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(P.OXY. 2455 FR. 4 COL. IV 32-9 + FR. 141)

32 [πορθεὶ]ν· ο ι δ [φθαραντες ψφασειν
[... ηπτειλησαν· ειπ[ψανει δ Απολλων
[Ελευνη] μεν αυτος [εφηεν εις θεους
35 [διακο]μιζειν· Ορε[ετη δε επταξεν
[... ] ι μεν Ερμιονη[ν λαβει]ν γνω[αικα
[καθα]ρθεντι δε των [της μητρος φονον
39 [Αργ]ους δυνατενειν

This is, in effect, the text which emerged after W.S.Barrett\(^1\) suggested that the scrap reported by E.G.Turner\(^2\) as \(\nu \gamma\nu\), with \(\iota\) below \(\nu\), 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 [πορθεὶ]ν· ο ι δ [φθαραντες εμπρη]η[\(\iota\)]
[ειν ηπτειλησαν· ειπ[ψανεις δ Απολλων
[Ελευνη] μεν αυτος [εφηεν] ε[\(\iota\)] Θ[\(\iota\)]ου
35 [διακο]μιζειν· Ορε[ετη δε] επταξε[\(\nu\) (ο επτειλε\(\iota\)]εν
[... ] ι μεν Ερμιονη[ν λαβει]ν γνω[αικα

I. In 32 Luppe suggests εμπρη[\(\iota\)]η[\(\iota\)]\(\iota\)\(\iota\)ι (ψφασειν codd., except Cr, which has ψφασειν), comparing Sisyphus (?) P.Oxy. 2455. 99 (Austin 93) ιτας εμπρηςειν, which he supplements ἁπειλοῦντας. I doubt δη[\(\iota\)]η[\(\iota\)]. 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 ιαλεικας[\(\iota\)], 181 προεπο[\(\nu\)τος, Plate VI fr. 5 col. v. 54 Τειρ[\(\nu\)θος, fr. 6 col. vi. 72 ειληφειναι[\(\iota\)], Plate IX fr. 12 col. xii. 158 απες]πειλεν. It is therefore not inconceivable that we have here the iota of ψφασειν. 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[\(\iota\)] not δε[\(\iota\)] (the lower arc of ε is visible) and in 38 τογ[\(\iota\)] not τογ[\(\iota\)] (ο certain, ν not; but much more likely ν than \(\nu\) [see below, n.50]).
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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 \( \gamma \) (so that \( \psi \omega \omega \) is probably excluded). Since Luppe's \( \epsilon \mu \pi \eta [(c)\-\epsilon \nu \iota \) 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. \( \kappa \alpha \tau \eta \pi \epsilon \omicron \lambda \iota \gamma \iota \alpha \nu \iota \)).

Luppe's readings in 33 and 34 (\( \delta \ \Lambda \pi \omicron \lambda \lambda [\iota \omicron \nu \iota \theta \epsilon \iota \nu \iota \) are possible. In 35 \( \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \) seems possible (the \( \tau \) is probable), and \( \alpha \zeta \) (in spite of Luppe's reservations) is not excluded, and indeed seems at least as plausible as \( \epsilon \iota \lambda \iota \). And I should be surprised if \( \epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \iota \nu \iota \) were right, since this verb is not attested in our author, who does however use both \( \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha \omega \omega \) and \( \rho \iota \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha \omega \omega \) (see below, under III). In 36 \( \gamma \ \gamma \nu \nu \alpha \) is right. In 37 the traces are very unclear, but are perhaps compatible with \( \iota \zeta \alpha \iota \), 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 \( \iota \zeta \alpha \iota \) are the letters which we might expect here (suvnoikίασι is the reading of RfSa and was conjectured by Brunck for -ήκαι 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 και may have been added after suvnoikίασι, as in V (and also Sa, which however omits the following \( \delta \) \( \epsilon \)). και \( \delta \) is found at Med. (a) 74 and Phil. P.Oxy. 2455. 256 (Austin 100). A further possibility, remote indeed, is suvkapatakίασι (suvkapaiκίασι? But the traces are not verifiable). Euripides has suvkapatoκίκειν at Hi. 646, and our author has suvkapatalακίκειν (otherwise unattested) in P.Mich. 1319.5 But suvnoikίζειν is found at Aeolus P.Oxy. 2457.28 (Austin 39).

