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Aeschylus, *Dictyulci* (fr. 47a Radt) and *Isthmiastae* (fr. 78a–d)

The following notes, based on a re-examination of the main papyri, P. Oxy. 2161 (*Dictyulci*) and 2162 (*Isthmiastae*), are intended as a supplement to Radt’s edition (*TrGF* iii; addenda and corrigenda in *TrGF* iv.2,783–5), of which we assume that the reader will have a copy to hand. Henry is responsible for the *Dictyulci*; we have both worked on the *Isthmiastae*, but Nünlist is responsible for most of the readings and for the final presentation. We are greatly indebted to Dr R. A. Coles for advice and technical assistance.

*Dictyulci*

767 |pαντάπας|, φθαρε (Radt). I read the verb as αποφθαρής. απο is quite clear on the original, and recognizable in the plate in E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Oxford 1971, no. 24: of a, the base of the loop and the end of the tail are preserved, of π, most of the cross-stroke and part of each upright. Lobel’s παντάπας, doubtfully already on linguistic grounds (see his note), is thus ruled out as an interpretation of what precedes, and I have not found any alternative to πάντ’ ἄπας (or παντάπας): cf. S. F. 1130.13 with P. Maas, *BPbW* 32, 1912, 1427f. = *Kl. Schr.*, Munich 1973, 51f.) ἀποφθαρής: the spacing at least suits τ, though none of the cross-stroke survives, and c is hardly open to doubt, the cross being the lower left-hand arc of a circle close to a. Cf. for the construction S. *El.* 962 άλεκτρα γηράκοκαν ἀνωμέναν τε; KG i.310, A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles*, Leiden 1982, 41f. The μ with which Lobel followed his παντάπας, while conceding that it is ‘not satisfactory’ as a reading, will have had its place earlier in the line.

777 Lobel gives in his second transcription αἰ[ξ]|μ[ά][λ][ω]τος ο [ξ]ozy κοκά, Radt αἰ[ξ]|μ[ά][λ][ω]τος ο [ξ]ozy κοκά. But the best reading of the verb, not mentioned by either, is ὀ[ι]ς: I owe it to Dr Coles, who observes that there is no justification for the ξ which Lobel prints and Radt thinks possible, nor for the ξ which Lobel considers for the same position. At the start of the line, the papyrus has not μ but μ1.


823 Below κ, I see traces of a paragraphus marking the end of an anapaestic system, like that after 826: for this use of the sign, see Heph. π. σημ. 9, p. 75.15–18 C. There are no grounds for taking the

---

1 Other minor points: 768 | ὀμάκα. λξ appears acceptable, e. g. ἡ|κοκαία. 772 For ξ . . . [ξ] . . , I read . . . ρ . . : ὀρχεχα-, proposed by Lobel merely as a suitable subject for the following ἐν χρόνω μενει, appears acceptable in this form. 773 | . . . The second letter looks like μ (the belly joined by part of the first stroke, with a dot in place for the top right-hand corner) rather than η (Radt): με might be accepted. 798 A letter-top speck before ν[η]ς: ν (γ[ά]|νοια Cantarella) among the possibilities. 801 The paragraphus following this line is now certain: much of it was hidden under a turn-over. 802 No trema on η: the ink in question is the displaced top of the first η (so Dr Coles). 805 oξ . . . A further speck at the end: οκ ζ[ξ]|μ[τ][α] (Fraenkel) acceptable as spacing. 822 γ[έ]|μον. 824 η|ς|λη: read γ[έ]|μον. 831 An alternative to γνθ[η]β[η] (Siegmann (γη-), Kamerbeek) is χατηβη (suggested by 799). Then not ημορο[ν |]ον but νομοφιον.

2 cύ|η- Mette (1959), but the form with η is to be preferred in Aeschylus (West, *Aeschylus tragoidiae*, xlii).
second example to mark change of speaker (so Siegmann, Philol. 97, 1948, 113 n. 1; M. R. Halleran, ZPE 79, 1989, 267–9).

