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5191. Lyric

72/55(a)  11.4 × 15 cm  Third/fourth century

A column-top with upper margin about 2.2 cm high and remains of sixteen lines. The back is blank except for some ink stains near the foot. The space between lines is 0.25–0.5 cm deep, with a slightly larger gap of 0.6–0.7 cm between lines 8 and 9 and between lines 13 and 14.
The fragment is written in an informal, somewhat irregular hand, generally upright, generally bilinear (ι and ρ project below the line, φ above and below). A certain cursive tendency shows in line-final ά and έ, which prolong their horizontal elements to the right, and in the frequent ligatures (notably after ά έ ά ά έ). έ sometimes has its upper element written in a single movement together with the cross-bar, sometimes added as a separate oblique. Π appears twice in the formal shape, with strongly curved right-hand upright (2, 14), otherwise cursively as a simple arch.

Dating the hand is complicated by its irregularity, whether we see it as a bookhand with cursive elements or as a formalized cursive. Provisionally I should set it at the frontier between the Roman and Byzantine periods. For datable parallels in (sub)literary texts, see LXIII 4352 (hexameters mentioning Zeus Kapitolios), dated by its content c.285; more cursive and more developed forms in LXXV 5063 (late III?) and in GBE BP 9a (388). Cf. also P. Ant. I 15 (IV?).

Diaeresis marks initial vowels in 5 and 16; in 10 its function is unclear. Elision is indicated in at least one instance (10) and possibly in a second (5, in lighter ink); no certain example of unmarked elision or scriptio plena. There are traces of two accents: one grave or circumflex (5, in lighter ink) and one apparent acute (10); see also 2 n. If lines 10 and 11 are correctly interpreted, iota adscript is not written.

There are several additions or corrections in lighter ink, but not necessarily by a second hand: 2, a sign or letter over -ων; 5, a sign over  and  struck through (scriptio plena replaced with elision?); 7 and 9  struck through (correcting itacistic  for short  or  ).  for long  remains uncorrected (15), and also δοτεϲ for δοντεϲ (11, another phonetic spelling?). 10 seems to be corrupt.

The cursive features of the hand may suggest that the papyrus is not the work of an experienced scribe. We have then to ask whether it is an amateur copy of an existing text, or the actual autograph of the author. Autographs have certainly been identified among literary papyri; see T. Dorandi, ZPE 87 (1991) 18–21, for a list: a striking example is the Encomium of Hermes/Theon, VII 1015, another celebratory composition from Oxyrhynchus. But the corrections there have the character of author variants: those in our papyrus are just orthographic niceties, while the apparent corruption in line 10 remains uncorrected. Thus we cannot tell whether the poem itself is earlier than the copy in 5191 or contemporary with it.

The text is clearly set out in cola. That, the metrical patterns, and the literary vocabulary, identify it as verse. We do not know how much is lost to the left, or whether any of the cola were originally indented; as it is, the column is already quite wide (c.12 cm at line 5). Line 1, the top of a column, may have been the first line (or the title), and there is no reason to doubt that all 16 lines belong to the same composition, though no way of proving it either.

A rigorous account of the metre is difficult, since all the cola lack their beginnings, and some their ends. There is no sign of responsion to suggest strophic
construction. The basic movement is anapaestic/dactylic, with occasional single-short elements (4?, 10, 11). In what seems to be an epinician poem, we might naturally look for dactylo-epitrite. But the ‘epitrites’ here are few and mostly (perhaps always) limited to verse-end. Professor D’Alessio therefore suggests that the whole basic structure consists of anapaestic cola, some acatalectic (ending ⏑⏑‒), some catalectic (ending ⏑⏑‒‒), some apokrota (ending ⏑⏑‒⏑‒); or indeed the equivalent in dactyls. This scheme does not quite fit lines 10 and 11, but both lines are in some degree corrupt (see commentary ad loc.).

Anapaests appear relatively often in poetry of the imperial period (West, *Greek Metre* 170–72), notably in hymns such as that to Antinous in the Kourion inscription (I. Kourion 104, SEG 53.1747bis), but also in other genres (cf. the mime 5187). Normally, however, they take the form of dimeters, whereas 5191 includes longer cola: something similar in Philostr. *Heroicus* 55.3, anapaests with Doric vocalization, in which Achilles summons Echo to sing the praises of Homer. For dactylic lyric compare Macedonicus’ hymn to Asclepius (IG II² 4473 = Furley & Bremer, *Greek Hymns* (2001) 7.5), late Hellenistic, with C. A. Faraone, *Mnemosyne* 64 (2011) 206–31, and various oddities of the Roman period (West, *Greek Metre* 176–7).

