

JAMES DIGGLE

THE PAPYRUS HYPOTHESIS OF EURIPIDES' ORESTES (P. OXY. 2455 FR. 4 COL.
IV 32–9 + FR. 141)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 77 (1989) 1–11

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE PAPYRUS HYPOTHESIS OF EURIPIDES' ORESTES
(P.OXY. 2455 FR. 4 COL. IV 32-9 + FR. 141)

- 32 [πορθει]ν· οἱ δε [φθακαντες υφαψειν
[... ηπ]ειλησαν· επ[ιφανειε δ Απολλων
[Ελενην] μεν αυτος [εφησεν εις θεουε
35 [διακο]μιζειν· Ορε[σθη δε επεταξεν
[...] μεν Ερμιονη[ν λαβει]ν γυν[αικα
[Πυλ]αδη δε Ηλεκτρα[ν κυνοικ]ι[σσαι
[καθα]ρθεντι δε τον [της μητροε φονον
39 [Αρ]γουε δυναστευειν

This is, in effect, the text which emerged after W.S.Barrett¹ suggested that the scrap reported by E.G.Turner² as]ν γυν[, with]ι[below υν, may be fitted in the gaps in lines 36-7. The scrap has now been detached from the back of fr. 18 and numbered as fr. 141, and W.Luppe has vindicated Barrett's suggestion, by showing that fr. 141 contains traces of 32-5 as well.³ The combination of fr. 141 with fr. 4 gives, in Luppe's reconstruction:

- 32 [πορθει]ν· οἱ δε [φθακαντες εμπ]ρη[(ε)
[σειν ηπ]ειλησαν· επ[ιφανειε] δ Απολλ[ων
[Ελενην] μεν αυτος [εφησεν] ε[ις] θ[ε]ου[ε
35 [διακο]μιζειν· Ορε[σθη δε] επεταξ[εν] (or επετειλ[εν])
[...] μεν Ερμιονη[ν λαβει]ν γυναι[κα
[Πυλ]αδη δε Ηλεκτρα[ν κυνοικ]ι[σσαι]

I. In 32 Luppe suggests εμπ]ρη[(ε)-[σειν (ύφάψειν codd., except Cr, which has ύφάπτειν), comparing Sisyphus (?) P.Oxy. 2455. 99 (Austin 93)]ταε εμπρησσειν[, which he supplements άπειλοδν]ταε. I doubt]ρη[. Luppe describes the first trace as 'der Ausläufer einer unter die Zeile reichenden Senkrechten'. The trace certainly projects well below the line, and bends back to the left. But I have not seen ρ in this papyrus with such a prominent left-projecting tail. The letter which sometimes does project left, well below the line, is iota, when it follows (and is partly joined to) ε. Examples are visible on the published plates: Plate IV fr. 14 col. xiii. 176]κλειεα[ε, 181 προσειπο[ν]τοε, Plate VI fr. 5 col. v. 54 Τειρ[υνηθεε, fr. 6 col. vi. 72 ειληφενά[ε, Plate IX fr. 12 col. xi. 158 απεε]τειλεν. It is therefore not inconceivable that we have here the iota of ύφάψειν. But the ink of this trace

¹ CQ n.s. 15 (1965) 68. My observations on the papyrus are based on autopsy. In line 32 I have printed δε[not δ[ε (the lower arc of ε is visible) and in 38 τον[not τον[(ο certain, ν not; but much more likely ν than υ [see below, n.50]).

² The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part xxvii (1962) 67.

³ ZPE 60 (1985) 16-19, with Tafel Ib, and 65 (1986) 29-30.

has a discoloured appearance, and the tail is rather larger than is normal for the tail of iota, and so I have no confidence in this diagnosis. The following trace is described by Luppe as 'der rechte Teil einer Waagerechten, an den eine Senkrechte anschliesst'. The trace is, rather, a small arc, but to what part of what letter it might belong is quite unclear. I doubt if it is compatible with γ (so that $\upsilon\phi\alpha\psi\epsilon\iota\gamma$ is probably excluded). Since Luppe's $\epsilon\mu\pi\rho\eta[(c)-[c\epsilon\iota\nu]$ does not commend itself, and there is no good reason for supposing that the papyrus had a reading different from that of the manuscripts, I suspect that line 33 began, as Turner suggested, with a compound (e.g. $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$).

Luppe's readings in 33 and 34 ($[\delta\ \text{Απολλ[ων and]\epsilon[ic] \theta[\epsilon]ου[c]$) are possible. In 35 $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau$ seems possible (the τ is probable), and $\alpha\zeta$ (in spite of Luppe's reservations) is not excluded, and indeed seems at least as plausible as $\epsilon\iota\lambda$. And I should be surprised if $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota[\lambda\epsilon\nu$ were right, since this verb is not attested in our author, who does however use both $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omega$ and $\pi\rho\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omega$ (see below, under III). In 36 $[\gamma\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha[$ is right. In 37 the traces are very unclear, but are perhaps compatible with $[\zeta\alpha\iota$, and, as Luppe observes, the preceding iota identified by Turner may have been lost when fr. 141 was detached from the back of fr. 18. A count of the letters which will have preceded shows that $\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$ are the letters which we might expect here ($\kappa\upsilon\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$ is the reading of RfSa and was conjectured by Brunck for $-\eta\kappa\alpha\iota$ of the remainder). Because the line will have ended about three letters earlier than the preceding line (and than 33 and 34), Turner and Luppe consider the possibility that $\kappa\alpha\iota$ may have been added after $\kappa\upsilon\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$, as in V (and also Sa, which however omits the following $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$). $\kappa\alpha\iota \dots \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is found at Med. (a) 74 and Phil. P.Oxy. 2455. 256 (Austin 100). A further possibility, remote indeed, is $\kappa\upsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\kappa\alpha\iota$ ($\kappa\upsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\tau[οικ[ι\kappa\alpha\iota?$ But the traces are not verifiable). Euripides has $\kappa\upsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ at Hi. 646, and our author has $\kappa\upsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\chi\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ (otherwise unattested) in P.Mich. 1319.⁵ But $\kappa\upsilon\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ is found at Aeolus P.Oxy. 2457.28 (Austin 39).