II. 34 αυτός (om. codd.) is a positive gain. See Herc. 2-3 καταλαλπφων \( \delta \) τοῦτοι \( \epsilon \) ταῖς Θήβαις αυτός εἰς Ἀργος ἦλθεν, Or. 12-13 αυτοί μὲν οὖν \( \epsilon \)πὶ τοῦτοι \( \epsilon \)λθόντες διεψαύθησαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ... Ἡλέκτρα \( \delta \) ..., Mel. Soph. P.Oxy. 2455. 12-13 αυτός μὲν οὖν φόνον] \( \pi \) \( \iota \)νκασ \( \epsilon \)π[\( \epsilon \)ν \( \nu \)τον ἀπήλθε φυγάς-] τὴν \( \delta \) Me[l]αν[\( \iota \pi \pi \)ν ... (restored from Johannes Logothetes and Gregory of Corinth),6 Pirith. (ap. Ioh., Greg.) αυτός μὲν γάρ \( \epsilon \)πὶ πέτρας ... ἐφρουρεῖτο ..., Θηκεύς \( \delta \) ..., 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.
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III. 36 [., . . . . .], μὲν. Turner hesitantly prints [ευθύς]. Luppe describes the trace as 'der untere Teil einer Rundung oder Schräge', and suggests [πρῶτος]. 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 ο, 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 δὲ regularly, and with some precision. If he had written ευθὺς μὲν or πρῶτος μὲν, he would have followed it with ἐπείτα δὲ 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 δὲ ..., Ph. 12-14 (P.Oxy. 2455 fr. 48 + fr. 125)9 ὁ μὲν οὖν νεανίκκος ... Θηβαῖοι δὲ ... (the former clause is variously corrupted in the ms.), 10 Ph. 16-17 (P.Oxy. 2455. 291-4) ἢ μὲν οὖν μήτηρ αὐτῶν Ἰοκάστη ... ὁ δὲ τούτης ὀδέληθς Κρέων ... (Ἰοκάστη is rightly omitted by the ms.),11 Ph. 19-20 (P.Oxy. 2455. 298-301) τοῦ ὑπὸ τὴν Καδμίειν (τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ τὴν Καδμίειν τοὺς, rightly)12 ... Πολυνείκην δὲ ..., Οἰδίπόδα δὲ ..., Ph. 21-2 (P.Oxy. 2455. 302-3) ἐφ’ ὄν μὲν ... ἐφ’ ὄν δὲ ..., Rh. 10-12 (PSI 1286 col. i. 3-6) τοῦτοι[ν] δ’ ἐπιφανεῖς μὲν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπικεθήμενος τὴν πολεμίων παρακολούθων, [ἐξαπατηθέεις δ’] ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ...,13 Alex. P.Oxy. 3650. 13-15 ὡς μὲν παῖς ... οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι νομεῖς ..., 27-9 Κακ[όν]δρο[ς] μὲν ... Ἐκάβη [δὲ ..., Mel. Soph. P.Oxy. 2455.

---

8 The supplements [πρῶτον μὲν] and [ἐπείτα] δὲ printed by Nauck in Stenh. are proved false by Ioh.
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, Anagenesis 2 (1982) 74-82; ἐπικεθήμενος τὴν πολεμίων, where the ms have ἐπίκατοθαι (ἐπικε and a space of c.6 letters in V) πολεμίου (πολεμίων coni. Kirchhoff), restored by Gallavotti.
9-10 [ê]κ μὲν ... (with ê dê restored from Ioh., Greg.).

21-2 φυλαυτ[ήμεν]α μὲν ...

[θήλα]ξόμ[ενα δ'] ...

(item Ioh., Greg.), Rhad. PSI 1286 col. ii . 2-3 (Austin 92) ἐπὶ μὲν ...

ἐπὶ δὲ ..., Sthen. P.Oxy. 2455. 53-4 + P.Strasb. 2676 B(d) 

Προὶ[το]ς Ἀβάν του (a mistake for -toco) μὲν ἦν ιός, [Ἀκρείτον] δὲ ὥδε[λφός], βασιλεὺς δὲ Τειρ[υνθός] (Προῖτος ἦν Ἀκραμάντος ["Ἀβάντος Ναυκ] ιός Ioh., Greg.), Sthen. P.Oxy. 2455. 72-3 τῆς] μὲν ... τοῦ δὲ ... (ita Ioh., Greg.), Sisyphus (?) P.Oxy. 2455. 91-2 (Austin 93)

ο[ι] μὲν οὖν cάτυρῳ ... Ἐρμῆς δὲ ..., Syleus P.Oxy. 2455. 106-7 (Austin 96) τούτου[ν] μὲν οὖν [ ... Ξενοδ[ή]κην] δὲ ... (suppl. Harder). 