**Col. iii** Editors do not mention a forked paragraphus at about the level of ii.24 with a dot above its right-hand end, no doubt belonging to the first letter of the previous line; a further dot on a displaced fibre probably belongs to the next letter. For the sign, cf. e.g. that after P. Oxy. 2162 iii\(^3\) (Isthmiastae fr. 78c.42 = 78 Snell); see in general Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, London 1987, 12 with n. 60. Blank papyrus is preserved to the right of the left-hand tip of the forked paragraphus to a distance of between 6 and 13 mm in the remainder of the column, suggesting that the final lines were in \(\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\\theta\varepsilon\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\varepsilon\)\(^4\); then the lower left-hand corner of the column is indicated by an alinement mark slightly further left than the forked paragraphus and just below the level of the foot of col. ii. Such marks are recognizable in the work of this scribe at the top left-hand corner of the column\(^5\) in col. ii of this papyrus\(^6\), P. Oxy. 2162 (Isthmiastae) cols. i and iii (touching the initial \(\kappa\)), 2245 fr. 1 cols. ii\(^7\) and iii (A. fr. 204b, c), and 2255 fr. 12 col. ii (A. fr. 25d)\(^8\); P. Oxy. 2162 col. ii\(^9\) and 2255 (A. fr. 451m) fr. 27(a)\(^10\) have examples at the lower left-hand corner\(^11\).

**Isthmiastae**

*The arrangement of the fragments*

Lobel mentions in the introduction to his edition the possibility that fr. 78c col. i forms the top part of fr. 78a col. ii, but notes that the arrangement ‘is not suggested by the appearance of the papyrus’. It is advocated nevertheless on internal grounds by Snell\(^12\), and a careful physical examination of the papyrus has made it clear that it is to be accepted: the cross-fibres match perfectly, and the edge of a collassis is visible on the backs of both pieces (at \(\kappa\epsilon\kappa\omicron\alpha\omicron\kappa\) in 43 Snell [fr. 78c i.7], \(\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\iota\) in 67 Snell [fr. 78a ii.31], etc.). If the fragments are aligned accordingly, the remains of the upper part of the column are seen to be compatible with iambic trimeters beginning on the same alinement as those in the lower part of the column\(^13\). Trochaic tetrameters, favoured by Radt, would project to the left of the trimeters in the

---

\(^{3}\) I. e. fr. 2(a) ii: see below for the arrangement of the fragments.

\(^{4}\) We should not expect to see the beginnings of the lines preceding the forked paragraphus, but it is at least clear that none of the preceding eight or so lines was in \(\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\\theta\varepsilon\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\varepsilon\). It is advocated nevertheless on internal grounds by Snell\(^12\), and a careful physical examination of the papyrus has made it clear that it is to be accepted: the cross-fibres match perfectly, and the edge of a collassis is visible on the backs of both pieces (at \(\kappa\epsilon\kappa\omicron\alpha\omicron\kappa\) in 43 Snell [fr. 78c i.7], \(\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\iota\) in 67 Snell [fr. 78a ii.31], etc.). If the fragments are aligned accordingly, the remains of the upper part of the column are seen to be compatible with iambic trimeters beginning on the same alinement as those in the lower part of the column\(^13\).

\(^{5}\) A use noticed by W. A. Johnson, ZPE 96, 1993, 214, who mentions my first five examples.

\(^{6}\) The mark is placed on the alinement of the opening verses, which is maintained throughout the column, except that the \(\pi\alpha\varphi\epsilon\iota\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\iota\) \(\iota\) 803 stands in \(\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\\theta\varepsilon\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\varepsilon\) and \(\iota\) 805 and the corresponding \(\iota\) 814 in \(\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\\theta\varepsilon\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\). Lobel, who represents the anaepasts ll. 821ff. as beginning slightly further to the left, is deceived by warping of the papyrus; he is followed by Radt.