II. 34 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (om. codd.) is a positive gain. See Herc. 2-3 $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\iota\pi\acute{\omega}\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon} \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \Theta\acute{\eta}\beta\alpha\iota\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{Ἄργος ἦλθεν}$, Or. 12-13 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu} \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \delta\iota\epsilon\psi\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu \tau\eta\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma \dots \text{Ἡλέκτρα δέ } \dots$, Mel. Soph. P.Oxy. 2455. 12-13 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu} \phi\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu] \pi[ο\iota\eta\kappa\alpha\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}]π' \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha[\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon \phi\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\kappa\cdot] \tau\eta\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon} \text{Με[λ]αν[ί]ππην } \dots$ (restored from Iohannes Logothetes and Gregory of Corinth),⁶ Pirith. (ap. Ioh., Greg.) $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\varsigma \dots \acute{\epsilon}\phi\rho\upsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron \dots$, Sthen. (Ioh., Greg., deest

⁴ For hypotheses to plays in volumes 1 and 2 of the Oxford Text, I refer to my own line numbers; for those in volume 3, to Murray's numbers.

⁵ See below, n.23.

⁶ The hypotheses of Mel. Soph., Pirith., and Sthen. are preserved by Iohannes Logothetes (H.Rabe, Rh.Mus. 63 [1908] 144-7, reproduced by H. von Arnim, Suppl. Eur. 25-6, 40, 43) and Gregory of Corinth (Rhet.Gr. 7. 1312-13, 1321 Walz [fuller text of Sthen. in F.G.Welcker, Die griechischen Tragödien 2 (1839) 777-8], reproduced by Nauck 509, 546-7, 567-8). Mel.Soph. may also be found in H. van Looy, Zes Verloren Tragedies van Euripides (1964) 199-200, Pirith. in Diels-Kranz, Vorsok. 88 [Critias] B 16, and in TrGF I [Critias] F 1.

P.Oxy. 2455. 56-8) Βελλεροφόντην δὲ φεύγοντα (-του δὲ φεύγοντος Greg.) ἐκ Κορίνθου διὰ φόνον αὐτὸς (Wilamowitz:⁷ -ὸν Ioh., Greg.) μὲν ἤγγιζε τοῦ μύκου, ἡ γυνὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ ..., Sthen. (Ioh., Greg., and for the greater part P.Oxy. 2455. 69-70) ὁ Βελλεροφόντης πρὸς τὸν Προΐτον αὐτὸς ὠμολόγησε πεπραχέναι ταῦτα, Sciron P.Oxy. 2455. 80-1 καὶ τῆ[ν τῶν στενῶν αὐ]τὸς ἔμβασιν οὐ θεωρῶν (suppl. Barrett ap. Austin 94). I exclude Rh. 15 ἵνα αὐτὸς περιγίνηται τῶν πεπραγμένων, where the truth is preserved by PSI 1286 col. i. 13-14 [ἵ]να αὐτόπτης τ[ῶν] πεπραγμέ[ν]ων γένηται.

III. 36 [. . . .] μὲν. Turner hesitantly prints [εὐθὺ]ς. Luppe describes the trace as 'der untere Teil einer Rundung oder Schräge', and suggests [πρῶτ]α. The trace, rather, is a low curve, inclining upwards towards the right and apparently curving backwards again to the left. It is scarcely compatible with ς or α, but resembles more the bottom right curve of ο or ω. I therefore doubt if either Turner's or Luppe's supplement is compatible with the trace. Further, neither proposal accords with this author's style. He uses μὲν and δέ regularly, and with some precision. If he had written εὐθὺς μὲν or πρῶτα μὲν, he would have followed it with ἔπειτα δέ or the like. In fact, he has no attested instance of μὲν after a temporal adverb.⁸ Usually, (i) he achieves a perfect syntactical balance. Sometimes, (ii) the balance is not perfect, but it is a balance none the less. There are (iii) few divergences from these norms. In the passages which follow I quote first the instances which are guaranteed by a papyrus, and second the instances where we have no papyrus evidence.

(i) Perfect syntactical balance: Tr. 2-3 (P.Oxy. 2455. 165-7) τοῦ μὲν ... τῆς δέ ..., Ph. 12-14 (P.Oxy. 2455 fr. 48 + fr. 125)⁹ ὁ μὲν οὖν νεανίσκος ... Θηβαῖοι δέ ... (the former clause is variously corrupted in the mss.),¹⁰ Ph. 16-17 (P.Oxy. 2455. 291-4) ἡ μὲν οὖν μήτηρ αὐτῶν Ἰοκάστη ... ὁ δὲ ταύτης ἀδελφὸς Κρέων ... (Ἰοκάστη is rightly omitted by the mss.),¹¹ Ph. 19-20 (P.Oxy. 2455. 298-301) τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν Καδμείαν (τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ τῆι Καδμείαι the mss., rightly)¹² ... Πολυνείκην δὲ ... Οἰδιπόδα δέ ..., Ph. 21-2 (P.Oxy. 2455. 302-3) ἐφ' ὧν μὲν ... ἐφ' ὧν δὲ ..., Rh. 10-12 (PSI 1286 col. i. 3-6) τούτοι]ς δ' ἐπι[φανεῖς μὲν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος] ἐπησθη[μένος τὴν πολεμίων παρ]ουσίαν, [ἐξαπατηθεὶς δ'] ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ...,¹³ Alex. P.Oxy. 3650. 13-15 ὁ μὲν παῖς ... οἱ δ' ἄλλοι νομεῖς ..., 27-9 Κακ[cάν]δρ[α] μὲν ... Ἐκάβη [δέ ..., Mel. Soph. P.Oxy. 2455.

⁷ Cl.Ph. 3 (1908) 226 = Kl.Schr. 1.275, and so anticipating Luppe, *Wiss. Zeitschr. Univ. Halle* 34 (1985) 99-102. Luppe's ὡς (εἰς) Κάρϊαν (ZPE 49 [1982] 19 n.14) was also anticipated by Wilamowitz.

⁸ The supplements (πρῶτον μὲν) and (ἔπειτα) δὲ printed by Nauck in Sthen. are proved false by Ioh.

⁹ See Barrett, *loc.cit.* (n.1) 67. The text after νεανίσκος is plausibly restored by Luppe, *Philologus* 126 (1982) 313-15.

¹⁰ See Barrett, *loc.cit.* 60.

¹¹ Barrett, *loc.cit.* 64.

¹² Barrett, *loc.cit.* 65.

¹³ μὲν ὁ (om. codd.) supplied to fill the available space by Luppe, *Anagennesis* 2 (1982) 74-82; ἐπησθη[μένος τὴν πολεμίων, where the mss have ἐπίστασθαι (ἐπι and a space of c.6 letters in V) πολέμου (πολεμίων conii. Kirchhoff), restored by Gallavotti.

