5191. Lyric

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 (ı and π project below the line, φ above and below). A certain cursive tendency shows in line-final α and ζ, which prolong their horizontal elements to the right, and in the frequent ligatures (notably after α ε λ μ τ). ε 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 τ and ε struck through (scriptio plena replaced with elision?); 7 and 9 ε struck through (correcting itacistic ει for short ι?). ει for long ι 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 natu-
rally 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 catalectic (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 inscrip-
tion (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 ζηταμίος (16), may direct us to the Cap-
toline 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 ἱθυτόνον 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 ques-
tion 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 2 πτα̣μένα and κάρνξ, possibly also 10 τύχαϲ (if genitive singular) and 14 -ριπτομένα (if feminine nominative singular), but epic-Ionic eta in 5 νηοίϲ and 12 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 ἀγῶν 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.

5191. LYRIC

\[\omega\ldots, \alpha, \phi, \ldots\]
\[\delta\epsilon\mu\sigma\tau, \mu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\nu\xi, \omega\chi\omega\]
\[\tau\nu\lambda\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\eta\chi\]
\[\lambda\mu\alpha\phi\epsilon\lambda\omega\rho\iota\nu\]
\[\nu\rho\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omega\nu\epsilon\omicron\eta\nu, \omega\rho\epsilon\ldots, \ldots, \tau\ldots\alpha\gamma\nu, \ldots\]
\[\epsilon\nu\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\tau\omega\lambda\omega\iota\omicron\epsilon\rho\gamma\nu\alpha, \ldots\]
\[\lambda\iota\nu\chi\omega\alpha\delta\omega\tau\epsilon\theta\epsilon\alpha\]
\[\nu\nu\rho\theta\epsilon\pi\epsilon\lambda\omega\rho\eta\gamma\nu\alpha, \ldots\]
\[\mu\nu\sigma\alpha\epsilon\epsilon\iota\alpha\epsilon\rho\ai\]
\[\eta\iota\pi\tau\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\na\]
\[\mu\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\theta\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\theta\]
\[\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu, \omega\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron, \ldots\]

\[\], the ligature to a suggests ε, but c cannot be excluded \[a,\] a low curve, fitting c or ε; the upper part is abraded \[\], the lower part of a curved letter, consistent with ε or θ \[2\], the end of a stroke joining δ, compatible with Λ or ε \[\pi\tau,\] the form of the π in ligature combined with
the long cross-bar guarantees τ (cf. 14); then a small diagonal trace on the edge at line level , first, specks; second, a slightly curved vertical on the right suits the rounded π ω, ο likeliest, but possibly the loop of ιν, a vertical on the edge, shorter than most i, consistent with the right vertical of a Ν, the ligature coming in high and a small trace above it favour ε over a Λ. ρ, the diagonal and right-hand vertical υ, traces of a slanted left-hand upright and two small traces at letter-top level ω, above this an oblique, grave accent or circumflex with left-hand part lost in hole? ε[], a small knot of damaged traces with a clear medial stroke: ε or θ, ι, a line coming up out of the lacuna, φ or ι; a small trace at mid-height , upright τ, the trace above is in lighter ink, either right-hand side of φ or a very round apostrophe ε deleted with a cancel-stroke τγ rather than τγ, top of an upright υ, a descending oblique joining an upright; the height of the upright suggests Ν rather than Λ, high trace ε, remains of the base and extended cap as in ι; a small trace above the cap , a descending oblique joining an upright ξ, deleted with a cancel-stroke in greyer ink ρο, the top of a small bowl: ο, ς, or ρ; ο or ρ; a short, slightly concave upright, consistent with Ν, ο or ω 8], end of a high horizontal stroke: τ, ρ, η, 9], joined to a, the tail of Λ, ο, or ρ; the height best suits α, lower parts of the first stroke and bridge, too low for Λ], foot of a stroke ascending steeply from left to right, e.g. Ν, deleted with a cancel-stroke in greyer ink 10], a curved foot, most likely π or η 11], the left-hand diagonal descends too sharply to fit Λ 12], a round letter, probably ο or ω y, the foot of the right-hand upright appears unusually pointed, and closer than usual to the left-hand upright a, a ligatured to an upright slanting to the right 13], rising from letter-top level, an ascending oblique, slightly curving at the top, with papyrus surface abraded to the right and missing below τ appears to have a low horizontal, but does not look like an ε: perhaps i with a smudge of ink 14], a trace on the line, perhaps the curved foot of a vertical or diagonal 15], ο or ρ θυ, the cross-bar of θ seems to be rewritten (corrected to or from ε?) 16], high trace c, τ, ρ, or η, a short high horizontal trace; a long cross-bar with a suggestion of the top of the upright of τ 17], a high curved trace and a horizontal just underneath the tail of Λ: perhaps ε...
591. **Lyric**

‘... to me, flying, a herald on a chariot... far-shining... enormous... temples of gods in... streets(?)... Capitoline... task... a foundation(?) of clear-sounding [songs]... [the] understood harmony... strive... fortune... having given to the... goddess... below, the enormous earth... lift... bracing(?) herself... straight-stretched... equal to [...] in the stadia...’

