

MARC HUYS

EURIPIDES, ALEXANDROS FR. 46 SNELL UNMASKED AS ILIAS T 325-329

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 79 (1989) 261–265

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## Euripides, Alexandros fr. 46 Snell unmasked as Ilias T 325-329

In 1922, W. Crönert published some interesting papyrus fragments of Euripides' "Alexandros" (P.Strasbourg inv. Gr. 2342-4 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 432), which have since been re-edited by C. Lefke, B. Snell, and finally by R.A. Coles.<sup>1</sup> Besides some larger fragments that could be interpreted within the framework of the action of the play with varying success, there were more than ten small scraps which for the most part remained unexplained. Among them fr. VII (= inv. Gr. 2344, 1-5), which was later numbered fr. 46 by Snell. The fragment was treated by all four authors mentioned above,<sup>2</sup> but only the study of Coles contains a photograph (plate VI), which does not possess the desired clarity. Obviously this circumstance, together with the apparent insignificance of the scrap and the deceptive confidence that it belonged to the "Alexandros", withheld scholars from an unprejudiced examination of the fragment.

As a matter of fact the fragment is not Euripidean, but contains lines 325-9 of Iliad book T.<sup>3</sup> H. Ibscher, who mounted the scraps under glass,<sup>4</sup> was probably misled by the resemblance of the handwriting of this Homer-papyrus to that of the "Alexandros"-fragments, and subsequent editors have been misled by his classification. Anyhow, the new identification makes a re-edition desirable, the more so as the scrap has never been accurately described by previous scholars. For this re-edition I am much indebted to J. Schwartz of Strasbourg, who not only sent me a new photograph, but also checked the material aspects and controlled some readings on the original. My thanks are also due to A. Wouters and W. Clarysse for their helpful suggestions.

---

<sup>1</sup> CRÖNERT W., *Griechische literarische Papyri aus Straßburg, Freiburg und Berlin. 1. der Alexandros des Euripides* in *NGG*, 1922, Heft 1, p. 1-17; LEFKE C., *De Euripidis Alexandro*, Bochum-Langendreer, 1936; SNELL B., *Euripides' Alexandros und andere Straßburger Papyri mit Fragmenten griechischer Dichter*, (*Hermes Einzelschriften*, 5), Berlin, 1937, p. 1-68; COLES R.A., *A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus: The Hypothesis of Euripides' Alexandros*, (*BICS Suppl.* 32), London, 1974, p. 38-58 with pl. III-VI.

<sup>2</sup> Crönert (*o.c.*, p. 12) held the fragment to be lyrical and l. 3 to have something to do with Paris, who was exposed as a child, and was generally believed to have perished many years before the action of the drama. Lefke (*o.c.*, p. 48) accepted that the fragment presumably referred to Paris and conjectured that it might have belonged to the first stasimon, whereas Snell (*o.c.*, p. 18) suggested a "Chorlied aus dem Anfang der Tragödie" and Coles (*o.c.*, p. 56) a "lyric fragment".

<sup>3</sup> Crönert (*o.c.*, p.12) had noticed that the expression εἴ που ἔτι ζώει, which is strongly suggested by the preserved part of l. 3, occurs in δ 833, but paid no special attention to this fact. The form ζώει, however, is nowhere to be found in extant Euripidean tragedy, whereas εἴ που ἔτι ζώει, is a typical Homeric turn, occurring not only at δ 833, but also at ξ 44, υ 207 and T 327. On the other hand, πρὶν μὲν γάρ (l. 4) introducing a hexameter is found in ξ 229, Σ 288, T 328 and Φ 100.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. CRÖNERT, *o.c.*, p. 2.

