



## Notes on Fragments of Euripides

James Diggle

*The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 47, No. 1. (1997), pp. 98-108.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-8388%281997%292%3A47%3A1%3C98%3AANOFOE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-S>

*The Classical Quarterly* is currently published by The Classical Association.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/classical.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

NOTES ON FRAGMENTS OF EURIPIDES<sup>1</sup>

## 1. ALEXANDROS

Fr. 23.2–8 Snell, 13–19 Page

This is Snell's text:

<Χο.>	[ἀλλ' εἰσὼρῶ γὰρ] Ἔκτορα ἐξ ἀγωνίω[ν ἤκοντα μὲν χθὼν κύγονόν τε, παῖδε σῶ, [ζέουσι δ'] εἷς θ' ἄμιλλαν ἤκουσιν λόγων.	
<Δη.>	[ . . . . . οὐδέν', ὅστις ἐστὶ δυσχερής, ἀλοῦς δὲ τοῖς κακοῖσι μαλθάσσει φρένας.	5
<Εκ.>	[έγω δέ γ' ὅς]τις μικρὰ ἔχων ἐγκλήματα [δεινὸν νο]μίζει καὶ συνέστηκεν φόβω[ι.	

2–3 suppl. Crönert

4 suppl. Snell

5–6 suppl. Crönert

7 suppl. Pohlenz

8 suppl. Crönert

2 ἀλλ' εἰσὼρῶ γὰρ (which Page, too, accepts) is unlikely to be right. I have observed elsewhere<sup>2</sup> that ἀλλ' εἰσὼρῶ γὰρ is normally followed by the deictic pronoun (τόνδε or the like). The only exception is *Ba.* 1165–6 ἀλλ' εἰσὼρῶ γὰρ ἐς δόμους ὀρμωμένην | Πενθέως Ἀγανὴν μητέρ'. In entrance announcements, whatever form they take, the deictic pronoun is more often present than absent. D. I. Jacob<sup>3</sup> plausibly suggests καὶ μὴν ὀρῶ τόνδ']. Compare *Hi.* 1151 καὶ μὴν ὀπαδὸν Ἰππολύτου τόνδ' εἰσὼρῶ, *Andr.* 494–5 καὶ μὴν ἐσὼρῶ τότε κύκρατον | ζεύγος πρὸ δόμων, 545 καὶ μὴν δέδορκα τόνδε Πηλέα πέλας, *Su.* 980 καὶ μὴν θαλάμας τάςδ' ἐσὼρῶ δῆ, 1009–10 καὶ μὴν ὀραῖς τήνδ' ἦς ἐφέστηκες πέλας | πυράν, *El.* 339 καὶ μὴν δέδορκα τόνδε, σὸν λέγω πόσιν, *Rh.* 627 καὶ μὴν . . . τόνδ' Ἀλέξανδρον βλέπω, *Ar. Lys.* 1082 καὶ μὴν ὀρῶ καὶ τοῦσδε τοὺς αὐτόχθονας, *Eccl.* 41–2 καὶ μὴν ὀρῶ καὶ Κλειναρέτην καὶ Ὠστράτην | προσιοῦσαν ἤδη τήνδε καὶ Φιλαινέτην, *Plut.* 332–3 καὶ μὴν ὀρῶ καὶ Βλεψίδημον τουτονὶ | προσιόντα. For καὶ μὴν ὀρῶ without the deictic pronoun, *Alc.* 611 καὶ μὴν ὀρῶ σὸν πατέρα . . ., *S. Ant.* 1180 καὶ μὴν ὀρῶ τάλαιναν Εὐρυδίκην ὁμοῦ, *Ar. Ran.* 288 καὶ μὴν ὀρῶ νῆ τὸν Δία θηρίον μέγα.

Professor Lee (who has examined the papyrus) writes: 'There is a trace at the left of ἐκτ. It is not compatible with ρ, but δ is possible: read τόνδ' Ἔκτ.'

3 ἤκοντα (which Page, too, accepts) is impossible, not only because ἤκουσιν follows in 4, but also (as Jacob observes) because the participle ἤκοντα, which properly describes an arrival which is completed, is not used in this type of entrance announcement, which describes an arrival still in progress. Jacob suggests ἔρποντα. But his alternative suggestion στείχοντα, which he believes to be too long for the space, is preferable. I shall examine the question of space later. For the moment I observe that στείχοντα is almost formulaic at the beginning of a trimeter in these

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful for helpful comments on *Alexandros* to Professor C. Collard and Professor K. H. Lee, on *Erectheus* to Dr C. F. L. Austin and Professor M. J. Cropp.

<sup>2</sup> *ZPE* 24 (1977) 291–2 = *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994) 171–2.

<sup>3</sup> *Hellenika* 29 (1976) 340–3.

entrance announcements: *Cycl.* 85–7 ὄρῳ . . . κάφος | κώπης τ' ἀνακτας . . . | στείχοντας, *Alc.* 611–12 καὶ μὴν ὄρῳ σὸν πατέρα . . . | στείχοντ', *Med.* 269–70 ὄρῳ δὲ καὶ Κρέοντα . . . | στείχοντα, 1118–19 καὶ δὴ δέδορκα τόνδε . . . | στείχοντ', *Hclld.* 49–50 ὄρῳ κήρυκα τόνδ' Εὐρυςθέως | στείχοντ', *Hi.* 51–2 ἀλλ' εἰσορῶ γὰρ τόνδε παῖδα Θηεῖως | στείχοντα, *Tr.* 707–8 τίν' αὖ δέδορκα τόνδ' Ἀχαιικὸν λάτρην | στείχοντα . . .; *Rh.* 627–8 καὶ μὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς τόνδ' Ἀλέξανδρον βλέπω | στείχοντα, fr. 105 ὄρῳ μὲν ἀνδρῶν τόνδε γυμνάδα στόλον | στείχοντα, *S.* *OC* 311–12 γυναιχ' ὄρῳ | στείχουσαν ἡμῶν ἄσσον. Similarly, in a messenger speech, *Or.* 877–8 Ὅρεστην κείνον οὐχ ὀραῖς πέλας | στείχοντ' . . .;.

