

JAMES DIGGLE

SOPHOCLES, *ICHNEUTAE* (FR. 314 RADT)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 112 (1996) 3–17

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

SOPHOCLES, *ICHNEUTAE* (FR. 314 RADT)*

5 The marginal note cited by Radt cannot refer to this line, now that the fragment containing lines 1–6 has been placed at the foot of a column preceding col. i (Siegmann, *RhM* 116 (1973) 113–126). The note stands to the left of the fifth from last line of col. ii (line 55) and so refers to line 29 or thereabouts.

12 [. . .] . ους Hunt (who supplied μό[χ]ου),]λ[ου]ς Siegmann (‘χ kaum richtig’), Radt (‘sed Λ incertissimum mihi quidem videtur’). A high dot on the edge of the papyrus, the right tip (not the apex) of a letter, compatible with X but also with at least half a dozen other letters, but not, as Maltese rightly says, with Λ.

15–17

ἐ]γὼ οὐκ ἄν ωίόμην
[οὔτ’ ἄ]ν θεῶν τιν[’ οὔτ’ ἐφημ]έρων βροτῶν
[δρᾶ]σαι τόδ’ ἔργ[ον . . .] πρὸς τόλμαν πεσεῖν.

Radt’s text; Hunt’s supplements. Observe the similarity of 17 to A. Ag. 1635 δρᾶσαι τόδ’ ἔργον οὐκ ἔτλης αὐτοκτόνως.

At 17 Radt’s app. crit. reads: ‘ὦδε suppl. Hunt, ἠδὲ Snell probabilissime; οὐδὲ Vollgraff . . ., longius spatio, ut vid.’ ἠδὲ is not at all probable: ‘to do this deed *and* to dare (to do it)’ is insufferably feeble. ὦδε is inoffensive but lacks point. οὐδὲ has point and is commended by Ar. *Thesm.* 524–527 τάδε γὰρ εἰπεῖν τὴν πανούργον | κατὰ τὸ φανερόν ὦδ’ ἀναιδῶς | οὐκ ἄν ωίόμην ἐν ἡμῖν | οὐδὲ τολμῆαί ποτ’ ἄν.

But Radt (and Maltese too) says that there may be insufficient space for οὐδὲ. They are mistaken. The space occupied γ[]π is 26 mm. With the supplement -γ[ον οὐδὲ] π- this space must accommodate 8 letters. From the immediate context we can readily find sequences of 8 letters which occupy no more than 26 mm.: 7 ΓΓΕΛΩ[Β]ΡΟ, 8 ΝΟΥΜΑΙΤΕ, 12 ΠΟΡΤΙΔΩΝ, 13 ΝΙΧΝΟΚΚΟ, 14 ΜΟΥΚΑΠΗΣ, 16 ΡΩΝΒΡΟΤΩ, 17 ΡΟΚΤΟΛΜΗ and ΜΗΝΠΕΣΕΙ (the 8 letters of ΗΝΠΕΣΕΙΝ occupy only 23 mm.), 18 ΟΥΝΕΠΕΙΠ and (9 letters) ΕΚΠΛΑΓΕΙΣ, 19 ΠΑΝΤΕΛΕΣ, 20 ΑΓΝΟΕΙΝΤ and ΟΕΙΝΤΑΔΕ, 21 ΕΙΚΚΥΝΗΓ. All depends upon the identity of the letters in question. The sequence ΟΝΟΥΔΕ contains two omicrons and an epsilon, two of the most economical letters.

18 Radt reads the beginning as]’ΟΥΝ (‘ante apostrophum manifestum vestigium – accentus pot. qu. litterae – mihi dispicere videor’). There is only the apostrophe, whose lower part (the ‘accent’) fails to meet the upper curve, because a fibre of papyrus has been lost.

34 Δωρικο[Hunt, -κο[Maltese, -κη[Siegmann, Radt. The right leg of Η would be too close to the left leg. If Ο, there is a further faint trace of ink above. In spite of this trace, Ο is more likely.

41–42 μαριλοκαυ]τῶν at the beginning of 40 enables us to measure the gaps at the beginnings of 41–42. In 41 the Ε of]ΕΙΩΝ will have stood directly under the Υ of μαριλοκαυτῶν. So there are about 8 letters missing, not 6 (Hunt, Radt, Maltese). ἠ τῶν ὀρ]είων (Wilamowitz) supplies 6; εἴτ’ οὖν ὀρ]είων supplies 8. See Denniston, *GP* 419 (add *Ph.* 345). At the beginning of 42 there are 6 letters missing, rather than 5 (Hunt, Radt, Maltese). The first visible letter is Ν (Hunt) or Ω (Siegmann), not Μ (Siegmann): Radt and Maltese rightly deny Μ, but Maltese is wrong to deny Ω. (Maltese’s Plate does

* My reports of P. Oxy. 1174 are based on photographs, followed by inspection of the papyrus under the microscope. By ‘Siegmann’ I refer to E. Siegmann, *Untersuchungen zu Sophokles’ Ichneutai* (Hamburg 1941). Earlier editions to which I refer may be found listed in S. Radt, *TrGF* 4 (Göttingen 1977), and E. V. Maltese, *Sofocle, Ichneutae* (Florence 1982). To these should now be added Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones’ Loeb edition of the fragments of Sophocles (1996). I am very grateful to Sir Hugh for helpful comments on this paper. I shall not draw attention to places where he has adopted my proposals in the Loeb edition; but I shall mention some in which he has not.

not show the cross-stroke which rises to the left from the foot of the right vertical). θηρῶ]ν (Wilamowitz) supplies only 4 letters; Κατύρῶ]ν supplies 6. Cf. E. *Cycl.* 100.

44 κε[ίμενος (‘Ἐ[, Ὀ[, Ω[(vestigium accentus dispicere mihi videor)’ Radt). The ‘accent’ is almost certainly the top, separated by surface damage from the bottom, of E.

45–50

- 45 [. . .]ζου φώνημα τὼς ἐπέκλυον
 [βοῶ]ντος ὀρθίοισι cὺν κηρύγμασι,
 [c]πουδῆι τάδ’, ἢ πάρεστι πρεσβύτη[ι
 [c]οί, Φοῖβ’ ἸΑπολλων, προσφιλῆς εὐε[ργέτης
 θέλων γενέσθαι τῶιδ’ ἐπεσσύθην δρ[ό]μω[ι,
 50 ἄν πως τὸ χρῆμα τοῦτό σοι κυνηγ[έ]ω.

Radt’s text; Hunt’s supplements. These are the opening words of Silenus, in answer to Apollo’s appeal for help.

In 45 Hunt printed [ὦ Φοῖβε], σοῦ φωνήμα(θ)’ ὡς, admitting that ‘ὦ Φοῖβε is a rather longer supplement than is expected’. It is far too long; and ὦ Φοῖβε, σοῦ . . . σοί, Φοῖβ’ ἸΑπολλων would be unbearably repetitious. Hunt offered no comment on his alteration of φώνημα τὼς to φωνήμαθ’ ὡς. Diehl comments that ‘pluralis huius vocis usus a Sophocle alienus esse videtur’. Indeed, such a plural is unwelcome: see the discussion of plural for singular in A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (1982) 4–7. Of the other supplements listed by Radt most are too long; the two which are not are unthinkable.

Those who accept τὼς are obliged to give it the sense ‘when’. Such a sense is unexampled. Examples of τὼς fall into two classes: (i) = demonstrative οὕτως, ‘thus, so’: κείνος τὼς ἀγόρευε H. *Il.* 2.330 (Ar.: θ’ ὡς uel δ’ ὡς codd.), 14.48 (γ’ ὡς uel θ’ ὡς pars codd.), *Od.* 18.271 (Ar.: θ’ ὡς uel δ’ ὡς codd.); *Il.* 3.415 τὼς δέ σ’ ἀπεχθήρω ὡς νῦν ἔκπαγλα φίλησα, *Od.* 19.234 τὼς μὲν ἔην μαλακός, Hes. *Theog.* 892 τὼς γάρ οἱ φρακάτην, *Sc.* 20 (= fr. 195.20 M–W) τὼς (Π⁵: ὡς codd.) γάρ οἱ διέκειτο, 219 τὼς γάρ μιν . . . τεῦξεν, 441–442 τὼς (ἄρ’) (Solmsen: τὼς J: τόσσηι cett.) ὁ μὲν ἰαχῆι . . . κεκληγὼς ἐπόρουσεν, 478–479 τὼς γάρ μιν ἸΑπόλλων . . . ἦνωξ’, A. *ScT* 483–485 ὡς . . . βάζουσιν . . . , τὼς νιν . . . ἐπίδοι, *Su.* 68–70 τὼς καὶ ἐγὼ . . . δάπτω, 670 τὼς πόλις εὖ νέμοιτο, S. *Ai.* 841–842 τὼς . . . ὀλοίατο (spurious), plausibly conjectured in *OT* 510–511 τὼς (Lloyd-Jones: τῶι(δ’) codd.: των Π) ἀπ’ ἐμᾶς φρενὸς οὐποτ’ ὀφλήσει κακίαν,¹ Bacchyl. 5.31–33 τὼς νῦν καὶ (ἐ)μοὶ μυρία πάντα κέλευθος . . . ὕμνεῖν, Parmenides 28 B (8. 21 DK) τὼς . . . ἀπέβεσται; (ii) = relative ὡς, ‘as’: *Ichn.* 303 ὡς αἰέλουρος εἰκάσαι πέφυκεν ἢ τὼς πόρδαλις;² fr. 431 κάτω κρέμανται, σπίζα τὼς (Walker: τέως codd.) ἐν ἔρκεσιν, Ar. *Ach.* 762 (Megarian) τὼς ἀρωραῖοι μύες, alabastron c. 480 B.C. (Beazley, *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* (1963²) 306) ἸΑφροδιμία καλέ, τὼς δοκεῖ Εὐχίροι, and three doubtful passages in Aeschylus, *ScT* 637 ἀτιμαστῆρα τὼς ἀνδρηλάτην, *Su.* 718 τὼς (τῶς[’] M) ἄν οὐ φίλη, *Ag.* 242 πρέπουσα τὼς (Maas, *Jahresber. Philol. Verein Berlin* 41 (1915) 237 = *Kl. Schr.* (1973) 38) ἐν γραφαῖς. There is possibly a further example of τὼς at *Ichn.* 295,] | τὼς ἐξεφ[, but since the immediate surroundings are not available we cannot classify it.³

