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 ή, which prolong their horizontal elements to the right, and in the frequent ligatures (notably after ά ε λ μ τ). 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 285; more cursive and more developed forms in LXXV 5063 (late III?) and in GBEFP 9a (388). Cf. also P. Ant. I 15 (iv?).

Diacriticals 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 scribro 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 ei for short ι?), ei 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, ΖΠΕ 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. 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 2 πτα̣μένα and κάρυνξ, possibly also 10 τύχαϲ (if genitive singular) and 14 -ριπτομένα (if feminine nominative singular), but epic-Ionic eta in 5 νηοῖϲ 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 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.
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 ο; ο likeliest, but possibly the loop of Ρ . . . a vertical on the edge, shorter than most ι, consistent with the right vertical of a Ν . . . , the ligature coming in high and a small trace above it favours ε over Λ . . . , the diagonal and right-hand vertical Ṽ. . . , 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 . . . , 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 Ω or a very round apostrophe ε deleted with a cancel-stroke γΥ rather than τΥ . . . , a descending oblique joining an upright; the height of the upright suggests Ν rather than ΛΙ . . . , high trace ]ε, remains of the base and extended cap as in 3; a small trace above the cap . . . , a descending oblique joining an upright . . . , deleted with a cancel-stroke in greyer ink βΘ . . . , the top of a small bowl: Ω, Ξ, or Π; a short, slightly concave upright, consistent with Ν . . . , Ω or ω . . . , end of a high horizontal stroke: τ, ρ, Χ . . . , joined to a, the tail of Λ, Ω, or Λ; the height best suits Ω . . . , foot of a stroke ascending steeply from left to right, e.g. Ν . . . , deleted with a cancel-stroke in greyer ink . . . , a curved foot, most likely Π or Η. . . , the left-hand diagonal descends too sharply to fit Λ . . . , a round letter, probably Ω or ω . . . , the foot of the right-hand upright appears unusually pointed, and closer than usual to the left-hand upright . . . , a ligatured to an upright slanting to the right . . . , rising from letter-top level, an ascending oblique, slightly curving at the top, with papyrus surface abraded to the right and missing below . . . . , a trace on the line, perhaps the curved foot of a vertical or diagonal . . . , Ω or Ρ θυ, the cross-bar of Ω seems to be rewritten (corrected to or from ξ?) . . . , high trace: Ξ, Τ, Γ, or Χ . . . , a short high horizontal trace; a long cross-bar with a suggestion of the top of the upright of τ . . . , a high curved trace and a horizontal just underneath the tail of Λ: perhaps ε
'... 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. 16.488–9 ὠμήρισε δὲ μοι παρ' ἐταίρων ἄγγελος ὥκις, / κήροξ. It may have been a verb of arrival, like ὁμήρισε, or ὅλθε (cf. Sapph. 44.2 θ. κάροξ θλθε θεί; B. 18.16–17 ἤλθε(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 Νίκα... πταμένα, see Eur. Ion 457–60; here Athena is addressed as Nike. See also Αρ. Αι. 574 αὐτίκα Νίκη πέτεσε πτερόγονα χρυσῶν, Paus. 5.17.3 ἔχονε 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. Αί. 720, Nonn. Dion. 44.123, 18.1 and 24.179 (winged); GVI 805.3 (ν θεό) φήμι κηρώσεις. 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 Sosos*, 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) 83–93 (GBD′A). Maehler on Bacch. 2.1 compares Ebert, *Epiogr. auf Sieger* (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 ἐν τῇ δύχων from ἐπιχορών (ἐπιχορήγω or ἐπιχέω)?

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

4 ἐλμα. Several words end thus, e.g. (-)άγγελμα, δῆλαμα, σέλμα, τέλμα. Archimedes, (FHG 89) has σέλμα πέλωραν, ‘giant deck’, of Hiero II’s monster ship. In epinician context, Pind. *Ol.* 10.21 πελάρων... κλάος.


ἐν ὑπωροφ[ία] the traces between ν and ω match no letter perfectly, but the rounded π comes closest; ς small and partly closed, like φ. Then, after a damaged patch, a vertical trace high above the line. In itself, ὑπωροφ- would suggest ὑπωροφ- or ὑπωροφ-. ὑπωροφ[ία] 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 χ] would have to be abnormally tall. ὑπωροφ[ία] would introduce a word familiar from poetry, and Φ would fit the high trace perfectly. However, χ does not match the ink (unless the traditional stroke is a mark of deletion), or the gap that follows...