There is another entrance announcement at fr. 6. 11–12 Snell (1–2 Page), where Snell and Page print Wilamowitz's supplements:

<Χο.> [καὶ μὴν δέ]δορκα παῖδα Κ[ακάνδραν] εἴθεν  
[ἦκουσα]ν ἀδύτων ὦ[δε] Φοιβείων πάρος.

The Δ of δέ]δορκα stands above the Ν of ἦκουσα]Ν. So the former line has eight letters in the space occupied by six in the latter. If the supplements are written out in the script of the papyrus, the magnitude of the discrepancy is confirmed. Jacob suggests [ἐρπουσα]ν or [χωρουσα]ν. I prefer [στείχουσα]ν. With [στείχουσα]ν we have nine letters in the space occupied by eight in the preceding line. If the supplements are written out, they will be found to occupy much the same space. Jacob's supplements (seven letters), when written out, will be found to be too short. Then ὦ[δε] is probable, fulfilling a role similar to that of the more regular deictic pronoun. It is used in entrance announcements at *S.* *OT* 298 τὸν θεῖον ἦδη μάντιν ὦδ' ἄγουσιν, *OC* 1097–8 τὰς κόρας γὰρ εἰσορῶ | τὰς δ' ἄσσον αὐθις ὦδε προσπολουμένας, 1249–51 καὶ μὴν ὄδ' . . . ὦδ' ὀδοιπορεῖ. A vocative ὦ [γύνα] is less likely. The objection of H. J. Mette<sup>4</sup> to Wilamowitz's πάρος, and his own proposal ἔσω, are based on a misconception of the meaning of the perfect δέδορκα. Finally (as Jacob observes, citing Fraenkel on *A. Ag.* 1035) we must write Κ[ακάνδραν] not Κ[ακάνδραν].

4 The supplement ζέουσι δ' appears to be Snell's. Snell attributes it to Körte, who in fact proposed ὀργῶσι δ'.<sup>5</sup> 'They are seething' would sound odd even if it were a true observation, and of Hector at least it is probably not true, for he appears to be very calm. ὀργῶσι δ' is no better. σπεύδουσιν (Pohlenz) and σπεύδουσι δ' (Wilamowitz), both reported by Crönert, have no appeal. πάρεισι (Page), 'Here they are', sandwiched between 'I see Hector coming' and 'they are coming for a quarrel', is insufferably otiose. I suggest [Δηίφοβον]. Even if (what there is no means of knowing) Deiphobus was associated with Hector in a preceding narrative, the name is welcome. If he was not, it is indispensable. That Hector names Deiphobus in 11 counts for little or nothing; Deiphobus names Hector in 9. Compare *Hclld.* 118–19 καὶ μὴν ὄδ' αὐτὸς ἔρχεται σπουδῆν ἔχων | Ἀκάμας τ' ἀδελφός. Then 'Perhaps δ' rather than θ' (i.e. εἰς δ' ἄμιλλαν), R. A. Coles.<sup>6</sup> The photograph (Coles, plate IV) certainly suggests that Δ is likelier than Θ.

Since no line-beginnings are preserved in this column, we have no guide to the number of letters lost. The Χ of μό]χθων stands above the CΔ of εἰς δ': so

<sup>4</sup> *Lustrum* 9 (1964) 70.

<sup>5</sup> *APF* 7 (1924) 256.

<sup>6</sup> *BICS* Suppl. 32 (1974) 45.

*ΤΕΙΧΟΝΤΑΜΟ* (11 letters) will have occupied roughly the same space as *ΔΗΙΦΟΒΟΝΕΙ* (10 letters). The *E* of *Ἔκτορα* stands above the *C* of *κύγγονοι*: so *ΤΕΙΧΟΝΤΑΜΟΧΘΩΝ* (15 letters) will have occupied the same space as *ΚΑΙΜΗΝΟΡΩΤΟΝΔ(Ε)* (13 or 14). When the supplements are written out in the script of the papyrus, they will be found to be compatible in length. Jacob's [ἔρποντα in 3 is also compatible with the supplements in 2 and 4, but I reject it because *στείχοντα* not *ἔρποντα* is the word which we expect in these entrance announcements.

5 Before οὐ]δέν' Crönert proposed [τιμῶ . . . (not *τιμῶ μὲν*, as Snell claims), Körte [τιμῶ γὰρ, Münscher more plausibly [ἐπήγνεε', which Page accepts.

6 Crönert's supplement (which Page, too, accepts) does not appeal. Page translates: 'Shame on all men who are first indignant, then—captives of misfortune—abate their temper!' It is curious to allude to Hector, defeated in the games, as a 'captive of misfortune'. Further, the adjective *δυσχερής* needs some qualification. I suggest that this qualification is provided by *κακοίσι*, which will be masculine not neuter. The construction is the same as *S. El.* 929 ἡδύς οὐδὲ μητρὶ *δυσχερής*. Then we should get a suitable antithesis by supplying [ἀθθις δὲ τοῖς: 'I do not approve of any man who is hard on the base but then softens his temper towards them.' 'The base' alludes to Paris and his like (cf. fr. 29, 38, 39 Snell [59, 57, 60 Nauck]). For *ἀθθις* δέ see *Alc.* 502–3 *πρώτα μὲν Λυκάονι, | ἀθθις δὲ Κύκνωι*, *S. fr.* 88. 1–2 Radt . . . *φίλους, | ἀθθις δὲ Τιμάς* (the context of *S. fr.* 314.235 *ἀθθις δ'* is lacunose), *H. h. Ap.* 159, *h. Aphr.* 23, *Hes. Theog.* 50, *Sol. fr.* 36. 24 West, *Bacchyl.* 15. 60, *Hdt.* 3.2.2, 7.10δ.1, 7.102.2, 8.60β, 8.144.2, 9.78.3. As for *τοῖς* ('there is in fact a slight trace of ink that permits the ]σ in Crönert and Snell . . . but this could have percolated through from the layer above', Coles),<sup>7</sup> the article, though not indispensable, is appropriate.

