

W. B. HENRY – RENÉ NÜNLIST

AESCHYLUS, *DICTYULCI* (FR. 47A RADT) AND *ISTHMIATAE* (FR. 78A–D)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 129 (2000) 13–16

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



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<sup>2</sup>.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** ]παντάπασι . . . φθαρης (Radt). I read the verb as αποφθαρης. απο is quite clear on the original, and recognizable in the plate in E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*<sup>1</sup>, Oxford 1971, no. 24: of α, 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 παντάπασι, doubtful 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' ἄπασι' (or παντάπασι': cf. S. fr. 1130.13 with P. Maas, *BPhW* 32, 1912, 1427f. = *Kl. Schr.*, Munich 1973, 51f.) ἀποφθαρή(ι)ς: the spacing at least suits τ, though none of the cross-stroke survives, and ς is hardly open to doubt, the trace being the lower left-hand arc of a circle close to α. Cf. for the construction S. *El.* 962 ἄλεκτρα γηράσκουσιν ἀνυμέναιά τε; KG i.310, A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles*, Leiden 1982, 41f. The μή with which Lobel followed his παντάπασι, 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 αἰχ]μάλωτος ο ς[ ]ζω κακά, Radt αἰχ]μάλωτος ο ςα ω κακά. But the best reading of the verb, not mentioned by either, is οἴζω: I owe it to Dr Coles, who observes that there is no justification for the ζ 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 ]χμ<sup>1</sup>.

**820** No reliably attested or probable trisyllable can be produced with the papyrus' ]γτροπος, and Harrison's -τροφος (*CR* 57, 1943, 20) is certainly to be accepted: for the corruption, no doubt 'due to the neighbouring τρόπων', cf. Pi. O. 13.7 (ὁμότροπος and -φος vv. ll.), *PGM* vii.765 (cύντροφος Preisendanz: -πος pap. (iii AD)); F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* i, Milan 1976, 93. But ξύ]γτροφος<sup>2</sup>, not too long for the space, is an improvement on Harrison's ἔ]γτροφος: the latter would require the last syllable of the previous line to be taken as *brevis in longo*, giving metrical pause between a preposition and its case in the corresponding lines of the strophe (810f. ξὺν | μητρὶ), an anomaly not paralleled in Aeschylus' lyrics (West, *Aeschyli tragoediae*, xxxi). For the use of a pair of pherecrateans in synartesis, see L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* 26, 1976, 22–5; also T. C. W. Stinton, *CQ* 27, 1977, 65 = *Collected Papers*, Oxford 1990, 359.

**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. cημ. 9, p. 75.15–18 C. There are no grounds for taking the

<sup>1</sup> Other minor points: **768** ] ουσα. ]κ appears acceptable, e. g. ἡ]κουσα. **772** For ] . . . [ ] [ ] ς, I read ] . . . ρ ς: ὄρκος, proposed by Lobel merely as a suitable subject for the following ἐν χρόνῳ μενεῖ, 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 υται: υ (γάν]υται 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 τθι: the ink in question is the displaced top of the first τ (so Dr Coles). **805** ως [ . A further speck at the end: ως τὰ]χιστα (Fraenkel) acceptable as spacing. **822** γ]άμον, **824** ἦ[δ]η: read γά]μον, ἦδη. **831** An alternative to γαθ]εῖ (Siegmann (γη-), Kamerbeek) is χάρ]ει (suggested by 799). Then not νυμφ[ ]λον but νυμφ]ον.

<sup>2</sup> κύ]γ- Mette (1959), but the form with ξ is to be preferred in Aeschylus (West, *Aeschyli tragoediae*, xli).

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<sup>3</sup>.6 (*Isthmiastae* fr. 78c.42 = 78 Snell); see in general Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*<sup>2</sup>, 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 εἴθετις<sup>4</sup>; 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<sup>5</sup> in col. ii of this papyrus<sup>6</sup>, P. Oxy. 2162 (*Isthmiastae*) cols. i and iii (touching the initial κ), 2245 fr. 1 cols. ii<sup>7</sup> and iii (A. fr. 204b, c), and 2255 fr. 12 col. ii (A. fr. 25d)<sup>8</sup>; P. Oxy. 2162 col. ii<sup>9</sup> and 2255 (A. fr. 451m) fr. 27(a)<sup>10</sup> have examples at the lower left-hand corner<sup>11</sup>.