If τὼς is given its commonest sense, ‘thus’, it may be combined with [βοῶ]ντος (not the only possible supplement, but a plausible one), on the model of the epic κείνος τὼς ἀγόρευε cited above (the interposed ἐπέκλυον causes no more awkwardness than at *Tr.* 1231 ὦδ’ ὄραν φρονούντα). Then we may look for a connective word in what precedes. It is unlikely that ζου represents ζc οὔ, for elsewhere the second hand adds accent and breathing to the genitive of the relative pronoun (80, 154). Maltese

¹ See H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea* (1990) 91.

² We should write, rather, πάρδαλις. See A. H. Sommerstein on Ar. *Lys.* 1015.

³ At 230–231 κατέκλ[υ]ον | ὁμοῦ πρέπον κέλευμά πως κυνηγετ[ῶ]ν Lloyd-Jones prints κέλευμ’ ὅπως. We might consider κέλευμα τὼς. The τὼς printed by Mette in A. fr. 17.40 (78c.4 Radt) is rightly ignored by Radt.

observes that the ζ could be ξ : all that is visible is a trace on the level of the line, with a slight upward inclination to the right, which is found regularly in ζ , occasionally in ξ . He suggests ἐγὼ θ]εοῦ. The pronoun is unsuitable. I suggest ἐπεὶ θ]εοῦ. There is room enough: E and I are narrow letters.

At the end of 47 Hunt's μαθών provides a construction for τάδ', but τάδ' . . . μαθών does not cohere well in sense with σπουδῆ ἢ πάρεστι πρεσβύτη. Bignone's βαρεῖ⁴ provides no construction for τάδ'. Walker's πέρι gives an uncomfortable anastrophe, and calls for genitive not accusative. Steffen's μολών is rejected by Radt because 'insolitus esset vocis τάδε usus adverbialis (Steffen) vel localis'. The objection is proved invalid by OT 1005 τοῦτ' ἀφικόμην, ὅπως . . ., OC 1291 ἂ δ' ἦλθον ἤδη σοι θέλω λέξαι.⁵ But τάδ' . . . μολών is a rather flat anticipation of 49 τῶιδ' ἐπεccύθην δρ[ό]μω[ι]. I suggest τελών (future), a verb often used to connote the execution of a command: Ai. 528 ἐὰν μόνον τὸ ταχθὲν εὔ τολμῶι τελεῖν, OT 252 ὑμῖν δὲ ταῦτα πάντ' ἐπισκήπτω τελεῖν, Tr. 285–286 ταῦτα γὰρ πόσις τε cὸς | ἐφεῖτ', ἐγὼ δὲ πιττὸς ὦν κείνωι τελῶ, OC 12–13 μανθάνειν γὰρ ἤκομεν . . . ἂν δ' ἀκούσωμεν τελεῖν, 465 ὡς νῦν πᾶν τελοῦντι προξένει, 503 ἀλλ' εἴμ' ἐγὼ τελοῦσα, E. Or. 1670 (after a command from Apollo) ἀλλ' εὔ τελεῖται, πείσομαι δὲ σοῖς λόγοις, H. Od. 4.485 ταῦτα μὲν οὔτω δὴ τελέσω, γέρον, ὡς cὺ κελεύεις. The verb will suitably echo παντελὲς κήρυγμα at 19 and (in view of εὐεργέτης in the next line) will be suitably echoed by παντελής (Pearson: προτελής pap.) εὐεργέτης at 85.

In 50 (and in 74 and 171) ὄν should be changed to ἦν.

56 τ[. 'The letters τ[are on a small fragment which no doubt belongs to one of the first three columns, and must on account of the paragraphi come from the bottom of col. ii; its location in this line is, however, quite conjectural' (Hunt). The fragment should be placed at the beginning not of 56 but of 57. It has been mounted upside down under the glass; and so it appears in Maltese's Plate and my own photograph. When placed the right way up it can be seen to exhibit the same worm-eaten outlines as a section (attached to col. iii) of the margin between cols. ii and iii, opposite the end of 57. The letter identified by Hunt as Α is represented only by a short stroke descending from left to right. The surface beneath the stroke is damaged, and Α must remain very uncertain. What has not previously been reported is a trace from the line below, a tiny high speck beginning at the point where the right tip of the horizontal of τ ends. So the fragment should be reported as

τ . [

[.] . [.

Hunt proceeds: 'If it is rightly placed, Fr. I will follow below, though whether in 24–5 [57–58 Radt] or 25–6 [58–59 Radt] cannot be determined.' Fr. I was read by Hunt as

Siegmann may be right to prefer Π to Η. I am less sure that he is right to prefer Φ to Δ. If Fr. I really does belong to this column, then the trace which I have detected under the second letter of τ . [in 57 will be the second letter of 58, which should therefore be printed as beginning Π . [.

62 πο[ι Hunt, πῶ[ς Siegmann, Radt, πῶ[Maltese. Radt and Maltese fail to note that Siegmann saw a trace of the circumflex (which confirms that ω not o is right). The circumflex extends just over the left top of ω, as at 141].ῶς, 365 τῶιδε.

78 παραδειγματα Hunt, πα[ρ]αδειγματα Radt, Maltese. The P is no longer present under the glass, nor is it present in Maltese's Plate. But it is present on my photograph. It stands on a small slip of papyrus precariously attached to the line above – so precariously that it evidently became detached and has now gone astray. This slip also preserves the upper right of the M of ΔAIMON in 79.

⁴ *Atti della R. Accad. delle scienze di Torino* 48 (1912–13) 778–779.

⁵ See KG 1.310 Anmerk. 6, Jebb on OT 788, Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* 42. And compare Homeric τόδ' ἰκάνεις and the like (LSJ s.u. ὅδε IV.2, P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* 2 (1963) 44).

In 80 the top right of C and the following OY (with rough breathing ⁺ and circumflex added by the corrector) are preserved on another slip of papyrus, which is present in my photograph. The slip is no longer in place under the glass, nor is it present in Maltese's Plate. Yet neither Radt nor Maltese registers that it is missing. Like the slip above, it has become detached, but I have found it: mounted upside down at the top of this column after]TΩ[in 61. And that is where it can be seen in Maltese's Plate. And so now we have the explanation for Radt's note on 62 'supra T notam ⁺ scripsit corrector', and Maltese's 'spatio inter litt. Y et T notam ⁺ superscripsit P², quam primus dispiciens supra T tamen legit Radt'.

The explanation for this unhappy state of affairs is clear. From time to time the papyrus has been removed from the glass, in order that various detached fragments might be located in places suggested for them by Siegmann. Proof of this is that fr. 23a stands at the top of col. iii in my photograph, where Siegmann (10–11) originally located it, before col. i in Maltese's Plate, where Siegmann afterwards located it (*RhM* 116 (1973) 123) and where it now stands under the glass. The papyrus has been damaged during these operations. My photographs are taken from a negative made before this damage occurred, Maltese's from one made after it had occurred.

85 [Φοίβωι τ]' ἄνακτι. The supplement seems inevitable. I detect a tiny speck at the bottom edge of the papyrus, below the O of E]MOI in 84, compatible with the top of I. So ΦO]I[BΩI.

110 αὐτ' ἐκτὶ τοῦτο μέτρον [.]κμε[. .]μ[.]νον. So Hunt read the end. Pearson's [ἐ]κμε[μαγ]-μ[ἐ]νον better suits the space and the sense than Hunt's [ἐ]κμε[τρού]μ[ε]νον. Radt denies that either supplement suits the traces, and Maltese appears to agree with him. Radt describes the trace before O as 'pars infima litterae E, O, Σ, Θ, Β, Λ, Α, ut vid.'. Siegmann, like Hunt, read N, and the trace is compatible with the right end of the crossbar of N, which sometimes meets the right vertical not at an angle but (having, as it were, finished its descent prematurely) horizontally. So e.g. 40 εN, 51 κειμεNov, 70 διαNυτων, 99 απαNτα, 102 εκειNα, 116 κειNων, 158 [π]τηccoNτοc. After the O Siegmann read YC, which I judge to be impossible (there is no trace, as there ought to be, of the foot of Y), and denied that N was possible. Radt read O[.] . [.]. The solitary visible trace is compatible with the end of a similarly shaped crossbar. The right vertical of the N will have extended slightly lower than the left, as it sometimes does.

115–116

ἀλλ' αὐτὰ μὴν ἴχ[νη τε] χῶ ζτίβοc τάδε
κείνων ἐναργῆ τῶν β[ο]ῶν μαθεῖν πάρα.