16 Temenos (?) P.Oxy. 2455. 119-23 (Austin 12) 


No papyrus available: Held. 1 υίος μὲν ... ἀδέλφριδος δὲ ..., 14-15 ταύτην μὲν οὖν ... αὐτὸς δὲ ..., Hi. 1 υίος μὲν ... βασιλεὺς δὲ ..., 22-3 τὴν μὲν Φαίδραν ... τούτον δὲ ..., Andr. 11-12 Μενέλαος μὲν οὖν ... Ἐρμιόνη δὲ ... (P.Oxy. 3650. 44-5, in which only ]οῦν ἀπ' survives, will have had the same text), 16-18 τούτον μὲν ... τὴν δὲ Ἀνδρομάχην ... αὐτὸν δὲ ...,18 Hec. 1-2 οἱ μὲν Ἐλληνες ... Ἀχιλλεὺς δὲ ..., 3-5 οἱ μὲν οὖν Ἐλληνες ... Πολυμήτωρ δὲ ..., 15 τούς μὲν υίους ... αὐτὸν δὲ ..., Tr. 8-9 ταύτην μὲν οὖν ... Ἀκτούσκατα δὲ ..., Hel. 5-7 οἱ μὲν γὰρ ... ὁ δὲ ..., 7-8 τὴν μὲν ἀλλήδος Ἐλενίν ... τὸ εἴδωλον δὲ αὐτῆς, 12-13 τὰς μὲν ναῦς ... ὀλύγους δὲ τίνας ..., Or. 6-7 νυκτὸς μὲν Ἐλενίνῃ εἰςαπεκτείλε,19 μεθ' ἡμέραν δὲ αὐτὸς ἥλθεν (αὐτὸς δὲ


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 εἰςαπεκτείλε(ν) ἢ ἀπεκτείλε V, εἰς ἄκτου ἢ ἀπεκτείλε C. The compound εἰςαποκτέλλω is barely attested, and I doubt it here. We need to know where Helen was despatched; and the answer is 'into the city' (eis akto, as C, accepted by Di Benedetto). The verb ἀποκτέλλω (usually with a prepositional phrase indicating direction) is found at Andr. 17 (eis Μολόσσοις), Ph. 21 (eis Μολόσσοις), P.Oxy. 2455. 301 ἀπεκτείλε[ν] (ἀπέπεμψεν codd. plerique, ἀπέσπασαν GXXaXb), Ba. 6 (ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τὸν θεόν), Temenos (?) P.Oxy. 2455. 146 (Austin 98) ἀ(πέκτε)[τε]λε[ν] (Turner) ... eis Στάρ[ην], Telephus P.Oxy. 2455. 158 (Austin 67) ἐπὶ τοῖον χρήματον | ἀπεκτείλεν, Pirith. (Ioh., Greg.) ἐπὶ τὸν Κέριμβον ... ἀποκτέλεις. I have two reservations: (i) I have not found ἄκτου elsewhere in these hypotheses (pôle would be normal); (ii) eis ἄκτου ἢ ἀπεκτείλε 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 ἀπεκτείλεν eis ἄκτου would answer (ii). We should then suppose that eis ἄκτου was accidentally omitted, written above the line or in the margin, and then incorporated in the wrong place (entirely in C, part in the majority, not all in V). Alternatively, eis (Ὑropolis) ἀπεκτείλε, since it is appropriate that the city should be named.
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μεθ' ἵμεραν εἰσῆλθε BFG), 12-14 αὐτοὶ μὲν οὖν ... Ἡλέκτα ἐκ ..., Rh. 8-9 τὸν μὲν Ἔκτορα ἐκ ..., Pith. (Ioh., Greg.) αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ... Ἐθησεὶ δὲ ..., Sthen. (Ioh., Greg.) αὐτὸς 20 μὲν ... ἡ γυνὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ ... I exclude Ph. 8-9 ἡ μὲν Ἰοκάστη ... Πολυνεύκης δὲ ..., 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 παθῶν μὲν ἐξερήθησαν ὑπεξερήθησαν (ὑπεξερήθησαιν codd.), αὐτὴ δὲ ..., El. 1-5 (P.Oxy. 420. 1-5) τὴν μὲν Ἡλέκτρα[τρ]ην τοὺς ἄνδρας εἰκότας ἐπικόταις μὲν ἄλλα [φι]λοτήμων ἑννίους μεθεξόντας, [αὐ]τὸς δὲ ... ἐπήθηθεν. 22 Ορ. 18 (P.Oxy. 2455. 34-5) 'Ελένη[ν] μὲν ... 'Ορέ[χτη δὲ ... (μὲν om. R; -τη(1) uel -την codd.), Mel.Soph. P.Oxy. 2455. 12-14 (αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν) ... τὴν δὲ Μελανίππην ... (restored from Ioh., Greg.), Sciron P.Oxy. 2455. 83-4 (Austin 94) ἐκεῖνοι μὲν ... αὐτὸς δὲ ..., Temenos (?) P.Mich. 1319 23 + P.Oxy. 2455. fr. 107.4 τὸ μὲν οὖν κρίμα τῆς μάχης ἐγένετο ... ἀριστος δὲ ἐκρίνετο Ἀρχέλαος.

