

Apollodoriana

Sozomena

Studies in the Recovery of Ancient Texts

Edited
on behalf of the Herculaneum Society

by
Alessandro Barchiesi, Robert Fowler, Dirk Obbink
and Nigel Wilson

Volume 16

Apollodoriana

Ancient Myths, New Crossroads

Studies in Honour of Francesc J. Cuartero

Edited by
Jordi Pàmias

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-054074-1

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-054532-6

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-054430-5

ISSN 1869-6368

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2017 Walter de Gruyter Inc., Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: Konvertus, Haarlem

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

♻️ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Table of Contents

Jordi Pàmias

1 Preface: Apollodorus: Cutting through Mythography — 1

José B. Torres

2 Between the *Homeric Hymns* and the Mythological *Bibliotheca*: Demeter in Apollodorus (1.5.1-3 [29–33]) — 7

Jaume Pòrtulas

3 From Panyassis to Pseudo-Apollodorus: The Resurrection of Tyndareus — 22

Nereida Villagra

4 Lost in Tradition: Apollodorus and Tragedy-Related Texts — 38

Joan Pagès

5 Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* and the *Mythographus Homericus*: An Intertextual Approach — 66

Lowell Edmunds

6 Helen in Pseudo-Apollodorus Book 3 — 82

Ezio Pellizer

7 Typhoeus-Typhon in Hesiod, Apollodorus and Elsewhere — 100

Alberto Bernabé

8 Orpheus in Apollodorus — 113

Anna Santoni

9 Myths of Star and Constellation Origins in the *Bibliotheca* — 126

Francesc J. Cuartero

10 The *Bibliotheca* of Pseudo-Apollodorus, *Textus Unicus* — 146

Robert L. Fowler

11 Apollodorus and the Art of the Variant — 158

VI — Table of Contents

Charles Delattre

12 Apollodorus' Text: Experimental Layout and Edition — 176

Ulrike Kenens

**13 The Edition of Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* by Thomas Gale (Paris, 1675):
Between Tradition and Innovation — 204**

Sotera Fornaro

14 The Apollodorus of Christian Gottlob Heyne — 219

Glenn W. Most

15 Postface: The Mazes of Mythography — 227

Index of Names — 235

Index of Passages Cited — 241

Subject Index — 253

Jordi Pàmias

1 Preface: Apollodorus: Cutting through Mythography

The origins of this volume lay in the colloquium ‘Apollodoriana. Antics mites, noves cruïlles’ held at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona on the 25th and 26th of April 2013.¹ A growing interest in myth over the last decades has brought to the fore the main mythographical handbook that has come down to us from Antiquity: Apollodorus’ *Bibliotheca* (*Library*). A number of recent editions shows this trend, like (among others) the commented translation of Carrière & Massonie (1991), the translated and commented edition of Scarpi & Ciani (1996), the bilingual editions of Brodersen (2004) and Dräger (2005), the translations of Guidorizzi (1995) and Smith & Trzaskoma (2007) or the critical text by Papatomopoulos (2010).² The last ambitious editorial undertaking is the Catalan edition of Apollodorus. Based on a fresh examination of the manuscripts and provided with a massive apparatus of notes, a four-volume bilingual edition of the *Bibliotheca* for the Fundació Bernat Metge collection is being currently completed by Francesc J. Cuartero.³ The publication of the first two volumes (2010 and 2012) seemed a suitable occasion to come to grips with this particular text and to address it from a scholarly perspective. Indeed, scientific study of Greek myth as a narrative has intensely focused on this comprehensive compilation of ancient myths written in the Roman period. No conference devoted to this engaging text, however, was held prior to that one. And, to this date, no monographic volume on Apollodorus’ mythology exists either. To cover a broader scope of analysis, three further papers were commissioned to scholars dealing with mythographical texts from diverse

1 The organisation of the Colloquium was made possible by the financial assistance of the Project “Los Mitos en Grecia: edición y comentario de los mitógrafos antiguos” (BFF2010-16301) of the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación of Spain, as well as the Facultat de Lletres of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

2 Huys & Colomo 2004, 220: “This supplement [covering the Apollodorean scholarship of the period 1997–2004, *scil.*] contains no less than six new translations in English, French, German, Spanish and Italian...”.

3 Reviews of Cuartero (2010) by Alganza (2011) and Torres (2012).

perspectives (Kenens, Pagès and Villagra). The present collection of essays is meant to be a homage to Paco Cuartero.⁴

In the burgeoning scholarly field of Greek mythology, a leading trend is now mythography.⁵ As the recent studies of Robert Fowler have positively shown (2000 and 2013), mythography is an activity that cannot be longer confined within the narrow chronological frame of Hellenistic and Imperial periods. Writing down myths proves to be an intense activity in Archaic and Classical poleis. Yet, a turning point in the history of Greek mythography is to be located in Hellenistic Alexandria. In the wake of the institutional research conducted in the library of the Museum, the reception of Greek mythology arrived at a conscious conversion into literature. Later on, if the Greek mythological patrimony can become a literary corpus, a mythographical manual would eventually aspire to be the compendium of, and substitute for, an entire mythological library: in fact, Apollodorus' *Library (Bibliotheca)*.⁶

This manual has served as the primary model for many modern collections of Greek myths and as a source for the study of ancient mythology. Thanks to its totalizing character, with its endless accumulation of mythical characters and references to now missing sources, the *Bibliotheca* invites consultation on particular matters. As Delattre proves in his chapter, already in Antiquity the *Bibliotheca* encouraged a particular reading: namely, one that aims for the reader to acquire information – and it does not necessarily entail a continuous act of reading.

This approach, however, shall not obscure its coherent character and internal logic. In its genealogical arrangement by broad mythical families, the *Bibliotheca* echoes the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, often considered its main structural source.⁷ But far from paraphrasing the genealogical poem, the author combines different and disparate sources in a single text.⁸ Myth, which has been losing its

⁴ Pagès, Villagra, and Pàmias have been disciples of Paco Cuartero at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

⁵ See Edmunds' predictive words in the introduction to the (second) edition of *Approaches to Greek Myth*: "Finally, the history of Greek myth in the sense of mythography, written collection of myths, will certainly need a chapter in a future edition of *Approaches to Greek Myth*" (Edmunds 2014, 24). A *Handbook to Greek and Roman Mythography*, edited by Smith and Trzaskoma, is forthcoming at Oxford University Press. And a *Cambridge History of Mythology and Mythography* is planned for publication, too (Cambridge University Press).

⁶ On the Alexandrian reception of Greek mythology, see Pàmias 2014, 50–52. On Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* as a 'library-book' and as a total text, see Too 2010, 116–142.

⁷ See, among others, West 1985, 44–46; Hirschberger 2004, 32. An exception is Fletcher (2005, 299–303), who challenges the circular logic consisting of taking the *Bibliotheca* as a basis to restore the *Catalogue*.