7 Page's [μάταιος is less apt than Pohlenz's [ἐγὼ δέ γ' (see Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 153–4). Then not *μίκρ'* but *σμίκρ'*.<sup>8</sup>

8 Page (accepting *δεινὸν νομίζειι*) translates 'Only a fool is led by petty grievances to think it disaster'. But *δεινὸν νομίζειι* is not elsewhere used absolutely, like *δεινὸν ποιεῖσθαι*. At *Antiope* 23 Page (fr. XLVIII.23 Kambitsis), where Page and Kambitsis begin a sentence with *δεινὸν νομίζων*, which Page translates 'in indignation', the words are likely to have been combined with an infinitive in the preceding line, like *Herc.* 281–2 *τὸ καθθανεῖν | δεινὸν νομίζω*. Further, the sense, which amounts to 'think it a disaster to have petty grievances', is most unconvincing. Supply *μεγάλα νομίζειι*, like fr. 275. 4 *κἄν σμίκρ' ἔχη τις, μεγάλ' ἔχει νομιζέτω*.

I do not know what to make of *καὶ συνέστηκεν φόβωι*. For a survey of the renderings which have been proposed see M. Huys, *ZPE* 62 (1986) 16–17.

## 2. ANTIOPE

*Fr. 187 Nauck, VIII Kambitsis*

(Ζήθος) ἀνὴρ γὰρ ὅστις εἰς βίον κεκτημένος  
τὰ μὲν κατ' οἴκους ἀμελείαι παρεῖς ἔαι,

<sup>7</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 6) 57, n. 12.

<sup>8</sup> See *Gnomon* 47 (1975) 289–90 = *Euripidea* 145–6.

μολπαῖσι δ' ἤσθεις τοῦτ' αἰὲ θηρέεται,  
 ἄργος μὲν οἴκοις καὶ πόλει γενήσεται,  
 φίλοισι δ' οὐδέεις· ἢ φύσις γὰρ οἴχεται,  
 ὅταν γλυκείας ἠδονῆς ἤσσων τις ἦι.

5

How are we to translate 4 ἄργος μὲν οἴκοις καὶ πόλει γενήσεται? (i) 'Inutilis quidem domi et in civitate evadet' Musgrave; 'will be lazy in his house and in the state' Snell.<sup>9</sup> But, although οἴκοις can be taken as a locative dative, 'in his house' (so *Hec.* 682; cf. *Hec.* 457, *Ph.* 1035, both lyric, 'in [their] houses'), πόλει is not very naturally taken as locative, 'in the city', which is elsewhere (too commonly to need illustration) ἐν πόλει.<sup>10</sup> (ii) 'non civitati, non domo ('domui' Barnes) prodest suae' Valckenaer; similarly Kambitsis, 'οἴκοις et πόλει doivent être, sinon des datifs d'intérêt, du moins des *dativi iudicantis* . . . ἄργος signifie "inutile de par son oisiveté".' But no parallel has been offered to support the suggestion that ἄργος can be linked to the datives in this way and in this sense.

With ἄργος itself no fault is to be found (Kambitsis cites *Med.* 296 and fr. 512), and replacements such as ἄλγος μὲν (Dowdall)<sup>11</sup> or ἄχθος μὲν or ἀχρεῖος (Blaydes)<sup>12</sup> should not be contemplated. And Elmsley's ἀστοῖς for οἴκοις has nothing to commend it, since ἀστοί and πόλις are tautologous, whereas οἶκος and πόλις form a naturally contrasting pair: cf. *El.* 130 τίνα πόλιν, τίνα δ' οἶκον, 611 οἶκον καὶ πόλιν, *Tr.* 892–3 ἐξαιρεῖ πόλεις, | πῖμπρησι οἴκους, *Ph.* 533 πολλοὺς δ' ἐς οἴκους καὶ πόλεις εὐδαίμονας, *Antiope* fr. 200 N (XIX Kambitsis) 1–2 γνώμη (Stob.: γνώμαις ps.-Plut., Orio, Diog. Cyn., Epict.: βουλαῖς Clem. Alex.)<sup>13</sup> γὰρ ἀνδρὸς εὖ μὲν οἰκοῦνται πόλεις, | εὖ δ' οἶκος, εἴς τ' αὖ πόλεμον ἰσχύει μέγα, *Archel.* fr. 239 N (13 Austin) 2 οὔτ' οἶκον οὔτε πόλιν <ἀν>ορθώσειεν ἄν (Valckenaer: π- ὁ- ἄν Stob. 3.8.13: γαίαν ὁ- ἄν Orio: βίοντον οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ Stob. 3.29.22), *A. ScT* 190 οἴκωι καὶ πόλει, *S. Ant.* 673–4 αὕτη πόλεις ἄλλωσι, ἢ δ' ἀναστάτους | οἴκους τίθησι, Moschion TrGF 97 F 6.7–8 οὔτε . . . οἶκος οὔτε . . . πόλις.

The text provokes suspicion not only because of the difficulty of explaining the datives. It also provokes suspicion because of the plural οἴκοις. For, in a sentence which is concerned with a single individual, we do not want a plurality of οἴκοι. It may be replied that οἴκοις, like οἴκους at line 2, can be taken as plural for singular. But, with singular πόλει following, why avoid singular οἴκωι? That οἴκωι (not οἴκοις) καὶ πόλει is the natural pairing is suggested by the passages cited above.

If ἄργος could be constructed with the datives in the sense suggested by Kambitsis and others, then we could be satisfied with οἴκωι καὶ πόλει. But, even if a parallel for such a construction were to be adduced, I should still regard sense and style as better served by οἴκοι καὶ πόλει, which gives the sense reflected in Musgrave's and Snell's translations. For οἴκοι see *E. Tr.* 379, 397, fr. 793, *A.* fr. 317 Radt, *S. OT* 1123, *Tr.* 730 (οἴκοι Wakefield: οἴκοις codd.), *OC* 352, 759,<sup>14</sup> 1037, fr. 934 Radt. For other such contrasts between the domestic and the civic spheres see *S. Ant.* 661–2 ἐν τοῖς γὰρ

<sup>9</sup> *Scenes from Greek Drama* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964) 83.

<sup>10</sup> On locative datives in general see KG 1.441–3.

<sup>11</sup> Reported by Blaydes, *Adversaria in Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Halle, 1894) 101.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.* (above, n. 11) 312.

