

W. B. HENRY

STESICHORUS, P. OXY. 3876 (*PMGF I APP.*) FR. 67(B)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 126 (1999) 66

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

STESICHORUS, P. OXY. 3876 (PMGF I APP.) FR. 67(B)¹

] [

]εραταν[

]μφιβρότα[

]υρεωνκ[

5]υπεριχρ[

]τηλόθεχα[

]σελας α[

]εικαλοσωρτο[

] [

]ονταϊδοντ[

A passage including in the space of a few lines ἀ]μφιβρότα² (3), no doubt of a shield, as always in Homer³, ἀργ]υρεων⁴ (4), perhaps περι]χρ[ωτί⁵ (5), and]τηλόθεχα[κ-⁶ (6) with ἐέλας⁷ (7), is naturally taken to belong to a description of preparations for battle. It is surprising then to find at l. 8, according to the articulations proposed by the first editor, ἀλδς or κάλος ὄρτο⁸: κάλος is hardly a suitable subject for this verb, and while εἰς ἀλδς ὄρτο⁹ might be defended by comparison with B. 17.76f. ὄρνυ' ἐς βαρύβρομον πέλαγος, it will not be easy to devise a connection between 'dived into the (?wave(s)) of the sea' and what precedes. I suspect that κο]ν[ε]ίκαλος¹⁰, a word found in military contexts in Homer¹¹, is to be restored: cf. for its use with this verb *Il.* 3.13f. τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ κονίκαλος¹² ὄρνυτ' ἄελλήσ† ἐρχομένων, 11.151f. ὑπὸ δέ σφιν ὄρτο κονίη | ἐκ πεδίου.¹³

Merton College, Oxford

W. B. Henry

¹ The placing of fr. 67(a) in relation to fr. 67(b) doubtfully accepted by the first editor, M. W. Haslam, is not supported by comparison of the cross-fibres: I am indebted to Dr R. A. Coles for a demonstration of this point using digital images prepared by G. Nisbet. I have examined the papyrus.

² Haslam (commentary) considers this reading to be 'excluded by the initial trace', but the traces in question seem quite compatible with the tops of the second upright and second oblique of μ written as in fr. 67(a).2: abrasion has left blank papyrus below the top of the oblique, and the apparent cross-stroke is on a lower layer. Haslam's suggestions, ν, ω, and η (the last made in his commentary), are unattractive.

³ *Il.* 2.389, 5.797 v. l., 11.32, 12.402, 20.281. Not elsewhere in lyric.

⁴ Suppl. Haslam.

⁵ περι]χρ[οί rejected by Haslam on metrical grounds. His χρ[υε- is another possibility.

⁶ Suppl. Haslam: cf. *Il.* 11.43-5 (Agamemnon) εἴλετο δ' ἄλκιμα δοῦρε δύο κεκορυθμένα χαλκῶι | ὄξεα· τῆλε δὲ χαλκὸς ἀπ' αὐτόφιν οὐρανὸν εἴω | λάμπ', 10.152-4 ἔγχεα δέ σφιν | ὄρθ' ἐπὶ σαυρωτῆρος ἐλήλατο, τῆλε δὲ χαλκός | λάμφ' ὥς τε στεροπὴ πατρὸς Διός. Haslam writes that the gap between ε and χ contains 'perhaps a low-middle stop', but the mark in question appears to be merely a stain. I should say that the specks he mentions between ε and α[in l. 7 and the 'doubtful' stop in l. 9 are also fortuitous.

⁷ Haslam compares *Il.* 19.379 ἀπ' Ἀχιλλῆος κάκεος ἐέλας αἰθέρ' ἴκανεν.

⁸ 'Or a name, but none attested', he adds.

⁹ So W. Luppe, *Gnomon* 64 (1992), 298.

¹⁰ The first trace is compatible with ν, being the upper part of an upright.

¹¹ *Il.* 3.13, 5.503, 22.401. Not hitherto attested in lyric.

¹² -νειc- pap. 553 West (*ZPE* 46 (1982), 71; iii AD), -ε[ι]c- pap. 886 (P. Oxy. ined.).

¹³ In the marginal note, if Haslam is right to recognize a phrase of the form]ονταc· ιδόντ[ac, the latter explaining the former, one might restore δρακ]όνταc: cf. Stes. S135.9 δ]ρακοῖcα, Hsch. δ 2307 δρακεῖν· ιδεῖν, βλέπει.

I take this opportunity to record the following pair of corrections in other fragments. Fr. 35.7 εἶα: the supposed 'long', of which Luppe, *ZPE* 95 (1993), 58, attempts an explanation, being gently curved (contrast the 'longs' at fr. 8.1, 26.14, 32.3, 35.10, 70.2, 72.2; little survives of that at fr. 64(b).4), is to be interpreted rather as a hyphen relating to the previous line: other possible hyphens at l. 17, fr. 46.4. Fr. 60: a blank line is to be inserted between ll. 3 and 4.