The context remains uncertain. Καπιτώλιοϲ (6) looks like a reference to Zeus Kapitolios; and that, in conjunction with ςταδίοϲ (16), may direct us to the Capitoline Games, whether the great Roman festival or the local imitations set up e.g. at Oxyrhynchus in the late third century (see 6 n.). We can perhaps recognize the outlines of an epinician: news reaches the poet (2–3) of an athletic (16) victory at the Capitoline Games (6). 15 ἱθύτονοϲ may even be a direct reminiscence of Pindar; and with Pindar in mind we could see references to myth (8? 12?) and poetry (7, 9) as part of the traditional structure of the praise-poem. This would be remarkable. The Roman world produced many self-advertising athletic and poetic victors (see e.g. 5202), and the epinicians of Pindar and Bacchylides certainly circulated, yet there is very little evidence that the Pindaric model found imperial imitators; see I. Rutherford in P. Agócs et al. (edd.), *Receiving the Komos* (2012) 93–104.

If we take our poem as an epinician, we need to ask whether it refers to the Roman or the local games, whether the notional victor was local or foreign, and whether it is an imported or a local composition. Then there is the further question whether this poem celebrates a victor in the competition, or was itself an entry in the competition. Note LXIII 4352, hexameter compositions which celebrate Antinous and then Diocletian and his Prefect, where Zeus Kapitolios has installed the new Emperor and should reward the poet with an Olympic crown: the editor suggested that the verses were composed to be recited at Capitoline games. But of course there were other poetic competitions in Egypt (see 4352 introd.), and perhaps other types of occasion. In the context of athletics (16?), remember the various compositions designed probably for performance at the Gymnasium of Oxyrhynchus (below, 5194 introd.); if Nike is central (2 n.), we could think of the
processions in which her statue was carried before images of the imperial family (LXI 4125 7–8 n.) and of the (partly metrical) ‘mime’ for the accession of Hadrian (P. Giss. Lit. 4.4; Mim. adesp. 5 Cunningham).

The poet remains anonymous. Καπιτώλιος shows that he (or she) wrote no earlier than the first century AD. He writes competent anapaests, in a mixture of dialect forms: Doric alpha in πτα̣μένα and κάρυξ, possibly also τύχαϲ (if genitive singular) and -ριπτομένα (if feminine nominative singular), but epic-Ionic eta in νηοῖϲ and πελώρην (if correct). He seems to know Pindar (15), and if we interpret his work as an epinician we can see the overall design as in the Pindaric tradition. It is remotely possible that we have a local copy of a work by some external author. More likely, no doubt, that we have a local copy of a local composition, perhaps even an autograph. A local composition might refer to the Ludi Capitolini, but again more likely to a local ἄγων καπετωλιακόϲ, provided always that 5191 should be dated iii/iv, a judgment that like all palaeographic judgments may be open to question.

I am grateful to Prof. E. L. Bowie, Dr D. Colomo, Prof. W. Furley, and Dr L. Savignago for sharing their thoughts on the papyrus, and to Prof. G. B. D’Alessio, Dr W. B. Henry, and Prof. P. J. Parsons for the contributions indicated by their initials.
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2 κάρυξ seems more likely than κάροξ’. If this is nominative, the lacuna probably contained a finite verb: cf. Od. 16.468–9 ὑπωρείας δὲ μου παρ’ ἐν τιναίνω ἀγγέλοις ἅλκες, / κάροξ. It may have been a verb of arrival, like ὑμηρέω, or ἀπαίθη (cf. Sapph. 44.2 Ν. κάροξ ἀπαίθη θεῖοι; B. 18.16–17 ἀπαίθη(ν) . . . κάροξ) or a verbum dicendi like εἶπε (cf. Tim. PMG 802). If κάροξ is vocative, the lacuna may have contained an imperative. I print κάροξ with the traditional accent; see P. Probert, A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek (2003) §156."

The female flying messenger might be Nike. For Nike . . . πταμένα, see Eur. Ion 457–60; here Athena is addressed as Nike. See also Ar. Av. 574 αὐτίκα Νίκη πέτασε πτερόγλαιν χρυσῶν, Paus. 5.17.3 ἔχωνα Νίκη πτερά. But I know of no passage where Nike is referred to as κάροξ. Φήμα or the equivalent might also fit the context, as GBD‘A and WBH both suggest: cf. Bacch. 2.1 (messenger), Hdt. 9.100, Aristoph. Av. 720, Nonn. Dion. 44.123, 18.11 and 24.179 (winged); GVI 805.3 (τε θεῶν) φήμα κηρύξες. I have found no reference to a chariot of Pheme, but perhaps such transport was generally available to mobile goddesses.