### *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<sup>12</sup>, 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 collesis is visible on the backs of both pieces (at κακάτις in 43 Snell [fr. 78c i.7], κιδήρι in 67 Snell [fr. 78a ii.31], etc.). If the fragments are alined 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<sup>13</sup>. Trochaic tetrameters, favoured by Radt, would project to the left of the trimeters in the

<sup>3</sup> I. e. fr. 2(a) ii: see below for the arrangement of the fragments.

<sup>4</sup> 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 εἴθετις.

<sup>5</sup> A use noticed by W. A. Johnson, *ZPE* 96, 1993, 214, who mentions my first five examples.

<sup>6</sup> The mark is placed on the alinement of the opening verses, which is maintained throughout the column, except that the παραπεριγραφή l. 803 stands in εἴθετις and l. 805 and the corresponding l. 814 in εἴθετις. Lobel, who represents the anapaests ll. 821ff. as beginning slightly further to the left, is deceived by warping of the papyrus; he is followed by Radt.

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> The final trimeters, unlike those in col. i, are not indented, no doubt because col. ii did not include tetrameters.

<sup>10</sup> 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).

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> *Hermes* 84, 1956, 1–11 (≈ *Gesammelte Schriften*, Göttingen 1966, 164–75 = B. Seidensticker (ed.), *Satyrspiel* (Wege der Forschung 579), Darmstadt 1989, 78–92).

<sup>13</sup> 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). πόρθια (Kamerbeek) also seems incompatible with the trace, which suggests rather the curved tip of a stroke ascending from left to right, e. g. υ, but further ink may have been lost to the right through abrasion, so that e. g. θ (as in 35 φθειρών) cannot be excluded.

**36** ἐπ ρανὸ ἴ πονων. The papyrus can now be seen to have επηρ-: ἐπηράνωι πόνων, as Lobel had suspected, or possibly ἐπ ἠράνωι (Cantarella). The false reading επκρ- (Lobel, Radt) was due to the displacement of the trace at the lower right-hand corner of η, now corrected.

**39** ]α . . . ηι coi πρ . . . [ ± 6 ] . . . νε . . . ν. 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 ι (so already Snell, Mette). After coi, traces suggesting προϋττα. At the end of the line, νεπη (Dr Coles). Read therefore ] . . . χρηι coi προϋττα [ . . . ] . . . ν ἔπη. If με (Mette) preceded χρηι, there will be no room for another letter between it and the first trace; the choices include an adjective (or πότερ]ά) followed by με χρή{ι}. At the end of the line, if . . . ν represents an infinitive, either [ένν]ἐπειν or [έξε]ιπειν (preceded by τὰδ') would suit space and traces.

**44** ]ει παλαιο . . . τῶδ' ἐνοικτε . . . [ . . . ] . . . 'Between ο and τ traces of ink perhaps compatible with υ' (Lobel). With the microscope one can see the lower right-hand corner and a dot in place for the top right-hand corner of ν (whose second upright would touch the cross-bar of τ as in οΝΤωc four lines earlier). Articulate therefore παλαίοντ' οὐδέν: the verb παλαίω is not so far attested in Aeschylus, but he has δυσπάλαιτος, δυσπαλής, πάλαισμα, παλαιστής, and πάλη. Then Radt rightly suspects that a form of οικτίρω is to be supplied: the papyrus has οικτειρε[. After the lacuna, the end of the cap of ε, touching the cross-bar, as often in this hand (e. g. in 8 Ειδῶλον), 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 polyp thus disappears. After the following ο, 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 changes<sup>14</sup>:

ὡc δ]οῦλον ἢ τρίδουλ[ον  
 ἄν]αξ δ]ικαι[ . . . ] [ . . . ]θενα[ . . . ]μ[ . . . ]  
 κακ]ῶι τε κοί[τ]ωι καὶ κακαίc δ]υ[σ]αυλίαιc  
 αἰ]εὶ παλαίοντ' οὐδέν οικτ{ε} ἴρε[ιc ἐμ]έ.  
 45 ἐγ]ὼ δὲ τ[α]ύ[τ]αc πολυπ[ό]νον[υ]c ὀμιλί]αc  
 φ]εύγων [ . . . ] [ . . . ]ατονδ' [ . . . ] [ . . . ]

raises two objections to the view that all the lines are trimeters: 'v. 5 [41 Snell] etiam cum supplemento ὡc δ]οῦλον [Kamerbeek] brevior est et v. 13 [49 Snell] in trimetrum suppletus multo longius protruderet'. The first is false, Kamerbeek's supplement being the only one of those recorded by Radt which fills the space; as to the second, see the suggestion made at 47–50n.