No papyrus available: Hi. 15-16 τῇ μὲν τροφοί ... ἀνατή δὲ ..., 24 19-20 τὸν μὲν Ἰππόλυτον ... αὐτὸς δὲ ..., Andr. 13-14 ταύτην μὲν ... Νεοπτολέμου δὲ ... (and probably the same in P.Oxy. 3650. 48-9), Tr. 6-8 'Αγαμέμνονι μὲν Κασσανδρᾷ, Ἀνδρομάχην δὲ Νεοπτολέμου, Πολυξένην δὲ Ἀχιλλεί, 25 11-12 τῆς μὲν Ἐλένης ... τοὺς ἀνατήθεντας δὲ ..., Ioh. 8-9 τούτων μὲν οὖν ... τὸν δὲ ἐκτραφέντα ..., Ba. 5-6 καὶ τινος μὲν τῶν Βασχών εὐλαβῶν ἐδησεν, ἐπί αὐτόν δὲ τὸν θεὸν ὃς ἠλλακτά ἀπέστειλεν, Rh. 6-7 Δόλαια μὲν ἀνήμηρικότες, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν 'Εκτορος κατηνηκότες εἰκνήν, 26 Pith. (Ioh., Greg.) τοῦ μὲν θηρίου (θηρὸς Greg.) ... τοὺς δὲ περὶ Θησέας ...

(iii) The following diverge, in some degree, from the norms established above: Alex. P.Oxy. 3650. 9-11 κατωδύρατο μὲν [τό]ξον ἐκπεθέντα, Πρίσμου [δ' ἐξε]ικβλήσει, 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 Ἡλέκτρα[τρ]ην, ἐπικόταις ἐπικόταις (Luppe, Philologus 125 [1981] 181-7, had suggested [ἐ]ξ[έ]πεθ[ε], and [φι]λοτήμων (Barrett compares Mel. Soph. [Ioh., Greg.] φιλοτήμων). Luppe remarks that 'Auch der ἐκέλευσεν-Satz wird übrigens ... mit μὲν eingeleitet worden sein' and I should suppose that the writer chose the (for him) unusual variation μὲν ἄλλα at the end of the first half of the sentence because he was using μὲν ... δὲ to link the two halves of the sentence.
25 Of these words P.Oxy. 2455. 171 has only Ἀργαμένοις.[Luppe, Aristotle, Werk und Wirkung, Paul Moraux gewidmet, i (ed. J.Wiesner, 1985) 615, considers restoring full syntactical balance with Νεοπτολέμου δὲ Ἀνδρομάχην, Ἀχιλλεῖ δὲ Πολυξένην. But the variation has a certain elegance, and is comparable with Sthen. 'Ἀβαντος μὲν ἴνα νίκην, Ἀκρινίου δὲ ἀδελφός, βασιλέως δὲ Τείρηθος, S.Tereus (?) ἢ μὲν ἑπόδων, ἢ δὲ χελιδῶν, ἐποὺ δὲ οὶ Τηρεῖ, both cited above under (i).
26 So Q (Harl. 5743); ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν 'Ε- (om. κατηνηκότες) κοιτήν (tum spat. fere ix litt.) V; (ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν 'Ε- κατ- om.) εἰκνήν Ambros. O 123 sup.
PSI 1286 col. ii. 4-8 (Austin 92) πρ[ος]έταξε τὴν μὲν Ἐλένην ὁ[μφοτέροις] τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς τεῦχ[ηκόσι τάς]27 τιμᾶς καταστῆσασθαι, [τα]ς θυγ[α]τέρας δ’ αὐτοῦ θεὰς ἔφησε γι[νέξθαι] (the balance is slightly upset by the change of construction, the writer having realised, that he needed a verb other than προετάξει to govern the second infinitive).28 Sthen. P.Oxy. 2455 fr. 24 + fr. 95 τὸ[ν μὲν Προίτον κατεμέμψατο, ἀν[ή]ε[ε]τ[ε] τὴν Σθενέβοιαν (a speculative restoration,29 based on κατεμέμψατο τῶν Προίτον, ἀνέσεις δὲ (δὲ καὶ Greg.) τὴν Σθ- Ioh., (Greg.)), Sthen. (Ioh., (Greg.)) γενόμενος δὲ κατὰ Μήλον τὴν νῆσον ταύτην (sc. Σθενέβοιαν) ἀπέρριψεν. αὐτὴν μὲν ὅν (ὅν om. Greg.) ἀποθανόντας ἄλλες ἀναλαβόντες διεκόμισαν εἰς τὴν (τὴν om. Greg.) Τίρυνθα, πάλιν δὲ ἐπιστρέψας (いました- Greg.) ὁ Βελλεροφόντης ..., where P.Oxy. 2455. 65-7 should probably be supplemented κ[α]τὰ Μὴ[λὸν τὴν νῆσον γενόμενεν ἕκε[ι]ν[η ἀπέρρησε] [ε(ν)], ταύτην μὲν ὅν ἄ[πο]θανόντας ἀλ[λ[ε])ἰείς,30 Temenos (?) P.Mich. 1319 θότοι μὲν ὅν βιασάμενοι ... εὐκατελοχίστησαν· ἄν[α]βιβαζασμένοι δὲ ... (the drift of the passage remains unclear, and there is likely to be corruption).31

