscription on a picture of Narcissus, found in the *Domus Musae* of Assisi (Bulloch (2006) 137-8) has τῆς ἰδίας ὄδ' ἄκων [ed. pr., ὁ δακὼν Bulloch] εἰκόνας ὑγρὸν [according to Bulloch (2006) 139-40 an internal accusative meaning 'limply'] ἐρᾶν.

²⁷ For this phrase in the context of metamorphosis, cf. earlier Mosch. *Eur.* 163 of Zeus taking on his old appearance: σφετέρην ἀνελάξετο μορφῆν.

of metamorphosis (e.g. *Dion.* 9.158 ἐὶν ἀνεδύσατο μορφῆν). But even if we assume some kind of influence, after what we maintained above under (A), we do not have any reason to think that an imitation of the papyrus poem by Gregory is the only possible explanation. For, of course, the relationship could be the other way round (if we insist on direct influence), or – more probably – in this case, too, both authors could have drawn on the same source independently.

To sum up:²⁸ on the one hand, none of the evidence just examined makes Parthenian authorship of the text in *P.Oxy.* 4711 probable. On the other hand, none of it excludes such an attribution. What seems necessary is a comparison of the papyrus poem with what we actually have of Parthenius' poetry, especially with *fr.* 28 Li. For it remains possible that this fragment comes from his *Metamorphoseis*, and if we attribute *P.Oxy.* 4711 to Parthenius, it would be reasonable to assume that both the papyrus poem and *fr.* 28 Li. belonged to the same poem.

II

Fr. 28 Li. = *SH* 640 consists of a pentameter and two elegiac distichs, describing a maiden who loves the river Cydnus and is transformed into a spring. She can be identified with Comaetho:²⁹

παρθένος ἢ Κιλικῶν εἶχεν ἀνακτορίην,
ἀγχίγαμος δ' ἔπελεν, καθαρώϊ δ' ἔπεμαίνετο Κύδνῳι,
Κύπριδος ἐξ ἀδύτων πυρσὸν ἀναψαμένη,
εἰσόκε μιν Κύπρις πηγὴν θέτο, μίξε δ' ἔρωτι
Κύδνου καὶ νύμφης ὑδατόεντα γάμον.

A maiden ruling over the Cilicians,
to wedlock near, she raved with love for Cydnus,
Lighting a torch for him from Cypris' shrine;
Till, rendering her a spring, Cypris conjoined
Of river and of nymph an aqueous match. (trans. J.L. Lightfoot)

Before we can compare this fragment with the new poem we have to examine the arguments by those who doubt that these verses could have belonged to Parthenius' *Metamorphoseis*.³⁰ Martini, in his note on his *fr.* 14, deduces from Stephanus of Byzantium's introduction to the verses that they belong to a longer geographical description of the spring into which Comaetho was transformed. But as Henry (2005) 47 n.1 justly stresses, Stephanus' words (πηγή ...) περὶ ἧς Παρθένιος γράφων ἄλλα τε λέγει καὶ ὅτι ... do not say anything about the extent of what has

²⁸ It may also be relevant that Parthenius is known to have treated two of the subjects we find in the new papyrus, namely the myths of Adonis (*fr.* 29 = *SH* 641 u. 42 Li. = *SH* 654) and of Delos (*fr.* 10-12 Li. = *SH* 620-2); cf. Henry (2005) 47, who does not, however, regard this as a real argument for Parthenian authorship. *Fr.* 29 Li. deserves our special attention, since it is from an elegiac poem (*fr.* 42 consists only of the epithet Κανωπίτης): ... Ἄφως ... Κωρυκίων σεύμενος ἐξ ὀρέων. Since it cannot be integrated into ↓ *fr.* 1.5-6, Hutchinson (2006) 74 suggests it could have stood at the beginning. This is, of course, possible, but at least the only beginning of a mythical section we possess, ↓ *fr.* 1.7ff. on Asterie, starts with a genealogy, not with a geographical detail to be explained aetiologically in the following story. Another problem could lie in the fact that the river in *fr.* 29 Li. is Cilician whereas in ↓ *fr.* 1.5 the river Adonis near Byblos

is most probably mentioned or implied (Henry (2005) *ad loc.*; Reed (2006) 79). Henry (2005) 47 doubtfully raised the possibility that Parthenius' Delos might have been part of the *Metamorphoseis*, but Hutchinson (2006) 74 finds this unlikely. Indeed, we do not have the slightest evidence for it (Lightfoot (1999) *ad loc.* thinks of a hymn). But even if we accepted Henry's suggestion, I do not see how it can strengthen the case for the Parthenian authorship of *P.Oxy.* 4711, because the part on Asterie-Delos we possess could not easily be combined in a single narration with the Delos-fragments. So the Delos myth would have been treated twice in the *Metamorphoseis*, which is an odd assumption.

²⁹ Rohde (1960) 100 n.1 referring to Nonn. *Dion.* 2.143-4 and 40.141-3.

³⁰ Most recently by Lightfoot (1999) *ad loc.*

been omitted by the citation. Secondly, one might expect a poem on metamorphoses to be written in hexameters.³¹ Indeed, the known poetic works on metamorphoses are either in hexameters (Nicander's *Heteroiumena*, Nestor of Laranda's *Metamorphoseis*) or we do not know their metre because no original word has been transmitted (Antigonos *Alloioseis*, Didymarchus' and Theodoros' *Metamorphoseis*). But we do have examples of mythological narrations in elegiacs from Hellenistic times, and Ovid's *Fasti* give an example of an elegiac work which at least partly deals with metamorphosis myths. Moreover, I would like to draw attention to a piece of evidence which as far as I know has not been mentioned in this context before.³² In *Ep.* 5.17.2 the Younger Pliny mentioned a recitation by Calpurnius Piso:

Recitabat καταστερισμῶν eruditam sane luculentamque materiam. Scripta elegis erat fluentibus et teneris et enodibus, sublimibus etiam, ut poposcit locus.

'He read a poem he has composed upon a very bright and learned subject, namely, the mythology of the constellations. His numbers, which were elegiac, were soft, flowing, and easy, nor wanted even sublimity when the topic demanded it.' (trans. W. Melmoth/W.M.L. Hutchinson)

These *Katasterismoi*, which to judge by the title contained transformations into stars, were in elegiacs, and the way Pliny describes this poetry does not suggest that it was a selection of epigrams (esp. *sublimibus*). Thus at least in the first century AD it was possible to write elegiacs about a mythical action which is related to ordinary forms of metamorphosis and which was treated together with them in poems called *Metamorphoseis* (Nikander ap. Antonin. Lib. 25; Ovid). Therefore, I see no objection in principle to regarding *fr.* 28 Li. as a part of Parthenius' *Metamorphoseis*, although there is no positive evidence other than the mere content of the fragment.