\(^{7}\) I am not sure that the second dot which Johnson observes, about 0.7 cm further down, is not a foreign speck; it has no parallel in the other rolls.

\(^{8}\) Hardly a paragraphus, as Lobel doubtfully suggests, since any indented lines preceding it ought to be represented in fr. 13, which belongs to the right.

\(^{9}\) The final trimeters, unlike those in col. i, are not indented, no doubt because col. ii did not include tetrameters.

\(^{10}\) Lobel misleads by using the same symbol for the tiny mark in question as for the forked paragraphus preceding l. 1. My interpretation would be excluded if he were right in placing the fragment above fr. 27(b), but we should expect the beginning of the following line, if there were one, to be represented in fr. 27(a).

\(^{11}\) I take these marks to have been used simply to indicate for each successive column the top, bottom, and left-hand margins. The hypothesis of Johnson (n. 5) that they served to ensure ‘a regular column-to-column width’ is now seen to be false: the distance between the left-hand edge of P. Oxy. 2162 col. i and that of col. ii is about 15 cm, while the distance between that of col. ii and that of col. iii is only about 14 cm, and there will have been a similar discrepancy in P. Oxy. 2161, where the width of col. i was considerably more than 11.2 cm (the distance between the top left-hand corner of col. ii and the left-hand edge of the papyrus), while the distance between the lower left-hand corner of col. ii and that of col. iii is only about 11.5 cm.


\(^{13}\) Cf. already Lobel: ‘prima facie iambic trimeters wanting 0–2 syllables at the beginning’. Radt in his note on fr. 78c.1–16, while accepting that 42–8 Snell (fr. 78c.6–12) can be supplemented as trimeters beginning on a single alignment,
lower part of the column by about three syllables, considerably more than the distance of about four letters between the corresponding alinements in col. i; and anyway, it seems clear from the position of the alinement mark at the foot of the column that col. ii did not contain tetrameters (see note on fr. 47a col. iii).

Dr Coles has found no strong external evidence supporting Lobel’s suggestion that fr. 78b belongs in this column; he has not succeeded in placing fr. 78d.

In what follows, I use Snell’s continuous line-numbering, given in Radt’s margin. The main fragments are set out in the correct order by Lloyd-Jones in his appendix to the Loeb Aeschylus, ii.541–556.

29 τὰ φ[αλλί]α (Maas), though introducing an unattested form, would give good sense, but the trace before the gap is not high enough for the top of φ, which almost touches the line above in this hand (Dr Coles). πόδιθα (Kamerbeek) also seems incompatible with the trace, which suggests rather the curved tip of a stroke ascending from left to right, e. g. ν, but further ink may have been lost to the right through abrasion, so that e. g. θ (as in 35 φθεῖρων) cannot be excluded.

36 ἐπὶ παντοίτιν ἕπονον. The papyrus can now be seen to have ἐπηράνων πόνον, as Lobel had suspected, or possibly ἐπὶ ἕπονον (Cantarella). The false reading ἐπηρ- (Lobel, Radt) was due to the displacement of the trace at the lower right-hand corner of η, now corrected.

39 [α]…ημι κοι πρ… [± 6 …]…υν. The first trace might represent μ (Snell) rather than α. Before η, χ (traces of both obliques: not κ, λ), then ρ (the upright and vestiges of the loop) rather than τ (so already Snell, Mette). After ροι, traces suggesting προστα. At the end of the line, νεπι (Dr Coles). Read therefore ]…χρημι κοι προστα […]…υν ἐπη. If με (Mette) preceded χρημι, there will be no room for another letter between it and the first trace; the choices include an adjective (or πότερι) of followed by με χρη. At the end of the line, if ν represents an infinitive, either [ἐνν] ἐπείν or [ἐξε] ἐπείν (preceded by τάδ’) would suit space and traces.