<sup>13</sup> Not γνώμαις (Nauck, Kambitsis), since the singular γνώμη must be understood as subject of ἰσχύει (so Wecklein, *BPhW* 34 [1914] 1059, *Philologus* 79 [1923–4] 56, n. 4). Variation between plural and singular is regular only in the case of *personal* subjects (KG 1.56–7, 87), such as at *Su.* 435–6, adduced (in support of γνώμαις) by Kambitsis.

<sup>14</sup> ἐκεῖ (Wecklein) is needless: see Housman, *Classical Papers* 769.

οἰκείοισιν ὅστις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ | χρηστός, φανεῖται κὰν πόλει δίκαιος ὢν, 1247–9 ἐς πόλιν γόου | οὐκ ἀξιώσειν, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ στέγης ἔσω | δμωαῖς προθήσειν πένθος οἰκείον στένειν.

After I had written this note I found that R. J. Walker had already proposed (without discussion) οἴκοι κὰν πόλει, together with an unwanted μάργος for ἀργός.<sup>15</sup>

Fr. 219. 1 Nauck, XXIV. 1 Kambitsis

κόσμος δὲ σιγῆς στέφανος ἀνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ.

Kambitsis rightly censures Herwerden's σιγῆ στεφανός, printed by Nauck. But it will take more than the authority of Wilamowitz, which Kambitsis invokes, to convince me that, whether in sentiment or in style, 'the ornament of silence is the crown of a good man' is better than puerile. Herwerden himself saw this, better than his detractors: 'inepte loquacem ipsum poetam fuisse dicamus necesse est, qui scribere potuerit: ornamentum taciturnitatis ornamentum esse viri probi'.<sup>16</sup> But he coupled this valid objection with the invalid claim that στέφανος, when used figuratively, never means merely 'ornamentum', but always 'victoriae praemium'. This is proved false by *Herc.* 839 τὸν καλλίπαιδα στέφανον, *Tr.* 803 (the olive) οὐράνιον στέφανον λιπαραῖς <τε> κόσμον Ἀθάνας, *IA* 193–4 (Ajax) τὸν Καλαμῖνος στέφανον.

Pearson in his note on S. fr. 64.4 (κόσμος ἢ σιγῆ) quotes the line in the form κόσμος δὲ σιγῆ στέφανος ἀνδρὸς οὐ κακοῦ. It should be punctuated κόσμος δὲ σιγῆ, στέφανος κτλ. Note the collocation of στέφανος and κόσμος in *Tr.* 803, cited above.

### 3. AUTOLYCUS

Fr. 282. 11–12 Nauck

ὄταν δὲ προσπέσῃ γῆρας πικρόν,  
τρίβωνες ἐκβαλόντες οἰχονται κρόκας.

12 ἐκβαλόντες Athen. 413 D: ἐκλιπόντες uel ἐκλείποντες Diog. Laert. 1. 56

Athletes, when they grow old, 'go to ruin, (like) cloaks which have lost their nap'. J. Dumortier<sup>17</sup> entertains the curious notion that Euripides has borrowed this image from deutero-Isaiah 50:9. The proper model for comparison is comedy. This is that form of brachylogy, identification instead of comparison (like Ar. *Vesp.* 144 καπνός ἔγωγ' ἐξέρχομαι), which is characteristic of comedy and proverbial speech (P. Shorey, *CPh* 4 [1909] 433–6, Headlam-Knox on Herodas 6.14, E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* [Berlin, 1922] 51–2 = *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* [Florence, 1960] 47–8, R. Kassel, *RhM* 116 [1973] 109–12 = *Kleine Schriften* [Berlin and New York, 1991] 388–91) but is comparatively rare in tragedy (A. *ScT* 835–6 ἔτευξα τύμβωι μέλος | θυιάς, *Ag.* 394 διώκει παῖς ποτανὸν ὄρνιν, [A.] *PV* 856–7 ἔπτοημένοι φρένας, | κίρκοι πελειῶν οὐ μακρὰν λελεειμμένοι, S. *OC* 1081–2 εἴθ' ἀελλαία ταχύρρωστος πελειὰς | αἰθερίας νεφέλας κύρσαιμι, E. *Rh.* 56–7 ὅστις μ' εὐτυχοῦντ' ἐνόσφιας | θοίνης λέοντα, and possibly S. *OT* 477–8 φοιτᾷ . . . πετραῖος

<sup>15</sup> *Euripidean Fragments emended* (London, 1920) 8–9.

<sup>16</sup> *Exercitationes criticae* (The Hague, 1862) 35.

<sup>17</sup> *REG* 80 (1967) 148–51.

ὁ ταῦρος).<sup>18</sup> It is found in satyric drama (*Autolycus* is satyric) at A. fr. 207 *τράγος γένειον ἄρα πενθήσεις κύ γε* (on which see Shorey and Kassel, cited above, and Radt ad loc.). We do not know the genre of S. fr. 800 *Λυδία λίθος κίδηρον τηλόθεν προσηγάγου*, but S. fr. dub. 1122 *ἐγὼ μάγειρος ἀρτύω σοφῶς* (if it is an example of this locution) will be satyric or comic.

#### 4. ERECTHEUS

(a) *Lycurg. Leocr. 100* (fr. 360 Nauck, 50 Austin, 13 Martínez, 10 Carrara)<sup>19</sup>

4-6 ἐγὼ δὲ δώσω παῖδα τὴν ἐμὴν κτανεῖν.  
 λογίζομαι δὲ πολλά: πρῶτα μὲν πόλιν  
 οὐκ ἂν τιν' ἄλλην τῆσδε βελτίω λαβεῖν.

6 οὐκ ἦν τιν' ἄλλην Bothe, οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλην Kaibel,<sup>20</sup> οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην Prinz, οὐκ ἂν τις ἄλλην . . . λάβοι Blaydes<sup>21</sup> λάβοι Dindorf,<sup>22</sup> λάβοις Blaydes,<sup>23</sup> λαχεῖν Carrara

The text of line 6, as the list of conjectures shows, has often been impugned. Even those who believe the text sound differ in their interpretations of it.