Let us now compare this fragment with *P.Oxy.* 4711. If we first consider the question of mere length of the single stories told in Parth. *fr.* 28 Li. and the sections of the papyrus, there is no difficulty in assuming that they belong to the same poem. For although one cannot be sure about the actual extent of the sections, a rather short length seems probable.

The fact that *fr.* 28 Li. starts with a pentameter and the use of δ' in line 2 (according to Hermann's generally accepted restoration of the first couplet) suggest that there was an introduction of at least one hexameter, perhaps more but not many more because we seem to be at the beginning of the story. In line 5 the story comes to an end. Thus it had at least six or perhaps a few more verses.

That matches the probable length of the sections of the papyrus: Hutchinson (2006) 73-4 came on codicological grounds to a theoretical maximum of 45 lines for the story of Asterie and of 36 lines for Adonis, if the codex had (as usual at that time) no more than 45 lines a page; and to a maximum of 29 lines for Asterie and of 20 for Adonis, if it had its probable minimum of 29 lines a page. Hutchinson (2006) 74 points out, however, that the rapidity of the narrations suggests a shorter extent for the single sections. The story of Asterie which starts in ↓ *fr.* 1.7 seems to have come to its end in 14 where the birth of Apollo and Artemis is mentioned. Even if we assume that there are two more couplets following,³³ we have a length of 12 lines for the story of Asterie. The part on Narcissus seems not to start before line 10, where we find a description of how the

³¹ As I tried to show, following Meineke and arguing against Lightfoot (1999) 437-8, it seems improbable that the poetic version, from which the hexametrical *fr.* 33 Li. = *SH* 646 is taken, contained a metamorphosis (Bernsdorff (2003) 17-18). Therefore, *fr.* 33 Li. cannot be from the *Metamorphoseis* and gives us no evidence that

this work was in hexameters. This fact does not, however, exclude the possibility that it was.

³² Obbink (1999) 64 refers to the passage in his discussion of parallels for the astrological elegiacs by Anubion.

³³ *Cf.* n.42 on line 15.

hero rejects all advances. Θ]εοείκελον εἶ[δος, if it is related to Narcissus, might be part of the introduction.³⁴ Since 14 contains, as Henry suggests, Narcissus' suicide, this story probably had about 8-12 lines. We cannot make the same points about the part concerning Adonis because only its end is preserved, but the rapidity of narration in this part fits the impression given by the case of Asterie and Narcissus.

But if we consider not only the question of quantity but also that of quality and style of the narration, huge differences between *fr.* 28 Li. and the papyrus poem emerge. *Fr.* 28 Li. = *SH* 640 tells the story of Comaetho in a swift but highly artistic manner. Its use of alliterations and assonances has already been noted by Lightfoot (1999) 177.³⁵ Words beginning with kappa, especially with kappa ypsilon, are spread all over the text: 1 Κιλίκων, 2 καθαρῶι ... Κίδνωι, 3 Κύπριδος, 4 Κύπρις, 5 Κύδνου καί. As can be seen from the examples, the assonances are partly the result of word repetitions which underline the content, as 3 Κύπριδος / 4 Κύπρις does, because it stresses that it is the same goddess who both caused Comaetho's desire and satisfied it. The repetition 2 ἀγγίγαμος ... 5 γάμον marks the start (virginity) and the goal (marriage) of the story.

The repetition of Κύπρις in 3-4 just mentioned leads us to the elaborate imagery in this couplet. It is apparently dominated by the opposition of fire and water, both elements which are connected in the figure of Aphrodite. First, on the level of the narrative, she is responsible for the fire Comaetho is suffering from and she brings rescue by transforming her victim into water. Secondly, on the level of mythology, Aphrodite is traditionally associated with water³⁶ as well as fire.

At the same time, the opposition between fire and water is complicated by a transition from metaphor to metamorphosis, a technique which reminds us of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In line 3 the torch is used metaphorically for Comaetho's love, but the solution in 4 consists in the real water the heroine is transformed into. A similar device occurs in μίξε δ' ἔρωτι in the same line. The expression is based on the old Homeric metaphor φιλότητί τινι μιγῆναι used for sexual intercourse. This metaphor (which is in danger of fading) in this story has been revived through the metamorphosis which causes the mixing of river and spring (or their ὕδατοίεις γάμος as Parthenius calls it in the next line). As in Ovid, this connection of metaphor and metamorphosis has two results: first, the strategy revives metaphors which are in danger of fading, e.g. the meaning of the fire of love becomes clear if it is put in contrast with real water. Secondly, the process of metamorphosis becomes more plausible. By means of the fire metaphor we understand better why Comaetho has to become a spring.

I have just mentioned the relation between 2 ἀγγίγαμος / 5 γάμον stressing Comaetho's transition from virginity to marriage. The idea of this transition seems to be present also in the relationship between παρθένος in the first and νύμφης in the last line, the one meaning 'virgin', the other 'bride' (stressed by the vicinity of γάμον). At the same time, these two words play upon the idea of Comaetho's transition from girl to spring. Therefore, Comaetho becomes a νύμφη in the sense of 'bride', but also in the sense of 'nymph' (this meaning is stressed by ὕδατόεντα which follows νύμφης immediately). In this respect, by using παρθένος in line 1, Parthenius

³⁴ This section would, however, have been longer if → *fr.* 1.4 κερατή is the horn of Narcissus' father Cephissus, who was a river god (*Ov. Met.* 3.343). The bull shape of rivers is common enough (*Archil. fr.* 287 West; Nonn. *Dion.* 19.345; for Latin, *Thll.* 4.966.52-967.15) and would match the general theme of metamorphosis. For Paus. 10.33.5 as indirect evidence for the bull shape of the Boeotian Cephissus (Narcissus' father), cf. *LIMC* s.v. Kephisos IV; but cf. also Eur. *Ion* 1261 on the Attic Cephissus ὃ ταυρόμορφον ὄμμα Κηφισοῦ πατρός; also Ael. *VH* 2, 33.

³⁵ Van Groningen (1953) 21-56 regards Parthenius as a representative of 'verbal poetry' which intends to be euphonic even if the sense becomes unclear, and exemplifies this by an analysis of *fr.* 33 Li. (cf. 51-2). But see the critical remarks of Lightfoot (1999) 48 on van Groningen's schematization.

³⁶ Hes. *Theog.* 188-93.

could also allude to the purity of water³⁷ which Comaetho might have as a spring and which matches the well-known purity of her husband Kydnos (2 καθάρῳι ... Κύδνωι).³⁸ This association may be even easier for a reader who knows (or who is even told in the context of the fragment) that the son of Kydnos (and Comaetho?) was called Parthenius.³⁹

III

With this piece of artistic poetry let us now compare what we find in *P.Oxy.* 4711. First let us look at the Asterie-section because only here are we able to survey the whole extent of the narration. What is most striking is the density of mythological facts.⁴⁰ It is remarkable that no other poetic treatment of the Asterie myth combines the transformation into a bird and that into an island. Only mythography does so and, as far as I can see, only Hyg. *Fab.* 53, from which schol. Stat. *Theb.* 4.796 derives.⁴¹ One gets the impression that the author of this poem is anxious to put all the details known by him into one story. You may call this a kind of versified mythography. This view can be supported by a comparison with the account in Hyg. *Fab.* 53:

Iouis cum Asterien Titanis filiam amaret, illa eum contempsit; a quo in auem ortygam commutata est, quam nos coturnicem dicimus, eamque in mare abiecit, et ex ea insula est enata, quae Ortygia est appellata. Haec mobilis fuit; quo postea Latona ab Aquilone uento delata est iussu Iouis, tunc cum eam Python persequeretur, ibique oleam tenens Latona peperit Apollinem et Dianam; quae insula postea Delos est appellata.