No papyrus available: Hcld. 8-10 τούτῳ μὲν ἀλλιγῶρε, χρημαί δὲ αὐτῶι νικηφόροις γενηθέντων ... τοῖς λογίοις βαρέως ἔσχεν, Ioun 4-6 τὸ μὲν ὅν βρέφος Ἐρμῆς ... ἤνεγκεν· εὐρός δ’ ἡ προφήτης ἀνέθρεψεν, Hel. 1-5 καὶ φησιν ἐλάθειν μὲν αὐτὴν ... οὐ μὲν δὲ οὕτως ὡς Εὐρυπίδης φησίν,32 14-15 ἀπατάσι μὲν τὸν Θεοκλύμενον, αὐτοὶ δὲ νη ἐμβάντες ...33 Ba. 15-16 Διόνυσος δὲ ἐπισφαίρει (τὰ) μὲν πάσι παρῆγγελεν, ἐκάστῳ δὲ ἡ εὐμβηχείαν, διεκολήθησαν.34

27 Or τεύχ[ηκόσιν]? The article is unwanted, and the line-endings were not all aligned in this papyrus.
28 At the end read ἔφησε γι[νέξθαι] or γι[νέξθαι] (Luppe, Anagennesis 2 [1982] 81 and not ἔφη γενι (ed.pr.). Similarly at Phaethon P.Oxy. 2455. 207 (Austin 99, Diggle 53) not ἔφη[ν] τὸ[γ]υ but ἔφη[ε(ν)] τὸ[γ]υ (Luppe, Philologus 127 [1983] 135-9) or possibly ἔφη[ε(ν)] τὸ[γ]υ[α]. At Hi. 24 ἔφη will be a corruption of ἔφησε (Luppe). At Or. 18 ἔφη[σεν] is corrupted to ἔφη by Cr.
30 The first part (to ἕκε[ι]ν[η] supplied by Turner, whose following εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· ἤν ἀπό) was prompted by the false supplements printed in Greg. by Nauck and therefore has no foundation. Luppe restored αὐτὴν μὲν ὅν ἄπο] from Ioh. But we must have ταύτην μὲν ὅν καὶ not αὐτὴν μὲν ὅν, and now that the papyrus offers ἕκε[ι]ν[η in the preceding clause in place of ταύτην (Ioh.; Greg. is defective), there is no obstacle to writing ταύτην here. For ταύτην (τούτον, τούτῳς) μὲν ὅν see Hcld. 14. Tr. 8, Ion 8, Syleus P.Oxy. 2455. 106 (Austin 96). Our author uses only (as we should expect) nominative αὐτόκ (-οι) μὲν ὅν (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 τὸ[ν μὲν Θεοκλύμενον ἀπατάσι, αὐτοὶ δὲ ... like Hi. 15-16 τὴν μὲν τροφήν ἐπέπληξεν, εὐτυχὴν δὲ ..., 19-20 τὸν μὲν Ἰππόλυτον ἐπέταξε φιάζειν, αὐτὸκ δὲ ..., Andr. 7-8 τὸ παιδίον μὲν ὑπεξῆθηκεν, 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 αὐτὸς, to be taken as a scribal error for αὐτόν or αὐτόι. Examples were given (under II) of αὐτὸς μὲν balanced by a second noun + ἔ: Or. 12-13 αὐτοί μὲν οὖν ... Ἡλέκτρα δὲ ..., Mel. Soph. αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν ... τὴν δὲ Μελανίππην ..., Pirith. αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ... θείως δὲ ..., and above all Sthen. αὐτὸς (Wilamowitz: -ον Ioh., Greg.) μὲν ... ἡ γυνὴ δὲ αὐτῶν ... .