9-10 [ἐ]κ μὲν ... (with ἐκ δέ restored from Ioh., Greg.),¹⁴ 21-2 φυλατ[όμεν]α μὲν ... [θηλα]ζόμ[ενα δ'] ... (item Ioh., Greg.), Rhad. PSI 1286 col. ii . 2-3 (Austin 92) ἐπὶ μὲν ... ἐπὶ δέ ..., Sthen. P.Oxy. 2455. 53-4 + P.Strasb. 2676 B(d)¹⁵ Προῖ[τ]ο[ς] 'Αβάν]του (a mistake for -τος) μὲν ἦν υἱός, [Ἄκρι]οῦ δὲ ἀδε[λφός], βασιλεὺς δὲ Τεῖρ[υ]νθος (Προῖτος ἦν Ἄκάμαντος [Ἄβαντος Nauck] υἱός Ioh., Greg.), Sthen. P.Oxy. 2455. 72-3 τῆς] μὲν ... [τοῦ δέ ... (ita Ioh., Greg.), Sisyphus (?) P.Oxy. 2455. 91-2 (Austin 93) οἱ μὲν οὖν κάτυροι ... Ἐρμῆς δέ ..., Syleus P.Oxy. 2455. 106-7 (Austin 96) τοῦτου[ς] μὲν οὖν [... Ξενοδί]κην δέ ... (suppl. Harder),¹⁶ Temenos (?) P.Oxy. 2455. 119-23 (Austin 12)¹⁷ τῆν μὲν Ἀργείαν ... τὴν δὲ Μεσσηνίαν ... τὴν δ[ὲ] Λακ[ωνίαν, Tennes P.Oxy. 2455. 182-3 (Austin 97) τὴν μὲν νῆσον ... [τ]ὴν δὲ ψευσα[μέν]ην γυναῖκα ..., Hyps. P.Oxy. 2455. 197-8 (Bond 21) τούτ[ο]υ[ς] μὲν ... τὴν [μη]τέρα δ' αὐτῶν ..., Phrixus A P.Oxy. 2455. 224-5 (Austin 101) + 3652. 18 υἱὸς μὲν] ... βασιλεὺς δέ ..., S.Tereus (?) P.Oxy. 3013. 31-3 (TrGF 4 p. 436 Radt) ἐγέ[νοντο ἢ μὲν] ἀηδών, ἢ δὲ χε[λιδών, ἔποψ] δὲ ὁ Τηρεύς.

No papyrus available: Hcl. 1 υἱὸς μὲν ... ἀδελφιδουὺς δέ ..., 14-15 ταύτην μὲν οὖν ... αὐτὸς δέ ..., Hi. 1 υἱὸς μὲν ... βασιλεὺς δέ ..., 22-3 τὴν μὲν Φαίδραν ... τοῦτον δέ ..., Andr. 11-12 Μενέλαος μὲν οὖν ... Ἐρμιόνη δέ ... (P.Oxy. 3650. 44-5, in which only Ἰοῦν ἀπ[survives, will have had the same text), 16-18 τοῦτον μὲν ... τὴν δὲ Ἄνδρομάχην ... αὐτὸν δέ ...,¹⁸ Hec. 1-2 οἱ μὲν Ἑλληνας ... Ἀχιλλεὺς δέ ..., 3-5 οἱ μὲν οὖν Ἑλληνας ... Πολυμήτωρ δέ ..., 15 τοὺς μὲν υἱοὺς ... αὐτὸν δέ ..., Tr. 8-9 ταύτην μὲν οὖν ... Ἀκτυάνακτα δέ ..., Hel. 5-7 οἱ μὲν γὰρ ... ὁ δέ ..., 7-8 τὴν μὲν ἀληθῶς Ἑλένην ... τὸ εἶδωλον δὲ αὐτῆς, 12-13 τὰς μὲν ναῦς ... ὀλίγους δέ τινας ..., Or. 6-7 νυκτὸς μὲν Ἑλένην εἰσαπέστειλε,¹⁹ μεθ' ἡμέραν δὲ αὐτὸς ἦλθεν (αὐτὸς δὲ

¹⁴ Cf. Luppe, ZPE 73 (1988) 30.

¹⁵ Ed. J.Schwartz, ZPE 4 (1969) 44. Combined with P.Oxy. 2455 by Luppe, ZPE 55 (1984) 7-8.

¹⁶ ZPE 35 (1979) 11 n.12. See also Luppe, SIFC ser. 3,2 (1984) 37-8.

¹⁷ On the ascription of this fragment see A.Harder, ZPE 35 (1979) 12 and Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos (1985) 288-9; also Luppe, Prometheus 13 (1987) 193-203.

¹⁸ For P.Oxy. 3650. 52-6 in this passage, see below, n.36.

¹⁹ εἰσαπέστειλε(v)] ἀπέστειλε V, εἰς ἄκτυ ἀπέστειλε C. The compound εἰσαποτέλλω is barely attested, and I doubt it here. We need to know where Helen was despatched; and the answer is 'into the city' (εἰς ἄκτυ, as C, accepted by Di Benedetto). The verb ἀποτέλλω (usually with a prepositional phrase indicating direction) is found at Andr. 17 (εἰς Μολοκοῦς), Ph. 21 (P.Oxy. 2455. 301) ἀπέστειλε[v] (ἀπέπεμψεν codd. plerique, ἀπεπέμψατο GXXaXb), Ba. 6 (ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸν θεόν), Temenos (?) P.Oxy. 2455. 146 (Austin 98) ἀ[πέστει]λε[v] (Turner) ... εἰς Σπάρτην], Telephus P.Oxy. 2455. 158 (Austin 67) ἐπὶ τ[ὸ]ν χρημὸν[] ἀπέστειλεν, Pirith. (Ioh., Greg.) ἐπὶ τὸν Κέρβερον ... ἀποσταλείς. I have two reservations: (i) I have not found ἄκτυ elsewhere in these hypotheses (πόλις would be normal); (ii) εἰς ἄκτυ ἀπέστειλε introduces hiatus (sometimes found where the mss are our only source, very rarely in papyrus sources: see Barrett, loc.cit. 61 n.2, 62 n.1, imperfectly answered by Luppe, Philologus 120 [1976] 15, 127 [1983] 139 n.19, who fails to distinguish between unavoidable instances and instances which are avoidable by elision). The transposition ἀπέστειλεν εἰς ἄκτυ would answer (ii). We should then suppose that εἰς ἄκτυ was accidentally omitted, written above the line or in the margin, and then incorporated in the wrong place (entirely in C, in part in the majority, not at all in V). Alternatively, εἰς (Ἄργος) ἀπέστειλε, since it is appropriate that the city should be named.