It becomes evident that apart from the fixing of Delos, which was probably mentioned in 13, all the points of the narration in the papyrus poem appear in the mythographic account of Hyginus.

P.Oxy. 4711, ↓ fr. 1.7-15

7-8: Κοίου καὶ Φοίβης Τιτη[νί]δος ἐκ[γεγαυ]ία/
Λητοῦς ἔσκε φίλ[η] σύγγονος Ἄστ[ερί]η

9a: τὴν δὲ Ζεὺς ποθέεσκεν

9b: ἔφε[υγε] δὲ

10: πρῶτα μὲν ἡερίων ὄρνις ὑπὲρ ν[εφέων]

11: δ[ε]ῦτερον αὖ μεμαυία μέσσω ἐνί . [- ~ ~ πόντωι

12: ἔ[π]τη δ' ἤυτε νηῦς ...

13: Zeus's fixing of the island?

14-15: σ[ὺ]ν Φοίβωι καλήν Ἄρ[τεμι]/ δ'

ἀμφιλ .⁴²[

Hyginus, Fab. 53

Asterien Titanis filiam

Iouis cum ... amaret

illa eum contempsit

a quo in auem ortygam commutata est

eamque in mare abiecit, et ex ea insula est

enata haec mobilis fuit

oleam tenens Latona peperit Apollinem et

Dianam

³⁷ As the mixing with Kydnos is not real sexual intercourse Comaetho remains a 'virgin'. For a metaphorical use of παρθένος, cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 613 παρθένος πηγῆ, for Παρθένιος as a name for a well, *h. Hom. Cer.* 99 with Richardson (1974) *ad loc.*; Segal (1969) 24 gives examples for 'the virginal associations of the fresh water of rivers and pools' from Ibycus, Euripides and Ovid.

³⁸ Lightfoot (1999) *ad loc.*

³⁹ Athenodorus Tarsius, *FGrHist* 746 F 1 ('Artemidorus' is to be corrected in Lightfoot (1999) 178).

⁴⁰ This fact has been stressed by Hutchinson (2006) 77, 80, 83.

⁴¹ Wernicke (1896).

⁴² Henry (2005) 53: '... perhaps some part of ἀμφιλαφής'. I suggest this adjective may have belonged to the palm-tree Leto is embracing during the birth of Apollo and Artemis, cf. *h. Hom. Ap.* 117 ἀμφὶ δὲ φοίνικι βάλε πήχεε with Allen *et al.* (1936) *ad loc.* For ἀμφιλαφής of palm-trees, cf. Hdt. 4.172.4. Magnelli (2006) 10 has now come to the same interpretation independently.

It is, of course, possible that the author has chosen this ‘mythographic’ style⁴³ only in the Asterie section just as Ovid can tell his stories in the *Metamorphoses* in varying degrees of detail.⁴⁴ But the sections on Adonis and Narcissus give a similar impression of rapidity to the part on Asterie. In the lines on Adonis we find the same eagerness to combine as many versions of the myth as possible. As Reed observes, the combination of exchange between Aphrodite and Persephone and Adonis’ death by hunting ‘do not normally go together’.⁴⁵ As a third element, the author puts into his narration the rare aetiology that a river was named after Adonis.⁴⁶ We cannot say whether the section on Narcissus showed the same tendency,⁴⁷ and the poet seems to describe Narcissus’ suffering over a whole couplet (12-13). But altogether we find here the same effort to hurry to give a survey of the cardinal points of the story without much attempt to exploit them.

But as the comparison with Hyginus shows as well, the poem is not mythography in the strict sense of the word, because it is in verse and shows a certain degree of stylization. Compared to Parthenius, however, this stylization can be called anything but high. There may also be assonances in *P.Oxy.* 4711 (e.g. ↓ *fr.* 1.11 *μεμαυῖα μέσῳι*, 12 *ἦύτε νηῦς*, the repetition of verbs with -σκε, cf. below) and semantic oppositions and correspondences (↓ *fr.* 1.4 || *Κύπριδι ... Φερσε[φόνηι* ||, 6 || *αἶματι ... ἔθαλ[λε ῥόδον*;⁴⁸ → *fr.* 1.10-11 *ἀπεχθαίρεσκε ... ἠράσατο*) and certainly more would be visible if we had the complete text; but, of course, to a certain extent such a use is inevitable in every poetic text. But what we have can hardly be called elegant.⁴⁹ As for the imagery, the two most remarkable phrases are ↓ *fr.* 1.12 *ἔ[π]τη δ’ ἦύτε νηῦς* and → *fr.* 1.12 *πηγῆς ὀλοφύρατο τέρψιν ὀνείρου*. The first describes Asterie after her transformation into an island. In spite of her new status the island flies over the sea as if she continues in her former existence as a bird. The use of this metaphor seems plausible because the island now is a kind of ship (cf. Delos in Call. *Del.* 4.36 and 53), and according to an old poetical tradition the movement of ships can be described as flying.⁵⁰ Up to this point there would be nothing offensive in this metaphorical use of *πέτομαι*. But at the same time the poet feels compelled to explain his choice of metaphor pedantically by adding a comparison with a ship. Thus we get a rather muddled phrase describing ‘an island which flies on the sea like a ship’.

→ *fr.* 1.12 apparently describes Narcissus’ unsatisfied longing for his reflection. In his commentary Henry refers to Nonn. *Dion.* 35.252 *ρίψας κλεψινόνων σκιοειδέα τέρψιν ὀνείρων*, which is a perfectly lucid description of a man waking up and losing his pleasant dreams that are compared to a shadow (*σκιοειδέα*).⁵¹ In the papyrus, on the other hand, the expression has been twisted in an odd way: Narcissus’ reflection on the water (a kind of *σκιά*, cf. LSJ s.v. I.2 with supplement)⁵² is seen as a pleasant dream. The pain this deception causes to Narcissus is stressed

⁴³ For a short description of the way of narrating in Hyginus, cf. Boriaud (1997) XXX. For Hyginus’ use of sources, cf. now Cameron (2004) 33-45.

⁴⁴ For instance in the catalogue of tapestries in the Arachne story in *Met.* 6.87-100 and 103-26 (cf. Hutchinson (2006) 79), or the transformations mentioned during Medea’s flight in *Met.* 7.350-93.