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 ἐπιτάξκω and προστάκκω may be constructed with accusative or dative: Hi. 19-20 τὸν μὲν Ἰππόλυτον ἐπέταξε φεύγειν, αὐτὸς δὲ ..., Andr. 15-18 Πηλεῖ δὲ ... Θέτις ἐπιφανεῖα τούτοις μὲν ἐπέταξεν ἐν Δελφοῖς θάγασι, τὴν δὲ Ἀνδρομάχην εἰς Μολοσσοῦς ἁπατεύει (Lascaris: ἁπάτειλεν) κατὰ τοῦ παιδός, αὐτὸν δὲ ἀθανασίαν προοδέχεθαι,36 Rh. 8-9 οὖς Ἄθηνα κατέχετο ἐπιφανεῖα καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἑκτορά ἐκέλευσε μὴ ξησεῖν, Ὑήκων δὲ ἁναρείν ἐπέταξε, Syleus P.Strasb. 2676 A(a) 5-37 ἐπὶ ἐπίταξεν εἰς δουλείαν ἀπὲμπολὴ[1]θέντι [ ... λατρεύει]ν.38 Mel. Soph. (Ioh., Greg.) Μελανίππη τῇ θυγατρί προσετάξειν ἔνταφιοι αὐτὰ κοιμήσαι, Phaethon P.Oxy. 2455. 210-12 (Austin 99, Diggle 53) ἀπιστοῦντι δὲ ... προετάξειν ἐ[λ]θεῖν, Rhad. PSI 1286 col. ii. 4-7 (Austin 92) προ[η]ταξε ἐθεῖν τὴν μὲν Ἐλένην ἀ[μφοτέρως τις ἀδέλφῳ τοῖς τεθνηκόσι τὰκ]39 τιμῶς καταπτήσασθαι, Sthen. (Ioh., Greg.) προσετάξειν αὐτοῦ διακινδυνεῦσαι. Among these there is no instance of ἐπιτάξκω and dative (at Andr. 15-18 Πηλεῖ takes its case from the nearer verb ἐπιφανεῖα) and in our passage, the manuscripts are divided between ἐπιτάξκω (BOAAbCrGZc) and ἐπιτάξκω (MVAaAdAnAtCFKMnPrRRfRwSSaXXaXbZu), just as they are divided between προστάθηκαι (MBOAAaAbAdAtCCrKMnPrRRwSSaXXbZu) and Πυλάδην (BOAAAbCrGZc) and Πυλάδην (MVAAaAdAnAtCFKMnPrRRfRwSSaXXaXbZu), as just as they are divided between Πυλάδην (MBOAAaAbAdAtCCrKMnPrRRwSSaXXbZu) and Πυλάδην.
(VGMnCrRFXaZc) and even Πυλάδης (FZu) and Πυλάδου (An), and between Ἡλέκτραν (BOAAFGKMNPrSSaZcZu) and Ἡλέκτρα(1) (MVAAAnAtCCrRRmWXaXb). The choice of Πυλάδη ... Ἡλέκτραν is dictated by the verb συνοικίσαι, which must have Electra, not Pylades, as its object.40 Between Ὀρέστη and Ὀρέστην the choice is dictated by the following dative καθαρθεῖται, attested not only by the papyrus but also by the greater part of the manuscripts (the exceptions are -ται R, -ταις K, -τες CrGabc, -τοις FS,41 -τοιν XaZcZu).

Now, the trace visible at the beginning of 36 is probably not Ἰ, and it is certainly not Ἰν or Ἰ (i.e. not αὐτο[ι], αὐτο[η], αὐτο[ί]). But it is compatible with Ἰν (i.e. αὐτ[η]ν). 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 την, 297 την τῶν[ην]).42 M.L.West43 prints, without comment, Ὀρέστη βαίνειν Ὀρέστη Ἡλέκτραν συνοικίσαι, καθαρθεῖται βαίνειν ... But, while Ὀρέστη ... ἐπέταξεν αὐτὸν μὲν λαβεῖν ... καθαρθεῖται βαίνειν ... would be without offence, a reversion to the dative in καθαρθεῖται is not acceptable.

The loss of the intervening αὐτοί μὲν has been accompanied in the manuscripts by a change in the order of ἐπέταξεν ... Ἐρμίονην to Ἐρμίονην ἐπέταξε, except in KSa, which have ἐπέταξεν Ἐρμίονην (the order was corrected by the first hand of K).