**Description and date**<sup>5</sup>

The scrap measures 3.6 cm. (width) by 3.1 cm. (height). Only one side of the papyrus has been used for writing — it is clearly part of a *volumen* — and the script runs along the fibres. No margins are preserved. What we have then are the beginnings of three verses and traces of five letters of two other verses. This is clearly an example of what W. Lameere<sup>6</sup> called a “petit fragment”, but its interest lies in its date. Indeed, the handwriting should be dated to the third century B.C., and by preference to the middle of that century on the basis of its likeness to the “Alexandros”-fragments. For this latter hand I refer to the accurate description and dating by E.G. Turner.<sup>7</sup> The same author<sup>8</sup> later proposed the middle of the third century B.C. for a specific type of Ptolemaic bookhands, the so-called “group D”, and here again he listed the hand of the “Alexandros”-papyrus as an example. Our papyrus seems to fit in this group, as the general flow and the forms of specific letters are the same as in the “Alexandros”-fragments. I noted only the following minor differences: as already indicated by Coles<sup>9</sup>, the size of the letters is somewhat larger in the Homer-fragment; the *mu* is also made in three movements, but instead of a horizontal cross-bar, the stroke between the two verticals is somewhat more curved, without however reaching the bottom line; and the left part of the horizontal bar of the *tau* has a marked “entry” and is unusually long in comparison to the right part — this disproportion is more striking than in the “Alexandros”-papyrus. But these slight differences do not give cause for proposing an alternative date. For example, a *tau* with the cross-bar extending well to the left is typical of cursive hands of the first half and middle of the third century B.C.<sup>10</sup> It is of course risky to classify the handwriting of such a small scrap, and it would perhaps not be impossible to place it in Turner's “group C”,<sup>11</sup> but a dating in the course of the third century B.C. is surely safe. Another indication of an early date is the double assimilation in l. 4 / v. 328, although this does not yield a dating more precise than the third or second century B.C.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> I have no exact information as to the provenance of the fragment, nor how it got into the ‘Bibliothèque Nationale Universitaire’ at Strasbourg. But some few facts are known about the modern history of the ‘Alexandros’-fragments, viz. that they were already at Strasbourg in 1912, and were probably purchased through Prof. Borchardt for the German ‘Papyruskartell’ in 1902: cf. TURNER E.G., *The Date of the Strasbourg Fragments of Euripides, Alexandros* in *Miscellanea codicologica François Masai dicata MCMLXXIX*, edd. P. Cockshaw, M.C. Garand & P. Jodogne, (*Les Publications de Scriptorium*, 8), Gand, 1979 [1980], p. 3-4). It is reasonable to suppose that our wrongly mounted Homer-papyrus was part of the same acquisition.

<sup>6</sup> LAMEERE W., *Aperçus de paléographie homérique. A propos des papyrus de l'Iliade et de l'Odysée des collections de Gand, de Bruxelles et de Louvain*, (*Les Publications de Scriptorium*, 4), Paris - Bruxelles, 1960, p. 4-6.

<sup>7</sup> TURNER, *o.c.*, p. 1-5.

<sup>8</sup> TURNER E.G., *Ptolemaic Bookhands and Lille Stesichorus* in *S & C*, 4, 1980, p. 19-40, esp. p. 30-31.

<sup>9</sup> COLES, *o.c.*, p. 56.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. ROBERTS C.H., *Greek Literary Hands. 350 B.C. - A.D. 400*, (*Oxford Palaeographical Handbooks*), 1956, p. 3; SCHUBART W., *Paläographie I: Griechische Paläographie*, (*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 1.4.1), München, 1985, p. 25 with Abb. 1,2 (p. 26), 5 (p. 28).

<sup>11</sup> TURNER, *Ptolemaic* ..., p. 27-30, but see also the postscript on p. 40.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *infra* p. 265 with n. 28.

Before giving a transcript of the papyrus, its importance for Homeric papyrology should be stressed. Book T is, in comparison with other cantos of the Iliad, remarkably poorly represented in the papyri. This was convincingly demonstrated in 1971 by A. Wouters:<sup>13</sup> on the occasion of his publication of two papyri of book T, he listed all known papyri containing fragments of the book. Besides his list of ten Homeric papyri, complemented by six non-Homeric papyri preserving some loose verses of the 19th book, only one fragment, with quotations of T 38-9 and 176, has since been discovered: P.Mich. inv. 8432c.<sup>14</sup> Thus, given the considerable overall increase of papyrological evidence, Wouters' conclusion that book T belongs to the Homeric passages least attested by papyrological finds<sup>15</sup> has been spectacularly confirmed.

The small fragment from the Strasbourg collection does not fundamentally alter this situation; while Wouters could state that the papyri supplied about 288 of the 424 verses of book T, this number has now been increased by only seven. But the Strasbourg scrap is certainly the earliest fragment of this book. Wouters' list contained only one item (P.Rein. I 1 = Pack<sup>2</sup> 963) that could belong to the late Ptolemaic period — in the *editio princeps* it was dated to the first century A.D., but later it has been assigned on palaeographical grounds to the first century B.C.<sup>16</sup> Also the newly discovered P.Mich. inv. 4832c is dated by its editor to the late second or the first century B.C.<sup>17</sup> Consequently the new fragment is our only surviving testimony of the pre-Aristarchean state<sup>18</sup> of the text of book T. Moreover, it is hitherto the only papyrus containing lines 325-9, the nearest fragment being P.Trinity College Dublin Sel.Box inv. 128 (T 291-315), published by Wouters. It should be added, however, that part of a parchment-codex edited by W. Schubart (Pack<sup>2</sup> 1203) may contain a scholion on T 326.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>13</sup> WOUTERS A., *Two Papyri of the Iliad, Book T* in *AncSoc*, 2, 1971, p. 52-65.