⁴⁵ Reed (2006) 81. For a different version (Aphrodite descends to Persephone in the underworld and seems to achieve Adonis’ permanent restoration from among the dead), first attested in Aristides, *Apol.* 11.3, cf. Reed (2002) 220 n.4.

⁴⁶ This aetiology is mentioned only in Lucian, *Syr.* 8 and alluded to only by Lyd. *Mens.* 4.64, p. Wünsch, cf. Lightfoot (2003) *ad loc.* That the river Setrachus is mentioned or implied here seems less probable: cf. Henry (2005) 51-2 and Reed (2006) 79.

⁴⁷ Although ‘there is no trace of Ameinias, the lover who killed himself when Narcissus rejected him’ (Henry (2005) 53).

⁴⁸ Suppl. Hutchinson (2006) 77: *φυτόν* Henry, by analogy with the non-specific *ὄρνις* in ↓ *fr.* 1.10. For *φυτόν* of metamorphosed plants, cf. *GDRK* VI.1.8 and 17 (here even *φυτόν καλόν*, cf. Reed (2006) 81), but this is a catalogue of different plants where the non-specific word seems more suitable (7 *ἄλλο φυτόν βλέπω*). A similar case is Dioscorus, *GDRK* XLII.27.

⁴⁹ Pace Hutchinson (2006) 83-4.

⁵⁰ West (1978), on Hes. *Op.* 628.

⁵¹ Two expressions similar to *τέρψιν ὀνείρου* can be found earlier in Greg. *Naz.* 2.1.1.89 (*PG* 37.976) *τερπόμενον ψεύστησι καὶ ἀδρανέεσσι ὀνείροις* and *PG* 35.636 *ὀνειρώδους τέρψεως* (cf. below n.53).

⁵² Narcissus’ mirror-image is called *σκιά* in Paus. 9.31.7; *P.Oxy.* 4352 *fr.* 5.ii.3 *αἰδέομαι, Νάρκισσε, τῆν σκιοειδέα μ[ορφήν]*.

by ὀλοφύρατο, which corresponds to κλα]ύσατο in 13 and which together with τέρψιν effects an oxymoron. As in the case of the ship in ↓ *fr.* 1.12, this expression seems to be based on a traditional concept. The association of shadows and dreams, also used in the passage from Nonnos cited above, is as old as the *Nekyia*, where Homer describes the fleeing of the soul of Odysseus' mother as follows (*Od.* 11.207-8): τρίς δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιῇ εἵκελον ἦ καὶ ὄνειρω/ ἔπτατ', and in 213 Odysseus calls this appearance an εἶδωλον.⁵³ But as in the former instance, the traditional image has been treated by the author of the papyrus poem in a manneristic way. It is not surprising that Luppe finds the expression ὀλοφύρατο τέρψιν ὄνειρου 'kaum verständlich'.⁵⁴

Finally we should have doubts about Parthenian authorship if we look also at the metre. For in two of seven relevant verses the treatment of the pentameter caesura infringes Callimachean rules, as Henry (2005) remarked.⁵⁵

↓ *fr.* 1.8

Λητοῦς ἔσκε φίλ[η] σύγγονος Ἄστ[ερίη]

Callimachus avoids a word shaped | ~ - | in that position unless a short monosyllable precedes, as in *fr.* 75.23 Pf. οὐ γὰρ ἐμή,⁵⁶ Henry (2005) *ad loc.* can adduce as the only Callimachean exception *HE* 1092 = *AP* 5.6.2: || ἔξειν μήτε φίλον.⁵⁷

The second deviation from Callimachean practice is ↓ *fr.* 1.12 ἔ[π]τη δ' ἠύτε νηῦς, because Callimachus allows monosyllables (except postpositives, e.g. *fr.* 87) before the caesura of the pentameter only if preceded by words formed | - | or | ~ -|. There seems to be no Callimachean exception to that rule. If we widen the perspective to other Hellenistic elegiacs⁵⁸ we find more exceptions, but one should bear in mind that at least in the extant fragments Parthenius never violates the Callimachean rules.⁵⁹ That holds true also for Parthenius' treatment of the middle caesura in the 13 observable instances. I am aware of the fact that our basis for calling Parthenius a 'strict Callimachean' is very narrow, but it seems broad enough to warn us not to attribute a rather short text to him which shows two anomalies.

IV

Above I dealt with → *fr.* 1.12 τέρψιν ὄνειρου from a stylistic point of view, trying to show that the use of this expression in the papyrus is hardly worthy of Parthenius. But perhaps it also gives a clue to the date of the papyrus poem. For it is remarkable that this very line end is, as I said before, almost identical with one in Nonnos (*Dion.* 35.252) and is found nowhere else in extant literature.⁶⁰ Since the expression fits very well in Nonnos but not in the papyrus, the similarity might give a hint that the author of our poem is imitating Nonnos. What we have to exclude,

⁵³ This association 'dream-shadow-mirror' is certainly relevant in the section on Narcissus and excludes the possibility that τέρψιν ὄνειρου is a mere paraphrase of ὄνειρώδης τέρψις, 'idle joy' (Greg. Naz. 38.636, *cf.* n.51 above). Another example of the association of shadow and dream is Pindar's famous σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος (*Pyth.* 8.95-6), on which *cf.* Jüthner (1936).

⁵⁴ Luppe (2006b) 2. Instead, Luppe proposes supplements which make another reading of the couplet necessary: οἰκτρὰ δ' ὑπέ]ρ πηγῆς ὀλοφύρατο τέρψιν ὄνειρου/καὶ σίτου φεύγων, κλα]ύσατο κτλ. Luppe points to the usual connection of τέρπομαι with ὕπνος as well as with σίτος in Homer, but I cannot find any parallels for the metonymy ὄνειρος = ὕπνος.

⁵⁵ *Cf.* also Hutchinson (2006) 71.

⁵⁶ West (1982) 158 with n.68.

⁵⁷ But, as J. Reed points out to me, Callimachus' μήτε is felt to cohere with the following φίλον as the anonymous' ἔσκε is not.

⁵⁸ West (1982) 158 n.67 and Hutchinson (2006) 71.