'iunge λογίζομαι . . . λαβεῖν' says Austin, rightly. Conjectures whose purpose is to alter the construction are needless. I mention only Dindorf's λάβοι, since it has been revived by Degani,<sup>24</sup> whose motive is to avoid the change from infinitive at 6 to indicative at 14, a change which (especially at that distance) is natural enough, as Carrara observes.<sup>25</sup> And the form of optative is hardly admissible in tragedy. If *τρέφειν* is right at fr. 903, the line is probably by a comic poet. See also KB 2.52–3. Further, let us be clear that the whole phrase πόλιν . . . τιν' ἄλλην is the object of λαβεῖν. It is scarcely natural to dissociate τιν' ἄλλην from πόλιν and to take it as subject of λαβεῖν, contemplated by Carrara and advocated by Martínez ('primero, que ciudad mejor que ésta ninguna otra se puede encontrar').

'λαβεῖν suspectum' adds Austin. Is suspicion justified? Probably not, if the infinitive is translated rightly. The following translations are not quite right: 'civitatem non posse aliam hac praestantiorē habere' (J. Taylor),<sup>26</sup> 'me numquam aliam urbem, quae hac praestantior est, habituram' (Musgrave). Carrara<sup>27</sup> objects that πόλιν λαβεῖν would not so naturally mean 'have a city' as 'get a city', in the sense 'assumere una cittadinanza da parte di chi prima non ne era in possesso'. But his own conjecture λαχεῖν gives even less apt sense. The only woman who could be said πόλιν λαχεῖν is a

<sup>18</sup> See A. C. Pearson, *CQ* 13 (1919) 119–20, endorsed by H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea* (Oxford, 1990) 91.

<sup>19</sup> C. Austin, *Noua Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris reperta* (Berlin, 1968), A. Martínez Díez, *Euripides, Erecteo* (Granada, 1976), P. Carrara, *Euripide, Eretteo* (Papyrologica Florentina III, Florence, 1977). See also the edition by M. J. Cropp in C. Collard, M. J. Cropp and K. H. Lee, *Euripides, Selected Fragmentary Plays*, vol. i (Warminster, 1995).

<sup>20</sup> *DLZ* 2 (1881) 161, anticipating Wecklein (*SBAM* 1890, i, 42) and Blaydes, op. cit. (above, n. 11) 125.

<sup>21</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 20).

<sup>22</sup> *Zeitschr. f. d. Alterthumsw.* 1839, 1127, anticipating Meineke (ibid., 1844, 14).

<sup>23</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 11) 321.

<sup>24</sup> *QUCC* 1 (1979) 134–6.

<sup>25</sup> *Sileno* 1 (1975) 70.

<sup>26</sup> In his edition of Lycurg., *Leocr.* (Cambridge, 1743).

<sup>27</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 25) 71.

woman who, like the captives in *Troades*, has been assigned to a city by the fall of the lot. The right translation is ‘urbem mea reperire quae sit melior haud usquam licet’ (Grotius), ‘où trouver une ville qui l’emporte sur la nôtre?’ (F. Durrbach),<sup>28</sup> ‘una città migliore di questa non si potrebbe trovare’ (E. Malcovati),<sup>29</sup> ‘findet man keine bessere Stadt als diese’ (G.A. Seeck),<sup>30</sup> ‘I could not find any other city better than this’ (Cropp). For λαβεῖν in this connection Degani cites S. *Ph.* 1051 οὐκ ἂν λάβοις μου μᾶλλον οὐδέν’ εὐεβή, and Prof. Cropp draws my attention to E. *IT* 350 δύνουν με λήψεσθ’. See LSJ s.u. λαμβάνω A4.

An altogether different interpretation has been advocated by editors of Lycurgus but is ignored by, or is unknown to, editors of Euripides. A. Petrie<sup>31</sup> suggested that ‘λαβεῖν . . . gives quite a good point with δώσω: “I am prepared to give my daughter, and I reckon that there is no other city more worthy to receive her”.’ This interpretation was adopted by J. O. Burt:<sup>32</sup> there is no state / I count more worthy to accept my gift’. This is clever, but it has a weakness. For clarity the object of λαβεῖν ought to be expressed. Should we, then, replace τιν’ with νιν? The enclitic pronoun would stand exactly where we should expect it to stand, in the earliest possible position in its colon, in obedience to Wackernagel’s law,<sup>33</sup> after οὐκ ἂν, which begins the colon,<sup>34</sup> just as, at line 24 of this fragment, οὐκ ἂν νιν (Matthiae: μὴν codd.) ἐξέπεμπον. When the enclitic stands early in the colon, it often separates words in agreement, as πόλιν . . . ἄλλην here. Although there would remain a formal ambiguity in the syntax (both νιν and πόλιν . . . ἄλλην could be either subject or object of the infinitive), the sequence of thought (with λαβεῖν picking up δώσω) would resolve the ambiguity, so that the correct relationship between subject and object would not be more difficult to perceive than it is in other formally ambiguous instances such as *Hec.* 265 Ἐλένην νιν αἰτεῖν χρῆν τάφωι προστάγματα.<sup>35</sup> I was once attracted by this approach. I am grateful to Dr Austin and Professor Cropp, whose lack of enthusiasm for it has prompted me to see the superior merits of the transmitted text and of the translation adopted, most recently, by Cropp himself.

(b) *P. Sorb.* 2328 (fr. 65 Austin, 20 Martínez, 18 Carrara)

17 μακάριός ἐστι κείνος εὐδαίμων [θ’ ἄμα.

Austin’s supplement [θ’ ἄμα is accepted by Carrara. Although the adjectives μακάριος and εὐδαίμων are distinguished from one another at Arist. *EN* 1101<sup>a</sup> 6–8 (ἄθλιος μὲν οὐδέποτε γένοιτ’ ἂν ὁ εὐδαίμων, οὐ μὴν μακάριός γε, ἂν Πριαμικαῖς τύχαις περιπέσει), Euripides and other writers use them with no appreciable difference in meaning.<sup>36</sup> At *Or.* 540–1 ἐγὼ δὲ τᾶλλα μακάριος πέφυκ’ ἀνὴρ | πλὴν ἐς

<sup>28</sup> *Lycurge, Contre Léocrate* (Budé ed., 1932).

<sup>29</sup> *Licurgo, Orazione contro Leocrate* (Rome, 1966).

<sup>30</sup> *Euripides, Sämtliche Tragödien und Fragmente* 6 (Munich, 1981).

<sup>31</sup> *Lycurgus, The Speech against Leocrates* (Cambridge, 1922).