The construction has caused unnecessary difficulties. Wilamowitz first (ap. Hunt) proposed to punctuate after ζτίβοc, later (*Neue Jahrb. f. d. klass. Altertum* 29 (1912) 457 = *Kl. Schr.* 1 (1971) 358) after βοῶν, and the latter punctuation is adopted by Lloyd-Jones. The construction was rightly explained by Hunt ('I take ἴχ[νη . . . ζτίβοc as the subject of πάρα and μαθεῖν as epexegetic') and (if I rightly apprehend him) by Pearson, and the lines were rightly translated by Page ('here are the very steps and trail of Apollo's cattle, clear to see'). For the epexegetis Maltese compares *Tr.* 223–224 τάδ' ἀντίπρωρα δὴ σοι | βλέπειν πάρεcτ' ἐναργῆ. What also needs to be observed is that ἴχ[νη τε] χῶ ζτίβοc τάδε is an example of the διὰ μέσου construction, comparable to E. *Cycl.* 604 αὐτόν τε ναύταc τ' ἀπολέcητ' Ὀδυσσεά, *Herc.* 774–776 ὁ χρυσοc ἄ τ' εὐτυχία . . . ἐφέλκων, *Hyps.* fr. 60.13–14 (p. 40 Bond) ὦ πρῶρα καὶ λευκαῖνον ἐξ ἄλμης ὕδωρ | Ἀργούc. See KG 1.80, West on Hes. *Op.* 406, Diggle, *ICS* 6 (1981) 92 = *Euripidea* (1994) 208.

120 τίc ὁ τρόποc τοῦ τάγματ[οc; (τροποc Hunt, τροχοc Siegmann, Radt, Maltese). 'Erhalten sind nur die beiden nach rechts ausgehenden Enden des χ' (Siegmann 60). On the contrary, there is a third trace, which would have to be the left lower tip of X. The distance between the two right traces is shorter than normal for X, though not quite unexampled. But when account is taken of the larger distance between the two lower traces, it is clear that X would be of a shape unexampled, squat and elongated. Even if the left trace (which seals the matter) were not visible, I should identify the two right traces as belonging to Π rather than to X because they are the normal distance apart for the top and

bottom of the right side of Π. The upper trace is a little to the right of the lower, because the horizontal will have projected a little beyond the vertical, as at 12 Πορτιδων, 42 Παειν, 43 Παιωνος, 50 Πως, 54 ειΠερ, 155 Παρ, 169 Παρων, 218 Πεδορτον, 260 οΠερ, 303 Πορδαλις, 332 Πορευω. In any case, τροχος τοῦ τάγματος (or πράγματος, the corrector's marginal variant) is an unbelievable expression (τροχος, of the sun's course, at *Ant.* 1065, cited by Siegmann, does nothing to justify it), and τρόπος is supported by *OT* 99 τίς ὁ τρόπος τῆς ζυμοφοῶς; *E. Herc.* 965–966 τίς ὁ τρόπος ξενώσεως | τῆςδ';, *Ph.* 390 τίς ὁ τρόπος αὐτοῦ; *Ar. Au.* 94 τίς ὁ τρόπος τῆς τριλοφίας; and *Vesp.* 30 τὴν τρόπιν τοῦ πράγματος, the latter adduced by P. Shorey, *CPh* 13 (1918) 96.

122 κυμ[επλεγ]μένα Hunt, 'eher B als Π' Siegmann, hence κυμβ[εβλη]μένα von Blumenthal (*Gnomon* 18 (1942) 91) and Snell (according to Radt, who seems wrong to give him priority), accepted by Radt. The trace is too long and flat for the top of B. I agree with H. Maehler, as reported by E. Degani (*Eikasmos* 2 (1991) 97), that Π is more likely; and I add that Hunt's longer supplement better suits the space.

135 τ[c. vi ciγ]ᾶτ', ὦ πρ[ὸ τοῦ . . . ᾿. . .]ατοι. The marginal variant ciγᾶθ' οἱ προ του (which could be right: cf. *E. Or.* 1283) guarantees πρ[ὸ τοῦ], and Wilamowitz's λαλίτ[α]τοι is more than 'very probable' (Radt). I read πρ[ο] τ[ου] λ[αλιτ]ατοι. There are two high specks, not previously noticed,⁶ which I take to belong to the extreme right tip of T and the apex of Λ.

139 Hunt read καὶ πῶς ἀκούσ[ω μηδεν]δς φωνήν κλύων; (cf. 299 καὶ πῶς πίθωμαι . . .); Siegmann (14, 61–62) καλῶς ἀκούσ[ομ' οὐδεν]δς, and this is accepted by Radt and Maltese. In the Addenda to *TrGF* 3 (p. 571) Radt admits that the elision is 'insolita'. It is unthinkable. The recent patronage of such elisions by M. Hose, *Hermes* 122 (1994) 32–43, leaves me unmoved.

Siegmann claimed that there is space for only one letter between Α and Ω. The papyrus has been badly mounted under the glass. The part of the papyrus containing the right hand portion of the line (from ΠΩC onwards) has been allowed to overlap the part containing the beginning. The same fault is present in 140, where the part containing ΠΠΘΟΥ overlaps the part containing EM. Since Hunt read EMOIΠΠΘΟΥ without any indication of doubt over the O (which is not now visible), we may assume that the two parts of the papyrus did not overlap when he handled it.

Siegmann's ΚΑΛ is impossible. The two traces which he identified as belonging to the left foot of Α and the right foot of Λ belong to the left and right feet of Α. The right trace, as well as the left, is on the same piece of papyrus which contains the K. This may be confirmed by looking at the verso of the papyrus. We must assume that Hunt really did see a trace of I, which has now been masked by the overlap. The high trace which follows suits the right upper tip of Π.

The overlap continues in 141, where Hunt read EM[. . .], Siegmann (followed by Radt and Maltese) EM[. . .]. There will have been room for EM[OY] or EM[OI].

144–148

145 <Cι.> . . . ψόφωι, τὸν οὐδε[ῖ]ς π[ώπο]τ' ἤκουεν βροτῶν.
τί μοι ψ[ό]φον; φοβ[. . .] . κα[. . .] δειμαίνετε
μάλθης ἀναγνα κό[μα]τ' ἐκμεμαγμένα
κάκιςτα θηρῶν ὄνθ[. . .]ν [π]άσει κκιᾶι
φόβον βλέποντες . . .

The papyrus has a colon after ψ[ό]φον, 'unde notam interrogationis posui', says Radt.⁷ Hunt himself had remarked that 'The punctuation apparently indicated by the papyrus is quite defensible (cf. e.g. Aristoph. *Acharn.* 345 μή μοι πρόφαειν) but less natural than that adopted'.

⁶ They are just visible in Maltese's Plate, more clearly in Plate 34 of the 1st ed. (1971) of E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, much less clearly in the 2nd ed. (1987).

⁷ Radt was anticipated by A. von Blumenthal, as Maltese observes, though not in the article to which he refers but in *Gnomon* 18 (1942) 91–92.

The Aristophanic passage exemplifies an ellipse very common in prohibitions: Ar. *Nub.* 84 μή μοί γε τοῦτον, *Vesp.* 1179 μή μοί γε μύθους, *Au.* 145–146 μηδαμῶς | ἡμῖν γε παρὰ θάλατταν, Alexis 132.1 Kassel–Austin μή προφάσεις ἐνταῦθά μοι, *Ephippus* 21.3 K.–A. μή μοι βρέφη, *Pherecr.* 67.4 K.–A. μή μοι φακούς, *Dem.* 4.19 μή μοι μυρίους μηδὲ διςμυρίους ξένους. Variations on this are Ar. *Lys.* 922 μή μοί γε, *E. Med.* 964 μή μοι κύ, *S. OC* 1441, *E. Ph.* 532 (and often) μή κύ γε, *Ion* 1331 μή ταῦτα, *S. El.* 369 μηδὲν πρὸς ὀργήν, *Ant.* 577 μή τριβὰς ἔτ'. See KG 1.330, 2.571, Schwyzer 2.707, P. T. Stevens, *CQ* 39 (1945) 101. None of these has any affinity to a question τί μοι ψόφον;.

One might say τί μοι ψόφον; (*H. Il.* 21.360 τί μοι ἔριδος καὶ ἀρωγῆς; *Men. Ep.* 253–254 Sandbach ἐμοί | τί παιδοτροφίας καὶ κακῶν;) or (because of preceding ψόφωι) τί ψόφωι; (see *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (1981) 51). But τί μοι ψόφον; appears to be unexampled.

We must read (with Hunt) to τί μοι ψ[ό]φον φοβ[εῖ]θε κα[ι] δειμάινετε . . .: Radt and Maltese reject these supplements because Siegmann has persuaded them that before κα[ι] there is a trace (which Hunt did not see) of a vertical, indicating a letter such as I or N, and incompatible with E. The trace is on a thin slip of papyrus which is now contiguous (at its narrowest end) with the part containing KA[ι], but looks as if it may once have been separate from it (there is a clear break between the two pieces of papyrus). We may doubt not only whether the slip is attached at the right angle but also (in view of Hunt's failure to report the trace) whether it belongs here at all. If the slip does belong here, the trace could just as well be part of E as part of I or N, since it shows a very slight curve. But I judge it prudent to disregard the trace altogether.

ψόφον φοβεῖθε calls to mind fr. 61.2 ἅπαντα γὰρ τοι τῶι φοβουμένωι ψοφεῖ, *E. Ph.* 269 κτύπον φοβούμεθα, and the adjective ψοφοδεής. Note also 157–158 ψόφοι . . . [π]τήσσοντος.