⁸ On the methodological problems that beset the study of the relationship between Ps.-Hesiod and Apollodorus, see Most's postface in this volume.

social and political efficacy, no longer serves the propaganda of the Greek cities or of the aristocratic families who asserted their mythical ancestors. In a moment in which knowledge of mythology has been converted into a crucial element in the definition and identity of the Greco-Roman elites, a function of the *Bibliotheca* is to put an artificial memory at the disposal of the reading public of Greek.⁹

However, outlining and describing the target audience for this particular manual is not an easy undertaking, as the contributions by Edmunds and Fowler show. Different levels of readership may be envisaged. On the one hand, one cannot hardly disagree with Cuartero, when he labels the *Bibliotheca* as a “discurs vulgarizador”.¹⁰ Indeed, it can be seen as a work of popularization that provides the mainstream reading public with basic information about the Greek myths. An excellent example of this standpoint is Bernabé’s contribution on the Orphic mythology in the *Bibliotheca*. Apollodorus compiles a number of traditions into a unitary tale “a sort of ‘least common multiple’ of the features contained in the oldest sources”.

On the other hand, the unique details and variants found in the *Bibliotheca*, as well as the great number of authors and the frequency of their citation, show that the author wanted to reach an elite readership having “aspirations to sophistication” (Fowler).¹¹ Some of these unusual, nay eccentric, traditions compiled by Apollodorus are described and analysed in Cuartero’s paper. In any case, Apollodorus’ inventiveness in combining elements into consistent stories, as astutely shown by Edmunds, encourages disagreement with Frazer, who called Apollodorus “a commonplace man, who relates without one touch of imagination or one spark enthusiasm the long series of fables and legends which inspired the immortal productions of Greek poetry and the splendid creations of Greek art”.¹² Santoni’s paper provides evidence, too, for the sophisticated way in which the author deploys the narrative elements. Inclusion of catasterismic myths in the *Bibliotheca* suggests that the result is not “to be considered the simple result of

⁹ In this context, reception of myth, the common cultural memory, has come to be a “pratique compensatoire et complémentaire de la domination romaine” (Mactoux 1989, 248). In Cameron’s words, “Greek mythology was the cultural currency of the Greco-Roman world. The mythographers are documents as much of social as of literary history” (Cameron 2004, x). In general, for the relationship between the Greek past and the present in the Second Sophistic, cf. Swain 1996, 65–100.

¹⁰ Cuartero 2010, 23. Cf. Mactoux 1989, 249: “discours de vulgarisation se donnant pour tel”.

¹¹ Söder (1939) was the first to tackle the unique details found in the *Bibliotheca*. She identified fifty in the first book alone.

¹² Frazer 1921, xxxiii. Even more disdaining were the Müllers, who labelled the *Bibliotheca* a “miseram fabularum hinc illinc corrasarum farraginem” (Müller & Müller 1841, XLIII).

a mechanical process of aggregation of information, but could reveal instead a certain level of elaboration and selection of data in the composition of the work”.

Unsurprisingly, a concern that can be recognized in a number of the individual contributions gathered in this volume is the implied readership of the *Bibliotheca*. Indeed, in the modern study of myth, a common trend is reception. And in this case reception starts with the intended audience of the manual. The active participation of readers in the construction of significance has serious consequences for the understanding of ancient texts. If the reader contributes to the construction of meaning, interpretation will emanate not solely from the original meaning but also from new readers in new contexts.¹³ Scholarly responses to ancient texts are to be taken as particular forms of reception. Accordingly, the present collection includes two chapters on modern Apollodorean scholarship. On the one hand, Kenens addresses Apollodorus’ edition by Thomas Gale and its intermediary role in the contemporary scholarly landscape between tradition and innovation. On the other hand, as Fornaro emphasises, Apollodorus plays a major role in the origins of modern mythology as science as envisaged by Heyne.¹⁴

In contrast with interest in reception, the focus seems to move slightly away from the critical scrutiny of sources, which has long been a crucial topic in Apollodorean scholarship.¹⁵ The *Quellenforschung*, as it was put into practice by 19th and 20th cent. classical scholars after the genealogical model of textual criticism, has been henceforth abandoned.¹⁶ Individual contributions dealing with the relationship of the *Bibliotheca* with previous or contemporary texts (Torres, Villagra, Pagès) address the issue from others points of view. What now matters is not only to identify the sources used by Apollodorus, but rather to untangle the particular ways in which the author of the handbook makes use of the amount of data available to him and how he combines the disparate mythographical traditions. Catchwords as ‘hypotext’ or ‘intertextuality’ are brought to the fore. The methodological difficulties of correlating a unitary text (Apollodorus) to a reconstructed work like the *Mythographus Homericus* (Pagès) or to a collection of fragments (Villagra: “comparing a text to a textual artifact”) are highlighted.

A number of chapters of this volume come to grips with particular mythical episodes (Pellizer’s Typhoeus: a *mythème*) and their place within the history of ideas. In some cases, connections of the Apollodorean accounts with the mythical and religious system of Greece are investigated, as Pòrtulas does on Tyndareus’ resurrection. In other cases, the Apollodorean mythical narratives can be used

¹³ Martindale 2007, 298; Pàmias 2014, 44.

¹⁴ See, too, in this respect Fornaro 2004.

¹⁵ See Huys 1997, 326–338 with Huys & Colomo 2004, 223–229.

¹⁶ On the “rise and fall of *Quellenforschung*”, see Most 2016.

to explore and reconstruct distant stages of the ritual protohistory of Greece, as Cuartero's paper shows. Connections of myth and ritual are examined anew. As a recent dissertation on the *Bibliotheca* proves, earlier institutional concepts may linger in the text of Apollodorus, without the author being aware of them.¹⁷

At this point, I wish to express my gratitude to the participants to the conference, who have been willing to contribute their articles to this volume. I am grateful also to the colleagues who have written a supplementary chapter. Especial thanks go to Bob Fowler, who has been closely following the editorial process from the very beginning, as well as to the de Gruyter team, including Serena Pirrotta, Marco Acquafredda, and Lena Ebert.

Bibliography

- Acerbo, Stefano. *I racconti mitici della Biblioteca: polivalenza delle immagini nella mitografia di età imperiale*, Diss. Università di Pisa, 2016.
- Alganza, Minerva. Review of Cuartero (2010). *Florilib* 22 (2011), 325–328.
- Brodersen, Kai. *Apollodoros: Götter und Helden der Griechen*. Griechisch und deutsch. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von Kai Brodersen (Darmstadt: Edition Antike, 2004).
- Cameron, Alan. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford: University Press, 2004).
- Carrière, Jean-Claude & Massonie, Bertrand. *La Bibliothèque d'Apollodore*. Traduite, annotée et commentée (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1991).
- Cuartero, Francesc J. *Pseudo-Apol-lodor. Biblioteca*. Vol. 1 [Llibre primer] (Barcelona: Fundació Bernat Metge, 2010).
- Cuartero, Francesc J. *Pseudo-Apol-lodor. Biblioteca*. Vol. 2 [Llibre segon] (Barcelona: Fundació Bernat Metge, 2012).
- Dräger, Paul. *Apollodor. Bibliothek. Götter- und Heldensagen* (Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler, 2005).
- Edmunds, Lowell (ed.). *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Second Edition (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014).
- Fletcher, Richard. Or such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses*..., in: *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions*, edited by Richard L. Hunter (Cambridge: University Press, 2005), 299–319.
- Fornaro, Sotera. I Greci senza lumi. L'antropologia della Grecia antica in Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729–1812) e nel suo tempo. *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 5 (2004), 109–195.
- Fowler, Robert L. *Early Greek Mythography I. Texts* (Oxford: University Press, 2000).
- Fowler, Robert L. *Early Greek Mythography II. Commentary* (Oxford: University Press, 2013).
- Frazer, James G. *Apollodorus: The Library*, 2 vols., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921).
- Guidorizzi, Giulio. *Apollodoro Biblioteca*. Con il commento di James G. Frazer (Milano: Adelphi, 1995).