If a messenger is the subject, ‘the first few lines [may] offer a topos that occurs in the incipits of at least two Hellenistic epinician poets: that of the arrival of the news of the victory. This is found in both Callimachus’ Victory of Berenice and his Victory of Sosibius, and reverses the equivalent motif in the classical victory ode, where it is the new poem that is the vehicle for the diffusion of the news: Th. Fuhrer, Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern (1992) 88–93’ (GBD‘A). Maehler on Bacch. 2.1 compares Ebert, Ἑπιγρ. auf Sieger 59.11–12 [= SGO I 06/02/21] and 72.7–9, both victory poems.

The apparent χ over the ω seems to be in lighter ink. Its function is unclear. χ is a critical sign commonly used in papyri, whose specific function is often unclear (cf. K. McNamee, Sigla and Select Marginalia (1992) 43–8, table 3), but it always occurs in the margin. GBD‘A suggests that it is actually an acute accent corrected to a grave, or the other way round. If so, to distinguish τηλεφανήϲ from τηλεφανήϲ (τηλεφανήϲ Νίκη πέτεται πτερύγοιν χρυϲαῖν). But I know of no passage where Nike is referred to as τηλεφανήϲ. For the Ionic vocalization, νηοῖϲ for νηόϲ, cf. Ar. Av. 202.1 (FGE 89) has νηοῖϲ πέλωρον, ‘giant deck’, of Hiero II’s monster ship. In epinician context, Pind. Ol. 10.21 πέλωρον . . . κλέοϲ. 

3 τηλεφανήϲ generally means ‘far-shining’ or ‘visible from afar’ (Achilles’ tomb in Od. 24.83). If it here applies to the subject in 2, and if that subject is e.g. Pheme, compare Soph. Phil. 189 ἄχω τηλεφανήϲ, where the meaning seems to be ‘making its appearance from far away’.


ἐν ὑπωρεῖ: the traces between ν and ω match no letter perfectly, but the rounded π comes closest; ε small and partly closed, like ο. Then, after a damaged patch, a vertical trace high above the line. In itself, ὑπωρεῖ would suggest ὑπωρεῖς or ὑπωροφ. ὑπωρεῖ(ι) εὑρεῖ could make sense, and the word does occur in poetry (ll. 20.218, A.R. 2.380), though more often in prose. However, the space seems too narrow for an written normally, and [ ] would have to be abnormally tall. ὑπωροφ(ί) would introduce a word familiar from poetry, and φ would fit the high trace perfectly. However, ο does not match the ink (unless the traditional stroke is a mark of deletion), or the gap that follows.

[ , τ(ε)]: originally it seems ], τε; then someone, using lighter ink, added an elision mark and struck out ε. We may consider a word-ending [ , τ(ε) (the first trace an upright), or the particle τ’: perhaps εν ὑπωρεῖ(ι) εὑρεῖ or εν ὑπωροφ. (ι) εὑρεῖ, or εν ὑπωροφ. (ι) εὑρεῖ ΦΠ, ‘roofed streets’ referring to the four stoai of the Oxyrhynchus town-centre, LXIV 4441), but neither version explains all the ink; see previous note.
μαθεν (without augment); επιβαθρων or επι βαθρων? If the former, perhaps επιβαθρων [αιδ]ων, where the genitive would represent αιδοι rather than αιδης, since λυγυρα αιδης is so common a conjunction from Od. 12.44 and 183 onwards. In Claudian, AP 9.140.3 επιβαθρων αιδης, the word has the concrete sense 'support', of a stool for the poet; so in AP 9.661.3 (Jul. Aegypt.) of a tree where birds perch; Call. fr. 196.23 of a statue-base (A. Kerkhecker, Callimachus' Book of Lambi (1999) 153–4). It can also mean 'fee paid when embarking on a ship', Od. 15.449 etc. Might it here refer to a physical support for the singer ('platform'), or more figuratively to the basis of his song (cf. Hes. ὂθ. 659 ἀνθα με το πρωτων λυγυρας επεβηκαν αιδης), which might be the έργου of 6? Or, in the other sense, 'a fee for clear-sounding songs', if that would somehow fit the context?