μεθ' ἡμέραν εἰσῆλθε BFG), 12-14 αὐτοὶ μὲν οὖν ... Ἡλέκτρα δέ ..., Rh. 8-9 τὸν μὲν Ἴκτορα ... Ῥῆσον δέ ..., Pirith. (Ioh., Greg.) αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ... Θησεὺς δέ ..., Sthen. (Ioh., Greg.) αὐτὸς²⁰ μὲν ... ἡ γυνὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ I exclude Ph. 8-9 ἡ μὲν Ἰοκάστη ... Πολυνείκης δέ ..., where P.Oxy. 2544. 10 shows that ἡ μὲν Ἰοκάστη is intrusive.²¹

(iii) Less than perfect syntactical balance: Andr. 7-8 (P.Oxy. 3650. 38-9) τὸ παιδίον] μὲν ἐξέθηκ[εν (ὑπεξέθηκεν codd.), αὐτὴ δέ ..., El. 1-5 (P.Oxy. 420. 1-5) τὴν μὲν Ἡ]λέκ[τρ]αν τοῦς ἄνδρα εἰκάγειν [ἐ]κ[έ]λ[ε]υ[ε]ν, πενιχρῶν μὲν ἀλλὰ [φι]λοτίμων ξενίων μεθέξοντα, [αὐ]τὸς δὲ ... ἀπῆλθεν,²² Or. 18 (P.Oxy. 2455. 34-5) Ἐλένη] μὲν ... Ὀρέ[κτη] δέ ... (μὲν om. R; -τη(ι) uel -την codd.), Mel.Soph. P.Oxy. 2455. 12-14 (αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν) ... τὴν δὲ Μελαλίπην ... (restored from Ioh., Greg.), Sciron P.Oxy. 2455. 83-4 (Austin 94) ἐκείνῳ μὲν ... αὐτὸς δέ ..., Temenos (?) P.Mich. 1319²³ + P.Oxy. 2455. fr. 107.4 τὸ μὲν οὖν κῆρυξ τῆς μάχης ἐγένετο ... ἄριστος δὲ ἐκρίνετο Ἀρχέλαος.

No papyrus available: Hi. 15-16 τῆι μὲν τροφῶι ... ἐαυτὴν δέ ...,²⁴ 19-20 τὸν μὲν Ἴππόλυτον ... αὐτὸς δέ ..., Andr. 13-14 ταύτην μὲν ... Νεοπτολέμῳ δέ ... (and probably the same in P.Oxy. 3650. 48-9), Tr. 6-8 Ἀγαμέμνονι μὲν Κακκάνδραν, Ἀνδρομάχην δὲ Νεοπτολέμῳ, Πολυξένην δὲ Ἀχιλλεῖ,²⁵ 11-12 τῆς μὲν Ἐλένης ... τοὺς ἀναιρεθέντας δέ ..., Ion 8-9 τούτῳ μὲν οὖν ... τὸν δ' ἐκτραφέντα ..., Ba. 5-6 καὶ τινα μὲν τῶν Βακχῶν συλλαβῶν ἔδιδεν, ἐπ' αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἄλλω[†] ἀπέστειλεν, Rh. 6-7 Δόλωνα μὲν ἀνηρηκότεσ, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν Ἴκτορος κατηντηκότεσ κληνῆν,²⁶ Pirith. (Ioh., Greg.) τοῦ μὲν θηρίου (θηρὸς Greg.) ... τοὺς δὲ περὶ Θησέα

(iii) The following diverge, in some degree, from the norms established above: Alex. P.Oxy. 3650. 9-11 κατωδύρατο μὲν [τὸ]ν ἐκτεθέντα, Πρίαμον [δ'] ἐπε[ι]ε[ν], Rhad.

²⁰ See above, p. 3.

²¹ Barrett, loc.cit. 64, 65.

²² This restoration (which I have verified by autopsy) was suggested to me by Mr Barrett, to whom are owed τὴν μὲν Ἡ]λέκ[τρ]αν, [ἐ]κ[έ]λ[ε]υ[ε]ν (Luppe, Philologus 125 [1981] 181-7, had suggested [ἐ]κ[έ]λευεν), and [φι]λοτίμων (Barrett compares Mel. Soph. [Ioh., Greg.] φιλότιμον). Luppe remarks that 'Auch der ἐκέλευεν-Satz wird übrigens ... mit μὲν eingeleitet worden sein'; and I should suppose that the writer chose the (for him) unusual variation μὲν ἀλλὰ at the end of the first half of the sentence because he was using μὲν ... δέ to link the two halves of the sentence.

²³ Ed. Turner, Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava 17 (1968) 133-6. The proof that this is from a hypothesis was supplied by Harder, ZPE 35 (1979) 7-14, who detected the link with P.Oxy. 2455 fr.107. See also Luppe, Philologus 122 (1978) 6-13, ZPE 35 (1979) 15-19, APF 27 (1980) 243-4, ZPE 49 (1982) 15-19, J.S.Rusten, ZPE 40 (1980) 39-42, 45 (1982) 270, Harder, Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos (1985) 289-90.

²⁴ For a speculative reconstruction of P.Mil.Vogl. 44. 14-16 see Luppe, Philologus 123 (1983) 155-62.

²⁵ Of these words P.Oxy. 2455. 171 has only Ἀγαμέμνονι. Luppe, Aristoteles, Werk und Wirkung, Paul Moraux gewidmet, i (ed. J.Wiesner, 1985) 615, considers restoring full syntactical balance with Νεοπτολέμῳ δὲ Ἀνδρομάχην, Ἀχιλλεῖ δὲ Πολυξένην. But the variation has a certain elegance, and is comparable with Sthen. Ἄβαντος μὲν ἦν υἱός, Ἀκριτεῖ δὲ ἀδελφός, βασιλεὺς δὲ Τείρυνθος, S.Tereus (?) ἡ μὲν ἀηδῶν, ἡ δὲ χελιδῶν, ἔποψ δὲ ὁ Τηρεὺς, both cited above under (i).

²⁶ So Q (Harl. 5743); ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν Ἐ- (om. κατηντηκότεσ) κοίτην (tum spat. fere ix litt.) V; (ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν Ἐ- κατ- om.) κληνῆν Ambros. O 123 sup.