¹⁷ Acerbo 2016, 111: “Lo ps. Apollodoro non doveva più avere coscienza di queste connessioni...”.

- Hirschberger, Martina. *Gynaikōn Katalogos und Megalai Ēhoiai. Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen* (München: Saur, 2004).
- Huys, Marc. 125 Years of Scholarship on Apollodoros the Mythographer: A Bibliographical Survey. *Ant. Class.* 66 (1997), 319–351.
- Huys, Marc & Colomo, Daniela. Bibliographical Survey on Apollodoros the Mythographer: A Supplement. *Ant. Class.* 73 (2004), 219–237.
- Mactoux, Marie-Madeleine. Panthéon et discours mythologique. Le cas d'Apollodore. *RHR* 206 (1989), 245–270.
- Martindale, Charles. Reception, in: *A Companion to the Classical Tradition*, edited by Craig W. Kallendorf (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing), 297–311.
- Most, Glenn W. The Rise and Fall of *Quellenforschung*, in: *For the Sake of Learning. Essays in Honor of Anthony Grafton*, edited by Ann Blair & Anja-Silvia Goeing. Vol. 2 (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2016), 933–954.
- Müller, Carl & Müller, Theodor. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Vol. I (Paris: Didot, 1841).
- Pàmias, Jordi. The Reception of Greek Myth, in: *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Second Edition, edited by Lowell Edmunds (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), 44–83.
- Papathomopoulos, Manolis. *Απολλοδώρου Βιβλιοθήκη / Apollodori Bibliotheca post Richardum Wagnerum recognita* (Athinaï: Aletheia, 2010).
- Scarpi, Paolo & Ciani, Maria Grazia. *Apollodoro. I miti greci. Biblioteca*. Traduzione di Maria Grazia Ciani (Milano: Mondadori, 1996).
- Smith, R. Scott & Trzaskoma, Stephen M. *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae. Two Handbooks of Greek Mythology* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2007).
- Söder, Anna. *Quellenuntersuchung zum 1. Buch der Apollodorschen Bibliothek*, Diss. Würzburg (Würzburg: Becker, 1939).
- Swain, Simon. *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250* (Oxford: University Press, 1996).
- Too, Yun Lee. *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World* (Oxford: University Press, 2010).
- Torres, José B. Review of Cuartero (2010) and Papathomopoulos (2010). *Emerita* 80 (2012), 199–202.
- West, Martin L. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Its Nature, Structure, and Origins* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

José B. Torres

2 Between the *Homeric Hymns* and the Mythological *Bibliotheca*: Demeter in Apollodorus (1.5.1-3 [29–33])

This research paper on the *Bibliotheca* is part of a more wide-ranging project whose purpose is to discern the traces of the *Homeric Hymns* in the mythological literature to which Apollodorus' work may be ascribed.¹ That these *Hymns* had a bearing on the *Bibliotheca* has been widely acknowledged, including at a number of points in Frazer's annotated edition.² In his commentary on the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Richardson points out that Apollodorus' text is one of the prose texts dating to the imperial period in which the influence of that *Hymn* may be traced; and he likewise holds that the latter may also have had a bearing on a number of verbal expressions used in the *Bibliotheca* text.³ In a later commentary on the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, Vergados argues that, although the *Bibliotheca* may encompass the hexametrical text via one source or another,⁴ the account of the narrative offered there (3.10.2 [112–115]) also draws on other hypotexts that appear to be different from, or even contradictory to, the version of the *Hymn*.⁵ In spite of these critical observations of particular textual details, and despite an extensive critical literature concerning the sources of his writings, no overall study tracing the influence of the *Homeric Hymns* on Apollodorus' work has yet been undertaken.⁶ The primary purpose of this contribution is not, however, to fill this gap in the research; rather, the objective is to shed some light on the issue by analyzing what Apollodorus (1.5.1-3 [29–33]) and the second *Homeric Hymn* may have to say about Demeter.

In the footnote to 1.5.1 [29], the point in the text at which Apollodorus opens his account about the two goddesses, Frazer's annotated edition states that:

1 Concerning Cornutus and Apollodorus of Athens, see Torres 2016.

2 Cf. Frazer 1921, 1.34, 2.5. For further insights into the relationship between the *Homeric Hymns* and Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*, see Cuartero in this volume.

3 Cf. Richardson 1974, 71.

4 An implicit issue here concerns the nature of Apollodorus' sources; see footnotes 6 and 12.

5 Cf. Vergados 2013, 93–97. Holland (1926, 163–164) assumes that *h.Merc.* is the origin of Apollodorus' narrative. In marked contrast, neither Schwartz nor Wendel cite the *Homeric Hymns* as sources for the *Bibliotheca*.

6 Cf. Schwartz 1894, 2877–2880; Wendel 1935, 1365–1366; Van der Valk 1958; Huys 1997; Cuartero 2010, 27–41; Kenens 2011.

“This account of the rape of Persephone and Demeter’s quest of her is based on the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*”.⁷ The similarities between the two versions are clear from the very beginning of both renditions; in both the *Homeric Hymn* and the *Bibliotheca*, the reader is told that Zeus colluded with Pluto in the kidnap of Persephone:

h.Cer. 1–3:

Δήμητρ’ ἠΰκομον σεμνήν θεὰν ἄρχομ’ αἰίδειν,
αὐτὴν ἠδὲ θύγατρα τανύσφυρον ἦν Αἰδωνεύς
ἤρπασεν, δῶκεν δὲ βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεύς.

Of Demeter the lovely-haired, the august goddess first I sing, of her and her slender-ankled daughter, whom Aidoneus seized by favor of heavy-booming, wide-sounding Zeus.⁸

Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.5.1 [29]: Πλούτων δὲ Περσεφόνης ἐρασθεὶς Διὸς συνεργοῦντος ἤρπασεν αὐτὴν κρύφα.

Pluto fell in love with Persephone and with the help of Zeus carried her off secretly.

This is the standard narrative of the myth, from which only the versions of Ovid and Claudian diverge,⁹ both of whom endeavor to frame the seizing of Persephone as a love-story, which explains why Pluto’s conspirator in their versions is Aphrodite, rather than Zeus. Correspondence on so general a point would be meaningful only if other common features such as textual parallels were also to be discerned. While it is true that the same verb (ἄρπάζω) is used in both instances to denote Pluto’s action (ἤρπασεν / ἤρπασεν), this correspondence is not significant given that the word in question (ἄρπάζω) is the generic verb for ‘kidnap’ in Greek.¹⁰

A comparative reading of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and Apollodorus’ version of the narrative discloses three different situations: first, there are corresponding passages that evince no significant verbal parallels, as would appear to be the case in the instance cited above; second, there are passages that tell the same story and are also similar at the level of verbal expression;¹¹ and third, the

⁷ Cf. Frazer 1921, 1.34, Richardson 1974, 76.

⁸ The *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* translations are taken from West 2003; the *Bibliotheca* translations from Frazer 1921.

⁹ Cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.365–384; Claud. *Rapt.* 1.26–27, 214–228.