44 [ει] παλαιο…ουδόν ἐνοικτε…[…]. ‘Between φ and τ traces of ink perhaps compatible with v’ (Lobel). With the microscope one can see the lower right-hand corner and a dot in place for the top right-hand corner of v (whose second upright would touch the cross-bar of τ as in οNTv four lines earlier). Articulate therefore παλαιοντ’ οὐδὲν: the verb παλαιάω is not so far attested in Aeschylus, but he has δοκαλάκιστος, δοκαλή, παλαίμια, παλαιτής, and πάλη. Then Radt rightly suspects that a form of οἰκτίρω is to be supplied: the papyrus has οἰκτεῖρε[. After the lacuna, the end of the cap of ε, touching the cross-bar, as often in this hand (e. g. in δ Ειδώλον), and a spot of ink belonging to the left-hand arc.

45 πολυπ[ ]δο[ ±8 …]. For δ, I read ν: vestiges of the second upright are preserved (the oblique projects to the left, as often in this hand). The puzzling polyplus thus disappears. After the following φ, the left-hand tip of ν. The last trace suggests a round letter.

41–6 may now be printed as follows, incorporating these and other changes14:

| óκ δ[ούλον] η τρίθουλ[ον] | \[α\]οξ δικαι[ ] | ]θενο[ ]μ[ ] |
| κακ[ ]τε κοι[τ]αι και [κακαίς δ[ι]ανλίας] |

45 ἐγ[ ]δ[ ]τ[α]ο[ ]κα πολυ[ ]δο[ ]ε[ ]ομιλί[ ][ε] |

45 ἐγ[ ]δ[ ]τ[α]ο[ ]κα πολυ[ ]δο[ ]ε[ ]ομιλί[ ][ε] |

---

14 The supplement at the start of 43 is now seen to be the only one of those recorded by Radt which fits the space. In 42 δικαι[1] and 43 κοι[1], the additional τ is represented by a trace of the foot (42) or middle (43) of the letter.
as a slave or thrice a slave... master... though I am always struggling with a bad bed and terrible lodgings, you do not pity me in the least. And I, running away from this toilsome company..."

For the sequence ἐμέ. ἐγώ (44ff.), cf. Eu. 779f. = 809f. 47–50 πὶ ὀπέρα in 47 (Fraenkel, Cantarella) and κοινῷ in 48 (Snell) fit the spaces at the beginnings of these lines. For 49ff., Henry suggests βίασις θαρσών δεξιοματὶ and εἰ (ἐν Setti, Kamerbeek, spatio longius) τῇ ιερῷ μὲν. 93 τῇ δὲ ἀντιποιεῖν [...]. Στιγμὰν μου [...]. Αὐδᾶν [...]. αὐδᾶν [...]. ξυνὶ θυματίζειν [οἴκιν] ἐμμελέτατον. 93 Nünlist, Henry 94 Henry

(Chorus) ‘To do what (...)’

(?) ‘To join in the Isthmian games with those things/persons with which it is most fitting.’

Though the field of possibilities in line 93 is thus somewhat reduced, I have not succeeded in finding a fully convincing supplement. Since a reference to sailing is not obviously suited to this context, I have considered the possibility that ἐπίπλους might from its use in cookery (Athen. iii p. 106e–107e) and sacrifice (see in general F. T. van Straten, Hiera Kala, Leiden 1995, 125–8: ἐπίπλους = κνῆς = δημός) come to mean ‘(mere) wrapping’, ‘puff’ 15. In that case one might interpret as follows:

— ἐν περὶ μεθεῖλεν [εἰ τῇ]ν τέχνην, τοῦτον πρέπει [εἰ] — 16
— τῇ δὲ ὁμοῦ; τῷ ποιεῖν; τῷ πιπλοῦμον μ’ οὐχ ὁνδᾶν [εἰ]. (ορ: μοῦφοι νανδᾶν [εἰ].) 17

(?) ‘It suits the τέχνη that you have taken up —’

(Chorus) ‘To do what? To make what? Your advertisement (viz. of the νεοχώμα ἀθύρματο, 86) does not please me/pleases me.’ 18

However, I have not found any parallel for this metaphor. The line remains a puzzle. 19