<sup>14</sup> Published by: RENNER T., *Three New Homeric on Papyrus* in *HSCP*, 83, 1979, p. 331-7. The quotations of book T are interwoven in a kind of summary of the canto. I should thank here P. Mertens for checking the actual state of the papyrological evidence for book T against his unpublished "Mertens-Pack<sup>3</sup>".

<sup>15</sup> WOUTERS, *o.c.*, p. 53-5.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. WEST S., *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*, (*Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Sonderreihe: Papyrologica Coloniensia*, 3), Köln - Opladen, 1967, p. 284; WOUTERS, *o.c.*, p. 55 with n. 15.

<sup>17</sup> RENNER, *o.c.*, p. 332 with n. 31.

<sup>18</sup> I call "pre-Aristarchean" a text that has not yet adopted the *numerus versuum* of Aristarchos' edition. Even an edition from the end of the second century B.C. can be "pre-Aristarchean": cf. WEST, *o.c.*, p. 15-17.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. SCHUBART W., *Griechische literarische Papyri*, (*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philol.-hist. Klasse*, 97.5), Berlin, 1950, p. 45-7 (nr. 21). Recently W. Luppe (*Achilleus bei Lykomedes in P.Berol. 13930 (Pack<sup>2</sup> 1203)* in *APF*, 31, 1985, p. 5-11) has clearly shown that this text has nothing to do with Neoptolemos, but relates the quest for Achilles by the Trojan embassy, who finds him ultimately among Lykomedes' daughters at Skyros. But this does not exclude this mythological account from being a scholion on T 326: compare the transmitted schol. D ad T 326, which also contains Achilles' youth-story: cf. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, ex codicibus aucta et emendata, ed. G. Dindorfius, Tomus IV, 1877, p. 222-3; *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. M. Davies, Göttingen, 1988, p. 75: "F incerti loci intra cyclum epicum 4".

Transcript<sup>20</sup>

cf. Tafel VIIa

→	1. 1	[εινεκα ρ]ιγ[εδανης Ελενης Τρωσιν πολεμιζω]	v. 325
	1. 2	η τον ος εν οι[	v. 326
	1. 3	ει που ετι ζω[ει γε Νεοπολεμος θεοειδης]	v. 327
	1. 4	πριμ μεγ γ[αρ μοι θυμος ενι στηθεσσιν εωλπει]	v. 328
	1. 5	[οιο]ν ε[με] φ[θιςεσθαι απ Αργεος ιπποβοτοιο]	v. 329

## Commentary

1. 1 / v. 325: The traces are perfectly compatible with ιγ, but as far as I can see on the photograph they would also fit ρι — compare with ρι in 1. 4 where the vertical stroke of the *rho* seems to be rather short. Crönert had proposed αι.
1. 2 / v. 326: Crönert read the first letters as ]μῶτον, but he clearly misinterpreted the thickish entry of the cross-stroke of the *tau* as an *omikron*. The first letter is *eta* resembling a *mu*, but note that the difference with *mu* (2 x) in 1. 4 is distinct enough.

The last two legible letters of the line have commonly been identified as οι[ — Snell also proposed ομ[ — and this is confirmed by Schwartz's reading on the original. D. Hagedorn, however, suggested that one might as well read ςκ[. Indeed, it is possible that the ink trace of the last but one letter comes to an end just below the hole, and the difference in size between ς and the other *sigma* on the same line would be no surprise in such a handwriting. Then the presumed *jota* would be the vertical of a *kappa*, although it is somewhat strange that no trace of its diagonals can be discerned. But the reading ςκ[ must certainly not be ruled out.

In any event the remnants of the line on the papyrus do not correspond with the Homeric verse in the vulgate: ἡὲ τὸν ὃς Σκύρω μοι ἐνὶ τρέφεται φίλος υἱός. But the verse, as transmitted in the manuscripts, has always been suspect, mainly because of τόν: this must be governed by πυθοίμην in v. 322, which is not only very distant but is also rarely found with personal accusative.<sup>21</sup> Another irregularity seems to be the position of μοι between a dative of place and a postponed preposition.<sup>22</sup> The latter problem at least could be solved if our papyrus had either η τον ος εν οι[κωι τρεφεται = — φιλος υιος] or η τον ος εν ςκ[υρωι τρεφεται = — φιλος υιος]. So either reading can be supplied as a metrically sound alternative text.<sup>23</sup> For ἐν οἴκῳ τρέφεται, compare P.Berol. 13930 (= Pack<sup>2</sup> 1203), l. 11: ἐν]

<sup>20</sup> The text used for the supplements is taken from T.W. Allen's *OCT*-edition (1920<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>21</sup> See already Eustathius 1187.10-2 (cf. *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, ad fidem codicis Laurentiani ed. M. van der Valk, IV, Leiden - New York - København - Köln, 1987, p. 338); cf. also *The Iliad*, edited with apparatus criticus, prolegomena, notes and appendices by W. Leaf, II: *Books XIII-XXIV*, London, 1902<sup>2</sup>, reprint: 1971, p. 341.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *The Iliad*, ed. by W. Leaf, *l.c.* Indeed I have found no parallels for this position of μοι: H. Ebeling (*Lexicon Homericum*, I, Leipzig, 1885, reprint: Hildesheim, 1963, p. 412: s.v. ἐν) included this verse among his examples where ἐν and the dative are separated by short words such as δέ, δ' ἄρα, μέν, ... But in none of these cases is there anastrophe. Here one would expect ἐνὶ to follow immediately upon the dative.