¹⁰ The same verbs is used, likewise in an account of the kidnapping of Persephone, in Hes. *Theog.* 914 (cf. vv. 913–914: ἦν Αἰδωνεύς / ἤρπασεν ἧς παρὰ μητρός, ἔδωκε δὲ μητίετα Ζεύς). Cf. Currie 2012, 191.

¹¹ Parallels involving other significant features, such as the inclusion of rarer mythemes, may also be meaningful; for instance, both texts present Demeter wandering the world carrying a torch: cf. *h.Cer.* 47–48 and Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.5.1 [29]. On torches and the Eleusinian Mysteries, see Richardson 1974, 165, 166–167.

two texts present contrasting versions, which may be attributed to the fact that the *Bibliotheca* incorporates alternative readings based on other source texts or on local variants of the myth.¹²

Several excerpts pertain to the second category described above, including, for instance, the sequence featuring Iambe, the figure who succeeds in making Demeter laugh in Eleusis, despite the goddess' distress at the loss of her daughter. The key verses in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (vv. 202–204) run as follows:

πρίν γ' ὅτε δὴ χλεῦης μιν Ἰάμβη κέδν' εἶδυῖα
πολλὰ παρασκώπτουσ' ἐτρέψατο πότνιαν ἀγνήν,
μειδῆσαι γελάσαι τε καὶ ἴλαον σχεῖν θυμόν.

(...) until at last dutiful Iambe with ribaldry and many a jest diverted the holy lady so that she smiled and laughed and became benevolent.

The corresponding text in Apollodorus (1.5.1 [30]) also recounts how the goddess comes to the house of Celeus, the king of Eleusis, where she is welcomed by a group of women, who invite her to sit next to them; however, Demeter remains reserved until γραῖά τις Ἰάμβη σκώψασα τὴν θεὸν ἐποίησε μειδιᾶσαι, “a certain old crone, Iambe, joked the goddess and made her smile”. In both texts, the woman who makes Demeter laugh is called Iambe, not Baubo as in other versions;¹³ and Iambe teases Demeter (σκώψασα: cf. παρασκώπτουσ', *h.Cer.* 203) to make the goddess (τὴν θεόν: cf. πότνιαν ἀγνήν, *h.Cer.* 203) smile (μειδιᾶσαι: cf. μειδῆσαι, *h.Cer.* 204).¹⁴

There are also significant verbal parallels between the two texts in the description of Demeter as a wet-nurse to Celeus' son, which is recounted in this passage from the *Bibliotheca* as follows:

ὄντος δὲ τῆ τοῦ Κελεοῦ γυναικὶ Μετανεῖρα παιδίου, τοῦτο ἔτρεφεν ἡ Δημήτηρ παραλαβοῦσα· βουλομένη δὲ αὐτὸ ἀθάνατον ποιῆσαι, τὰς νύκτας εἰς πῦρ κατετίθει τὸ βρέφος καὶ περιήρει τὰς θνητὰς σάρκας αὐτοῦ. καθ' ἡμέραν δὲ παραδόξως αὐξανομένου τοῦ Δημοφῶντος (τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ὄνομα τῷ παιδί) ἐπετήρησεν ἡ <Μετανεῖρα>, καὶ καταλαβοῦσα εἰς πῦρ ἐγκεκρυμμένον ἀνεβόησε.

(Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.5.1 [31]).

¹² Apollodorus' status as an author suggests that he would be unlikely to invent new variants of the information that came down to him via intermediate sources. Cf. Schwartz 1894, 2877.

¹³ The Orphic version, which may correspond to the Attic version; to read the texts, cf. *Orphicorum Fragmenta* [OF] 391, 395. See also Graf 1974, 168–171; 2008, 683–687, Bernabé 2008, 30.

¹⁴ Apollodorus' text subsequently links this story to elements of the Thesmophoria ritual (διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς θεσμοφορίοις τὰς γυναῖκας σκώπτειν λέγουσιν), which may support part of the argument below concerning the author's favoring of Attic versions of the myth. In contrast, the *Hymn* version links Iambe's action to the Eleusinian ritual (with the αἰσχρολογία practiced there; cf. Richardson 1974, 213–217).

But Metanira, wife of Celeus, had a child and Demeter received it to nurse, and wishing to make it immortal she set the babe of nights on the fire and stripped off its mortal flesh. But as Demophon – for that was the child’s name – grew marvelously by day, Praxithea¹⁵ watched, and discovering him buried in the fire she cried out.

There are recurrent correspondences with the text of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. In Apollodorus’ version, Metanira has a son (παιδίου) who is raised by Demeter (ἔτρεφεν): in the *Hymn*, Celeus’ wife implores the visiting stranger to raise her son (παῖδα δέ μοι τρέφε τόνδε, *h.Cer.* 219), which is how the story unfolds (ὡς ἦ μὲν Κελεοῖο δαίφρονος ἀγλαὸν υἱὸν (...) ἔτρεφεν ἐν μεγάροις, 233, 235). According to the *Bibliotheca* version, Demeter hoped to make the child immortal (ἀθάνατον); this is also the case in the other ancient text (cf. ὁ δ’ ἀέξετο δαίμονι ἴσος, *h.Cer.* 235; χρίεσκ’ ἀμβροσίη ὡσεὶ θεοῦ ἐκγεγαῶτα, 237; θεοῖσι γὰρ ἄντα ἐώκει, 241; καὶ κέν μιν ποιήσεν ἀγήρων τ’ ἀθάνατόν τε, 242), which tells of how the goddess hid him in the fire at night (νύκτας δὲ κρύπτεσκε πυρὸς μένει ἢ τε δαλόν, 239: cf. τὰς νύκτας εἰς πῦρ κατετίθει τὸ βρέφος, Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.5.1 [31]). This deed accounts for the child’s extraordinary growth, which is noted by both Apollodorus (καθ’ ἡμέραν δὲ παραδόξως αὐξανόμενον τοῦ Δημοφῶντος) and the *Hymn* (μέγα θαῦμ’ ἐτέτυκτο, / ὡς προθαλῆς τελέθεσκε, 240–241). However, in both versions, a woman¹⁶ walks in and interrupts the magical ritual before it can be completed. The text contained in the *Bibliotheca* (ἐπιτηρήσεν ἡ <Μετάνειρα>, καὶ καταλαβοῦσα εἰς πῦρ ἐγκεκρυμμένον ἀνεβόησε) is a prose adaptation of the narrative recounted in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, and occasionally takes phrases from the poem (Μετάνειρα / νύκτ’ ἐπιτηρήσασα (...) / σκέψατο, 243–245; τέκνον Δημοφῶν, ξεῖνη σε πυρὶ ἔνι πολλῷ / κρύπτει, 248–249).

A similar pattern may be traced in relation to two other sequences of the myth. See, for instance, Pluto’s stratagem to prevent Persephone from leaving the hellish underworld forever, despite the order issued by Zeus that the Maiden return to her mother.¹⁷ The underlying idea in this passage is that whoever partakes of the food of the dead remains bound to them forever;¹⁸ thus, Pluto gives

15 Cf. n. 16.

16 In Apollodorus’ text transmitted by the manuscripts, the woman’s name is Praxithea, which most editors correct to read Metanira (Μετάνειρα); Frazer 1921, whose translation is cited above, is an exception in this regard. In relation to the textual issue involved, see Frazer 1921, 1.38, 2.312; Papatomopoulos 1973; Cuartero 2010, 115. See also Cuartero in this volume.