PSI 1286 col. ii. 4-8 (Austin 92) πρ[ο]c]έταξε τὴν μὲν Ἑλένην ἀ[μφοτέρω] τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς τεθνηκόσι τὰς²⁷ τιμὰς καταστήσασθαι, [τὰς θύγα]τέρας δ' αὐτοῦ θεὰς ἔφησε γ[ενέσθαι] (the balance is slightly upset by the change of construction, the writer having realised, as it were, that he needed a verb other than προc]έταξε to govern the second infinitive),²⁸ Sthen. P.Oxy. 2455 fr. 24 + fr. 95 τὸ[ν μὲν Προῖτον κατεμέμψατο, ἀν]έ[ει]σε δ[ὲ τὴν C]θενέβοιαν (a speculative restoration,²⁹ based on κατεμέμψατο τὸν Προῖτον, ἀνέεισε δὲ (δὲ καὶ Greg.) τὴν Cθ- Ioh., (Greg.)), Sthen. (Ioh., (Greg.)) γενόμενος δὲ κατὰ Μῆλον τὴν νῆσον ταύτην (sc. Cθενέβοιαν) ἀπέρριψεν. αὐτὴν μὲν οὖν (οὖν om. Greg.) ἀποθανοῦσαν ἀλειεῖ ἀναλαμβάνοντες διεκόμισαν εἰς τὴν (τὴν om. Greg.) Τίρυνθα, πάλιν δὲ ἐπιτρέψας (ὑπο- Greg.) ὁ Βελλεροφόντης ..., where P.Oxy. 2455. 65-7 should probably be supplemented κ]ατὰ Μ[ῆ]λον τὴν νῆσον γενόμενος ἐκεί]νην ἀπέρειψ[ε(v)]. ταύτην μὲν οὖν ἀπο]θανοῦσαν ἀλ[ειεῖς,³⁰ Temenos (?) P.Mich. 1319 οὔτοι μὲν οὖν βιαζόμενοι ... συνκατελοχίστησαν· (ἀν)αββαζόμενοι δὲ ... (the drift of the passage remains unclear, and there is likely to be corruption).³¹

No papyrus available: Hcl. 8-10 τούτου μὲν ὀλιγώρει, χρησμῶν δὲ αὐτῶι νικηφόρων γενηθέντων ... τοῖς λογίοις βαρέως ἔσχευ, Ion 4-6 τὸ μὲν οὖν βρέφος Ἑρμῆς ... ἤνεγκεν· εὐροῦσα δ' ἡ προφῆτις ἀνέθρεψε, Hel. 1-5 καὶ φησιν ἐλθεῖν μὲν αὐτὴν ... οὐ μὴν δὲ οὕτως ὡς Εὐριπίδης φησίν,³² 14-15 ἀπατῶι μὲν τὸν Θεοκλύμενον, αὐτοὶ δὲ νηὶ ἐμβάντες ...,³³ Ba. 15-16 Διώνυκος δὲ ἐπιφανεῖς (τὰ) μὲν πᾶσι παρήγγειλεν, ἐκάτωι δὲ ἄ συμβήσεται διεκάφηεν.³⁴

²⁷ Or τεθνηκόσιν! The article is unwanted, and the line-endings were not all aligned in this papyrus.

²⁸ At the end read ἔφησε γ[ενέσθαι] or γ[ενήσεσθαι] (Luppe, *Anagennesis* 2 [1982] 81) and not ἔφη γεν[εσθαι] (ed.pr.). Similarly at Phaethon P.Oxy. 2455. 207 (Austin 99, Diggle 53) not ἔφη τὸν but ἔφη[σε(v)] τ[ὸν] (Luppe, *Philologus* 127 [1983] 135-9) or possibly ἔφη[σε τὸν]. At Hi. 24 ἔφη will be a corruption of ἔφησε (Luppe). At Or. 18 ἔφησεν is corrupted to ἔφη by Cr.

²⁹ Luppe, *ZPE* 49 (1982) 19-20, *Wiss. Zeitschr. Univ. Halle* 34 (1985) 99. Wilamowitz, *Cl.Ph.* 3 (1908) 226 = *Kl.Schr.* 1.275, had already suggested κατεμέμψατο (μὲν) τὸν Π- in Ioh., Greg.

³⁰ The first part (to ἐκεί]νην) supplied by Turner, whose following εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· ἦν ἀπο] was prompted by the false supplements printed in Greg. by Nauck and therefore has no foundation. Luppe restored αὐτὴν μὲν οὖν ἀπο] from Ioh. But we must have ταύτην μὲν οὖν and not αὐτὴν μὲν οὖν, and now that the papyrus offers ἐκεί]νην in the preceding clause in place of ταύτην (Ioh.; Greg. is defective), there is no obstacle to writing ταύτην here. For ταύτην (τοῦτον, τούτους) μὲν οὖν see Hcl. 14, Tr. 8, Ion 8, *Syleus* P.Oxy. 2455. 106 (Austin 96). Our author uses only (as we should expect) nominative αὐτὸς (-οῖ) μὲν οὖν (Mel. *Soph.* P.Oxy. 2455. 12, Or. 12).

³¹ See the contributions cited above, n.23.

³² But this sentence does not belong to our author: see G.Zuntz, *The political Plays of Euripides* (1955) 133-4, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (1965) 143 n. §, and Kannicht's commentary, pp. 7-9.

³³ Normal usage would be restored by writing τὸν μὲν Θεοκλύμενον ἀπατῶσιν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ..., like Hi. 15-16 τῆι μὲν τροφῶι ἐπέπληξεν, αὐτὴν δὲ ..., 19-20 τὸν μὲν Ἰππόλυτον ἐπέταξε φεύγειν, αὐτὸς δὲ ..., *Andr.* 7-8 τὸ παιδίον μὲν (ὑπ)εξέθηκεν, αὐτὴ δὲ

³⁴ Elmsley's (τὰ) is certainly not the right supplement.

We may now return to line 36 of our papyrus. The word which will restore the balance we need was found by H.Lloyd-Jones,³⁵ who proposed αὐτὸ]ς, to be taken as a scribal error for αὐτὸν or αὐτῶι. Examples were given (under II) of αὐτὸς μὲν balanced by a second noun + δέ: Or. 12-13 αὐτοὶ μὲν οὖν ... Ἥλέκτρα δέ ..., Mel. Soph. αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν ... τὴν δὲ Μελαλίπην ..., Pirith. αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ... Θηεὺς δέ ..., and above all Sthen. αὐτὸς (Wilamowitz: -ὸν Ioh., Greg.) μὲν ... ἡ γυνὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ

It is reasonable to assume, since there is no positive evidence to disprove the assumption, that the papyrus, like the manuscripts, had the verb ἐπέταξε in 35. Both ἐπιτάσσω and προτάσσω may be constructed with accusative or dative: Hi. 19-20 τὸν μὲν Ἴππόλυτον ἐπέταξε φεύγειν, αὐτὸς δέ ..., Andr. 15-18 Πηλεῖ δὲ ... Θέτις ἐπιφανεία τοῦτον μὲν ἐπέταξεν ἐν Δελφοῖς θάψαι, τὴν δὲ Ἀνδρομάχην εἰς Μολοσσὸς ἀποστεῖλαι (Lascaris: ἀπέστελλε(ν) codd.) μετὰ τοῦ παιδός, αὐτὸν δὲ ἀθανασίαν προσδέχεσθαι,³⁶ Rh. 8-9 οὐκ Ἀθηναῖα κατέχευεν ἐπιφανεία καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἔκτορα ἐκέλευσε μὴ ζητεῖν, Ῥήσον δὲ ἀναιρεῖν ἐπέταξε, Syleus P.Strasb. 2676 A(a) 5-7³⁷ ἐπ[έταξεν εἰς δουλείαν ἀπ]εμπολη{ι}θέντι[| ... λατρεύει]ν,³⁸ Mel. Soph. (Ioh., Greg.) Μελαλίπην τῆι θυγατρὶ προσέταξεν ἐνταφίῳ αὐτὰ κομῆσαι, Phaethon P.Oxy. 2455. 210-12 (Austin 99, Diggle 53) ἀπικτοῦντι δὲ ... προσέταξεν ἐ[λ]θεῖν, Rhad. PSI 1286 col. ii. 4-7 (Austin 92) πρ[ο]έταξε τὴν μὲν Ἐλένην ἀ[μφοτέροις] τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς τεθνηκόσι τὰς³⁹ τιμὰς καταστήσασθαι, Sthen. (Ioh., Greg.) προσέταξεν αὐτῶι διακινδυνεύσαι. Among these there is no instance of ἐπιτάσσω and dative (at Andr. 15-18 Πηλεῖ takes its case from the nearer verb ἐπιφανεία, and so we should not assume that the construction changes from dative to accusative with αὐτόν), unless Luppe's ἐπ[έταξε is right in Syleus. There are two instances of ἐπιτάσσω and accusative (Hi. 19-20, where a dative would give an unwelcome hiatus, and Andr. 15-18 αὐτόν; Rh. 8-9 is not to be counted, since οὐκ takes its case from the nearer verb κατέχευεν). For προτάσσω there are three instances with dative (Mel. Soph., Phaethon, Sthen.) and one with accusative (Rhad., where a dative would give hiatus and an unwelcome collocation of datives).

In our passage, the manuscripts are divided between Ὀρέκτη(ι) (BOAAbCrGZc) and Ὀρέκτην (MVAaAdAnAtCFKMnPrRRfRwSSaXXaXbZu), just as they are divided between Πυλάδη(ι) (MBOAaAbAdAtCCrKMnPrRRwSSaXXbZu) and Πυλάδην

³⁵ Gnomon 35 (1963) 439.

³⁶ P.Oxy. 3650. 52-6 had a different wording. Hardly ... ἐπιφα]νε[ι]α [Νεοπτόλεμον μὲν ἐπέταξεν ἐν Δε]λφοῖς θάψαι, Ἀνδρομάχην] δὲ με[τὰ τοῦ παιδὸς εἰς Μολοσσὸς] ἀποστ[εῖλαι, αὐτὸν δ' ἀθανασίαν προσδέ]χεσθα[ι (so R.A.Coles, BICS Suppl. 32 [1974] 67-9), with two unwelcome instances of hiatus and much too short a line in 53 (the second hiatus is avoidable by τὴν Ἀνδρομάχην] δὲ, but the line remains too short). For an alternative see Barrett ap. Coles 69.

³⁷ Ed. J.Schwartz, ZPE 4 (1969) 43-4.

³⁸ A speculative reconstruction by Luppe, SIFC ser. 3,2 (1984) 37.

³⁹ See above, n.27.

(VGMn^c?RfXaZc) and even Πυλάδης (FZu) and Πυλάδου (An), and between Ἡλέκτραν (BOAAdFGKMnPrSSaZcZu) and Ἡλέκτρα(ι) (MVAaAbAnAtCCrRRfRwXXaXb). The choice of Πυλάδῃ ... Ἡλέκτραν is dictated by the verb συνοικίαι, which must have Electra, not Pylades, as its object.⁴⁰ Between Ὀρέτῃ and Ὀρέτην the choice is dictated by the following dative καθαρθέντι, attested not only by the papyrus but also by the greater part of the manuscripts (the exceptions are -τα R, -ταc K, -τεc CrG^{ac}, -τοc FS,⁴¹ -των XaZcZu).

Now, the trace visible at the beginning of 36 is probably not]ç, and it is certainly not]γ or]ι (i.e. not αυτο]ç, αυτο]γ, αυτο]ι). But it is compatible with]ω (i.e. αυτ]ω). The papyrus sometimes omits final adscript iota (as at 37 Πυλαδη, 83, 194, 209), and sometimes adds it (as at 18, and possibly 286, 295 τηι, 297 τηι τυ[χη]ι).⁴²

M.L.West⁴³ prints, without comment, Ὀρέτῃ δὲ ἐπέταξεν αὐτὸν μὲν Ἑρμιόνη λαβεῖν, Πυλάδῃ δὲ Ἡλέκτραν συνοικίαι, καθαρθέντι δέ But, while Ὀρέτῃ ... ἐπέταξεν αὐτὸν μὲν λαβεῖν ... καθαρθέντα δέ ... would be without offence, a reversion to the dative in καθαρθέντι is not acceptable.

The loss of the intervening αὐτῶι μὲν has been accompanied in the manuscripts by a change in the order of ἐπέταξεν ... Ἑρμιόνην to Ἑρμιόνην ἐπέταξε, except in K^{Sa}, which have ἐπέταξεν Ἑρμιόνην (the order was corrected by the first hand of K).

IV. 36 λαβεῖ]γ γυναι[ίκα. I know of only two manuscripts which have the word γυναικα. Xa (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barocci 120),⁴⁴ dated c. 1320-30, one of the manuscripts containing scholia by Moschopoulos, has γυναικα λαβεῖν. This was noted by Barrett.⁴⁵ Ad (Athos, Μονὴ Διονυσίου, 334),⁴⁶ from the 15th century or later, hitherto uncollated, has the same order as the papyrus. Ad has a text very similar to that of the 'Moschopoulean' manuscripts. I shall discuss elsewhere agreements such as this between the 'Moschopoulean' manuscripts and older witnesses, and the implications of such agreements for the textual tradition of Orestes. For the present it is sufficient to observe that the reappearance in the 'Moschopoulean' manuscripts of a reading whose antiquity is guaranteed by a papyrus is not unprecedented,⁴⁷ and that, although we should have every right to suspect γυναικα of being a late intrusion if it were attested only by Xa and Ad, its

⁴⁰ Cf. Aeolus P.Oxy. 2457. 27-8 (Austin 89) [τὰc θυ]γατέραc συνοικίαι τοῖc υἱοῖc, LSJ s.u. I.