In 147 Hunt read οντ[ι]ν and supplied ὄντ[ι]ν. The ἐ]ν is inescapable, but ὄντ[ι]ν cannot be right, for four reasons. (i) Τ is impossible. The letter is represented by a speck not quite as low as the bottom of the right vertical of the preceding N. It is not low enough, and is too close to the N, to be the tip of the vertical of T. In fact it is not the tip of a vertical but the bottom left arc of a rounded letter. (ii) There is hardly room for more than two letters in the lacuna. (iii) κάκιςα θηρῶν ὄντες is impossible Greek. At 153 we have κάκιςα θηρίων, and there would be no linguistic objection to κάκιςα θηρίων ὄντες, with a neuter predicate for the masculine participle (KG 1.53–54, 65), a structure little more striking than Ar. *Au.* 366–367 τί μέλλετ', ὃ πάντων κάκιςα θηρίων, | ἀπολέσαι παθόντες οὐδὲν . . .: But we cannot have κάκιςα θηρῶν, whatever the gender of the participle. So Pearson's κάκιςα θηρῶν ὄντ[ι]ν (in any case an impossibly long supplement) solves nothing. (iv) We do not want an expression which feebly anticipates κάκιςα θηρίων at 153.

Siegmann's ὄνθ[ι]ν ὡς ἐ]ν falls foul of objections (ii), (iii), (iv), and is unmetrical. But Θ suits the trace. The problems of syntax and space are solved by Walker's unnoticed ὄνθ[ι]ν, 'foul bits of animal dung', an appropriately physical image after 146, 'vile bodies moulded from wax'. The noun ὄνθος is Homeric and occurs in A. fr. 275.2. Another word for 'dung' occurs later (the marginal variant π[ε]λεθοῖς βοῶν cited by Radt on 452). The diminutive, not attested, is at home in a satyr-play: like 153 θηρίων, and *E. Cycl.* 185 ἀνθρώπιον, 266–267 ὁ Κυκλώπιον, | ὁ δεσποτίσκε, 316 ἀνθρωπίσκε, fr. 282a Snell (Phot. A 1760 Theodoridis) ἀνδρίων, A. fr. 26 θηρίων, fr. 78a.29 φ[αλλί]α, *TrGF* 20 Achaeus F 26.2 Ἡρακλεί(διον), *TrGF* 43 Crit. F 19.39 χωρίωι, *TrGF* 60 Astyd. F 3.2 κυμβία. The diminutive κόπριον, regular in prose, supplies an analogy. Similar abuse: Ar. *Pax* 790 σφυράδων ἀποκνίςματα, *Eur.* 306 Kassel–Austin ἀποπάτημ' ἀλώπεκος, *Men.* fr. 363 ὁ μύχοδος γέρων, *Cic. De Or.* 3.164 *stercus curiae* . . . *Glauciam*.

150 Hunt read διακονουντες [.] [.] ατ' ει [.] ιδ [.] ιν μονον (διακονοῦντες, [c]ῶ[μ]ατ' εἰ[c]-ιδ[ε]ῖν μόνον). The new scrap (P. Oxy 2081 (a) fr. 1), which he afterwards inserted in 149–51, provides only the M and part of the A of κόματ'. There was never any trace of the Ω. Nor is there any trace of the C of κόματ' which Siegmann purported to find. The correct report is not κόματ' (Radt, Maltese) but [cω]ματ'.

193 οὐχὶ καλ[ὸ]ν ἐπιδ[Radt, Maltese, adopting ΟΥΧΙ (Siegmann) in preference to CYTI (Hunt). I regard X as almost impossible. The high traces all appear to belong to a single horizontal, which is now broken, because a fibre has been lost. The low trace which Siegmann identified as the tip of the right leg of X is far too low. It must be (as Siegmann admitted it might be) the bottom of an acute accent on E in 194. Half way along the horizontal I detect what may be the juncture with a missing vertical. So T. The first letter (only a curved top) could be E, O, C. If the first two letters are EY or OY, we get a metrical sequence which may be compared with the puzzling 198 ἦ τάχ' ὀπόταν ἀπίη[ις (2 cretics?). But CY is more appealing, since it gives an initial sequence of six shorts, like 178, 183, 186, 194, 195, 202 (compatible with dochmiacs, iambics, or proceleusmatics).

Everyone reports καλ[ο]ν. But part of the O is preserved.

217 ὁ[. .]ῦ φαν[. .]αιτοικιν. Siegmann saw the accent. So (as Radt says) Hunt's ὁ [δ' ο]ῦ is out of court. But Siegmann's ὁ[μο]ῦ φανο[ῦ]μαι τοῖσιν will not do. The first person φανοῦμαι is ruled out by the following ἀλλ' ἐγὼ, as Radt observes, and φανε[ῖ]ται (φανε[εῖ]ται Hunt) suits the traces just as well (Φ is well nigh certain, and E, a mere speck at mid height, is as likely as O). And ὁ[μο]ῦ is improbable, since we should not expect this word to be given an accent: it does not have one at 231, 233, 238. So either ὁ[δ' α]ῦ (αῦ as at 119, 121, 124 bis, 306, 312) or ὁ[δ' ε]ῦ (as 170 εῦ). It is hard to see how ὁ[δ' α]ῦ φανε[ῖ]ται τοῖσιν would suit the context. As a long shot I hazard ὁ[δ' ε]ῦ φανε[ῖ]ται, as a mistake for ε]ῦφ[ρ]ανε[ῖ]ται. LSJ cite the middle from Xen. *Symp.* 7.5; for future middles as passives see KG 1.114–116.

223–226

τίς μετάστασις πόνων,
οὐκ πρόσθεν εἶχεσ δεσπότηι χάριν φέρων,
225 υ . .ινοσ αἰεὶ νεβρίνηι καθημμέν[ο]ς
δοῦραι χερ[ο]ῖν τε θύρ[ο]ν εὐπαλῆ φέρων . . .:

Radt's text. At the beginning of 225 Maltese's ὑποῖνος is admirable. At the end of 226 I suggest φορῶν for φέρων (note φέρων at the end of 224), as at E. *Ba.* 496 τόνδε (sc. θύρ[ο]ν) . . . φορῶ. For the propriety of φορεῖν and its frequent confusion with φέρειν see Lobeck, *Phrynichus* (1820) 585–587, Cobet, *Coll. Crit.* (1878) 205–206, Barrett on *Hi.* 316.

I should punctuate (differently from previous editors) with a question mark after 224. Lines 225–228 are a statement explaining the nature of the previous πόνοι, which have now been replaced by newer ones.

238 [κ]ληδῶν ὁμοῦ πάμφυρ[τ]' ἐγειν[ι (Hunt, Radt, Maltese). The phraseology does not inspire confidence; the context is too defective to help. I do not believe that [κ]ληδῶν is possible. The first trace is a speck level with the crossbar of H. It is not compatible with Λ. Even if it were, there would not be space for K before it. ΗΔ is certain. Then there is a gap of at least one letter before a detached scrap of papyrus. The size of the gap can be established by reference to 237, where a similar gap accommodated A and part of Y, and by reference to 239, where the apex of the second λ and the top of the left arc of ω must be aligned above the lower traces of these letters in the non-detached papyrus. The detached scrap has been mounted about 3 mm. too far left – and so it is shown in Maltese's Plate and my photograph. And this has misled Maltese into marking a gap of only one letter, not two, after κηρυκ[in 236. After the gap, no trace of Ω, NO very doubtful, ΜΟΥΠΑ certain, M wholly uncertain, Φ almost certain, YP possible, the apostrophe certain, ΕΓ possible. I should report the line as [(.) . ηδ[. (.)] . . μουπά . φυρ[.]' ἐγειν[.

I doubt if ἴλη δ[όμω] μου (Lloyd-Jones) is right.

242 νο[.]νεῖται ἀναιτίαν (Hunt, Radt, Maltese). νο[was reported by Hunt; Radt and Maltese print it without qualm. Presumably it stood on a detached scrap. I cannot identify it on any of the five scraps now mounted just beneath this column.

‘I should like to read τί νόμφη]ν ἐπτοεῖτ’, but though the supposed π of ποεῖτ may well be τ (or γ), π for τ is not possible. A fair sense, however, is obtainable with ἔτι ποεῖτ’, “what will you do next to an innocent nymph?” (Hunt). But τί ἔτι ποεῖτε does not mean ‘what will you do next?’

Hunt’s reading has one vertical too many. I cannot reconcile ΤΠΠ with the three verticals visible; and I see nothing to suggest that another may have been lost. And I believe that O is Θ, whose upper part has been rubbed away. The top of the letter is flat (compatible with the crossbar of Θ, unusual for the top of O) and I detect traces of both of the upper sides rising from it. θεῖτ’ ἀναίτιαν is conceivable, ‘would make blameless’, whether θεῖτ’ is 2nd plural aorist active optative or 3rd singular aorist middle. Can we now make sense of what precedes?

If Θ, the letter before it is likely to be I. We need a short vowel, and the only other possibility is Y, which gives -υθεῖτ’, not a promising sequence. If I, the letter before it could be T, and the letter before that could be Y. This last descends below the line (as Y usually does) and stands at exactly the correct distance apart from T. Before Y, the left arc of a curved letter, compatible with O. I hazard ἄ]ν οὐ τιθεῖτ’ ἀναίτιαν, ‘you/it would not make blameless’ (τιθεῖτε or τιθεῖτο).