⁵⁹ Lightfoot (1999) 42. G.O. Hutchinson draws my attention to Parth. *fr.* 2.4-5 Li. where two corrections appear close to each other. That might indicate that Parthenius allowed more corrections than Callimachus. On correction in Parthenius in general, *cf.* Lightfoot (1999) 45-6. The unusual treatment of initial πν- in *fr.* 27 b, 8 Li. πολὺ πνέουσαν can be explained as an imitation of Hes. *Theog.* 319; *cf.* Lightfoot (1999) *ad loc.*

⁶⁰ But the quotations from Gregory given in n.51 cannot be seen as evidence that the hexameter ending τέρψιν ὄνειρου existed in earlier poetry.

however, is the existence of a lost common source. I do not think we are able to exclude this with certainty, but the fact that we have another – admittedly not so impressive – case on the other side of the papyrus makes the assumption of direct influence more probable. In ↓ *fr.* 1.10

πρῶτα μὲν ἡερίων ὄρνις ὑπὲρ νεφέων

the supplement at the end is quite certain because the form of the alternative νεφελῶν is not common in dactylic poetry.⁶¹ Instances of ἡέριος/ἀέριος + νέφος/νεφέλη are rare (Duris *HE* 1773 = *AP* 9.424, 1 Ἠέριαι νεφέλαι, Orph. *H.* 21.1 Ἀέριοι νεφέλαι, Archias *GP* 3738 = *AP* 9.343.2 ἡερίης κόλπον ἔδου νεφέλης where νεφέλη has the meaning ‘bird-net’). The genitive ἡερίων ... νεφέων occurs only once in Nonnos, in a passage describing the effects of a metamorphosis as our papyrus poem does (Nonn. *Dion.* 45.133-135a, about Dionysus being tied up by the Tyrrhenians):

καὶ νέος ἐξαπίνης μέγας ἔπλετο θέσπιδι μορφῇ
ἀνδροφυῆς κερόεις ὑψούμενος ἄχρις Ὀλύμπου,
νύσσων ἡερίων νεφέων σκέπας.

Suddenly the lad grew tall with wonderful beauty, as a man with horned head rising up to Olympus, touching the canopy of aerial clouds. (trans. W.H.D. Rouse)

Although in this case the papyrus poem uses the expression in a clear way, it nevertheless appears strange. For ‘flying above the clouds’ is a very strong expression, if adapted to birds in general⁶² (the poet uses the non-specific ὄρνις). If the poet intends us to supply the detail that Asterie became a quail, that is a bird which was known as a bad flyer,⁶³ the author may have intended to play upon this ornithological fact, as Hutchinson (2006) 80 suggests. Asterie, attempting to escape Zeus, flies unusually *high*, only to fall *down* to the sea.⁶⁴ It seems strange, however, that an animal which has come into existence through metamorphosis behaves untypically just after the transformation. And to let her fly not only high but *even* above the clouds seems to be trying to outdo the Nonnian passage, where Dionysus grows only *up to* the clouds. Thus, although the metre of the papyrus does not show Nonnian restrictions,⁶⁵ we should face the possibility that this poem, like similar texts from the sixth century,⁶⁶ imitates Nonnos only in his language, not in his metrical practice.

Let us sum up the results of our investigation. The evidence for Parthenian authorship, especially the alleged imitations of the papyrus poem by Ovid and Gregory, has proved to be weak. On the other hand, a comparison with what we actually possess of Parthenius’ poetry shows that the metre of the fragment infringes Callimachean rules twice, and its style and poetic quality differ considerably from Parthenius’. Of course, there is the theoretical possibility that Parthenius’ elegiac poetry on metamorphosis showed very different levels of style, but as far as we can see

⁶¹ Henry (2005) *ad loc.*

⁶² On the lofty flight of eagles, *cf.* Thompson (1936) 4. Himer. *Or.* 54.3 on young eagles is clearly hyperbolic, as the detail of the sun shows: ... ἕως ἂν ὑπὲρ αὐτὰς τὰς νεφέλας γενόμενοι περὶ αὐτὸν ἤδη τὸν μέγαν ἥλιον πέτωνται (cited by Hutchinson (2006) 80), but *cf.* Antipater of Thessalonica, *GP* 172 (= *AP* 9.10.4) αἰετὸς ἐκ νεφῶν ὄξυς ἔμαρπεν ἰδὼν; for the beginning, *cf.* also Posidippus 31.1 A.-B. ~ Theocr. *Id.* 17.72.

⁶³ Arist. *HA* 597 a 23; Thompson (1936) 216.

⁶⁴ ἐκ νεφῶν is used by Antipater of Thessalonica (*cf.* n.62) for a similar effect: an eagle sees an octopus which is lying on a rock.

⁶⁵ Such as the reduction of contractions, preference for the feminine caesura, avoidance of paroxytone words at the verse end.

⁶⁶ Keydell (1935) 28 on Dioscorus of Aphrodito: ‘Die Hexameter offenbaren ihre Zugehörigkeit zur Schule des Nonnos nur noch in zahlreichen Entlehnungen aus dessen Dionysiaka.’ It should be said, however, that the metre of *P.Oxy.* 4711 is far better than Dioscorus’.

P.Oxy. 4711 is quite homogeneous in that respect. Altogether, it seems improbable that an author like Parthenius, who was able to impress the sophisticated Roman neoterics, could be the author of such verses. Secondly, we may maintain that it is *not necessary* to date this poem to pre-imperial times because of its elegiac metre, for it certainly can be seen as a form of epigram whose strong epic colour is due to its content. On the other hand, we cannot exclude the possibility that the poem is by another Hellenistic author, although the examples of Hellenistic elegy which present catalogues of myths are clearly different: that holds true both for pieces by known authors⁶⁷ and for those found on papyrus in the last few decades.⁶⁸ But we have to reckon with the possibility that this kind of second-rate poetry existed also in Hellenistic times. At least we can say that there were mythographical handbooks already in the fourth century BC, but if the piece is Hellenistic, it would be astonishing that such poetry was transmitted down to the sixth century AD.⁶⁹ We should therefore assume a late date of composition, rather close to the date of the writing of the papyrus. If we believe, as I do, that the author imitates Nonnos, this dating naturally becomes certain.

V

As a background for this kind of poetry I would like to suggest an institution whose importance, especially for the poetry of late antiquity in general, has been stressed quite often: the school. I add some considerations which can strengthen this hypothesis.

As Criore's collection of schooltexts on papyri and ostraca shows, epigrams on topics like Spartan bravery,⁷⁰ the fatherland of Homer,⁷¹ or epigrams containing speeches of Homeric characters⁷² had a place in Hellenistic and imperial schools.⁷³ Thus the epigrammatic form of the poem in *P.Oxy.* 4711 was not unusual in this environment. As shown above by the comparison with Hyginus, the papyrus poem seems to be based on a mythographical account and Cameron has recently demonstrated that mythographical handbooks had their place also in schools.⁷⁴ Finally, that there was a special mythographic interest in metamorphosis is shown by handbooks devoted to this particular subject, such as the *Metamorphoseis* of Antoninus Liberalis (second century AD?) or the Michigan fragment of a dictionary of metamorphosed persons in alphabetical order.⁷⁵

The evidence presented so far demonstrates that there was a culture of epigram as well as an interest in metamorphosis myth in the Hellenistic and imperial schools. But we have not yet found an exact parallel for the treatment of metamorphosis which occurs in *P.Oxy.* 4711, namely the short narration of a whole myth. Although I do not know such parallels, their appearance in *P.Oxy.* 4711 can further be explained by what we know about the practice of progymnasmata.