17 Cf. *h.Cer.* 334–339; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.5.3 [33]: Διὸς δὲ Πλούτωνι τὴν Κόρην ἀναπέμψαι κελεύσαντος...

18 Cf. Frazer 1921, 1.39–41; Richardson 1974, 276.

Persephone a pomegranate seed to eat, which proves to be a baited hook ensuring that Persephone cannot simply leave Pluto and return to Demeter once and for all:

h.Cer. 371–372, 373–374

ὁ γ' αὐτὸς / ῥοιῆς κόκκον ἔδωκε φαγεῖν
ἵνα μὴ μένοι ἥματα πάντα / αὐθι παρ' αἰδοίῃ
 Δημήτερι

Apollod. Bibl. 1.5.3 [33]

ῥοιᾶς ἔδωκεν αὐτῇ φαγεῖν κόκκον
 Πλούτων, ἵνα μὴ πολὺν χρόνον παρὰ τῇ μητρὶ
 καταμείνῃ

There are also textual similarities between the passages describing the compromise reached regarding how Persephone is to divide her time between her mother and her husband:

h.Cer. 399–400, 445–447

οἰκήσεις ὠρέων τρίτατον μέρος εἰς
ἐνιαυτόν.] / τὰς δὲ δύο παρ' ἐμοί τε καὶ
[ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισιν
 κούρην ἔτεος περιτελλομένοιο / τὴν τριτάτην
 μὲν μοῖραν ὑπὸ ζόφον ἠέροντα, / τὰς δὲ
 δύο παρὰ μητρὶ καὶ ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισιν

Apollod. Bibl. 1.5.3 [33]

Περσεφόνη δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν τὸ μὲν
τρίτον μετὰ Πλούτωνος ἠναγκάσθη μένειν, τὸ
 δὲ λοιπὸν παρὰ τοῖς θεοῖς

While it is true that these corresponding passages evince close verbal parallels, both texts also present contradictory versions of the same sequence in the mythological narrative. The fate of Celeus' son, for example, is different in the two texts: in the *Homeric Hymn* version, the child does not become immortal because his mother disrupts the ritual before his nursemaid can complete it,¹⁹ whereas in Apollodorus' account, Metanira cries out, which brings about the child's death²⁰ (surprisingly, all the codices attribute this cry to an otherwise unknown 'Praxithea').²¹ Apollodorus' description of the invention of agriculture is also different; in line with the Attic version, agriculture was gifted to the world by Triptolemus, who was acting in obedience to the commands of Demeter.²²

¹⁹ Cf. *h.Cer.* 219–255.

²⁰ Cf. Richardson 1974, 242, 245–247: the *Hymn* narrative would appear to be a literary adaptation of a traditional motif. The argument pursued in the present paper is that Apollodorus' text presents the traditional (primary) version, while the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* includes a mythical innovation.

²¹ Cf. n. 16.

²² Cf. Richardson 1974, 194–197; Bernabé 2008, 20, 31–34; Currie 2012, 198–199.

By contrast, the *Homeric Hymn* presupposes the existence of agriculture²³ and Triptolemus plays only a minor role in the narrative, a chieftain in Eleusis who is referred to by name on only two or three occasions in the text.²⁴

The two texts are also different in their narration of how Demeter finds out that her daughter has been kidnapped by Pluto. According to the *Homeric Hymn*, she learns of the abduction from the Sun.²⁵ The Attic version followed by Apollodorus recounts how the people of Eleusis tell her what has happened; a number of fragments of poetry in the Orphic tradition also articulate this version, including the Berlin papyrus which is discussed in greater detail below.²⁶ However, in line with Apollodorus' account (1.5.1 [29]), Demeter learns the truth from the people of Hermion (μαθοῦσα δὲ παρ' Ἑρμιονέων ὅτι Πλούτων αὐτὴν ἤρπασεν..., "learning from the people of Hermion that Pluto had carried her off..."). Nevertheless, it should also be noted that no other version, except for the few texts that stem directly from the *Bibliotheca* version,²⁷ features this mytheme. Since there was an underground shrine to Demeter in Hermion, as Pausanias recorded (2.35.4-8), the author may have incorporated a local variation on the story, preserved for reasons that have not come down to us.²⁸

The argument thus far reaffirms Frazer's assertion cited at the start of this paper on the basis of textual evidence. However, the words of the Scottish scholar might well be turned back on themselves; perhaps, rather than saying that Apollodorus' text is based on the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, it could be said that the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* is a source for the story told in the *Bibliotheca*, as are other versions of the myth referred to by Apollodorus:

Πανύσις [fr. 13 Bernabé] δὲ Τριπτόλεμον Ἐλευσῖνος λέγει· φησὶ γὰρ Δήμητρα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔλθεῖν. Φερεκύδης [fr. 53 Fowler] δὲ φησιν αὐτὸν Ὠκεανοῦ καὶ Γῆς (Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.5.2 [32]). Panyasis affirms that Triptolemus was a son of Eleusis, for he says that Demeter came to him. Pherecydes, however, says that he was a son of Ocean and Earth.

23 Cf. *h.Cer.* 450–454: ἐς δ' ἄρα Ἄριον ἴξε, φερέσβιον οὖθαρ ἀρούρης / τὸ πρὶν, ἀτὰρ τότε γ' οὔτι φερέσβιον, ἀλλὰ ἐκλον / ἐστήκει πανάφυλλον· ἔκευθε δ' ἄρα κρὶ λευκὸν / μῆδεσι Δήμητρος καλλισφύρου· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα / μέλλεν ἄφαρ ταναοῖσι κομήσειν ἀσταχῦεσσιν.

24 Cf. *h.Cer.* 153, 474, [477].

25 Cf. *h.Cer.* 62–87.

26 Cf. *OF* 396–397; Parker 1991, 16; Currie 2012, 193. According to Richardson (1974, 82), the Berlin papyrus tells the legend local to Eleusis, which later spread to Attica.

27 These are Zenobius (1.7) and a scholium on Aristophanes (*Eq.* 782). Cf. Frazer 1921, 1.35; Richardson 1974, 174.

28 On the different local versions of the story, see Richardson 1974, 174.

In line with the standard patterns established in the *Bibliotheca*, Apollodorus' text draws together a range of versions of the story about Demeter and her daughter. Such versions, which must already have been integrated in a text that functioned as the source-text, are comprised of the *Homeric Hymn*, the texts authored by Panyasis and Pherecydes, as well as the Attic tradition and one or more alternative legends for such details as the account of how the people of Hermion pass on the news of the kidnapping to Demeter. Could there be another literary work in the background of the *Bibliotheca* which accounts for some of the details recounted in its version? In this regard, an analysis of another excerpt from Apollodorus' text may be worthwhile – the sequence at 1.5.3 [33], which also diverges from the archaic text:

Διὸς δὲ Πλούτωνι τὴν Κόρην ἀναπέμψαι κελεύσαντος, ὁ Πλούτων, ἵνα μὴ πολὺν χρόνον παρὰ τῇ μητρὶ καταμείνῃ, ῥοιᾶς ἔδωκεν αὐτῇ φαγεῖν κόκκον. ἡ δὲ οὐ προΐδομένη τὸ συμβησόμενον κατηνάλωσεν αὐτόν. καταμαρτυρήσαντος δὲ αὐτῆς Ἀσκαλάφου τοῦ Ἀχέρωντος καὶ Γοργύρας, τούτῳ μὲν Δημήτηρ ἐν Ἅιδου βαρεῖαν ἐπέθηκε πέτραν, Περσεφόνη δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον ἔνιαυτὸν τὸ μὲν τρίτον μετὰ Πλούτωνος ἡγαγκάσθη μένειν, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν παρὰ τοῖς θεοῖς.