I have also contemplated ἄν αἰτίαν. But I should expect the words to have diacritical marks to indicate the division (as 239 αν ἄλλωσ). Feminine ἀναίτια is supported by A. Ch. 873, and μεταίτια Tr. 447, A. Ch. 100, παραιτία A. Ch. 910.

243–244 νόμφη βαθύζωνε π[αῦσαι χόλου] | τοῦδ’ (Hunt’s text, Murray’s supplement). ‘Nach dem Π[am Ende sind noch Buchstabenreste: O eher als A, danach ist I sehr wohl möglich. Also etwa: ποῖ[ου τελος] τουδ’ (Siegmann 17). ‘post Π vestigia duarum litterarum dispexit Siegmann; prioris nihil manet nisi punctulum, alterius infima pars hastae verticalis infra lineam protrudentis; spatium inter Π et hanc litteram tam angustum ut vix alii litterae atque O sufficere videatur (certe A legi posse negaverim); ΟΥ[?]’ (Radt).

The traces are compatible with ΠΑΥ[. The ‘punctulum’ is a speck on the edge of the papyrus, not quite as low as the foot of the right leg of Π. This is where we find the left tip of A at (e.g.) 19 ΠΑντελεσ, 43 ΠΑιωνοσ, 71 ΠΑτρικαν, 72 ΠΑι, 116 ΠΑρα. The second trace is too low to be the right bottom tip of A. But it is the correct distance below the line to be the bottom tip of Y. The vertical of Y sometimes slopes slightly to the left as it descends, and sometimes it ends in a tail which curves back even further to the left. At 121 ΑΥ, 124 the second ΑΥ, and 165 τΑΥτ’, the tail of Y extends back as far as the right bottom tip of A. In these three places the distance between the left tip of A and the foot of Y is no greater than the distance between the traces in 243. Even at 368 πΑΥου, where the Y does not curve left, the distance is scarcely greater.

247 μή με μὴ προσαλ[. The scribe wrote ΜΔΕΜΕΜΗ, and the corrector deleted ΔΕ by writing a line above the letters. Hunt’s supplement μή με μὴ προσαλ[άξητισ κακοῖσ (or Lloyd-Jones’ μή με μὴ με κτλ.) would be appealing, were not the space available in the corresponding line of the antistrophe, 294 τονδαφ[non plus xii], too short to admit a supplement — (∪) — ∪ — — ∪ —. Perhaps the corrector deleted too little. μή με προσαλ[άξητισ would be an ithyphallic, like 331 ~ 373. The verb needs no qualification: Ar. Lys. 275 ἀπῆλθεν ἀψάλακτοσ (Σ ἀπαθήσ, ἀτιμώρητοσ).

283 [.]τ . .[. . .]’ ἐστι τοῦ πατροσ θέσει.

Cyllene has just narrated the miraculously rapid growth of the infant son of Zeus and Maia. The preceding line, . . . τοῖόνδε παῖδα θησαυροσ στέγει, appears to bring this part of her narrative to an end.

Hunt read the first visible traces as]τ . .[, and filled the lacuna which follows with [τ’ ἔτ]. Murray completed the line with [δυσεύρε]τοσ [τ’ ἔτ]’ (which Hunt accepted), Pearson with [κατάσχε]τοσ [δ’ ἔτ]. Neither adjective has any appeal: ‘And he is still hard to find / held back’ is not a natural way for the narrative to proceed. Vollgraff’s [κάνένδυ]τοσ [γ’ ἔτ]’ (‘adhuc veste caret’, *Mnem.* 42 (1914) 172) and Walker’s [ὁ μὲν στα]τοσ [γ’ ἔτ]’ (‘He indeed still abideth by the cave’) are unthinkable.

‘]ΤΟÇ[ist richtig’ (Siegmann). The first doubtful letter may well be O (there survives only a brief trace, compatible with the top of an arc, slightly lower than the horizontal of T). But the next (there survives a very short stroke, with the very slightest downward inclination from left to right, a little

higher than the horizontal of T), although compatible with the top of C, is probably not C, because, as Hunt himself observed, ‘the supposed c is a little too far apart from the o’.

What is the meaning of τοῦ πατρὸς θέσει? According to Pearson, ‘θέσει, which does not occur elsewhere in tragedy, is probably rather *disposition* than *command*’. Perhaps θέσει does occur elsewhere in tragedy. I have printed it at E. *El.* 1262–63 ἴν’ εὐσεβεστάτη | ψήφου βεβαία τ’ ἐστὶν ἐκ τούτου θέσει (ψήφου . . . θέσει Tucker: ψήφος . . . θεοῖς L; ἐκ τούτου Pierson: ἔκ τε τοῦ L). The expression ψήφου θέσει reflects the regular ψήφον τίθεσθαι (*El.* 1266 ψήφοι τεθεῖσαι, LSJ s.u. τίθημι A.5).⁸

Another regular application of the verb τίθεσθαι is to the giving of a name: A. fr. 6.1 ὄνομα θήκονται, E. *IT* 499, *Ion* 75, *Hel.* 149–150, *Ph.* 12–13, 636–637, *Erechth.* fr. 65.73 Austin, Ar. *Nub.* 65, 67, *Au.* 809–810, 817, fr. 342 Kassel–Austin, H. *Od.* 18.5, 19.403, 406, *h. Dem.* 122. And the noun is so applied in Pl. *Crat.* 390D ἢ τοῦ ὀνόματος θέσει, 397B, 401B.

Since it is appropriate that the infant should now be named, I suggest [Ἐρμῆς δὲ] τοῦ[νομ]’ ἐστὶ τοῦ πατρὸς θέσει. The letters ΟΥ are compatible with the traces. I take the second trace as belonging to the right arm of Y, which often rises a little higher than the left arm. The trace (as I have earlier described it) is compatible with the slight curve in which the right arm of Y sometimes ends: as at 105 ταΥτηι, 156 οΥ, 174 τριΖΥγης, 177 Υπεκριγες, 184 [ο]Υριας, 211 εξΥπελ[, 224 οΥς, 261 αΥτωι, 267 κρΥφ[,⁹ 299 τοΥ, 306 εξεΥροΥ, 312 αΥ, fr. 24.3]ξΥνα[. The accent stands on the first vowel of the diphthong, as is usual in this papyrus: 108 τὸνπισημον, 114 εικακούω, 119 τούμπαλιν (not τὸν-, as Radt reports), 207 πλόυ[τ, 210 ὄν τι, 259 ὄννεκ’, 309 τούξω.

For the phraseology compare E. *Ion* 260 Κρέουσα μὲν μοι τοῦνομ’, *Hel.* 87 ὄνομα μὲν ἡμῖν Τεῦκρος, *IA* 827–828 Κλυταιμῆστρα δέ μοι | ὄνομα. The construction τοῦ πατρὸς θέσει, ‘by the father’s giving (of the name)’, is analogous to δόσει with genitive of the giver, as fr. 646.5 δαίμονος κακοῦ δόσει, A. *Ch.* 782 σὺν θεῶν δόσει, E. *Tr.* 925 Παλλάδος . . . δόσει.

316 [ἐνήλατα ξύλα τρίγομφα διατ]όρωσ ἐρείδεται

The supplement derives from Poll. 10.34 μέρη δὲ κλίνης ἐνήλατον καὶ ἐπίκλιτρον ὑπὸ Ἄριστοφάνουσι εἰρημένον (*Eccl.* 907, fr. 41 Kassel–Austin). Σοφοκλῆς δ’ ἐν Ἰχνευταῖσι κατύροις (-ων codd.) ἔφη (fr. 293 Nauck, 315 Pearson) “ἐνήλατα ξύλα τρίγομφα διάτορος ερεται δε”.

Robert’s ξύλ’ <ός> and Radt’s ξύλα <γε> are metrical makeshifts which carry no conviction. Neither Radt nor Maltese (who follows Robert) mentions Walker’s ἐνήλατ’ ἄξυλ’ ἀρτίγομφα, an elegant and economical remedy for the metre, which has the further merit of eliminating two linguistic oddities, adjectival ἐνήλατα (always elsewhere a noun), and the three bolts (τρι- in such a compound as τρίγομφα cannot merely intensify, as in τριγέρων, τρίδουλος, cited by Pearson, but must be taken literally). Walker compared ἀρτίκολλος (A. *ScT* 373, *Ch.* 580, *S. Tr.* 768).

But Walker (and, in part, Ferrante, who accepted this conjecture) misinterpreted: ‘Hermes is represented as *pressing loudly* on certain *crossbars*, *not made of wood*, *tightly bolted*: these *crossbars* are clearly the strings of the lyre’ (p. 538). First, ἐνήλατα must be subject, not object, of ἐρείδεται (see *Studies on the Text of Euripides* 104–105). Rightly Ferrante: ‘Staggi . . . sono infissi’. Second, διατόρωσ, ‘piercingly’, qualifying ἐρείδεται, cannot refer to noise. Wrongly Ferrante: ‘sì da produrre un suono melodioso’. Third, ἐνήλατα are unlikely to be strings. ἐνήλατα are ‘things driven in’, such as ‘rungs’ which are driven into the sides of a ladder (E. *Su.* 729, *Ph.* 1179), ‘linchpins’ which are driven into axles (E. *Hi.* 1235), and ‘slats’ (in Pollux’s citation) which are driven into the frame of a bed.