⁶⁷ For instance, Hermesianax, *Leontion*, CA pp. 96-106 and Phanocles, CA 106-9.

⁶⁸ Compare the survey of Hellenistic elegiac 'fragmenti a tema erotico-mitologico' and 'testi didascalici e mitologici' in Barbantani (2001) 233-6 (*P.Oxy.* 3727 is now SSH 1187; Spanoudakis (2004) tries to attribute SH 964 to Parthenius); also Lightfoot (1999) 23-4.

⁶⁹ Cf. above point (B, a) in the argument for Parthenian authorship.

⁷⁰ Criore (1996) nos. 178 and 179 (= SH 971), first century BC. On this topic, see more below p. 15.

⁷¹ Criore (1996) no. 177 (= SH 973 b) second century BC; no. 198 (= SH 972) second century AD.

⁷² Criore (1996) no. 355 (*P.Heid. inv.* 1271 v.) fifth/sixth century AD; cf. also the elegiac epigram on a wax tablet containing a riddle, *P.Lit.Lond.* 63 = 202 Criore.

⁷³ Wißmann (2002).

⁷⁴ Cameron (2004) 116-19.

⁷⁵ *P.Mich. inv.* 1447 verso, late second or early third century AD, ed. princ. by Renner (1978); cf. Rossum-Steenbeek (1998) 144-5, 335-6 (with other examples of lists of metamorphoses); Cameron (2004) 43. There is perhaps another mythographical account of a metamorphosis story in *PSI* 1220 (second century AD) whose 'talking names Dryas and Staphylus ("Oak" and "Grapes") suggest the possibility of an aetiological metamorphosis' (Cameron (2004) 62). The anapaestic dimeters preserved in *GDRK* VI (*P.Heid. inv.* 222, second/third century AD) seem unlikely to originate from a school because of their very elaborate language. The presentation of the catalogue in the form of a narration by a female first person is remarkable, 1, col. II, 45 βλέπουσ' ἀπεθαύ[μισα].

I would like to start with two forms of progymnasmata for the more advanced students: the encomium and the ethopoeia. For both types⁷⁶ the rhetoricians of late antiquity offer us models in prose.⁷⁷ But as Fournet and Crihiore have pointed out, all the examples for encomia and ethopoeiae found on papyrus but three⁷⁸ are in verse.⁷⁹ Some of these examples are longer poems in hexameters, but at least *P.Heid.* 1271 verso = 355 Crihiore presents speeches of Homeric characters in short units.⁸⁰ Beside other evidence, the poetical quality of the verses makes it probable that they are school products.⁸¹

At the same time it should be mentioned that there are several examples of ethopoeiae in the *Anthology* (*AP* 9.126.451-2, 454-80; *AP* 16.4).⁸² As far as these literary epigrams are concerned, we cannot say whether they are the product of a school. And although none of them is in elegiacs, but almost all are in hexameters⁸³ (due to their Homeric content⁸⁴), it seems at least remarkable that this form was adopted somehow also in epigram.

The poems contained in *P.Oxy.* 4711, however, are not an ethopoeia, i.e. a speech of mythical figures, but short narratives of the whole myth itself. But telling just the plot of the myth was also a part of the progymnasmata; it took place on a lower level than the ethopoeia. The handbooks call these exercises διηγήματα and most often locate them between μῦθος ('fable') and χρεία ('anecdote'). As an example I quote [Liban.] *Narrat.* 44.13-45.3 Förster:

Περὶ Δάφνης.

Δάφνης τὸ κάλλος ἐγέννησε μὲν Λάδων ὁ ποταμός, ἐθαύμασε δ' Ἀπόλλων. παθῶν δέ τι πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐρωτικόν, ἐπεὶ πείθειν οὐκ εἶχεν, ἐδίωκεν. ἡ δὲ εὐχεται τῇ Γῆι μὴ ἀλῶναι καὶ τυχοῦσα τῆς εὐχῆς ἀφανίζεται. καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα δένδρον ἐγένετο, δάφνη δὲ τὸ δένδρον ἦν. ὁ θεὸς δὲ τὸν πόθον οὐ κατέλυεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ πρὸς τὴν κόρην μετήνεγκεν ἐπὶ τοὺς κλάδους καὶ ἔστιν ἐραστὴς τῶν φύλλων.

It cannot be a surprise that there are also many other διηγήματα in the Libanian corpus:⁸⁵ metamorphosis as a supernatural act offers good examples of the form of διήγημα which Hermogenes defines as μυθικόν and which is characterized by Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.2: *fabulam, quae uersatur in tragoediis atque carminibus non a ueritate modo sed etiam a forma ueritatis remota*.⁸⁶ Later (2.4.18) Quintilian recommends adding to narration the exercise of refuting and confirming it, and then mentions the mythical type as the most obvious: ... *id porro non tantum in fabulosis et carmine traditis fieri potest* ... And in fact myths of metamorphosis often occur in this context in the rhetorical handbooks. For instance, [Hermog.] *Progymn.* 5 = p.11.11-12 Rabe illustrates the ἀνασκευάσις ἐκ τοῦ ἀσαφοῦς with οἶον ἀσαφῆς ἦν ὁ περὶ Νάρκισσον χρόνος and in p.11.17-18 the type ἐκ τοῦ ἀπρεποῦς with ἀπρεπὲς ἦν τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα θεὸν ὄντα θνητῇ

⁷⁶ A combination of both in the same papyrus can be found in *P.Vind. G.* 29789 and *P.Oxy.* 3537; cf. Fernández Delgado (1994) 303.

⁷⁷ Encomium: e.g. Liban. vol. VIII, 216-77 Foerster, ethopoeia Liban. vol. VIII, 372-437 Foerster. A list of prose ethopoeiae up to Byzantine times is given by Fournet (1992) 254 n.9.

⁷⁸ *P.Vindob. G.* 29789 (papyrus codex, third/fourth century AD, 'Prosaethopoiien eines jungen Schülers' according to Fernández Delgado (1994) 299) = *Pack*² 2528 = no. 9 in Fournet (1992) 259; *P.Oxy.* 2084 (third century, 'encomion on the fig') = *Pack*² 2527; *P.Oxy.* 4647 (second/third AD, 'encomion on the horse') = *Mertens-Pack*³ 2527.020.

⁷⁹ Survey at Fournet (1992) 256-9; Crihiore (2001) 229-30.

⁸⁰ Cf. also Dioscorus, *GDRK* XLII.26 (7 verses) and 27 (6 verses).

⁸¹ Fernández Delgado (1994) 303.

⁸² Not before the second half of the fifth century, according to Wifstrand (1933) 170.

⁸³ *AP* 9, 476, 478, 480 are in iambics. An elegiac ethopoeia can be found in the tenth century by Johannes Geometres (*PG* 106, 932).

⁸⁴ Fournet (1992) 261.