⁴¹ This corruption was caused by the following τοῦ φόνου for τὸν φόνον, an error (for so I take it to be: see below, n.48) shared by FS with several other mss.

⁴² For 295 and 297 see Barrett, loc.cit. (n.1) 67.

⁴³ Euripides, Orestes, edited with translation and commentary (Aris and Phillips, Warminster, 1987).

⁴⁴ A.Turyn, The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides (1957) 98, K.Matthiessen, Studien zur Textüberlieferung der Hekabe des Euripides (1974) 48, D.J.Mastrorade and J.M.Bremer, The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai (1982) 11, N.G.Wilson, Mediaeval Greek Bookhands (1972-3) 30-1 (Plates 64-5).

⁴⁵ Loc.cit. 66, 68.

⁴⁶ Turyn 121-2, Matthiessen 37-8, Mastrorade and Bremer 13-14.

⁴⁷ Readers of Barrett's article will know why.

appearance in the papyrus proves that, if it is intrusive, the intrusion is a very early one. I believe that γυνάικα is not intrusive but genuine. 'To take *as a wife*' adds a desirable specification to the verb.

V. 38 τὸν [τῆς μητρὸς φόνον (Turner, who however reads τὸν []). The manuscripts have τὸν φόνον (MOACKPrRfRwSa) or τοῦ φόνου (VAaAbAdAnAtCrFMnPr¹RSXXaXbZcZu) or τῶν φόνων (BGR^{1s}).⁴⁸ Turner's supplement is probably right. Something is needed to fill the available space, and τῆς μητρὸς, which is just the right length,⁴⁹ tells us what we need to be told. After the allusion at the beginning to the murder of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra (1-2) and in the middle to the attempted murders of Helen and Hermione (12, 14-15), a bare reference to purification for 'the murder' is undesirably imprecise.

But, in view of 1 τὸν φόνον τοῦ πατρὸς (τὸν τοῦ π- φ- K), we may wonder whether the order τὸν φόνον τῆς μητρὸς may be preferable to τὸν τῆς μητρὸς φόνον.⁵⁰ Decision is impossible. Our author uses both orders. As before, I give first the passages for which we have papyrus evidence.

(i) τὸν τῆς μητρὸς φόνον: Tr. 2 (P.Oxy. 2455. 164-5) τὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν τράτευμα (ita codd.), Rh. 16 (PSI 1286 col. i. 15) ὁ τῶν (or τοῦ) Ῥήκου πῶλων ἐπιμειλίτης (ὁ τοῦ Ῥήκου ἐπι- codd.), Rh. 20 (ibid. 22-3) τὸ [τοῦ παιδὸς πένθος] (ita codd.), Aeolus P.Oxy. 2457. 21 (Austin 88) τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων δ[⁵¹ Auge P.Köln 264. 4⁵² ὁ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας δυνάκτης,⁵³ Temenos (?) P.Mich. 1319⁵⁴ τὸ τῶν Πελοποννησίων τράτευμα, Hyps. P.Oxy. 2455. 193 (Bond 21) τὴν τῆς μητρὸς ζήτησιν, 194 τῆι τοῦ Λυκούργου γυναικί, S. Tereus (?) P.Oxy. 3013. 2 (TrGF 4 p. 435 Radt) ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δυνάκτης, ibid. 5-6 [τῶν] [τῶν] Θραικῶν βασιλεῖ.

No papyrus available: Hec. 5 ὁ (om. FPARRwYvZc) τῶν Θραικῶν βασιλεύς, 10-11 τὰς τῶν αἰχμαλωτῶν κληνάς, Tr. 8 τῆς τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ταφῆς,⁵⁵ IT 2-3 τὸ ... τῆς

⁴⁸ τοῦ φόνου is possible (cf. S. fr. 434 Nauck, 475 Pearson, Radt καθαίρονθ' ἵππον ἀχμηρῶς τριχός [-ὰν τρίχα and -ὰς τρίχας have been conjectured]), Hdt. 1.44.1 τὸν αὐτὸς φόνου ἐκάθηρε, Plut. Mar. 6.1 καθαίρει ληικτηρίων τὴν ἐπαρχίαν), but there is no good reason for preferring it to the accusative (cf. H. II. 16.667-8 αἶμα κάθηρον ... Καρηδόνα, A. fr. 45 Nauck, Radt, 126 Mette καθαίρομαι γῆρας, Hdt. 1.43.2 ὁ καθαρθεὶς τὸν φόνον).

⁴⁹ Line 38 will have 29 letters. The preceding lines vary between 26 letters (37?), 28 (32, 34), 29 (35?; 36) and 30 (33). I have counted a colon as equivalent to a letter.

⁵⁰ If (what seems improbable: see above, n.1) the papyrus had τοῦ not τον, we should have to prefer τοῦ φόνου τῆς μητρὸς, since τοῦ τῆς μητρὸς φόνου would give hiatus (see above, n.19).

⁵¹ For suggested supplements see below, under VI.

⁵² See L.Koenen, ZPE 4 (1969) 7-18.

⁵³ The supplements (Luppe, APF 29 [1983] 19-23) are speculative. Luppe introduces another instance by his supplement at 9-10 τὴν τῆς Ἀθηναίων ἐσθ]ήτα (τὴν τῆς θεᾶς ἐσθ]ήτα Koenen).

⁵⁴ See above, n.23.

⁵⁵ Rather, τῆς τοῦ προειρημένου (Q: εἶρ- P: Ἀχιλλέως V) ταφῆς, as commended by Luppe, DLZ 104, 12 (1983) 1052, and in Aristoteles, Werk und Wirkung (see above, n.25) 615, comparing Ion 8 τὸν τῆς προειρημένης γάμον, Hyps. P.Oxy. 2455. 196 (Bond 21) τ[ο]ῦς π[ρ]οειρημέν[ου]ς, to which add Syleus P.Oxy. 2455. 104 (Austin 96) τοῦ προειρημένου.