<sup>23</sup> For the lengthening of ἐν before οἴκῳ, compare I 147 (πρὸς οἴκον) and Z 189 (πάλλιν οἴκόνδε): cf. WEST M., *Greek Metre*, Oxford, 1982, p. 38.

οἰκία τρεφόμεν[ο]ν: this probably refers to Achilles' education at Skyros, not to his son's,<sup>24</sup> but in many ways both stories are doublets.

Thus, although we cannot reconstruct exactly the divergent text of the Strasbourg scrap, it is surely no simple scribal error. If it is not the original reading, it is most probably an attempt to emend a verse which may have been suspected from Ptolemaic times onwards.

- l. 3 / v. 327: Here Crönert read εἰ που ετ, <sup>σ</sup>τι ζω[ or ζυ[, but in reality the papyrus has ετι. Here again the marked entry of the conspicuously long cross-bar of the *tau* has led him to believe that there was originally another letter before it. Close inspection of the photograph and Schwartz's autopsy prove that this is not the case. This verse was athetized on grounds of content by Aristophanes and Aristarchos (cf. scholion *ad* T 327a),<sup>25</sup> and also by some modern scholars,<sup>26</sup> although it has been staunchly defended by others.<sup>27</sup> Evidently the occurrence of the verse in a pre-Aristarchean text is only what we expect, and in itself it proves nothing about its authenticity.
- l. 4 / v. 328: Notice the double assimilation: πριμ μεγ γ[ instead of πριν μεν γ[. According to E. Mayser<sup>28</sup> this assimilation is frequent in the papyri of the third century B.C., becoming more rare in the second century B.C., and disappearing thereafter. This does not only apply to documentary papyri, but also to literary texts especially in the case of the assimilation of nasals at word-end. The phenomenon indeed occurs in other papyri belonging to the same palaeographical group,<sup>29</sup> e.g. in P.Strasbourg inv. Gr. 2342,2, "Alexandros" fr. 23,15 Snell (νεομ φουσαι) and in P.Petrie I 1 (= Pack<sup>2</sup> 433), "Antiope" fr. XLVIII,78 Kambitsis (ωγ χρη) and 110 Kambitsis (τηγ γαρ).
- l. 5 / v. 329: Crönert and his successors had only read ]νε[, but Schwartz has brought to my notice that the upper part of a long vertical stroke is visible just below the first *gamma* of l. 4. Evidently only a *phi* or a *psi* or perhaps a *kappa* can project so radically above the upper line. Here it is no doubt a *phi* belonging to φθίσεσθαι and so favouring the conclusion that the text of this hexameter corresponds with that of the vulgate.

Leuven

Marc Huys

<sup>24</sup> For this papyrus text and its referring to Achilles' youth-story: cf. supra p. 263 n. 19.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia vetera)*, rec. H. Erbse, IV, Berolini, 1975, p. 636; BARTH H.-L., *Die Fragmente aus den Schriften des Grammatikers Kallistratos zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee (Edition mit Kommentar)*, diss., Bonn, 1984, p. 143-54 (with exhaustive commentary); *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, post A. Nauck collegit, testimoniis ornavit, brevi commentario instruxit W.J. Slater, (SGLG, 6), Berlin - New York, 1986, p. 189.

<sup>26</sup> Most of them are enumerated in BOLLING G.M., *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad*, (*Special Publications of the Linguistic Society of America*), Baltimore, 1944, p. 164.

<sup>27</sup> Already Eustathius 1187,12-3 (ed. van der Valk, *l.c.*), and recently again by BARTH, *o.c.*, p. 148-54.

<sup>28</sup> MAYSER E., *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluß der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfaßten Inschriften*, I.1. *Einleitung und Lautlehre*, 2<sup>e</sup> Auflage bearbeitet von H. Schmoll, Berlin, 1970, p. 204-6.

<sup>29</sup> Turner's so-called "group D" of the middle of the third century B.C: cf. supra p. 262 with n. 8.



Homer, Ilias T 325-329 (P.Strasb. inv.Gr.2342-4, Frgm.46)