<sup>32</sup> *Minor Attic Orators* (Loeb ed., 1954).

<sup>33</sup> *Kleine Schriften* 1 (Göttingen, 1953) 1–104 (on νιν see 9–10). For further literature on Wackernagel’s law see my *The Textual Tradition of Euripides’ Orestes* (Oxford, 1991) 59, and *Euripidea* 170.

<sup>34</sup> See E. Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge* 1 (Rome, 1964) 101–2.

<sup>35</sup> For πόλιν . . . ἄλλην . . . βελτίω (without τιν’) cf. *Hi.* 292 ἄλλον . . . βελτίω λόγον.

<sup>36</sup> The relevant material may be found in C. De Heer, *ΜΑΚΑΡ-ΕΥΔΑΙΜΩΝ-ΟΛΒΙΟΣ-ΕΥΤΥΧΗΣ* (Amsterdam, 1969), M. McDonald, *Terms for Happiness in Euripides* (Göttingen, 1978).



θυγατέρας· τοῦτο δ' οὐκ εὐδαιμονῶ the expression μακάριος πέφυκα is synonymous with εὐδαιμονῶ. At *Ar. Eccl.* 1112–13 ὦ μακάριος μὲν δῆμος, εὐδαίμων δ' ἐγώ, | αὐτὴ τέ μοι δέσποινα μακαριωτάτη the two adjectives are interchangeable. When Euripides applies the adjectives to the dead Erectheus, it is hard to believe that he intends us to read into them any significant distinction in meaning. One would imagine that they reinforce each other, and bring out the completeness of the dead man's felicity, rather than distinguish between two different aspects of that felicity. They appear together, as a formulaic pair, in a variety of contexts (e.g. *Ar. Plut.* 654–5 τότε μὲν ἀθλιώτατον, | νῦν δ' εἴ τι ν' ἄλλον μακάριον κευδαίμονα, *Pl. Symp.* 193 D, *Rep.* 344 B, 354 A, *Gorg.* 507 C, *Leg.* 660 E, 718 B, *Arist. EN* 1098<sup>a</sup> 19, 1178<sup>b</sup> 9, *Isoc.* 5. 228), and are again applied to the dead at *Arist. fr.* 44 R<sup>3</sup> (p. 18 Ross) μακαρίου καὶ εὐδαίμονα εἶναι τοὺς τετελευτηκότας νομίζειν. If we are not meant to detect any significant difference in meaning between the two adjectives, then we may doubt whether θ' ἅμα are the right words to link them. Elsewhere in tragedy an adjective which is linked by θ' ἅμα adds something new or even paradoxical to the adjective or noun which precedes, so that there is a pairing of items which, so far from being synonymous, are either complementary or antithetical to each other: *Hi.* 348 ἤδικτον . . . ἀλγεινόν θ' ἅμα, *Hec.* 810 γραυὸς ἅπαις θ' ἅμα, *Ion* 580 δυσγενῆς πένης θ' ἅμα, *Hel.* 1684 ἀρίστης ωφρονεστάτης θ' ἅμα, *Ph.* 499 καλόν . . . σοφόν θ' ἅμα, *IA* 614 ἀβρόν . . . ἀσθενέες θ' ἅμα, *fr.* 235 ὁ πλοῦτος δ' ἀμαθία δειλόν θ' ἅμα, *fr.* 246 πένης σοφός θ' ἅμα, *A. Su.* 618 ξενικὸν ἀστικόν θ' ἅμα, *S. Ai.* 1008 cὸς πατὴρ ἐμός θ' ἅμα. So perhaps [τ' ἀνῆρ: cf. *Med.* 1228, *fr.* 157, both ending εὐδαίμων ἀνῆρ. Alternatively (as Dr Austin suggests to me) [τε νῦν.

33–5 . [ . . . ] . . . .  
 Ἀγούς κᾶρα· φερόμεθ' ἀγόμεθ' ἐπὶ δάκρυα·  
 εἰ δ' αἰαὶ διήλθέ ε', οἴμοι.

I am still troubled by the repeated pronoun εἰ.<sup>37</sup> But my earlier proposal διήλθεν leaves a question unasked: what is the subject of the verb? The question had been asked by J. C. Kamerbeek,<sup>38</sup> who offered two answers: 'Ou bien il faut l'emprunter à δάκρυα ou un mot exprimant "douleur" ou "calamité" est à supposer dans la lacune.' It is hard to imagine how a noun lost before 34 could be understood as the subject. And δάκρυα is too concrete; we should need something more abstract, as at *Su.* 288 κᾶμέ γὰρ διήλθέ τι, *Ph.* 1285–6 διὰ κάρκα δ' ἐμὴν | ἔλεος ἔλεος ἔμολε,<sup>39</sup> *S. Tr.* 476–7 ἴμερος . . . Ἡρακλῆ | διήλθε.

As a shot in the dark I suggest *cū* δ' Αἶδα διήλθεσ οἶμον.<sup>40</sup> 'You' (addressed to the dead girl) 'have completed the path to Hades': cf. *A. fr.* 239 Radt ἀπλή γὰρ οἶμος εἰς Αἴδου φέρει, *Alc. Mess. AP* 7. 412. 8 (Gow-Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* 89) *σιδηρείην οἶμον ἔβησ Αἰδεω*, *Diod. AP* 7. 627. 2 (Gow-Page, *Garland of Philip* 2131) *ὄλοῃν οἶμον ἔβησ Αἰδου*, *Philet. fr.* 6 Powell ἀτραπὸν εἰς Αἰδαο | ἦνυσα, *Hor. carm.* 1.28.16 *calcanda semel uia leti*. For the verb see *Herc.* 425–6 δρόμων τ' ἄλλων ἀγάλατ' εὐτυχῆ | διήλθε, *Hdt.* 3.25.4 τῆς δόδου τὸ πέμπτον μέρος διεληλυθέναι, *Pl. Leg.* 685 A *διελθεῖν τὴν δόδον*, and for this type of genitive in tragedy [A.] *PV* 394 οἶμον αἰθέρος, [E.] *Ph.* 1 οὐρανοῦ . . . ὀδόν, *E. Ph.* 842 ἀστεως ὀδός, *Or.* 1003–4 κέλευθον οὐρανοῦ.