But when Zeus ordered Pluto to send up the Maid, Pluto gave her a seed of a pomegranate to eat, in order that she might not tarry long with her mother. Not foreseeing the consequence, she swallowed it; and because Ascalaphus, son of Acheron and Gorgyra, bore witness against her, Demeter laid a heavy rock on him in Hades. But Persephone was compelled to remain a third of every year with Pluto and the rest of the time with the gods.

Following the reference to the pomegranate seed ploy, but before the reader is told of how Persephone must divide her time between this world and the otherworld, the text sounds a distinctive note by mentioning a figure who appears primarily in Latin sources,²⁹ and who does not appear in the *Homeric Hymn* or the Greek tradition in general: Ascalaphus, son of Acheron and a nymph, Gorgyra,³⁰ who told of how Persephone had partaken of food in the underworld; as a result of this revelation, τούτῳ μὲν Δημήτηρ ἐν Ἅιδου βαρεῖαν ἐπέθηκε πέτραν, “Demeter laid a heavy rock on him in Hades”. There is a further reference to Ascalaphus later in the *Bibliotheca*, at 2.5.12 [124–126], in the context of Heracles' wanderings

²⁹ The story is told in Ovid (*Met.* 5.539–551), Servius (*Aen.* 4.462, *G.* 1.39), Lactantius Placidus (*Stat. Theb.* 3.511) and the Vatican Mythographers (*Myth. Vat.* 2.100). Cf. Frazer 1921, 1.41, Richardson 1974, 286–287.

³⁰ Ascalaphus is also the name of a son of the god Ares, who took part in the voyage of the Argonauts and the Trojan war (cf. *Hom. Il.* 2.511–516). Moreover, there is clearly a connection between Ascalaphus and Ascalabus, the son of Misme; the latter figure is analogous to the former, and appears in some versions of the myth (*Ant.Lib.* 24; *Nic. Th.* 484–487; *Ov. Met.* 5.446–461), and ends up being turned into an ἀσκάλαβος or lizard (*Platydictylus mauretanicus*) by Demeter.

in Hades, where the latter sets the former free: [Ἡρακλῆς] ἀπεκύλισε δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀσκολάφου πέτρον (...) Ἀσκόλαφον μὲν οὖν Δημήτηρ ἐποίησεν ὄπιον, “And he [Hercules] rolled away also the stone of Ascalaphus (...). But Demeter turned Ascalaphus into a short-eared owl”.³¹

The subsequent fate of Ascalaphus is not especially pertinent to the purposes of this paper. The key point to be underlined here is that, according to a version of the myth drawn on by Apollodorus (at 1.5.3 [33]), Demeter herself must have been ἐν Ἅιδου, ‘in Hades’. Although there is no explicit reference to her descent into the world of the dead, the *Bibliotheca* would appear to presuppose just such a journey. It is easy to understand why the goddess would have wanted to venture into the underworld to recover her daughter, following the discovery of her destiny through the Sun or human messengers. Hades is the only place where Demeter could have come across a denizen of hell such as Ascalaphus, who betrays Persephone; and there, too, Ascalaphus must have suffered the punishment referred to by Apollodorus and in the Ovidian version of the narrative, albeit in the *Metamorphoses* Ascalaphus is punished – turned into an owl – by Proserpine, Queen of Hades,³² not by Ceres. The issue at hand at this juncture concerns what text or texts explicitly state that Demeter journeys into Hades to recover Persephone in person.

Although this mytheme is not common, it is not wholly unknown. On the one hand, two Latin poets, Ovid and Claudian (in *Fasti*, 4.611–614, and *The Rape of Proserpine*, 3.107–108),³³ appear to frame this variant reading as a narrative possibility; the sequence is voiced by two of their characters (Ceres and Proserpine), although the story is not developed further:

*atque ita ‘nec nobis caelum est habitabile’ dixit;
‘Taenaria recipi me quoque valle iube’.
et factura fuit, pactus nisi Iuppiter esset
bis tribus ut caelo mensibus illa foret.*

And thus she spoke: ‘For me, too, heaven is no home; order that I too be admitted to the Taenarian vale.’ And she would have done so, if Jupiter had not promised that Persephone should be in heaven for twice three months.³⁴

³¹ For the Ovidian version of the Ascalaphus episode, as distinct from Apollodorus’ rendition, see *Met.* 5.538–550.

³² Cf. *Ov. Met.* 5.544–546.

³³ Cf. also *Ov. Met.* 5.533 (at *Cereri certum est educere natam*); Richardson 1974, 84.

³⁴ For the English translation of Ovid’s *Fasti*, cf. Frazer 1931.

*inque superna refer. prohibent si fata reverti,
vel tantum visura veni.*

Restore me to the upper world. If the fates forbid my return come thou down at least and visit me.³⁵

At the same time, this variant reading is explicitly attested in a number of texts. Hyginus opens chapter 251 of his *Fabulae*, under the heading *qui licentia Parcarum ab inferis redierunt*, with the following reference to Demeter: *Ceres Proserpinam filiam suam quaerens*; moreover, according to Hyginus, as is to be expected, the reason for the goddess' descent into the underworld was to seek out her daughter. A scholium on Pindar's work³⁶ would appear to tell the same story: λέγεται μετὰ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν ἡ Κόρη (...) εὐρεθεῖσα λοιπὸν ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς Δήμητρος, λευκοπώλῳ ἄρματι ἀνῆχθαι εἰς τὸν Ὀλυμπον πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τὸν Δία ("It is said that, after the kidnapping, the maiden (...) was found by her own mother and brought up to Olympus, beside her father Zeus, in a chariot drawn by white colts").³⁷ Interesting though such references to Hyginus and the scholium on Pindar may be, however, the origin of so novel a mytheme cannot be attributed to either author.³⁸

The story of Demeter's journey down into the underworld is also recounted in Orphic texts, most clearly in one of the poems collected in the hexametrical *Hymns* attributed to Orpheus himself:³⁹

ἦλθές τ' εἰς Αἴδην πρὸς ἀγαυὴν Περσεφόνειαν
ἀγνὸν παῖδα Δυσάουλου ὀδηγητῆρα λαβοῦσα,
μηνητῆρ' ἀγίων λέκτρων χθονίου Διὸς ἀγνοῦ.

You came to Hades for noble Persephone.
Your guide was the guileless child of Dysaules,
Who brought the news of pure chthonic Zeus' holy union.

According to this hymn, Demeter descended into hell in search of Persephone,⁴⁰ guided by the "child of Dysaules", the swineherd Eubulus or Eubouleus, one of

³⁵ For the English translation cited in the text, see Platnauer 1922.

³⁶ Sch. Pind. *Ol.* 6.160c.

³⁷ Translation by the author.

³⁸ In general, critical views on Hyginus are quite harsh; see, for instance, Cameron 2004, 33–51 (especially 33).