<sup>14</sup> 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 δ]ικαι[ and 43 κοί[, the additional ι is represented by a trace of the foot (42) or middle (43) of the letter.

41 ὡς Kamerbeek, cetera Cantarella 42 Kamerbeek 43 init. Cantarella, cetera Lobel 44 init. Snell, fin. Nünlist post Radt 45 πολυπ[ό]νου[ς] Nünlist, ὀμιλί[α]ς Henry, cetera Snell 46 Cantarella

‘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 (44f.), cf. *Eu.* 779f. = 809f.

**47–50** π]ότερα in 47 (Fraenkel, Cantarella) and κο]ῦ in 48 (Snell) fit the spaces at the beginnings of these lines. For 49f., Henry suggests βία]ια θαρσῶν δέξ[ομαι and εἰ (ἐν Setti, Kamerbeek, *spatio longius*) τ]ῶι ἱερῶι μὲν[.

**93** τί δ' ἀντιποιεῖν [ . . . ]πιπλουν μου[ . ]ανδαν[. α alone will not fill the space between δ and ν at the beginning of the line: probably we should supply τί δ[ρ]ᾶν. The trace following the next lacuna is the right-hand end of a cross-bar: not τ, which always touches the following ι below the top in this combination, as twice in this line, and so probably π. Between υ and α, a minimal trace on the line, prima facie suiting the lower left-hand corner of χ. 93f. might then be given as follows:

— τί δ[ρ]ᾶν, τί ποιεῖν[ . . . ]πιπλουνμου . ανδαν[  
— ξυνηθμιάζειν [οἴειν] ἐμμελέετατον.

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 ὁ/τὸ ἐπίπλουσ/ν 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 ≈ κνίχη ≈ δημός) come to mean ‘(mere) wrapping’, ‘puff’<sup>15</sup>. In that case one might interpret as follows:

— ἦνπερ μεθεῖλ[εσ τή]ν τέχνην, τάυτηι πρέπ[ει —<sup>16</sup>  
— τί δ[ρ]ᾶν; τί ποιεῖν; [τοῦ]πίπλουσ μ' οὐχ ἀνδάν[ει. (or: μούφανδάν[ει.)<sup>17</sup>

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

(Chorus) ‘To do what? To make what? Your advertisement (viz. of the νεοχμὰ ἀθύρματα, 86) does not please me/pleases me.’<sup>18</sup>

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

Merton College, Oxford  
Basel/Oxford

W. B. Henry  
René Nünlist

<sup>15</sup> Cf. also Prometheus’ sacrificial betrayal in Hes. *Th.* 540f.

<sup>16</sup> πρέπει must be impersonal on this view, though it might seem more natural to supply τοῦτο as its subject from the previous line. For the form of the intervention, cf. *Pers.* 734–6 and other passages cited by D. J. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity*, Berkeley 1979, 57 with n. 16.

<sup>17</sup> For the seeming redundancy of δρᾶν/ποιεῖν, cf. Pl. *Soph.* 233d9–10. – μ' οὐχ has to be read with synizesis: ἀνδάνω never certainly takes the accusative (KG i.414 Anmerk. 14). For this kind of synizesis, cf. probably line 24; also *Ch.* 927 (κούριζει = κοί ὀρίζει, if not κοί οὐρ-), Ar. *Eccl.* 912 (μούταίρος = μοί ὀ εταίρος) and οἴμ(οι) ὡς, e. g. Ar. *Ach.* 590 (I owe these references to Martin L. West).

<sup>18</sup> Alternatively one might think of: ‘Your paltry offering (i. e. the ἀθύρματα) does not please me’. Cf. Dionysus’ complaint in Eubulus fr. 94 Kassel–Austin, whose gist is clear despite the heavy corruption.

<sup>19</sup> The following minor improvements may be noted, besides those made in passing above: **65** τόνδε. **72** After πλ, a trace at mid-height, e. g. πλῆ[θος (Kamerbeek). **97** ] [ . ]φερων. **Fr. 78b.2** του[ (so already Mette). **9** ] ις. **11** τ [ . **Fr. 78d.4** ] δ.