<sup>37</sup> See *Papyrologica Florentina* 7 (1980) 58. To the literature cited there add KG 1.660, D. J. Mastronarde on *Ph.* 497–8.

<sup>38</sup> *Mnem.* 23 (1970) 121.

<sup>39</sup> See Collard on the former passage, Mastronarde on the latter.

<sup>40</sup> For the aspiration (οἶμος) see Pfeiffer on *Call.* *fr.* 1.27, M. L. West on *Hes. Op.* 290.

The reference to Demeter (*Δηοῦς κάρα*) suggests that thoughts of the underworld may not be astray. The girl was sacrificed to Demeter's daughter (Demaratus, FGrH 42 F 4 Jacoby).<sup>41</sup> So should we also remove the puzzling 'head' (*κάρα*) and replace it with 'daughter' (*κόρα*)? The same idea has occurred independently to Collard, as Cropp reports.

40–2                   ... ἢ σὲ τὰν πρὸ πόλεωσ  
τὸν ἀνίερὸν ἀνίερὸν ὄσιον ἀνόσιον  
καικορνφηναπαταιθ[

41                   <ἀν>όσιον Turner

Austin, Martínez, Carrara, and Cropp accept Turner's proposal. It looks irresistible, until we ask what is the metre. Line 41 is unlikely to be an iambic trimeter, as the first three editors suggest, because it has no caesura, and Euripides' lyric trimeters, no less than his spoken trimeters, require a caesura.<sup>42</sup>

Since we do not know what is the correct text at the beginning of 42 or what is the metre of any of 40 or 42, or what is the structure of the sentence as a whole, speculation over the text and metre of 41 is hazardous. But I am struck by the fact that τὸν {ἀν}ιερὸν ἀνίερὸν ὄσιον ἀνόσιον gives two dochmiacs, a welcome enough rhythm, since there are other dochmiacs in the context. The former has divided resolution (- ~ - ~ - ~). But there are parallels enough for that.<sup>43</sup> And I doubt if it is desirable to avoid the divided resolution with a chiasmic τὸν ἀνίερὸν {ἀν}ιερὸν. The point would be the paradoxical nature of the girl's sacrificial death, which was both holy and unholy, and we should have to assume that the noun which these adjectives qualify occurred in 42 (e.g. θάνατον). For ὄσιος and ἀνόσιος opposed to each other see *Tr.* 1315–16 μέλας γὰρ ὅσσε κατεκάλυψε θάνατος ὄσιος ἀνοσίους σφαγαίειν, *Or.* 546–7 ἐγὼ δ' ἀνόσιός εἰμι μητέρα κτανῶν, | ὄσιος δέ γ' ἔτερον ὄνομα τιμωρῶν πατρί.<sup>44</sup> The paradoxical combination of positive and negative words is in Euripides' manner. One thinks of *Hel.* 363 ἔργ' ἀνεργ' and the like,<sup>45</sup> and such formulations as *Hec.* 566 οὐ θέλων τε καὶ θέλων, 948 γάμος οὐ γάμος, *El.* 1230 φίλαι τε κοῦ φίλαι, *IT* 512 οὐχ ἐκὼν ἐκὼν, *Hel.* 1134 γέρας οὐ γέρας, *Ph.* 1495 ἔρις οὐκ ἔρις, *Or.* 819 τὸ καλὸν οὐ καλόν, [904] Ἄργεῖος οὐκ Ἄργεῖος, *Ba.* 395 τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία,<sup>46</sup> and such paradoxical antitheses as *Andr.* 420 δυστυχῶν . . . εὐδαιμονεῖ, *IT* 559 εἶδ' ἀκακὸν δίκαιον ἐξεπράξατο, *Hel.* 644 τὸ κακὸν . . . ἀγαθόν, *Or.* 823 εἶδ' (Bothe: *av* codd.) κακουργεῖν, 891 καλοῦς (Ad, conl. Hartung: -οῖς fere codd.) κακούς, *A. Ag.* 1272 φίλων ὑπ' ἐχθρῶν, *S. Ant.* 74 ὄσια πανουργήσασα, and the parodies at *Ar. Ach.* 396 οὐκ ἔνδον ἔνδον ἐστίν, *Ran.* 1443–4 ὅταν τὰ νῦν ἄπιστα πίσθ' ἡγάμεθα, | τὰ δ' ὄντα πίστ' ἄπιστα. Positive and ἀ-privative adjectives are combined at *A. Su.* 862 θέλεος ἀθέλεος.

<sup>41</sup> The text is cited by Austin 22, Carrara 38. In passing I suggest that the first sentence of another *testimonium*, Hyginus 46 (Austin 23, Carrara 40), would be the better for a small addition: 'Erectheus Pandionis filius habuit filias quattuor, quae inter se coniurarunt <ut> si una earum [eorum, by a slip of the pen, Austin and Carrara] mortem obisset ceterae se interficerent'. Cf. Hygin. 2 'iniit consilium cum totius generis matronis et coniuravit ut fruges in sementem quas daret torrerent', and *TLL* IV.339–41.

<sup>42</sup> See *Textual Tradition* (above, n. 33) 138, n. 18; *Euripidea* 475, n. 158.

<sup>43</sup> See L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* 18 (1968) 266.

<sup>44</sup> For the text of this passage see *Euripidea* 364–70.

<sup>45</sup> See Kannicht ad loc.

<sup>46</sup> For comparable formulations with verbs, see *Alc.* 521 ἐστιν τε κοῦκέτ' ἐστιν, *Ion* 1444 καθθανὼν τε κοῦ θανῶν, *Hel.* 138 τεθνᾶσι κοῦ τεθνᾶσι, 611 οὐκ ἔχοντ' ἔχειν, 696 ἔλιπον οὐ λιπούσα, *Ph.* 272 πέποιθα . . . κοῦ πέποιθ' ἄμα, 357 φρονῶν εἶδ' κοῦ φρονῶν, *Ba.* 332 φρονῶν οὐδὲν φρονεῖς.

51 iv-v ]ων πόνοι πάρεισι, κυμπίπτει στέγη.