The likely sense of ἐνήλατα and of διατόρωσ is indicated by *h. Herm.* 47–48, where Hermes makes a lyre by fixing stalks of reed to a tortoise shell, apparently through holes which he has pierced in the shell, to serve as supports for the arms (πήχεις). The text is not certain, but the general picture is clear: πῆξε δ’ ἄρ’ ἐν μέτροισι ταμῶν δόνακας καλάμοιο | πειρήνας (τετρήνας Matthiae) διὰ (κατὰ Allen)

⁸ The noun is also found in lyric: Alc. 204.6 L–P, Pi. *Ol.* 3.8.

⁹ I should supply κρυφ[αίως, in preference to κρυφ[αίαν Hunt, κρυφ[αίος Radt. And, later in this line, read not τέ]γην but τε]έγην (the tip of the upper stroke of ε is visible).

νῶτα διὰ ῥινοῖο (κραταιρίνοιο Barnes cl. Hdt. 1.47.3, διατρήτοιο Ludwich) χελώνης. The reed used for these supporting slats is mentioned at S. fr. 36 κάλαμος . . . λύρας and Ar. *Ran.* 233–234 δόνακος ὄν ὑπολύριον | ἔνυδρον ἐν λίμναις τρέφω. Aratus, *Phaen.* 269, refers explicitly to the piercing of the shell (ἐτόρησε). And pierced tortoise shells, remnants of lyres, have been found. See P. Courbin, *BCH Suppl.* 6 (1980) 93–114, T. Hägg, *Symb. Osl.* 64 (1989) 37, M. Maas and J. M. Snyder, *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece* (1989) 36, 94–95, M. L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (1992) 56–57. The epithet ἄξυλ', as Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones observes to me, perhaps helps to stress the difference between the new style of lyre and the kithara, whose soundbox was made entirely of wood (Maas and Snyder 66, 181, West 50–56).

325–337

325 καὶ τοῦτο λύπη[σ] ἔστ' ἄκετρον καὶ παραψυκ[τ]ήρ[ιο]ν
κείνῳ μόνον, χα[ί]ρει δ' ἀλύων καὶ τι προσφών[
ξύμφωνον· ἐξα[ί]ρει γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰόλιμα τῆς λ[ύ]ρας.
οὕτως ὁ παῖς θανόντι θηρὶ φθέγμ' ἐμηχανήσατο.

Χο. < x >οψάλακτός τις ὁμφὴ κατοιχνεῖ τόπου, [στρ.
330 πρεπτά < - > δὴ τόνου φάσματ' ἔγ-
χωρ' ἐπανθεμίζει.
τὸ πρᾶγμα δ' οὐπερ πορεύω βάδην,
ἴσθι τὸν δα[ί]μον', ὅστις ποθ' ὄς
ταῦτ' ἐτεχνήσατ' — οὐκ ἄλλος ἐστὶν κλ[ο]πεὺς
335 ἀντ' ἐκείνου, γύναϊ, κάφ' ἴσθι.
εὐ δ' ἀντὶ τῶνδε μὴ χαλε-
φθῆις ἐμοὶ <μη>δὲ δυσφορηθῆις.

In 326 the papyrus has αλυίων, Aeolic for ἀλύων according to Et. Ma. 254.17, preferred to ἀλύων at H. *Od.* 9.398 by τινὲς τῶν παλαιῶν according to Eust. ad loc.¹⁰ 'The unfamiliar sound is regarded as a sign of distraction', says Pearson, who translates 'he is crazy with delight'. The idea and the language are insipid.¹¹ F. Bucherer's ἀθύρων (*BPhW* 32 (1912) 1107–08) suits both the child at play (τίς δ' οὐχὶ χαίρει νηπίοις ἀθύρμασιν; E. fr. 272) and the music which he is playing, and provides a proper complement for προσφών[ων μέλος (-ῶν Hunt, μέλος Wilamowitz). The two participles represent the two aspects of Hermes' musical activity. Bucherer compared *h. Herm.* 485 (the lyre) ῥεῖα συνθηεῖται ἀθυρομένη μαλακῆται, *h. Pan* 15 (Pan plays on his pipe) δονάκων ὑπομοῦσαν ἀθύρων. He might have observed that the lyre is called an ἄθυρμα at *h. Herm.* 32, 40, 52. Further illustration: Alc. D 12.3–4 L–P ἀθύρει . . . βάρμος, Pi. *Isth.* 4.42–43 πᾶσαν ὀρθόσασιν ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασαν | θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν, Bacchyl. 9.87 Μουσ[ᾶν] . . . ἄθ[υ]ρμα, 'Bacchyl.' *AP* 6.313.3 (Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* 548) ἐν ἀθύρμασι Μουσᾶν, *TrGF* adesp. 646a.21 (satyr play) ἦθυρον ἐγὼ νέος ἄντροι[σ] ('carmina lusi?', Kannicht–Snell), Ap. Rh. 3.949–950 ἦντιν' ἀθύροι | μολπήν, *Anacreontea* 43.10–11 κατὰ πηκτίδων ἀθύρει | προχέων λίγειαν ὁμφάν.

Bucherer's conjecture was approved by Maas (*BPhW* 32 (1912) 1429 = *Kl. Schr.* 53), who proposed to punctuate before, not after,ξύμφωνον ('das als Epitheton zu αἰόλιμα ebenso willkommen wie neben τι προσφώνων μέλος überflüssig ist'). What then elates Hermes (ἐξάγει 327) is not merely the sound of the lyre but the responsiveness of the lyre to his own voice. The postponement of γὰρ is acceptable (Denniston, *GP* 96), and is a small price to pay for avoidance of the disagreeable combination προσφώνων . . .ξύμφωνον.

¹⁰ See W. Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae* (1892) 310–311, P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* 1 (1958) 372, Schwyzer 1.686. W. Vollgraff (*Mnem.* 42 (1914) 174–175) even wished to retain it here.

¹¹ The entry in LSJ s.u. ἀλύω I.6, 'from joy or exultation', should be taken with a pinch of salt.

If, as I believe, Doric ὀμφά (Hunt)¹² should be restored in 329, we should also restore ἐτεχνάσατ' in 334, an unnoticed proposal of Walker.¹³ The genitive in the phrase κατοικνεῖ τόπου is the same as at E. *Med.* 838 χώρας (Reiske: χώραν codd.) καταπνεύσαι.

Of the six supplements listed by Radt for the initial syllable of 329, the first five (ὀρθ- Murray, ἀπρ- Wilamowitz, ὑπ- Walker, ἀπ- Steffen (anticipated by Pearson), καλ- Snell) are less choice than the sixth, ὀμ- (A. von Blumenthal, *Hermes* 71 (1936) 453–454). The ‘voice twanged in unison’ is the voice of the lyre, twanged in unison with that of Hermes. This neatly picks up the thought of 326–327, and ὀμοψάλακτος echoes ζύμφωνον. Lloyd-Jones’ (χερ)οψάλακτος would also serve well enough.

Von Blumenthal himself took ὀμφά to refer to the voice of Hermes, alleging that this noun is not elsewhere used of the sound of a musical instrument. He has overlooked Bacchyl. 14.13 φόρμιγγος ὀμφά and Pi. fr. 52c.94 ἀλῶν ὀμφάν. The sound of the lyre is commonly described in terms more properly applicable to the voice (βοή H. *Il.* 18.495, Pi. *Pyth.* 10.39, E. *Ereth.* 65.8 Austin, *Hyps.* I.iii.10 (p. 27 Bond), Ar. *Thesm.* 125; γῆρυς Pi. *Ol.* 3.8; ἐνοπή E. *Ion* 882; φθόγγος h. *Herm.* 484, E. *Herc.* 350; ἄοιδή E. *Cycl.* 40, *Med.* 425; μολπή E. *Herc.* 684); and the sound heard from the cave has already been described as a φθέγμα (260, 284, 299, 328), γῆρυς (297), and φωνή (300). The verb ψαλάσσω, whether we connect it with ψάλλω, ψαθάλλω, ‘touch lightly’ (LSJ), or with ψηλαφάω, ‘touch, stroke’ (lexicographers cited by Pearson on fr. 550), is appropriate only to the lyre (*Lyc. Alex.* 139 ψαλάξειε . . . νευράς κτύπον). A ‘voice twanged / stroked in unison (with the lyre)’ would be a banal locution.¹⁴

In 330 Hunt read διὰ and proposed <δ' ἀν> διὰ; Vollgraff proposed <τ' ἄ> διὰ. If διὰ were right, it would be the only instance of resolution in either strophe or antistrophe. Siegmann’s δη is likely to be right. The obvious supplement is <δ' ἦ>δη. For the blend of images in πρεπτά . . . τόνου φάσματα see Diggle, *PCPS* 15 (1969) 41 = *Euripidea* (1994) 12, C. P. Segal, *ICS* 2 (1977) 88–96. With ἔγχωρ' ἐπανθεμίζει compare Ar. *Nub.* 1173–74 τοῦτο τοῦπιχώριον | ἀτεχνῶς ἐπανθεῖ.

In 332 the words τὸ πρᾶγμα δ' οὔπερ (ὅπερ the corrector) πορεύω βάδην give neither adequate sense in themselves nor coherence with the words which follow. That ‘οὔπερ in der Luft schwebt, das transitive πορεύω ebenso, das doch nur etwas wie διώκω oder πέμπω bedeuten kann, βάδην auch nicht paßt’ says Wilamowitz (*NJhrb* 29 (1912) 462 n. 5 = *Kl. Schr.* I. 365 n. 4), with every justification. A contorted interpretation is devised by Pearson (who prints οἴπερ, considered but rejected by Hunt). Page treats πορεύω as if it were intransitive (‘But here’s the point I am slowly coming to —’), Lloyd-Jones (accepting οἴπερ) treats it as transitive (‘But here’s the matter to which I’m slowly bringing you’) but is obliged to insert an unwarranted ‘you’.¹⁵

I suggest τὸ πρᾶγμα δ' ὅπερ πολεύω βάδην: ‘But as for the business on which I am tramping around’ (i.e. the search for the tracks of the oxen). The clause is a loosely prefixed accusative of

¹² In *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Papyracea nuper Reperta* (1912), and so anticipating Pearson, to whom Maltese ascribes the change.