⁸⁵ Other pseudo-Libanian narrations which describe metamorphosis are nos. 1 Sirens, 2 Hyacinthus, 4 Pithys, 12 Callistho, 18 and 19 Procne and Philomela, 20 Marsyas, 26 Alectryon, 32 Pitys, 35 and 36 Perseus, 38 Elate.

⁸⁶ Cf. Clark (1957) 183 on these διηγήματα: 'They would include such mythological subjects as Ovid used it in his *Metamorphoses*, which, indeed, may well be considered as school exercises elevated to great literature.'

μίγνυσθαι. Aphthonius gives a model pair of confirmation and refutation concerning the story of Apollo and Daphne.⁸⁷

I would like to suggest that we regard the poem preserved in *P.Oxy.* 4711 as a collection of thematically arranged διηγήματα. For their treatment in verse, there is, as I said before, no immediate parallel, but we can refer to the analogy in other forms of progymnasmata such as encomia and ethopoeiae. The epigrammatic form would fit the shortness expected of a διήγημα.

At this point we should take into consideration another example of school poetry which has been transmitted on two ostraca from the first century BC. They contain an epigram of six verses on a lame Spartan soldier who in spite of his weakness is eager to fight (*SH* 971):

τοῦθ' ὁ Λάκων ποτ' ἔλεξεν ὁ μὴ ποσὶν ἄρτια βαίνων,
 εἰς τὸν ὑπὲρ πάτρας στελλόμενος πόλεμον·
 Σπάρτα κᾶμ' ἐδέδεκτο βοηθόν, ἀνίκα καυλῶι
 ὀπλίσμην, καίπερ γυῖα βαρυνόμενον.
 ἴξομαι, οὐδ' ἀχρεῖον ἐφόλκιον ἴξομαι, αἰχμάν·
 οὐ φε ἀλλὰ μένειν ἔμαθον.

Thus spoke the Laconian once, who could not walk properly on his feet, when he got ready for the battle for his country: 'Sparta took me, too, hastening to battle, after I was armed with the shaft [of the spear]. I will come, not as a useless appendage, I will come to the spear: a Laconian, I have learnt not to flee but to stay.' (trans. J. Wißmann)

What is remarkable in our context is the fact that this little story has the form of another rhetorical exercise, namely of the χρεῖα, in Clark's definition 'a brief exposition of what a person said or did, for the purpose of edification'.⁸⁸ The χρεῖα was the object of various kinds of further manipulation by students.⁸⁹ Elsewhere the anecdote of the brave soldier is transmitted only in Plutarch's *Spartan Apophthegms*,⁹⁰ i.e. in a genre which is very close to the χρεῖα.⁹¹ It should be noted that anonymous Lacedaemonian soldiers of outstanding bravery also appear in other χρεῖαι, which can be found as examples in rhetorical handbooks.⁹²

This example from the ostraca is important for us for two reasons. First, it gives an example of a versified progymnasma which was – unlike the encomion and the ethopoeia, but like the διήγημα – practised not by advanced students but by beginners. Secondly, it shows that a 'small' form of progymnasma can appear as an epigram.

A possible objection to my interpretation may be that one would expect a schooltext to be of a rather simple style. The 'relatively straightforward, standard poetic diction'⁹³ on the ↓-side may match this,⁹⁴ but, as I said before, the phrase τέρψιν ὀνειρίου in → *fr.* 1.12, seems rather manneristic.⁹⁵ But we have to take into consideration that in late antiquity the forms of versified progymnasmata were practised outside schools, too, although the genre originates from the school.

⁸⁷ *Rhetores Graeci* 1.72.15-76.18 and 77.14-80.15 Walz. For an ethopoeia connected with metamorphosis, cf. Dioscorus of Aphrodito, *GDRK* XLII.27 (Fournet (1999) 1, 446): Apollo to Hyacinthus and Daphne after their transformation. Menander Rhetor 393.1-5 recommends the reading of metamorphosis poetry like that of Nestor of Laranda in order to find appropriate themes for *laliai*.

⁸⁸ Clark (1957) 186.

⁸⁹ On this, cf. Hock and O'Neil (1986) 35-41.

⁹⁰ Agesilaus no. 34 (*Mor.* 210 f); Androkles (217 c); anon. 45 (234 e); cf. Wißmann (2002) 219-20.

⁹¹ Pointed out, e.g., by *LAW* s.v. 'Chrie' (O. Gigon/H.Hommel).

⁹² Nos. 44-6 in Hock and O'Neil (1986) 326-30.

⁹³ Reed (2006) 76.

⁹⁴ ↓ *fr.* 1.4 Henry (2005) proposes to read βεβλέσ[θαι] which would be a gloss, but Reed (2006) 77-8 has shown that βε is unlikely and καὶ (which would remove the asyndeton) is an attractive possibility. (I have doubts, however, whether after that Reed's βλοσυρῆ ('solemn') can be read because I would rather read an epsilon instead of an omicron.)

⁹⁵ The thematic links between the sections listed by Hutchinson (2006) 74 do not seem very artful to me and therefore do not suggest a literary level which would be impossible outside the schools.

This 'radiation' of school poetry can be illustrated for instance by Dioscorus of Aphrodito, who composed among other *Gelegenheitsdichtungen* also ethopoeiae (*GDRK* XLII.26 and 27, Fournet (1999) 446-51).⁹⁶

Another objection may lie in the fact that *P.Oxy.* 4711 belonged to a codex written in a rather formal script ('Coptic uncial').⁹⁷ But we should bear in mind that, for instance, the papyri which contain ethopoeiae are of varying quality. Although there is, as far as I can see, no example in the Coptic uncial in particular, we do find comparable cases.

(a) *P.Oxy.* 3002, fourth century, a Homeric ethopoeia, according to its editor Parsons 'in orthography as in script ... a very professional piece'.⁹⁸

(b) *P.Heid. inv. G.* 1271, sixth century = 355 Criore, although showing a much worse script, orthography and prosody, gives an example of a codex with an anthology of ethopoeiae.

(c) *P.Graves = Pack²* 1844 = *GDRK* XXVI, dated by the first editor to the fourth century but by Turner (1977) 116 no.314 to the fifth-sixth century, gives an example of a collection of ethopoeiae in a professionally written codex.⁹⁹

There are two possible explanations for the existence of such elaborate anthologies of versified progymnasmata. We could think, as Fernández-Delgado (1994) 303 does in view of *P.Graves*, of a versified equivalent to the prose collection in the *Corpus Libanianum*. This anthology could then have been a model for the students. Or we could again consider the possibility that this poetry was written outside school by a poet (like Dioscorus) who continued a genre he knew from school. It seems quite possible that such a poet thought his products worthy of being preserved in a more formal way.¹⁰⁰

The results of my paper may be disappointing for all who wish to read more of Parthenius' poetry. But at the same time we have to take into consideration that Parthenian scholarship can profit from this piece even if it is not by the master himself. First, it illustrates the existence of a subliterate poetical treatment of metamorphosis continuing a tradition in which Parthenius' *Metamorphoseis* are without doubt an important element. Secondly, this kind of metamorphosis poetry enables us to estimate how skilfully Parthenius seems to have treated this subject in his poetry. Thirdly, the new piece sheds light on the importance that mythography had for educational and literary culture in the imperial age. In this sense it illustrates the impact of a genre of which Parthenius' *Erotica Pathemata* are our most splendid example.