6  [επιβαθρων or επι βαθρων] εν: the first trace would suit ο, -εν would most likely be the last syllable of a third person singular verb in the imperfect or aorist. Possibilities include έκαθαιν 'accomplished/provided', έφαινεν 'showed', and έπιβαινεν 'accomplished'.

Καπιτώλιος (sometimes Καπετώλιος) occurs occasionally as a proper name, but more commonly as an epithet of Zeus: Ζευς Καπιτώλιος = Jupiter Capitolinus. For his cult in the Greek East generally, see J. P. Oleson et al., ΖΠΕ 140 (2002) 108–9 (and SEG 52.1707); for Roman Egypt, G. Ronchi, Lexicon theonymon ii (1974) 401; for Oxyrhynchus, J. Whitehorne in AVW II 18.5 (1995) 3084. The Capitoline Games were celebrated in his honour, and εταιοιδες in 16 suggests that this was the context here. In that case we have to choose between two different festivals. (1) The Ludii Capitolini at Rome, founded by Domitian in AD 86, held prime place on the athletic and musical circuit. See M. L. Caldeli, L'Agon Capitolinus (1993). (2) Imitations of the Roman model, called Καπετώλια or άγων Καπιτωλιακός, appear in Egypt from the later third century on: at Antinoopolis, founded in 267/8, and specifically at Oxyrhynchus, which celebrated its games first in 273 and possessed its own Καπιτώλιον (see J. C. Quinn and A. Wilson, 'Capitolia', JHS 103 (2013) 117–73, at 149). For the documentary evidence see P. Frisch, Zahn agonistische Papyri; LXIII 4352 introd.; below pp. 194–5, 196 [Remijsen].

a. [...].c: the high trace above the bowl best matches a preceding slanted epsilon (cf. the ε of θεων in 5), which suggests the neuter of an adjective in -ης to go with έργου (e.g. δε[ιε][ε], cf. II. 14.13 etc. έργου δειοε, but the space might be just too large for that); if the trace is something else, the form may be a nominative participle, e.g. δε[ιε][ε] (GBD'A).

7  επιβαθρων or επι βαθρων? If the former, perhaps επιβαθρων [αιδ]ων, where the genitive would represent αιδοι rather than αιδης, since λυγυρα αιδης is so common a conjunction from Od. 12.44 and 183 onwards. In Claudian, AP 9.140.3 επιβαθρων αιδης, the word has the concrete sense 'support', of a stool for the poet; so in AP 9.661.3 (Jul. Aegypt.) of a tree where birds perch; Call. fr. 196.23 of a statue-base (A. Kerkhecker, Callimachus' Book of Lambi (1999) 153–4). It can also mean 'fee paid when embarking on a ship', Od. 15.449 etc. Might it here refer to a physical support for the singer ('platform'), or more figuratively to the basis of his song (cf. Hes. ὂθ. 659 ἀνθα με το πρωτων λυγυρας επεβηκαν αιδης), which might be the έργου of 6? Or, in the other sense, 'a fee for clear-sounding songs', if that would somehow fit the context?

8  έκαστο[...]. ειςων: perhaps έκαστο[γ]χειρων (or έκαστο[ν]-, as transmitted in Acusilaus fr. 988 Fowler), but this looks a letter short (perhaps a diastrole was written between γ and χ; see GMAW ii p. 11 n. 50). An alternative might be έκαστο[ν]-ςειρων, compare LXIII 4352 fr. 5 ii 18, where Zeus Kapitolios gives the empire to Diocletian οικειας γενειν . . . αν[δρων]. τ is a doubtful reading, since we might expect the cross-piece to extend rightwards and touch the following ε, but it matches the trace slightly better than т. If т, then e.g. δε[ιε][ε] or έκαστο[ν] δε[ιε][ε] (‘rousing the far-shooter’ [sc. Apollo]; cf. F. L. 385).

9  μαθεν: the initial trace favours (α)μαθεν over (ε)μαθεν. Perhaps μαθεν (without augment); (α)μαθεν is unlikely, since it would give three successive short syllables.

10  εα̣[ε]ε[ε]λων suits the space. The fourth letter visible from the end appears to be a cancelled epsilon; presumably the scribe first wrote the itacistic spelling -εαιν. However, the process may have been more complicated, since [ε]αιν and perhaps also the preceding μ[ε] are written in a hand that, while basically similar to the rest, slopes strongly to the right.