IV. 36 λαβεῖν γυναίκα. I know of only two manuscripts which have the word γυναίκα. Xa (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barocci 120),44 dated c. 1320-30, one of the manuscripts containing scholia by Moschopoulos, has γυναίκα λαβεῖν. This was noted by Barrett.45 Ad (Athos, Μονή 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 'Moschopouléan' manuscripts. I shall discuss elsewhere agreements such as this between the 'Moschopouléan' 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 'Moschopouléan' 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 γυναίκα 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) ταύς θύσαις συνοικίσαι τοῖς υἱοῖς, 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.
45 Loc.cit. 66, 68.
46 Turyn 121-2, Matthiessen 37-8, Mastronarde 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 γυναικα is not intrusive but genuine. 'To take as a wife' adds a desirable specification to the verb.

V. 38 τῆς μητρός φόνον (Turner, who however reads τῶν []). The manuscripts have τῶν φόνον (MOACKPrRfRwSa) or τοῦ φόνου (VAAaAbADAnAtCrFMMnPR1sRXXaXbZCZU) or τῶν φόνον (BGR18).48 Turner's supplement is probably right. Something is needed to fill the available space, and τῆς μητρός, 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 οὐκ ἡμιρκός (τῶν τοῦ πατρός τῆς μητρὸς), we may wonder whether the order τῶν φόνον τῆς μητρὸς may be preferable to τῶν τῆς μητρὸς φόνον.50 Decision is impossible. Our author uses both orders. As before, I give the passages for which we have papyrus evidence.

(i) τῶν τῆς μητρὸς φόνον: Tr. 2 (P.Oxy. 2455. 164-5) τῶν Άρειοι κτράτεμα (ita codd.), Rh. 16 (PSI 1286 col. i. 15) ο τῶν [or τοῦ] Πηλίου πόλων [πτυμ]ελήτης (ο τοῦ Πηλίου ἐπι- codd.), Rh. 20 (ibid. 22-3) το [τοῦ ποιδός πένθος] (ita codd.), Aeolus P.Oxy. 2457. 21 (Austin 88) την τῶν ἀνέμων δτ.[51 Auge P.Köln 264. 452 ο τῆς Άρκαδίας δύναστής,53 Temenos (?) P.Mich. 131944 τῶν Πελοποννησίων κτράτεμα, Hyrs. P.Oxy. 2455. 193 (Bond 21) τήν τῆς μητρο[ς] ζήτησιν. 194 τής τοῦ Αυκούργου γυναικί, S. Tereus (?) P.Oxy. 3013. 2 (TrGF 4 p. 435 Radt) ο τῶν Άθηναίων δυνάστες, ibid. 5-6 το[ν] Θασικέων βασιλεί.[55 IT 2-3 το ... τῆς

48 τοῦ φόνου is possible (cf. S. fr. 434 Nauck, 475 Pearson, Radt καθαίρονθ' ἵππον σώματος τριξός [-οι τρίγα and -ας τρίγας have been conjectured], Hdt. 1.44.1 τον αυτου φόνου ἐκάθηνε, Plut. Mar. 6,1 καθαίρει ληστηρίαν την ἐπαρχίαν, but there is no good reason for preferring it to the accusative (cf. H. II. 16.667-8 οίμα κάθησαν ... Σαρπιδώνα, A. fr. 45 Nauck, Radt, 126 Mette καθαίρει καταγιάτης, Hdt. 1.43.2 ὁ καθαίρες τον φόνον).
49 Line 38 will have 29 letters. The preceding lines vary between 26 letters (377), 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 τοῦ], we should have to prefer τοῦ φόνου τῆς μητρός, since τοῦ τῆς μητρός φόνου would give hiatus (see above, n.19).
51 For suggested supplements see below, under VI.
53 The supplements (Luppe, APF 29 [1983] 19-23) are speculative. Luppe introduces another instance by his supplement at 9-10 τῆς Άθηναίας ἐκθείτηα (τῆς τῆς θέας ἐκθείτηα Koenen).
54 See above, n.23.
᾽Αρτέμιδος ἔζοσαν, 6 τοῦ τῆς ᾿Αρτέμιδος ἴεροῦ, Ιον 8 τὸν τῆς προειρημένης γάμον, Ηελ. 6 τὴν τῆς ᾿Ιλίου πόρησιν, 11-12 τοῦ τοῦ Πρωτέως μνήματι, Βα. 2-3 τάς τῶν Θηβαίων γυναίκας, 3 αἱ τοῦ Κάδύμος θυγατέρες, 4 ὁ τῆς ᾿Αγαύης παῖς, 14-15 τάς τῆς τεκόυσης ... χερίν, Rh. 18 ὁ τοῦ ῾Ρήκου μήτρη ἡ Μοῦκα (but PSI 1286 col. i. 19 has the preferable ὑ(?)) ᾿Ιακοπτή, Mel. Soph. (Ioh., Greg.) τῷ τοῦ πατρὸς ᾿Ελληνος γνώμης.56