2 κάρυξ seems more likely than κάροξ’. If this is nominative, the lacuna probably contained a finite verb: cf. Od. 16.468–9 ὄμηρες δε μου παρ’ ἑταίρων ἄγγελος ὑμίκε, / κήρες. It may have been a verb of arrival, like ὀμήρες, or ἔδηθε (cf. Sapph. 44.2) ν. κάροξ ἔδηθε θεί[ε]; B. 18.16–17 ἔδηθε(ν)... κάροξ or a verbum dicendi like εἴπε (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 Νίκα... πταμένα, see Eur. Ion 457–60; here Athena is addressed as Nike. See also Ar. Αἰ: 574 αὐτίκα Νίκη πέτεται πτερόγων χρυσά, Paus. 5.17.3 ἔχονα Νίκη πτερά. But I know of no passage where Nike is referred to as κήρος. 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. Αἰ: 720, Nonn. Dion. 44.129, 18.1 and 24.179 (winged); GVI 805.3 (ι θεός) φήμη κηρεῖς[e]. 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 poems: that of the arrival of the news of the victory. This is found in both Callimachus’ *Victory of Berenice* and his *Victory of Sosibios*; 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, *Epos zu Sieger* 59.11–12 (= SGO I 06/02/21) and 72.7–9, both victory poems.

Δέκων. The apparent χ over the ο 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. McNamme, *Sigla and Epigr. auf Sieger* 59.11–12 [= SGO I 06/02/21] and 72.7–9, both victory poems.

3 τῇθεφανείς 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. t89 ἄχω τῇθεφανείς, where the meaning seems to be ‘making its appearance from far away’.

4 ήλμα. Several words end thus, e.g. (-)άγγελμα, δέφλαμα, σέλμα, τέλμα. Archimedes, SH 202.1 (ΦΕ 89) has σέλμα πέλωρον, ‘grand deck’, of Hiero II’s monster ship. In epinician context, Pind. *Ol.* 10.21 πέλωρον... κλέος.


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

[. τε[ι]οι: originally it seems [. τε; then someone, using lighter ink, added an elision mark and struck out ο. We may consider a word-ending [. τε(ε) (the first trace an upright), or the particle τε: perhaps ἐν ὑπωριφ[ι]α[ι][ι][ε] ε] τε’ ἄγοι[ειε] αι[ει], or ἐν ὑπωρφιφ[ι]α[ι][α] τε’ ἄγοι[ειε] [ΠΠ] ‘roofed streets’ referring to the four stoai of the Oxyrhynchus town-centre, *LXIV* 4441), but neither version explains all the ink; see previous note.
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

ἀγυιαν: perhaps ἄγυιαν.-

6) ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου λιγυρής: the initial trace favours (-)μαθεν over (-)λαθεν. Perhaps μάθεν (without augment); (-)ἐμαθεν is unlikely, since it would give three successive short syllables. ἀρμανοιεων suits the space. The fourth letter visible from the end appears to be a cancelled epsilon; presumably the scribe first wrote the itacistic spelling -ειαν. However, the process may have been more complicated, since ]ειαν and perhaps also the preceding μαθεν 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 Porphyrio subdued ὑμαθεν, which would fit the traces in 9, but not the metre as analysed above. Typhos and music reappear in Dion. 1.376ff.: see Rutherford in Agócs et al. (edd.), Receiving the Kamos 103–4.

10) εὐδέτε: or ], εὐδέτε`, indicative or imperative. The apparent acute accent would exclude the articulation εὐδετε′; εὐδετε′. If imperative, addressed to the external audience or to some group within the framework of the poem?


5191. LYRIC

ecīo: ἵω τύχας (Eur. El. 1185), possible in itself, would leave ec stranded. ecīo (from e[ί]σείναι) exists as a form, and the internal diaeresis has parallels elsewhere in the writing of compound words. But it seems to make no obvious sense, particularly if 11 δο[ν]τεϲ goes with e[πεἴδετ]. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of aiceīo (see for e instead of ai Gignac, Grammar i 192–3), but this would be the only example of such a spelling in the text.

tύχας accusative plural or Doric genitive singular?