PJP speculates that the author has in mind Pindaric references to the children of Gaia: Pyth. 1.15–16 Typhos fears the Muses’ song; Pyth. 8.16–18 Typhos and Porphyron subdued (δμαθεν, which would fit the traces in 9, but not the metre as analysed above). Typhos and music reappear in Nonn. Dion. 1.376 ff.; see Rutherford in Agöcs et al. (edd.), Receiving the Komos 103–4.
τύχας accusative plural or Doric genitive singular?

11 ἱλιοῖ χυ... θεα. Perhaps ποιλιούχοι, often applied to Athena but elsewhere also to other tutelary deities. However, it may be worth considering πιθανιλιούχοι, as PJF suggests, if θεα (or θεα) refers to ῥάντας: for Tyche as pilot (often in art) see Pind. fr. 15 ἄδημοι επέφοιτα πιθάνοι, Dio. Chrys. Θ. 63.7 τό δὲ πιθάνοι δηλοὶ ὅτι κυβερνά τῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίων ἡ τύχη. So GVI 1516.3 τύχες... 

δοτες is probably a mistake for δώτες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, δ. δώτες); see Gignac, Grammar i 116–17. This would be an unexpected lapse in an otherwise quite literate manuscript. Alternatively, WBH suggests a graphic corruption, e.g. δοτες for δ(εδωκ)οτες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 620 μητρι δοσα εύ. The object might be e.g. τιμα, 'giving honour to the god(dess)', as at Eur. Ba. 342 μεθ' ἡμων τωι θεωι τιμη διων. Since the context is unknown, the possibility of a dual ἱλιούχο δ' ἁτ' εσ θεα (and when to the ... goddesses'), though unlikely, cannot be excluded.

12 ἵνα νέρθε: νέρθε may be adverb or preposition. The preposition takes the genitive, which may precede it [LS] s.v. ἄνερθε p.11a): in that case perhaps read ἄνω, which is not excluded by the traces (cf. Η. 2.150 ποδῶν δ' ὑπένερθε). πελώρην γαίαν: πελώρη is a Hesiodic formula at verse end (Th. 159 etc., see West ad loc.; picked up in Thgn. 9 and in Q.S. 6.225, 6.335, 10.72). This recommends restoring γαίαν here, rather than γαίν, where in any case we would expect γήν. For the Ionic vocalization in πελώρη cf. 5 νηοῖς. In Homer the longer form πελώρην is the norm, and our author has πελώρος in line 4. But in 12 πελωρίαν is excluded by the space, while μην (two-termination) is excluded by the traces.

13 ἵνα δέω: δέω optative or δέω infinitive? At the beginning, the trace stands well to the left of ἴνα; there may or may not have been a narrow letter in between. ἵνα δεω, with a damaged β, would fill the space, and give sense; cf. Dorieux, SH 396.1 (FGE 159) ἄρατο βριθος. If e.g. (ἐν)διάβος, the cross-bar of ε must have been unusually prolonged.

14 ἀριστομένα: ἀριστομένα Doric feminine or ἀριστόμενα (neuter plural), ἀριστόμενα (Doric feminine) or ἀριστόμενα (neuter plural), or [ἐ]γειροπότενα. If we accept the first articulation, ἐ might end a noun agreeing with the participle. But if it was feminine singular, the author should have written Doric -α; if it was neuter plural, we might have expected -αθα, though the author is not necessarily in full control of his dialects.

15 εἰθύτονος: I. ἱθυτονος. The word occurs only at AP 6.187.4 (GP 3539), Alpheus, ἱθυτόνων... ἀπα εταλίουν (’straight’ or ‘upright’). However, as GBD'A points out, the equivalent εἴθυτονος is transmitted at Pind. Ol. 10.64–5 στάδιον μὲν ἄριστομεν εἴθυτονος / τοσι τρέχον (where edd. normally print εἴθυτον τόνα: WBH refers to W. S. Barrett, Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism (2007) 73–4). The scholia understand it to qualify στάδιον, τὸ μὴ ἤχων καμπη, τῶν ἀπλών δρόμων, and so here εταλίους appears in the next line.

16 ἢσκελος: ἢ has a diaeresis, as expected at word-beginning. Its dative probably preceded, e.g. thea[ε] ἢσκελος.

eταλίους refers to the racecourse as a place or as an event (cf. Pind. Ι.6. 1.22–3 λάμπεται... ἀρετά ἐν... γεμνοὶς εταλίους; 1015 Ἡ Ἑρμῆν δ' ἐν στάδιοις ἐναγώνων ἀθλητήρες [sc. κλήξους]). The word following εταλίους begins with α, then indeterminate traces: in this context α[θ]α is worth considering.

M. DE KREIJ