¹³ The metre of 329–337 ~ 371–377 [-379] is lyric iambics, like 243–250 ~ 290–297, and Doric α is attested at 245 μάχας, 250 ἀνδρά[ν], 377 τᾶ[ν]δ'. It is hard to accept, alongside these, νύμφη (νύμφα Hunt, ‘sed fort. Sophocles formam Doricam eo consilio evitavit, ne quis more Homericο νύμφα legeret’, remarks Radt, with the approval of Maltese; but Sophocles was not writing for readers), 329 ὀμφή, 334 ἐτεχνήσατ'. Perhaps we should also restore προφάνας for προφήνας at 76, in the same context as 71 πατρικάν. The Attic forms at 177 μάτην and 185 παρέβης can stand, if these are non-lyric anapaests. And 71 γῆρ[υ]ν, 250 ἐγήρυσε, 297 γῆρυν (Hunt restored Doric α in all three places) are acceptable, as Radt observes. Finally 289 βοῆς, which Hunt printed as part of a line of lyric, then changed to βοᾶς in 1912 (see above, n. 12), has now been plausibly located in an iambic trimeter (Siegmann 25–26).

¹⁴ Σ Pi. *Ol.* 3.11 κύμψαλμα (cited by von Blumenthal), of the concord of voice and instrument, does not help. His alternative proposal, to retain ὀψάλακτος as equivalent to ὀμοψάλακτος, by analogy with Hesych. O 161 ὄθορον ὀμόφωνον, κύμφωνον (a formation like Homeric ὄτριχας οἰέτεας *Il.* 2.765, ὄπατρος *Il.* 11.257, 12.371, and other Hesychian glosses ὀγάτωρ, ὄζυγες, ὄζυλον: see Schwyzer 1.433, P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (1968) 770) is absolutely to be rejected. Irregular correspondence of cretic and iambic metron (371) is unbelievable.

¹⁵ The conjectures of J. M. Stahl in this passage (*RhM* 68 (1913) 308–309) are rightly condemned by K. Münscher (ibid. 69 (1914) 184–188). And Vollgraff’s πορεύεις (*Mnem.* 42 (1914) 176) solves nothing.

reference, like *OT* 216 ἂ δ' αἰτεῖς, 936 τὸ δ' ἔπος οὐξερῶ, *Phil.* 863 τὸ δ' ἀλώκιμον ἐμῶι φροντίδι, *E. Hcl.* 1024 τὸ γὰρ σῶμ', *Hel.* 684 τὰ δὲ (σὰ) . . . πάθεα, fr. 360.43 ἐκεῖνο δ' οὐ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐν κοινῶι μέρος, perhaps *Or.* 1175 ὃ βούλομαι γάρ.¹⁶ The verb *πολεύειν* is found once in Homer (*Od.* 22.223 κατὰ ἄστν πολεύειν) and once in Sophocles (*Ant.* 341 ἱπείωι γένει πολεύων).¹⁷ For the confusion of ρ and λ see *Euripidea* (1994) 469. The dative ὥπερ is causal, here with a verb of motion as in *Phil.* 243–244 τίνι | ττόλωι προσέχεσ τήνδε γήν; ('on what errand' Jebb); *OC* 1280 ὦν χρεῖαι πάρει, *E. Su.* 150 ἀράϊε πατρώιαι (sc. Θήβας λιπών), *Ph.* 1043 ἔβα | Πυθίαι αποστολαίειν.¹⁸ βάδην is now combined with a suitable verb, and refers to the measured steps of the tracking satyrs: *H. Il.* 13.515–516 τρέσσαι δ' οὐκέτι ρίμφα πόδες φέρον ἐκ πολέμοιο· | τοῦ δὲ βάδην ἀπιόντος . . ., *A. Pe.* 18–19 ἔβαν . . . πεζοί . . . βάδην, *Su.* 886–887 ἄγει | ἄραχνος ὡς βάδην, *Hdt.* 9.57.1 ἦγε βάδην, *Ar. Lys.* 254 ἡγοῦ βάδην, *Xen. Anab.* 4.6.25 οἱ μὲν . . . δρόμωι ἔθειον . . . Χειρίοφος δὲ βάδην ταχὺ ἐφείπετο, *Cyr.* 3.3.62 ὁ Κῦρος ἐπιλαθόμενος τοῦ βάδην δρόμωι ἡγεῖτο, *Hell.* 5.4.53 θάττον ἢ βάδην ἀπῆλθον, *Men.* fr. 689 Koerte τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον τοῦτο "θάττον ἢ βάδην". With the whole expression compare 80 τυχεῖν με πράγους οὐ δράμημ' ἐπείγεται.

In 333 a parallel for ὅστις ποθ' ὅς, 'strangely substituted for ὅστις ποτ' ἦν ὅς' (Pearson), is provided by *Ar. Ran.* 38–39 ὡς κενταυρικῶς | ἐνήλαθ', ὅστις.¹⁹

χαλεφθῆις (336–337) is one instance among many of a middle verb with a passive aorist form (see Schwyzer 1.757–758, Fraenkel on *A. Ag.* 1498), and this form recurs at *Theogn.* 155 (Stob.: χολωθείς codd.), com. adesp. 157 Kassel–Austin, *Call. h. Dem.* 48, *Ap. Rh.* 3.97. The only instances which have been alleged of a middle *δυσφοροῦμαι* are two variant readings, which there is no good reason to accept, in *Xen. Cyr.* 2.2.5 *δυσθετούμενος* (u.l. *δυσφορούμενος*) and 2.2.8 *ἐδυσφόρουν* (u.l. *ἐδυσφοροῦντο*). It is therefore difficult to believe in a passive/middle aorist *δυσφορηθῆις*. I prefer to believe that its ending has been wrongly assimilated to that of *χαλεφθῆις*, and to restore *δυσφορήσις*.

367 π[ώγ]ωνι θάλλων ὡς τράγος κνήκωι χλιδῶις (κνικῶι Hunt, καςκῶι Radt, κα . κῶι Maltese; κνήκῶι conit. Hunt, κνηκῶι Wilamowitz, κάσκῶι Maltese, κασκῶι Degani). A (Radt, Maltese) is certain. Of the next letter the top is lost, but the bottom trace resembles no recognisable letter. I hazard a guess that it is a letter which has been deleted by a cross-stroke, like 115 *τσι*[[λ]]βος, 174 [[ι]]ει, 178 [[ε]]ιδες, 371 *θελοι*[[ς]], 400 [[τ]]οδ, 444 *ην*[[δ]]. If so, then the corrector (or the scribe himself) behaved rationally, by offering *κακῶι* (the ι is apparently by the original scribe, but squeezed in as an afterthought). I say nothing of the third and fourth conjectures listed above. *κνήκῶι* is impugned with good reason by E. Degani (*Eikasmos* 2 (1991) 98–99), who rightly prefers (both to it and to his own conjecture) *κνηκῶι*, an epithet regularly applied to goats: *Thespis TrGF* 1 F 4.2, *Theoc.* 7.16 (cf. 3.5), *Kaibel Ep. Gr.* 1034.23, *Agathias AP* 6.32.4. It is applied to a beard by Cercidas, 7.13 Powell (*Coll. Alex.* 209). In all these passages, except *Ep. Gr.* 1034, the Doric *κνακός* is found, and this form (presumably more familiar to scribes) perhaps lies behind the corruption κα . κῶι.²⁰

376 Radt and Maltese print *δοράς* [γ' ἦ] ἀπὸ (Walker, Ferrante) in preference to *δοράς* [ἦ] ἀπὸ (Wilamowitz). The latter, so far from being too short, as is alleged, suits the space perfectly, since both C and A are almost totally contained in the lacuna. The γ' is inept.

¹⁶ See KG 1.330–331, Schwyzer 2.88. Moorhouse, *Syntax* 21–22, prefers to take *OT* 936 and *Phil.* 863 as nominative; that does not affect the issue.

¹⁷ LSJ and commentators take *πολεύων* here as transitive ('turning up the earth'), and some commentators compare *Hes. Op.* 462 ἔαρι πολεῖν, where again LSJ and commentators treat the verb as transitive, against its normal usage and without strict necessity. Nothing prevents our taking *πολεύων* as intransitive, with the dative constructed as at *El.* 704–705 ἔκτος ἐξ Αἰτωλίας | ξανθαῖσι πάλοισι, *Phil.* 1027 *πλευσανθ'* ἐπτά ναυσί, *H. Od.* 4.8 ἵπποισι καὶ ἄρμασι πέμπε νέεσθαι. See KG 1.434, Schwyzer 2.162, Moorhouse 90.

¹⁸ For other causal datives see Pearson on 153–154 (159–160 Radt) and Index, III.299, KG 1.438–440, Schwyzer 2.167, Moorhouse 89.

¹⁹ Prof. E. W. Handley refers me to another probable example of this ellipse at *Men. Sic.* 265.