HANS BERNSDORFF

*Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität,
Frankfurt am Main*

⁹⁶ For other mannerisms in this kind of poetry, cf. *P.Heid.* 1271.Z.18 (of Achilles) μάχης ἀκόρητος ἐρώτων, 'wo sich der Verfasser mit der καινοτομία im Plural ἐρώτων (= ἐπιθυμία) wohl sehr geistreich vorkam' (Crusius (1905) 620); *P.Oxy.* 3537 (Hesiod ethopoeia), 12 μάνδρη ἐμῆ τρίτά[λαινα]. In Latin literature Dracontius (who was a lawyer like Dioscorus) is another example of a poet outside school who wrote poetry in rhetorical forms (ethopoeiae: Romul. IV and IX, controversia: Romul. V).

⁹⁷ Henry (2005) 46-7; on this style, cf. Gonis (2000) 125-6.

⁹⁸ Parsons (1974).

⁹⁹ Fournet (1992) 257; Fernández Delgado (1994) 303.

¹⁰⁰ The progymnasmata poetry by Dioscorus, however, was not written in a codex but on the verso of a contract.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, T.W., Halliday, W.R. and Sikes, E.E. (1936) *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford)
- Barbantani, S. (2001) Φάτις Νικηφόρος: *Frammenti di Elegia Encomiastica nell'età delle Guerre Galatiche* (Milan)
- Bernsdorff, H. (2003) Review of Lightfoot (1999), *Gnomon* 75, 12-18
- Boriaud, J.-Y. (1997) *Hygin, Fables* (Paris)
- Bulloch, A. (2006) 'Iamus and Narcissus in the Domus Musae', *ZPE* 156, 135-40
- Cameron, A. (2004) *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (New York)
- Clark, D.L. (1957) *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York)
- Cribiore, R. (1996) *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Atlanta)
- (2001) *Gymnastics of the Mind* (Princeton)
- Crusius, O. (1905) 'Mythologische Epigramme in einem Heidelberger Papyrus', in *Mélanges Nicole* (Geneva) 619-24
- Demoen, K. (1996) *Pagan and Biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen* (Tournhout)
- Fernández Delgado, J.-A. (1994) 'Hexametrische Ethopoiiae auf Papyrus und anderen Materialien', in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists. Copenhagen 23-29 August 1992* (Copenhagen) 299-305
- Fournet, J.-L. (1992) 'Une éthopée de Caïn dans le Codex des Visions de la Fondation Bodmer', *ZPE* 92, 253-66
- (1999) *Hellénisme dans l'Égypte du VIe siècle. La bibliothèque et l'œuvre de Dioscore d'Aphrodité* (Cairo)
- Gonis, N. (2000) 'Two literary fragments from Antinoopolis', in H. Melaerts (ed.), *Papyri in honorem Johannis Bingen octogenarii (P.Bingen)* (Leuven) 125-30
- Groningen, B.A. van (1953) *La Poésie verbale grecque. Essai de mise au point* (Amsterdam)
- Guidorizzi, G. (1984) 'Gli epigrammi papiracei di epoca imperiale', in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli, 19-26 maggio 1983* (Naples) 313-17
- Henry, W.B. (2005) Editio princeps of P.Oxy. 4711: Elegy (*Metamorphoses?*), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 69, 46-53
- Hock, R.F. and O'Neil, E.N. (1986) *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric 1: The Progymnasmata* (Atlanta)
- Hollis, A.S. (1976) 'Some allusions to earlier Hellenistic poetry in Nonnus', *CQ* 26, 142-50
- Hutchinson, G.O. (2002) 'The new Posidippus and Latin poetry', *ZPE* 138, 1-10
- (2006) 'The metamorphosis of metamorphosis: P.Oxy. 4711 and Ovid', *ZPE* 156, 71-84
- Jüthner, J. (1936) 'Zu Pindar Pyth. 8, 96', *WS* 54, 142-3
- Keydell, R. (1935) 'Dioskoros', *RE Suppl.* 6.27-9
- (1960) Review of Lefherz (1958), *BZ* 53, 123-4
- Knecht, A. (1972) *Gregor von Nazianz: Gegen die Putzsucht der Frauen* (Heidelberg)
- Lefherz, F. (1958) *Studien zu Gregor von Nazianz. Mythologie, Überlieferung, Scholiasten* (Bonn)
- Lightfoot, J.L. (1999) *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford)
- (2003) *Lucian: On the Syrian Goddess* (Oxford)
- Luppe, W. (2006a) 'Die Verwandlungssage der Asterie im P. Oxy. 4711', *Prometheus* 32, 55-6
- (2006b) 'Die Narkissos-Sage in P.Oxy. LXIX 4711', *APF* 52, 1-3
- Magnelli, E. (2006) 'On the new fragments of Greek poetry from Oxyrhynchus', *ZPE* 158, 9-12
- Obbink, D. (1999) Editio princeps of P.Oxy. 4503-4507: Anoubion, *Elegiacs, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 66, 57-109
- Parsons, P.J. (1974) Editio princeps of P.Oxy. 3002: Ethopoea, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 42, 12-15
- Reed, J.D. (2002) 'At play with Adonis', in J.F. Miller et al. (eds), *Vertis in usum. Studies in Honor of Edward Courtney* (Munich) 219-29
- (2006) 'New verses on Adonis', *ZPE* 158, 76-82
- Renner, T. (1978) 'A papyrus dictionary of metamorphoses', *HSCP* 82, 277-93
- Richardson, N.J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford)
- Rohde, E. (1960) *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (4th edn, Hildesheim)

- Rossum-Steenbeek, M. von (1998) *Greek Readers' Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri* (Leiden)
- Segal, C.P. (1969) *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Wiesbaden)
- Spanoudakis, K. (2004) 'Adesp. Pap. Eleg. SH 964: Parthenius?', *APF* 50, 37-41
- SSH = Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici*, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones (Berlin and New York 2005)
- Thompson, D.W. (1936) *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford)
- Turner, E.G. (1977) *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Pennsylvania)
- Wernicke, K. (1896) 'Asteria (6)', *RE* 2.1781-2
- West, M. (1978) *Hesiod, Works and Days* (Oxford)
- (1982) *Greek Metre* (Oxford)
- Wifstrand, A. (1933) *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos* (Lund)
- Wißmann, J. (2002) 'Hellenistic epigrams as school-texts in classical antiquity',
in M.A. Harder *et al.* (eds), *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Leuven) 215-30
- Wyß, B. (1983) 'Gregor II (Gregor von Nazianz)', *RAC* 12. 793-863