βάθρων Austin, ἐκ πόνων Kamerbeek,<sup>47</sup> δωμάτων uel πολέμων Martínez

Kamerbeek's supplement is printed by Carrara, but it ruins the metre (presumably an iambic trimeter, and, in view of the Attic termination στέγη, spoken iambic). Martínez's first proposal is equally unmetrical, and his second gives no satisfactory sense (it is not the enemy who are causing the house to collapse but the earthquake sent by Poseidon).<sup>48</sup> βάθρων gives good sense. And the genitive might be supported (as Dr Austin suggests to me) by A. *ScT* 740 πόνοι δόμων. But I should prefer *σεισμῶν*. Then the line become even more closely reminiscent of *Herc.* 905 θύελλα *σειεὶ δῶμα, κυμπίπτει στέγη*. The plural *σεισμῶν*, particularly in combination with the plural *πόνοι*, is unexceptionable.<sup>49</sup>

### 5. CRETES

Fr. 81. 38–9 Austin

— μ]ατ[ὸς] δὲ μ[η]τρὸς ἢ βοὸς ζ[ι]  
— τρ]έφ[ου]σιν οἱ τεκόντες ου . [

38 μ]ατ[ὸς] δὲ Page, πάρ]εστ[ι τῶι]δε Snell ap. Turner ζ[θένο]ς Snell, ζ[φ'  
ἐθήλασεν Page, ζ[μικρὸν τρέφει Collard 39 οὐ κ[άτοιδ' ὅπως Page

How is the Minotaur being reared? By 'a mother's breast or a cow's . . . '? In view of the present tense τρ]έφ[ου]σιν in 39, Page's aorist ἐθήλασεν is unlikely, as Austin observes. Collard's τρέφει is apt; not so his ζ[μικρὸν, for a reason which, as he himself reports,<sup>50</sup> I have already given. I suggest θ[ηλή] τρέφει. One thinks of the hypothesis to *Mel. Sophē θηλαζόμενα . . . ὑπὸ μιᾶς τῶν βοῶν*.<sup>51</sup>

The letter reported by Turner as ζ[, by Austin as ζ[, is a circular letter, whose upper and lower arcs meet the edge of the papyrus. So the circle may have been complete, not half a circle. There is a short trace, visible even on Turner's Plate, projecting to the right from a point a little higher than the centre of the curve, and it is possible that this is a vestige of a lost horizontal, even though, under the microscope, I could detect no damage to the surface of the papyrus at this place. If that trace is not part of a lost horizontal, then the horizontal may have begun lower down the curve, for at the bottom of the curve the surface is uneven, and it is possible that a horizontal has been obliterated by an overlap in the fibres.

### 5. HYSIPYLE

Fr. 1. i. 9–10 (p. 25 Bond, p. 57 Cockle)<sup>52</sup>

ἔχο[με]ν δ' ὄ[ς]ων δεῖ· τ[ί] πο[τ']· ἀ]λύ[π]ητοῖ δό[μοις]  
ἔσ[ο]μεθα τοῖςδε, τὸ δὲ σὸν ὡς ἔχεις μ[ε]ν[ε]ῖ.

<sup>47</sup> Loc. cit. (above, n. 38) 124.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. 49 ἐνοσι]ν ἐμβάλλει Ποσειδῶν πόλει (my supplement, loc. cit. [above, n. 37] 59).

<sup>49</sup> For recent discussion of 'poetic' plurals see V. Bers, *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age* (New Haven and London, 1984) 22–61.

<sup>50</sup> Op. cit. (above, n. 19) 72.

<sup>51</sup> Nauck 509, Arnim (*Suppl. Eur.*) 26, Collard-Cropp-Lee (above, n. 19) 248.

<sup>52</sup> G. W. Bond, *Euripides, Hypsipyle* (Oxford, 1963), W. E. H. Cockle, *Euripides, Hypsipyle, Text*

This is Cockle's text, which differs (rightly, I believe) in two particulars from Bond's (9 ]ητοι; Cockle, ]ητ[ο]ι; Bond; 10 ἔχεις μ[ Cockle, ἔχει μ[ Bond).

Grenfell and Hunt read τ[ι] πο[τε] λυ[π]ηροῖ (with a question mark after τοῖςδε). To this Bond makes three objections: (i) 'there is room for three letters after πο'; (ii) 'there are clear remains before οἰ, but ρ is improbable: τ or c more likely'; (iii) 'δέ in 10 is awkward immediately after a question'. Reasons (i) and (iii) are valid. I shall examine (ii) later. Accepting (as does Cockle) Arnim's τ[ι] πο[τε]; ἀ]λύ[π]ητοι, Bond remarks that 'the short τί ποτε; may be thought rather curt, giving four sentences in 2 lines', and 'τί ποτε; has no parallel in Euripides, but compare the common τί γάρ; (A. Ag. 1139, etc.)'. I do not know what τί ποτε; is supposed to mean in this context. And there is no secure parallel in tragedy for ἀλύπητος in the active sense 'not causing distress', since at S. OC 1662 the variant ἀλάμπητον is probably to be preferred, as it is by Dawe and by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson.

Grenfell and Hunt observe (and Cockle quotes their observation with apparent approval) that 'τ after δεῖ is only fairly satisfactory, and κ or ν might well be substituted'. I think *K* very likely: the vertical descending below the line and the lower leg not descending at all but written as a horizontal (these are the only visible traces) are characteristic of *K* in this script. Then, after a gap of one letter, only a single vertical is visible, with no trace of a cross-bar, and I see no reason to prefer *Π* to *I*. After ]*H* there is a short high trace rising very slightly, and there is a speck near the foot of *H*. These traces appear to me to be far more compatible with *P* (Grenfell and Hunt) or with *C* than with *T* (Bond). The low speck cannot belong to the vertical of *T*, for it is too close to the *H*, and there is hardly space for a lost vertical before the following *O*.

I suggest κ[α]ῖ ο[ὐ]χ[ι] λυ[π]ηροῖ. Between κ[ and ]ι the space suits *A*. In the middle of the lacuna of three letters between ο[ and ]λ, there is, as Cockle observes, a 'high trace'; the trace is minuscule, and could belong to either the right arm of *Υ* or the left arm of *X*.

*Queens' College, Cambridge*

JAMES DIGGLE

*and Annotation Based on a Re-examination of the Papyrus* (Rome, 1987). I have examined the papyrus.