Ἄρτεμιδος ξόανον, 6 τοῦ τῆς Ἄρτεμιδος ἱεροῦ, Ion 8 τὸν τῆς προειρημένης γάμον, Hel. 6 τὴν τῆς Ἰλίου πόρθειν, 11-12 τῷ τοῦ Πρωτέως μνήματι, Ba. 2-3 τὰς τῶν Θηβαίων γυναῖκας, 3 αἱ τοῦ Κάδμου θυγατέρες, 4 ὁ τῆς Ἀγαύης παῖς, 14-15 ταῖς τῆς τεκούσης ... χερσίν, Rh. 18 ἡ τοῦ Ῥήκου μήτηρ ἡ Μοῦσα (but PSI 1286 col. i. 19 has the preferable ἡ (?)] Καλλιόπη), Mel.Soph. (Ioh., Greg.) τῆι τοῦ πατρὸς Ἑλληνος γνώμη.⁵⁶

(ii) τὸν φόνον τῆς μητρός: Andr. 12-13 (P.Oxy. 3650. 46-7) τὴν παρουσίαν] τοῦ Νε[οπτολέμου (ita codd.), Ph. 14-15 (P.Oxy. 2455 fr.48)⁵⁷ τοὺς ἡγεμόνας] τῶν Ἄρ[γείων (ita codd.), Rh. 14 (PSI 1286 col. i. 10-11) ἡ συμφορὰ δὲ (καὶ ἡ c- codd.) τῶν ἀνηρημένων, Mel.Soph. P.Oxy. 2455. 18-19 τῆ[ν ἐντολὴν τοῦ κα]ταπειράν[τ]ος (ita Ioh., Greg.), ibid. 19-20 τὴν κάθοδον τοῦ] δυνάτο[υ (ita Ioh., Greg.), Syleus P.Oxy. 2455. 104 (Austin 96) τὴν θυγα]τέρα τοῦ προειρημ[ένου (Turner's τὴν is less than certain), Temenos (?) P.Mich. 1319 + P.Oxy. 2455 fr. 107. 4⁵⁸ τὸ μὲν οὖν κρῖμα τῆς μάχης, Hyps. P.Oxy. 2455. 195 (Bond 21) τὸν ἐπιτάφιον τοῦ παιδός, Phaethon P.Oxy. 2455. 212 (Austin 99, Diggle 53) τὰς ἱπ[ποστ]άσεις τοῦ θεο[ῦ], Phil. P.Oxy. 2455. 253 (Austin 100) τὸν ἔλαιον (ἔλεον) τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων.

No papyrus available: Alc. (a) 3-4 ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ Ἄδμήτου (τοῦ Ἄ- BOV: om. PTr), Med. (a) 22 τῆι πρῶμνηι τῆς Ἀργοῦς, Andr. 8-9 τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Θέτιδος,⁵⁹ Hel. 9 τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς Αἰγύπτου, Or. 1 τὸν φόνον τοῦ πατρὸς (τὸν τοῦ π- φ- K), 3-4 τοῦ πατρὸς τῆς ἀνηρημένης.⁶⁰

Occasionally the dependent genitive precedes: Rh. 19 (PSI 1286 col. i. 20) τοῦ Ῥήκου τὸ σῶμα (τοῦ Ῥήκου omitted by the mss, but they had the interpolation ἡ τοῦ Ῥήκου μήτηρ ἡ Μοῦσα for (ἡ) Καλλιόπη just before, as noted above), S. Tereus (?) P.Oxy. 3013. 9-10 (TrGF 4 p. 436 Radt) τῆς Πρόκνης ... τὴν ἀδελφήν.

(iii) Occasionally the two constructions are combined: Mel. Soph. P.Oxy. 2455. 15-16 τὴν προσ]δοκίαν τῆς το[ῦ] πατρὸς [παρουσίας (item Ioh., τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς προσδοκίαν Greg.), Cycl. 4 τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς τῶν ἰδίων ἐκφορῆσεως.

VI. 39 δυνατεύειν (ἄρχειν fere codd.; ἔχειν Z et ante Ἄργουοι Sa). This writer affects the root δυνατ-: Herc. 7 δυνάκτην, Alex. P.Oxy. 3650. 17-18 δυνάτο[υ], Mel. Soph. P.Oxy. 2455. 20 δυνάτο[υ] (item Ioh., Greg.), Scyrii PSI 1286 col. ii. 16-17 (Austin 96) δυνά]κτηι, S. Tereus (?) P.Oxy. 3013.2 (TrGF 4 p. 435 Radt) δυνά]κτης,

⁵⁶ To be rejected is Ph. 1 τὴν τῶν Θηβῶν βασιλείαν (τῶν Θ- BAaAb^sAtCrFGMnPrRwSSaXXb, Θ-codd. cett.: ἐν Θήβαις P.Oxy. 2455. 172 and 2544.1). See Barrett, loc.cit. 64, 70.

⁵⁷ See Barrett, loc.cit. 67.

⁵⁸ See above, n.23.

⁵⁹ τὸ Θέτιδος ἱερὸν (Barrett ap. Coles, BICS Suppl. 32 [1974] 68) eliminates the hiatus and an unwanted article and is a little better suited to the space in P.Oxy. 3650.40.

⁶⁰ To be rejected is Ph. 3 τὴν θυγατέρα τοῦ βασιλέως (τὴν MAAtCCrMtXaZc, om. P.Oxy. 2544.4 et codd. plerique).

and conceivably Auge P.Köln 264. 4 δ[υνάκτης].⁶¹ The choice is unclear at Ph. 17 δυναστείαν XXaXb: βασιλείαν P.Oxy. 2455. 295 et codd. cett.⁶² I add a further possible instance: Aeolus P.Oxy. 2457. 21-2 τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων δ[]ανωκησεν (δ[ιοίκτησιν]| ανωκησεν Turner, δ[εσποτεί]|αν ικησεν Kassel ap. Austin 88, δ[υναστεί]|αν ικησεν Diggle).

Finally I observe that after ἄρχειν (after ἔχειν Zc) XaZcZu add ἠξιώθησαν and G adds ἠξιώθη. This (evidently intrusive) verb goes hand in hand with the corruption of καθαρθέντι to -τες (CrG^{ac}) and -των (XaZcZu),⁶³ and calls to mind Hec. 3 φάγον ἦιται, where AGXXaXb have φαγήναι ἠξίου.⁶⁴

Queens' College, Cambridge

James Diggle

⁶¹ Luppe, APF 29 (1983) 20.

⁶² See Barrett, loc.cit. 61, 65. βασιλείαν is found with παραλαμβάνω at Ph. 1, Ba. 4-5, with παραδίδομι in P.Mich. 1319.

⁶³ See above, p. 8.

⁶⁴ Rightly described by Barrett, loc.cit. 66, as 'manifestly inferior'.