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I


\[ \omega \varsigma \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho \iota \omega \kappa \varepsilon \chi \varphi \alpha \tau \tau \varsigma, [\varepsilon \delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon \tau \omega \mu \iota \varsigma \tau \iota \iota] \varepsilon \mu \omicron \upsilon \mu \omicron \nu \omicron \mu \epsilon \nu \varsigma, \kappa \tau \lambda. \]

This restoration appeared better suited to the size of the lacuna than did either Henrichs' reconstruction\(^1\) ([\[\varepsilon \delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon \tau \omega \mu \iota \varsigma \tau \iota \iota] \varepsilon \mu \omicron \upsilon \mu \omicron \nu \omicron \mu \epsilon \nu \varsigma] or Koenen's ([\varepsilon \delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon \tau \omega \mu \iota \varsigma \tau \iota \iota] ; BASP 16 [1979] 110). Now that J.N. Sullivan has established an objective means of checking the size of the lacuna in fr. B 1 and has concluded that the size of the supplements that C.P. Jones (Phoenix 34 [1980] 246-250) and I proposed are "very near the truth on the width of the gap" (ZPE 50 [1983] 7-11; quote from 9), I should like to suggest another possibility for the restoration of line 14:

\[ \omega \varsigma \mu \varepsilon \tau \rho \iota \omega \kappa \varepsilon \chi \varphi \alpha \tau \tau \varsigma, [\delta \iota \varepsilon \delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon \tau \omega \mu \iota \varsigma \tau \iota \iota] \varepsilon \mu \omicron \upsilon \mu \omicron \nu \omicron \mu \epsilon \nu \varsigma, \kappa \tau \lambda. \]

Also possible is [\varepsilon \delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon \tau \omega \mu \iota \varsigma \tau \iota \iota], but it seems slightly too long for the space involved (see Tafel V in ZPE 46). Reading \[\omega \varsigma \tau \iota \iota \varsigma\] instead of \[\tau \iota \iota\] leaves open the vexed question of whether the scene described in the text is in fact the record of a mystery ritual: we may translate either as "he distributed it to them as they were being initiated" or "as if they were being initiated." \[\omega \varsigma \tau \iota \iota\] therefore seems preferable to the tendentious \[\tau \iota \iota\].

II

Alcestis Barcinonensis 99. In his new edition of the poem,\(^2\) M. Marcovich reads, restores and translates lines 98-99 as follows:

Quos, rogo, ne parvos man\(<u>\)>s indigna\(<nda>\> novercae\(^3\)
prodat, et \(<h>eu\> flentes matris pia vindicet umbra."

"They are still small: I beg you, may no unworthy hand of a stepmother betray them! Alas! Know that the faithful shade of the mother will come to avenge her crying children!"

---

1 A. Henrichs, Die Phoinikika des Lollianos, PTA 14 (Bonn 1972) 93.
2 M. Marcovich, Alcestis Barcinonensis: Text and Commentary, Mnemosyne, Suppl. 103 (Leiden 1988) 34-35; also see ZPE 65, 1986, 39-57, esp. 44.
3 man\(<u>\)>s is the reading of the editio princeps (see below, n. 4), and indigna\(<nda>\> is R. Kassel's emendation: see Marcovich ad loc.
Marcovich reads *prodat, et *eu,* where the papyrus has the corrupt *proderentet.* Other emendations have been proposed: see Marcovich ad loc.: "proderet et *Ed.," *agn. Lebek : pro-

diderit Tandoi : verbet et *Nisbet : proterat et Watt." Inspired by Marcovich's *prodat, et *eu,* I venture the following emendation:

\[
\text{prodat, *eu* flentes matris pia vindicet umbra.}
\]

"... I beg you, may no unworthy hand of a stepmother betray them, and may the faithful shade of the mother not come to avenge her crying children" (i.e., as it surely will, if a stepmother attempts betrayal).

Paleographically the new reading is not particularly close to what the papyrus has, but the same text elsewhere offers passages that require surgery that is just as drastic: see the long list of corruptions listed by Marcovich under the heading "Improvisation" in his Index of Scribal Errors (p. 111), from which I select some specimens: 1, *doli piant : Deli<e> P<a>e-

nan; 52, *aeternam sede : terrena <in> sede; 70, illius : <ca>eli v<i>s; 118, tractabat quae manos : tractavitque manu. In the present case the course of corruption could have been as follows: *prodat neu →* *prodat eu* (or some other corruption of *neu) → *prodat et* (an attempt to restore the conjunction, but unmetrical)→ *proderet et* (an attempt to improve the meter, but with abnormal syntax)\(^5\) →*proderentet* (the reading of the papyrus).
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\(^5\) See Marcovich (above, n. 2) ad loc. (p. 81), where he notes that for the unusual sequence of tenses Lebek—who reads *proderet et*—refers to Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lat. Syntax* 2 552.