

MONIQUE VAN ROSSUM-STEENBEEK

MORE ON P.OXY. LXI 4096, MYTHOGRAPHUS HOMERICUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 113 (1996) 24–26

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

MORE ON P.OXY. LXI 4096, MYTHOGRAPHUS HOMERICUS\*

Michael Haslam has recently published some notes on P.Oxy. 4096 based on his inspection of the photographs in the first edition<sup>1</sup>. During a stay at Oxford, where I inspected the 77 papyrus fragments, I simultaneously arrived at some of the same observations. The following notes therefore consist primarily of additions to or comments on Haslam's notes and remarks on readings<sup>2</sup>, the most significant at fr. 11, 26 and 48.

Fr. 1. 15 the remains are not against Haslam's Ηλε]κτρων  
 16 ]θ'α' ed. pr. : instead of θ, perhaps ο with a stroke through it  
 18 ]λογο.[ ed. pr. : ]λογου[, (υ[ almost certain)

Fr. 2. ii 3 γ[ ed. pr., but perhaps π[  
 4 προσαγ[ορευ ed. pr., but γ is followed by another vertical trace; instead of γ.[, perhaps π[  
 14 τῶ[v ed. pr. : το[

Fr. 3 Haslam's 'Ακ]ουζ[ιλάφ fits very well since the trace after ου is not a "low speck" (ed. pr.) but the bottom of a curve. Lines 1-5 run as follows:

. . . . .  
 ρὰ 'Ακ]ουζ[ιλάφ  
 ἀυτὰρ] ὁ θυμ[ὸν ἄϊκ]θε κα[ὶ ἦρυ- 20, 403-404  
 γεν] ὡς [ὄ]τε τα[ύρος] ἦρυγεν ἑλκό-  
 μεν]ος 'Ελικών[ιον ἀμ]φίς [ἄνα-  
 κτα. etc.

4 ]φὶ α[ ed. pr., but α cannot be read; c fits the traces better, perhaps ο

Fr. 4 As Haslam suggests, the second line reads ]ρον κερα[. Compare the following passages from the scholia on *Il.* 21, 194: τὸ ἕτερον τῶν κεράτων and 'Ωκεανοῦ κέρασ

Frr. 5-6 Haslam's identification of fr. 5.i 5 and 15-16 is correct. Moreover, my reading of fr. 6.1 ]εϵ[[β.]] instead of ]ηϵ[[β.]] (ed. pr.) confirms the join of fr. 5.i 16 with fr. 6.1 ]φ.[. Together these lines yield ἐ]φρῆεϵ[

5. i 6 Haslam suggests: τὸν 'Απόλλωνα νό]μιον ὄν[ομ]άζ[ε | cθαἰ but a ζ does not agree with the trace after α: an upright with a descending oblique, probably part of μ or ν. Besides, the upright after ο in ον[- is not necessarily a ν

5. ii 2 θ]αφορ[ ed. pr. : the trace after ο looks more like a vertical with a stroke through it; above ο are traces from a correction: a vertical and a dot

7 ...αυτοϵ[ ed. pr. : ...αυτοϵ[.]τ.[ in which .[ is ο or ω

8 τα[[ε]] [ ed. pr. : perhaps ταθ[

---

Editor's note: This article was printed in *ZPE* 112, 1996, 34–36 and is reprinted here, because part of the author's corrections had been misunderstood. We offer our apologies.

\* Thanks to a scholarship from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) I was able to spend three months at Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> See M. Haslam, "On P.Oxy. LXI 4096, Mythographus Homericus", *ZPE* 110, 1996, 115-117.

<sup>2</sup> This list of readings is primarily concerned with the larger fragments. Further remarks will be published in my dissertation (forthcoming).

11 τερεμεν[.].[ ed. pr. : there seems to be a thin stroke through τ and perhaps through the second letter, which may be ε or ο

12 ]η ed. pr. : perhaps ]ει

6. 6 κατεκτω[ ed. pr., but -η[ or -ει[ cannot be excluded

Fr. 7. 2 *Iliad* 22 is indicated by τῆ]ς X[ and *Iliad* 24 (in fr. 11.8) by τ[ῆς] Ω[ (cf. Haslam, footnote 2)

3 Haslam's ]ρειων[ is correct

Fr. 10. 3 ]ορος τος ed. pr. : ]ορος το[ι]ς

9 ]...χει ed. pr. : ]ας ἔχει

13 Instead of φ[αειν (Haslam), λ[έγεται would fit the trace (a small oblique) better

19 κράτι]ς ed. pr. : κρατε]ις-

Fr. 11 A comparison with the T scholion on 23, 683 (Erbse, b.<sup>1</sup>) - ζῶμα δέ οἱ πρῶτον (παρὰ κάββαλεν): κατὰ τὴν δεκάτην καὶ τετάρτην Ὀλυμπιάδα ἐφ' Ἴππομένους Ἀθήνησιν ἄρχοντος Ὀλυμπίασι στάδιον θεόντων ἐν περιζώμασι συνέβη ἓνα αὐτῶν Ὀρσιππον ἐμποδιθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ περιζώματος πεσεῖν καὶ τελευτῆσαι· ὅθεν ἐθεσπίσθη γυμνοὺς ἀγωνίζεσθαι· κτλ.<sup>3</sup> - allows an almost complete reconstruction of 1ff.:

[ ... συνέβη ἔ-

- 1 να τούτ[ων Ὀρσιππον ?  
μα ἐνπο[διθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ περι-  
ζώματος [πεσεῖν καὶ τελευ-  
τῆσαι· ὅθεν [

After this the introduction of running naked must have been recounted: cf. 1. 5 ]εινηγησας[

Fr. 15. 3 συνε[ ed. pr. : θ[ also possible

Fr. 16 The *historia* on Callicolone is attached to *Il.* 20, 53 not only in this papyrus (in contrast to the D-scholia where the story is attached to verse 3) but also in the bT-scholia (Erbse) and in *P. Berol.* 13930 (cf. R. Merkelbach, *APF* 16, 1958, 117-118)

5 “λοφ[ον” (Haslam), or perhaps 4-5 ὑψη | λός[? Cf. D-sch. ὑψηλῶ τόπω

10 “[ι] | μο[υ]ντος or ποτα] | μο[υ” (Haslam), or επιση] | μο[τατος ?