³⁹ Orph. *H.* 41.5–7 (the translation is taken from Athanassakis 1977). Cf. Graf 2008, 681.

⁴⁰ In relation to this hymn, Graf (2008, 681) mistakenly concludes that "el descenso de Deméter al Hades no tiene paralelo".

Demeter's humble companions in the Orphic version of the myth.⁴¹ The meaning of 'guide' (ὀδηγητήρα) in this context is that Eubulus, a native of Eleusis, told Demeter that Pluto had abducted her daughter.⁴² He was privy to such knowledge because, according to the local version of the tale, the kidnapping took place in Eleusis, not in any of the other places traditionally cited in Greek texts;⁴³ and when Pluto's chariot disappeared into the earth, it took with it the pigs that Eubulus had been herding.⁴⁴

Although there are many and various Orphic versions of the myth of Demeter and Persephone, the key account would appear to be that found in the Berlin papyrus, which records part of a hymn dedicated to Demeter.⁴⁵ This text shows striking similarities (including verbal parallels) and, at the same time, differences to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. The two texts tell the same story: Pluto kidnapped Persephone and took her down into the underworld; Demeter went to Eleusis, revealed her true identity there, recovered her daughter and, finally, instructed the people of Eleusis in her Mysteries.⁴⁶ However, there are also some differences between the two texts, as regards the reasons for the goddess' sojourn in Eleusis and her passing on of the gift of agriculture.⁴⁷ Such discrepancies may be of greater significance but it is difficult to define exactly what they may be due to the fragmentary nature of the *Hymn to Demeter* recorded in the Berlin papyrus. Nevertheless, one possible difference is discussed here because of the bearing it may have on the line of argument pursued in this paper.

Following a reference to Triptolemus (...]πρὸς Τριπτο[όλ]εμο[ν]), the papyrus continues as follows: ...] ὄθεν Κάθοδος λέγ[ε]τ[αι τῆς Κόρης αὐτῆ]. This is the text of the fragment (OF 397) as printed in Bernabé's edition, which reads Κάθοδος

⁴¹ Cf. OF 391 II and Richardson 1974, 81–82, 178, Graf 1974, 171–174, Sfameni Gasparro 1986, 165, Bernabé 2008, 29. Although the swineherd is called Eubulus in the Orphic hymn cited here (cf. v. 8), the most common form of his name is Eubouleus; cf. OF 390, 391 II and III, 397 I, Richardson 1974, 84.

⁴² Cf. v. 7: μῆνυτήρ' ἀγίων λέκτρων χθονίου Διὸς ἄγνοῦ.

⁴³ Cf. Richardson 1974, 148–150, Graf 1974, 173.

⁴⁴ Cf. OF 390 II.

⁴⁵ For the edition of the papyrus text, see OF 383, 387–389, 392–393, 396–397. On the dating of the poem recorded in the papyrus, see Currie 2012, 190. The most recent research literature on the text includes Graf 2008, 674–675, 677–679, and Currie 2012. There are many Orphic fragments (cf. OF 386–397) about the same story, but it is not clear whether they come from the same poem; the best that may be said is that they are *cum fabula in P. Berol. seruata haud incongruentia* (Bernabé 2004, 315).

⁴⁶ As regards such similarities and differences, see the comparative table compiled by Currie 2012, 199.

⁴⁷ Cf. Currie 2012, 193, 199, 204.

τῆς Κόρης (with *κάθοδος* in upper-case letters), as the title of a poem about the descent of the Maiden into Hades.⁴⁸ Although Bernabé himself does not rule out this possibility, other scholars have argued that *κάθοδος* ought to be edited in lower-case letters, whereby the papyrus would then read: whence “it is said” (*λέγεται*) this descent came about.⁴⁹

Other interpretations of the passage are likewise possible.⁵⁰ The reading articulated by Bruno Currie in 2012, based on Hyginus 251 and *Orphic Hymn* 41 (see above), is especially relevant in this regard. In Currie’s view, the *κάθοδος* noted in the Berlin papyrus refers to the descent into Hades of Demeter herself, rather than Persephone; in pursuit of her daughter, Demeter left behind this earthly world, bringing about the famine that prompted Zeus’ action in forcing Pluto to return the Maiden.⁵¹

Should indeed the myth have been formulated in such terms in this other *Hymn to Demeter*, then this literary version might also be read as part of the backdrop to the Apollodorean text, which presupposes Demeter’s journey into Hades because, in the last analysis, its sources draw to some extent on the Orphic tradition. This hypothesis would be confirmed if, for example, there were a link between Orphism and Ascalaphus: indeed, it is to be recalled that the *Bibliotheca* version has been read as saying that Demeter descended into Hades in light of the reference to him. However, the name of Ascalaphus is nowhere to be found in the Orphic fragments.⁵²

Nonetheless, there may be a tenuous connection between Ascalaphus and Orpheus. According to Apollodorus (1.5.3 [33]), the former’s mother was Gorgyra. In the Ovidian version, however, his mother is referred to as Orphne, ‘darkness’ (*Ὄρφνη*), a name that could be etymologically related to the name Orpheus itself (*Ὀρφεύς*).⁵³ While this link cannot be said to lead to any firm conclusion, it should be recalled at this juncture that the fundamental relationship between Apollodorus and the Orphic versions of the narrative is not Ascalaphus but the reference to Demeter’s descent into Hades.

At the same time, this is not the only instance of a connection between Apollodorus and the Orphic tradition. In fact, on one occasion, the *Bibliotheca* appeals

48 Cf. Bernabé 2004, 330, Graf 2008, 678–679.

49 Cf. Richardson 1974, 81; Bernabé 2004, 330.

50 Cf. Bernabé 2004, 330.

51 Cf. Currie 2012, 198–199. Richardson 1974, 84 also notes this version: “there are traces of a version in which Demeter herself went down to Hades in order to recover her [Persephone]”.

52 Cf. the indices in Bernabé 2007. On the myth of Orpheus in the *Bibliotheca*, see Bernabé in this volume.

53 Cf. *Ov. Met.* 5.539. The etymology of the name Orpheus is unclear; cf. Chantraine 1983–1984², 829. In the past, the name was linked to *ὄρφνη*, and read as meaning that *Ὀρφεύς* was “he who is related to the darkness” of Hades; cf. Gruppe 1897–1902, 1063.

to the authority of the Orphic writers (3.10.3 [121]): εὗρον δέ τινας λεγομένους ἀναστήναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ [Asclepius] (...) Ὑμέναιον, ὡς οἱ Ὀρφικοί λέγουσι.⁵⁴

The analysis heretofore in this research paper, proving some form of relationship between the Apollodorus text and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, runs counter to the rather extreme hypothesis that the Orphic *Hymn to Demeter* may be the true source of the text of the narrative included in the *Bibliotheca*. Therefore, it might be more apt to conclude that the text contained in the *Bibliotheca* is as indebted to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* as to a hymn to the goddess in the Orphic tradition. For a more refined description of the relationship between the *Bibliotheca* and the other two poems, a more detailed discussion of a point mentioned in passing above is required: not only are there the similarities in terms of content between the Berlin papyrus and the *Homeric Hymn*; there are also verbal parallels between the two versions. Such parallelism may be exemplified by a comparison of verses 54–56 in the *Homeric Hymn* text with lines 22–24 of *OF* 396:⁵⁵