²⁰ *κνακῶν* in *Thespis* should perhaps be changed to *κνηκῶν*. These are hardly lyric anapaests.

378–395

| | | | |
|-----|-------|-----------------------|---------|
| | | [| col. xv |
| | | δηγυνη[| |
| 380 | | μανιων .[| |
| | | ὦ παμπονη[ρ | |
| | | [.] . αι τάχ' ὄργα[| |
| | | [τ]ἀληθὲς εἰ . [| |
| | | [.]ουρ γαρ[| |
| 385 | | [ὁ] παῖς κλο[π | |
| | | [.]τοι πονη[| |
| | | [κ]ακῶς ἀκου[| |
| | | [ε]ἰ δ' ἔστ' ἀλη[θ | |
| | | [ο]ῦ μὴ τὰδ' [| |
| 390 | <Xo.> | [| |
| | <Ku.> | τ[| |
| | <Xo.> | ι[| |
| | <Ku.> | . [| |
| | <Xo.> | [| |
| 395 | <Ku.> | δ[| |

Radt's text. Column xv was originally constituted by Hunt from two separate fragments. These were (i) the larger part, attached to col. xiv, containing line-beginnings (7–22 Hunt = 389–404 Radt), (ii) a detached fragment of six line-beginnings, lacking one or two initial letters (1–6 Hunt = 384–389 Radt). Hunt left a gap of one line between 6 and 7, but suggested that line 6 might be the continuation of line 7 (in which only the paragraphos is visible). Radt adopts this suggestion. Hunt subsequently identified P. Oxy. 2081(a) fr. 2 (five line-beginnings) as belonging to this column, and he placed them (379–383 Radt) before his line 1 (384 Radt), where they appear to fit perfectly. He suggested that the first new line (379 Radt) was the first line of the column. But, since col. xiv ends with the antepenultimate line of an antistrophe (377 Radt), he was obliged to conclude that 'what in the strophe was written in two lines (xiii. 12–13 [336–337 Radt]) was here given in one'. This is a most unappealing conclusion. Siegmann (20–21) suggested that col. xv began with the (missing) penultimate line of the antistrophe and that the first line of fr. 2 is the second line of the column. His suggestion was accepted by Radt and Maltese.²¹

Column xv is unlikely to have begun in this way, for two reasons. The first is not decisive, but the second probably is. (i) Hunt was able to claim that, if his original lines 6 and 7 are combined in a single line, the first line of col. xv (379 Radt) 'will stand quite on a level or slightly above l. 1 of Col. xiv'. But, if we add a further line at the head of col. xv, this column will start a line higher than col. xiv. (ii) Line 379 was either not indented at all or, if it was, was indented by no more than one letter. The first visible letter (Δ) stands above the second letter (A) of 380. Radt (in the arrangement printed above) has indented the line not because it is so indented in the papyrus but in order to match his (and the papyrus's) indentation of the preceding lines. Maltese aligns 379 in the way that the papyrus aligns it, except that he ought more correctly to have given its beginning as [.]Δ not Δ. But, if 379 was the last line of the antistrophe, why was it not indented like the seven preceding lines of the antistrophe (371–377) at the foot of col. xiv, which are indented by five letters? Is it likely that the scribe, when he passed from the foot of col. xiv to the top of col. xv, omitted to indent the final two lines? It is not at all likely. He did not omit to indent 216 and 297 which stand at the heads of their columns and are the final lines

²¹ And by W. Lange (*RhM* 108 (1965) 343), who vainly wished to identify fr. 27 as part of these first two lines. The two lines, as restored by him, have at least one grammatical solecism and one impossible elision.

of lyric passages.²² I conclude that 379 was not the last line of the antistrophe, and that it was neither the first nor the second line of col. xv.

I suggest that 379–389 (fr. 2 + 1–6 Hunt) belong lower down the column, and that 391 (9 Hunt) is the beginning of 386 (3 Hunt). I offer the following reconstruction:

| | | |
|-------|-----------------------|---------|
| | [.]δηγυνη[| 379 |
| | μανιων .[| 380 |
| | ὦ παμπονη[ρ | 381 |
| | [.] . αι τάχ' ὄργα[| 382 |
| ⟨Χο.⟩ | [τ]ἀληθὲς εἰ . [| 383 |
| ⟨Κυ.⟩ | [.]οῦς γαρ[| 384 |
| ⟨Χο.⟩ | [ὁ] παῖς κλο[π | 390/385 |
| ⟨Κυ.⟩ | τ[ά] τοι πονη[ρά | 391/386 |
| ⟨Χο.⟩ | κακῶς ἀκου[| 392/387 |
| ⟨Κυ.⟩ | εἰ δ' ἔστ' ἀλη[θ | 393/388 |
| ⟨Χο.⟩ | [ο]ὐ μὴ τάδ' [| 394/389 |
| ⟨Κυ.⟩ | δ[| 395 |

In 392 the letter identified as I by Hunt, Radt, and Maltese suits no less well the vertical of K. In 393 Hunt identified the first letter as Y, Siegmann as T. There is a small trace at mid height and a higher trace to the left of it. But this higher trace is on a fibre which has become misaligned, and so we cannot tell to what part of what letter it belongs. Since the evidence of this trace (which will have prompted Hunt's Y and Siegmann's T) is unreliable, I regard E (compatible with the other trace) as possible. With the supplement in 391/386 compare *Ai.* 268 τό τοι διπλάζον . . . κακόν, 1350 τόν τοι τύραννον, *Phil.* 637 ἦ τοι καίριος σπουδή, 894 τό τοι κύνηθεσ . . . ἔθος, *OC* 517 τό τοι πολύ, 880 τοῖς τοι δικαίοις, 1187–88 τά τοι κακῶς | ἠύρημέν' ἔργα, fr. 941.1 ἦ τοι Κύπρις,²³ Blaydes on *Ar. Lys.* 919, Denniston, *GP* 548.

If we work back from the end of the column, where the correct distribution of speakers in this stichomythia can be clearly determined, we can establish the correct distribution for 383–395. Line 381 was evidently spoken by Cyllene. No trace of a paragraphos is visible under the beginning of the line; had there been one, it would probably have been visible. But, if Cyllene also spoke 382, there must have been a paragraphos under 382, and here I should not expect it to be still visible. The surface of the papyrus, where it would have stood, is rubbed away. Almost certainly there was no paragraphos under 380. But there is a trace of a paragraphos under 379. So perhaps 379 was spoken by the chorus, and 380–382 were spoken by Cyllene.

Finally, consider the evidence of the marginal stichometric symbols. Now that Siegmann²⁴ has shown that the fragment of six lines (1–6 Radt) which Hunt located at the end of col. i must be located before col. i, the symbol A appears, where we expect it, at line 100. But the symbol B was written opposite the 103rd next line (201 Radt), then erased and written (by the original scribe) opposite the 105th next (203 Radt). The erratic numbering, and the scribe's dilemma, are comprehensible. Line 105 (ἀντιλαβή) is written on two lines. After 113 the word ῥοῖβδος (gloss or παρεπιγραφή) occupies the middle of its own line. And there are several short four-syllable lines (107, 109, 117, 131, 136, 138,

²² At 215–216 the supplement μι[θ]ο[ν] is very doubtful. The normal division (although the norm is not always followed: see KB 1.350.3) would be μι[θ]ον, like 250 |τωσ, 336–337 χαλε[φ]θησ. In any case, there is not enough room for θο[ν] δ[ό]μοισιν (Hunt). If δ[ό]μοισιν is right, there is no room for any other letter except I. We might contemplate, as an alternative, ν[ό]μοισιν.

²³ In this fragment, I suggest that, instead of deleting 12 (Herwerden) or marking a lacuna before it (Radt), we transpose it after 8: τίς οὐχὶ τῆδε τῆς θεοῦ πόρος (8) | ἐν θηρσίν, ἐν βροτοῖσιν, ἐν θεοῖς ἄνω; (12).

²⁴ *RhM* 116 (1973) 113–126.

140).²⁵ The symbol Γ was written opposite the line numbered by Radt as 299, which is the 99th line after the revised B, the 101st after the original B. Now, line 250 was omitted by the original scribe and was written above the column by the second hand. But the stichometric symbols are written by the first hand. Perhaps the scribe counted the lines for himself and did not merely reproduce symbols which he found in his exemplar. For, if we discount line 250, we gain a figure of precisely 100 lines between the original B and the Γ . The symbol Δ is written opposite the line numbered by Radt as 402. Here our calculations are hampered by the loss of a small number of lines at the foot of col. xiii. Radt, in his note on 349sqq., suggests the loss of 3 lines rather than 2: 'cum col. praecedens 28, col. subsequens autem 26 versus contineat, hanc columnam 27 versuum fuisse veri simile est'. He may be right, but his reasoning is not cogent, since col. vii contains 26 lines, col. viii 28. If 3 lines are lost at the foot of col. xiii, then col. xiv will have ended with the 78th line after Γ . In Radt's text, where Δ is opposite the 25th line of col. xv, it will be opposite the 103rd line after Γ . In my arrangement, Δ will be opposite the 100th line after Γ if we assume that line 379 is the 4th line of the column. If only two lines are lost at the foot of col. xiii, we may assume that line 379 is the 5th line of the column. So (if the stichometric symbols are reliable) col. xv began with the last two lines of the antistrophe, and either one or two trimeters, before we reach the first surviving line, 379.

Queens' College, Cambridge

James Diggle

²⁵ For a speculative attempt to explain the precise logic behind the alternative locations see Walker 155–161.