11 |λούχο . . . θεά. Perhaps στ[λ]ούχο, often applied to Athena but elsewhere also to other tutelary deities. However, it may be worth considering πηδα|λούχο, as PJP suggests, if θεά (or θεά) refers to τὰς Τύχας: for Tyche as pilot (often in art) cf. Pind. fr. 40 δίδυμοι εὐρόσεις πηδαλίους, Dio. Chrys. Θ. 63.7 τὸ δὲ πηδαλίου δὴ λο ὀ τι κυβερνᾶ τῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον ἡ τύχη. So GVI 1516.3 τύχας . . . οἰκαί (Orchomenos, Π/Π ΒC).

τοῦτος is probably a mistake for δωτέϲ (cf. XLII 3017 δοτέϲ, 1. δωτέϲ); 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. δωτέϲ for δ(ε)δωκτέϲ. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 820 μητρια δο[κ]ότεϲ: WBH refers to W. S. Barrett, Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism εὐθὺν τόνον is transmitted at Pind. Ol. 10.64–5 στάδιον μὲν ἄριστευϲεν εὐθύτονον / ποϲϲὶ τρέχων (where edd. άριστευϲεν τοῦτον). However, as GBD'A points out, the equivalent εὐθυτόνων is excluded by the space, while (two-termination) is excluded by the traces.

In Homer the longer form πελώριον is the norm, and our author has in line 4. But in 12 πελώριοϲ than πελώρην πελώριοϲ (two-termination) is excluded by the traces. (cf. Pind. Il. 2.150 traces (cf. Pind. Il. 2.150 ποδῶν δ' ὑπένερθε)).

... ἀπὸ ϲταλίκων εὐθύτονοϲ is excluded by the space, while ῥιπτόμενα (Doric feminine) or ῥιπτόμενα: If we accept the first articulation, ηριπτόμενα (ε[ἰ]ϲιέναι) might end a noun agreeing with the participle ηριπτόμενα. If e.g. (ε[ἰ]ϲιέναι) may be adverb or preposition. The preposition takes the genitive, which may precede it [LS] s.v. ἐνερθε: in that case perhaps read ἐνερθε, which is not excluded by the traces (cf. II. 2.150 ποδῶν δ' ὑπένερθε).

πελώρην γα[α]: γαῖα πελώρη is a Hesiodic formula at verse end (Th. 159 etc., see West ad loc.; picked up in Thgn. 9 and in Q.S. 2.225, 6.335, 10.72). This recommends restoring γα[α] here, rather than γαῖα, where in any case we would expect γῆν. For the Ionic vocalization in πελώρη cf. 5 νηοῖϲ.

In Homer the longer form πελώρην is excluded by the space, while ριον (two-termination) is excluded by the traces.

13 ] δο[ν]τεϲ, with a damaged θ, would fill the space, and give sense; cf. Dorieus, SH 396.1 (FGE 159) ἤρατο βρῖθοϲ. If e.g. (ε[ἰ]ϲιέναι) may be adverb or preposition. The preposition takes the genitive, which may precede it [LS] s.v. ἐνερθε: in that case perhaps read ἐνερθε, which is not excluded by the traces (cf. II. 2.150 ποδῶν δ' ὑπένερθε).

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

15 εὐθύτονον: 1. ιθύτονον. The word occurs only at AP 6.187.4 (GP 3539), Alpheus, ἑθύτωνον . . . ἀπὸ σταλίκων ("straight" or "upright"). However, as GBD'A points out, the equivalent εὐθύτονον is transmitted at Pind. Ol. 10.64–5 στάδιον μὲν ἄριστευϲεν εὐθύτονον / ποϲϲὶ τρέχων (where edd. normally print εὐθυτόν: WBH refers to W. S. Barrett, Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism 73–4). The scholia understand it to qualify στάδιον, τὸ μὴ ἔχων καμπήν, τῶν ἀπλόων ὑπάρχον, and so here σταδίον appears in the next line.

16 ἵκελο: τα ὑπάρχειν: e has a diaeresis, as expected at word-beginning. Its dative probably preceded, e.g. θεα[ῖ] ἵκελον.

εὐθύτονον refers to the racecourse as a place or as an event (cf. Pind. Isth. 1.22–3 λάµπτε . . . ἄρετά ἐν . . . γενοῖϲι εὐθυτονοϲ: 1015 δ' ἔριζον δ' ἐν σταδίοϲ εναγώνων ἀθλητήρεϲ [sc. κληξίωϲ]). The word following εὐθύτονο is begins with a, then indeterminate traces: in this context ἐ[θ]ά is worth considering.

M. DE KREIJ