πότνια Δημήτηρ ὠρηφόρε ἀγλαόδωρε
τίς θεῶν οὐρανίων ἢ ἐ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
ἦρπασε Περσεφόνην καὶ σὸν φίλον ἦκαχε
θυμόν;

εἰμί δὲ Δη[μ]ήτηρ ὠρηφόρ[ος ἀγλαό]δωρος.
τίς θεός οὐράνιος ἢ ἐ θν[η]τῶ[ν ἀνθρώ]πων
ἦρπασε Φερσεφ[ό]νην καὶ [ἐὸν φίλον ἦπα]φε
θυμόν;

The research literature thus far has treated the appearance in the papyrus of hexameter phrases that are similar or even identical to verses in the *Homeric Hymn* as textual borrowings, thereby implying that the papyrus be read as a kind of pastiche of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.⁵⁶ However, Currie's contribution (cited above) suggests that the relationship between the two poems may be more complex. Based on critical models used in Homeric scholarship in an endeavor to find common ground between Oralism and Neoanalysis, Currie argues that both poetic versions may be written-text renderings of different pre-existing oral traditions and compositions concerning the two goddesses: although they were originally oral, such compositions would have been relatively stable, especially in light of the fact that they may have been

⁵⁴ This passage has frequently (cf. Frazer 1921, 2.16) been treated as an interpolation; however, see the argument advanced by Cameron 2004, 99–100.

⁵⁵ Currie 2012, 194 presents these verses as an example of the “transference of wording” occurring between the two texts. For other instances of the same phenomenon, see *OF* 387 (6–11), 388 (5–9), 389 (10–15), 396 (11–12, 14–16, 19, 22–24).

⁵⁶ Cf. Richardson 1974, 67, 169.

related to the ritual culture of Eleusis.⁵⁷ Hence, the apparent quotations from the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* in the Orphic *Hymn to Demeter* could be read as independent reformulations of a common traditional source-material. This theory would also account for the fact that while the Orphic poem is more recent, it reads at times as though it were prior to the *Homeric Hymn*, which dates to an earlier era.⁵⁸

Were this hypothesis to be accepted, the idea that Apollodorus – or rather, his sources – may have learned of the myth of Demeter from an Orphic hymn like the one recorded in the Berlin papyrus becomes more credible; as Currie avers, the poem would no longer be read as a ‘cut-and-paste’ version of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, but as a free-standing poetic text, and potentially a mythographical source in its own right. At the same time, it should also be acknowledged that this hypothetical Orphic poem, which is assumed to have functioned as a source for the version in the *Bibliotheca*, may not be the text recorded in the Berlin papyrus. Nevertheless, whether or not it is identical to the version contained in the papyrus, it is likely that the Orphic *Hymn to Demeter* gave Apollodorus the narrative material that may be ascribed to the Attic version of the story, such as the details concerning Triptolemus and agriculture.⁵⁹

The purpose of this paper was not to provide a textual genealogy of the *Bibliotheca*, the family history of its intermediate sources and the intersecting links between them; rather, the objective was to argue the relevance of a further trace of the Orphic tradition in Apollodorus’ text. As regards the *Homeric Hymns*, the textual analysis outlined here shows once more⁶⁰ that although these texts may not have served as a compendium of divine mythology in Greece, they may still have played a more significant role than heretofore believed in the mythological tradition of which the *Bibliotheca* is such an outstanding representative.⁶¹

57 On contemporary perspectives re-framing the relationship between Oralism and Neoanalysis, see Torres 1995, 13–14; Burgess 2001, 133, 240, n. 4; 2006, Tsagalis 2008, 63, n. 2, 66–68; 2011. See also how Currie 2012, 184–185 addresses the issue.

58 In addition to the instance discussed in n. 22, see the comments on Demeter’s informants (the Sun or the people of Eleusis) as well as the view expressed by Currie 2012, 193, 195; for a different example, see Currie 2012, 194. On the chronology of the two hymns (*Homeric Hymn*: beginning of the 6th century BCE; the Orphic *Hymn*: between the end of the 6th and the end of the 5th century BCE?), see Currie 2012, 189–190, 205–206, 208–209.

59 Cf. Bernabé 2008, 31, Graf 2008, 686.

60 Cf. n. 1.

61 On the role of the *Homeric Hymns* in the Hellenistic and Imperial times, see Faulkner 2011, 177–196.

Bibliography

- Athanassakis, Apostolos. *The Orphic Hymns: Text, Translation, and Notes* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977).
- Bernabé, Alberto (ed.). *Poetae epici graeci testimonia et fragmenta. II.1. Orphicorum et orphicis similibus testimonia et fragmenta* (Munich & Leipzig: Saur, 2004).
- Bernabé, Alberto (ed.). *Poetae epici graeci testimonia et fragmenta. II.3. Musaeus, Linus, Epimenides, Papyrus Derveni, indices* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007).
- Bernabé, Alberto. Orfeo y Eleusis. *Synthesis* 15 (2008), 13–36.
- Burgess, Jonathan. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).
- Burgess, Jonathan. Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference. *Oral Tradition* 21 (2006), 148–189.
- Cameron, Alan. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford: University Press, 2004).
- Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1983–1984²).
- Cuartero, Francesc J. *Pseudo-Apol·lodor. Biblioteca*. Vol. 1 (Barcelona: Fundació Bernat Metge, 2010).
- Currie, Bruno. Perspectives on Neoanalysis from the Archaic Hymns to Demeter, in: *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, edited by Øivind Andersen and Dag Haug (Cambridge: University Press, 2012), 184–209.
- Faulkner, Andrew. The Collection of *Homeric Hymns* from the Seventh to the Third Centuries BC, in: *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, edited by Andrew Faulkner (Oxford: University Press, 2011), 175–205.
- Frazer, James George. *Apollodorus. The Library* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921).
- Frazer, James George. *Ovid. Fasti* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931).
- Graf, Fritz. *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974).
- Graf, Fritz. Orfeo, Eleusis y Atenas, in: *Orfeo y la tradición órfica: un reencuentro*, edited by Alberto Bernabé and Francesc Casadesús (Madrid: Akal, 2008), 671–696.
- Gruppe, Otto. Orpheus, in: *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, edited by Wilhelm Heinrich Roscher (Leipzig: Teubner, 1897–1902), vol. III.1, 1058–1207.
- Holland, Richard. Battos. *Rh. Mus.* 75 (1926), 156–183.
- Huys, Marc. Euripides and the ‘Tales from Euripides’: Sources of Apollodoros’ ‘Bibliotheca’? *Rh. Mus.* 140 (1997), 308–327.
- Kenens, Ulrike. The Sources of Ps. Apollodorus’s Library: a Case-study. *QUCC* 97 (2011), 129–146.
- Papathomopoulos, Manolis. Pour une nouvelle édition de la Bibliothèque d’Apollodore. *Hellenica* 26 (1973), 18–40.
- Parker, Robert. *The Hymn to Demeter and the Homeric Hymns*. *G&R* 38 (1991), 1–17.
- Platnauer, Maurice. *Claudian* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1922).
- Richardson, Nicholas (ed.). *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974).
- Schwartz, Eduard. Die apollodorische Bibliothek. *RE* I.2 (1894), 2875–2886.
- Sfameni Gasparro, Giulia. *Misteri e culti mistici di Demetra* (Roma: ‘L’Erma’ di Bretschneider, 1986).