Fr. 19 The empty space above l. 1 suggests the beginning of a story. ][[v]]κα.[ could be part of a quotation or part of a prose story after a short quotation. In the first case, *Il.* 19, 127 χαόμενος φρεσὶν ἦσι, καὶ ὅμοσε καρτερὸν ὄρκον could fit: this would also explain the correction (ἦσι[[v]] καὶ). However, the rest of the fragment shows no points of agreement with the scholia (only D) on the Styx.

Another possible verse would be *Il.* 23, 660 πὺξ μάλ' ἀνασχομένω πεπληγέμεν· ᾧ δέ κ' Ἀπόλλων. Against the quotation of this entire line speaks the position of κ' Ἀπόλλων. Perhaps only the second part was cited, followed immediately by the *historia* on Phorbas. Cf. sch. AD on *Il.* 23, 660 Φόρβας ἀνδρείοτατος τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν γενόμενος, ὑπερήφανος δὲ, πυγμὴν ἤσκησεν ... Applied to the papyrus, this would give the following picture:

ᾧ δέ] [[v]] κ' Ἀπ[όλλων. Φόρβας ἀνδρει-  
ότα]τος γ[ενόμενος ... (γ[ or π[ ed. pr.)

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Erbse b.<sup>2</sup>: περιζώματα γὰρ ἕως τῶν ποδῶν διήκοντα ἐφόρουν πρὸς τὸ μὴ εὐκόλως πλήττεσθαι. ὕστερον δὲ Ἀθήνησιν τινῶν ἀγωνιζομένων ἄρχοντος Ἴππομένους συνέβη ἓνα αὐτῶν πεσόντα πρὸς τὸ ἐμποδιθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ περιζώματος τελευτῆσαι· ὅθεν ἐθεσπίσθη γυμνοὺς ἀγωνίζεσθαι μέχρι τοῦ νῦν· κτλ. b (BCE<sup>3</sup>E<sup>4</sup>).

I have no explanation for the [v]. Lines 3 and 5-7 seem to be different whereas l. 4 may coincide with πυ- | γμή]ν ἤσκη[εν (not ησχη[ ed. pr.)

5 ]κατατ[ ed. pr. : ]και .ατ[, the letter before ατ is probably κ (low dot and high oblique)

Fr. 20. 1 η[ ed. pr. : υ[

4 πυκτικ[ης (Haslam) fits the traces

Fr. 21. 7 ]τωγ ed. pr. : ]τηγ

Fr. 24 Autopsy confirms Haslam's identification of fr. 24. The proposed combination of this fragment with fr. 53 (ed. pr.) is thus impossible.

1 ].[, probably ε or ς

7 ]..π[ ed. pr. : ].τ[

Fr. 26 does not belong to this collection of fragments, for it is written in a different hand. The same might hold for fr. 65, in which certainly the υ and perhaps the ε are written differently, but this fragment is too small to settle the issue.

Fr. 48 The stroke beneath l. 6 points at the transition from one story to another. L. 6 probably contains part of a subscription and ll. 7-8 a quotation. The latter seem to agree with the quotation of *Il.* 24, 602 which introduces the story on Niobe (cited in ed. pr. at fr. 12):

κ]αὶ [γάρ τ' ἠΰκομος Νιόβη ἐμνή-

ς]ατ[ο δίτου

9 the trace before ε does not resemble a μ (it is more like the right side of α, δ, κ or λ), which would have been convenient in view of the beginning of the text in the (D)-scholia: Νιόβη θυγάτηρ μὲν ἦν Ταντάλου, γυνὴ δὲ Ἀμφίονος. συνοικοῦσα δὲ ... The papyrus might have mentioned an alternative father or Niobe's mother or something similar.

10 ]υν[ might stem from γυνή or συνοικοῦσα

The *historia* preceding the one on *Il.* 24, 602 is a short story attached to *Il.* 24, 251 Ἀλεξάνδρου τοξευθέντος ὑπὸ Φιλοκλήτου, Πρίαμος τὸν Ἑλένης γάμον ἔπαθλον ἔθηκε τῷ ἀριστεύσαντι κατὰ τὴν μάχην, Δηϊφობος δὲ γενναίως ἀγωνιάμενος ἔγημεν αὐτήν. ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Λυκόφρονι. The traces of l. 6 (high dot, omicron and left side of curve) do not speak against the expected subscription:

ἡ δ' ἱστορία παρὰ Λυ-

κόφ[ρονι

Fr. 53. 5 ]ρηγ[ ed. pr. : ]ρη[, [ is a vertical. These letters are probably part of a citation<sup>4</sup>.

Fr. 61. 3 Haslam suggests the citation of *Il.* 23, 141. I would like to offer an alternative: *Il.* 20, 146 ὑψηλόν, τό ρά οἱ Τρῶες καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη

<sup>4</sup> Haslam's "Fr. 50. 3" should be "Fr. 53. 3".