No papyrus available: Alc. (a) 3-4 ᾧ κανῆ τοῦ ᾿Αδμήτου (τοῦ ᾿Α- BOV: om. PTr), Med. (a) 22 τῇ πρυμνῇ τῆς ᾿Αργοῦς, Andr. 8-9 τὸ ἰερὸν τῆς ᾿Θέτιδος.59 Hel. 9 τοῦ βασιλείᾳ τῆς ᾿Αἰγύπτου, Ορ. 1 τὸν φῶνον τοῦ πατρὸς (τοῦ τοῦ π- φ- Κ), 3-4 τοῦ πατρὸς τῆς ἀνηρικομένης.60

Occasionally the dependent genitive precedes: Rh. 19 (PSI 1286 col. i. 20) τοῦ ᾿Ρήκου τὸ κόμα (τοῦ ᾿Ρήκου omitted by the mss, but they had the interpolation ᾧ τοῦ ᾿Ρήκου μήτρη ᾧ Μοῦκα for ᾧ ᾿Ιακοπτή just before, as noted above), S. Tereus (?) P.Oxy. 3013. 9-10 (TrGF 4 p. 436 Radt) τῆς Πρόκοπης ... τὴν ἄδελφην.

(iii) Occasionally the two constructions are combined: Mel. Soph. P.Oxy. 2455. 15-16 τὴν προκοδικίαν τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς παρουσίας (item Ioh., τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς προκοδικίων Greg.), Cycl. 4 τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς τῶν ἱδίων ἐκφορῆσει.

VI. 39 δυναστεύει[ν (ἀρχεῖν fere codd.; ἔχειν Z et ante ᾿Αργοῦς Sa). This writer affects the root δυναστεύει-: Herec. 7 δυνάστην, Alex. P.Oxy. 3650. 17-18 δυνάστου, Mel. Soph. P.Oxy. 2455. 20 δυνάστο[ν (item Ioh., Greg.), Scyrii PSI 1286 col. ii. 16-17 (Austin 96) δυνάστην, S. Tereus (?) P.Oxy. 3013.2 (TrGF 4 p. 435 Radt) δυνάστης,

56 To be rejected is Ph. 1 τὴν τῶν Θηβαίων βασιλείαν (τῶν Θ- BAaAb’AtCfGMnPrRwSSaXXb, Θ-codd., cett.: en Θήβαντο 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 τό ᾿Θετίδος ἴερον (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 ΑΑaCtCmMsXeZc, om. P.Oxy. 2544.4 et codd. plerieque).
and conceivably Auge P. Köln 264. 4 δινόκτησε.\textsuperscript{61} The choice is unclear at Ph. 17 δυνατεῖαιν XXaXb: βασιλείαν P. Oxy. 2455. 295 et codd. cett.\textsuperscript{62} I add a further possible instance: Aeolus P. Oxy. 2457. 21-2 τήν τῶν ἁνέμων δὲ 1 ἁνακτησεν (δ[ιωκτησεν]) ανωκτησεν Turner, δ[εποτεί]λαν ἵκησεν Kassel ap. Austin 88, δ[δυνατεί]λαν ἵκησεν Diggle).

Finally I observe that after ἀρχεῖν (after ἔχειν Ze) XαZeZu add ἡξιώθησεν and G adds ἡξιώθη. This (evidently intrusive) verb goes hand in hand with the corruption of καθαρθέντι to -τες (CrG\textsuperscript{ac}) and -τον (XαZeZu),\textsuperscript{63} and calls to mind Hec. 3 εφάγον ἤτει, where AGXXaXb have εφαγήναι ἡξίου.\textsuperscript{64}

Queens’ College, Cambridge

James Diggle

\textsuperscript{61} Luppe, APF 29 (1983) 20.
\textsuperscript{62} See Barrett, loc.cit. 61, 65. βασιλείαν is found with παραλεμβάνω at Ph. 1, Ba. 4-5, with παραδίδωμι in P. Mich. 1319.
\textsuperscript{63} See above, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{64} Rightly described by Barrett, loc.cit. 66, as ‘manifestly inferior’.