]. Τ(ε) if originally it seems [...], τε; then someone, using lighter ink, added an elision mark and struck out ε. We may consider a word-ending [...], τε(ε) (the first trace an upright), or the particle τε: perhaps εν ὑπωροφ[ία] εντε ἕν ὑπωροφ[ία] τε ἕν ὑπωροφ[ία] Φ, ‘roofed streets’ referring to the four stoai of the Oxyrhynchus town-centre, *LYRIC* 4441), but neither version explains all the ink; see previous note.
The Kapitolios gives the empire to Diocletian ὀἰκτείραϲ γενεὴν . . . ἀνδρῶν.

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 Porphyris subdue δμᾶθεν, which would fit the traces in q, but not the metre as analysed above). Typhos and music reappear in Nonn. Dion. 1.376 ff.; see Rutherford in Agócs et al. (edd.), Receiving the Komos 103–4.

1.15–16 Typhos fears the Muses’ song; Pyth. 8.16–18 Typhos and Porphyris subdue δμᾶθεν, which would fit the traces in q, but not the metre as analysed above). Typhos and music reappear in Nonn. Dion. 1.376 ff.; see Rutherford in Agócs et al. (edd.), Receiving the Komos 103–4.

1.15–16 Typhos fears the Muses’ song; Pyth. 8.16–18 Typhos and Porphyris subdue δμᾶθεν, which would fit the traces in q, but not the metre as analysed above). Typhos and music reappear in Nonn. Dion. 1.376 ff.; see Rutherford in Agócs et al. (edd.), Receiving the Komos 103–4.
5191. LYRIC

εἰὼ: ὅ τυχας (Eur. El. 1185), possible in itself, would leave ε ε stranded. εἰὼ (from ε[ἰ]ειν) 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 δο[ῦ]τες goes with ε[πείδης]. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of αἰεῖω (see for ε instead of αι 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 |λαι̣οίχ̣ῳ ... θεά. Perhaps σο[ϊ]λαοίχ̣ῳ, often applied to Athena but elsewhere also to other tutelary deities. However, it may be worth considering πηδά[λ]αιοίχ̣ῳ, as PJP suggests, if θεά (or θεά) refers to τὸ . . . γυμνοὶς . . . σταδίοις θεοῖς ἴκελον.

dοτες is probably a mistake for δώτες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, l. 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)ότες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΙΠ 920 μητρι δοσκέων εὐθύτονον, τὸ μὴ ἔχον καμπήν, τὸν ἁπλοῦν δρόμον εὐθὺν τόνον. The scholia understand it to qualify στάδιον, τὸ μὴ ἔχον καμπήν, τὸν ἁπλοῦν δρόμον εὐθὺν τόνον. This recommends restoring ευθύτονον here, rather than εὐθύτον (‘straight’ or ‘upright’). However, as GBD’A points out, the equivalent (two-termination) is excluded by the traces. In Homer the longer form πελώριον is excluded by the space, while πελώριον is the norm, and our author has πελώριον in line 4. But in 12 πελώριον is the norm, and our author has πελώριον. In Homer the longer form may be adverb or preposition. The preposition takes the genitive, which may precede it (LS s.v. ἐνερθεῖν: ΠJT: l. δοτες) or follow it (LS s.v. ἐνερθεῖν: ΠJT: l. πελώριον). However, it may be worth considering, as PJP suggests, if ε[ἰ]σιέναι, ε[ἰ]σιέναι (Doric feminine) or ε[豨]ηπτομένα (Doric feminine) or c[豨]ηπτομένα (neuter plural). If we accept the first articulation, η 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 -αι, though the author is not necessarily in full control of his dialects.

12 |ν νέρθε: νέρθε may be adverb or preposition. The preposition takes the genitive, which may precede it [LS s.v. ἐνερθεῖν: ΠJT: l. δοτες] or follow it (LS s.v. ἐνερθεῖν: ΠJT: l. πελώριον). This recommends restoring γαια[ϊ]ν: γαία τελωρή 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 γαια[ϊ]ν: here, rather than γαία [ ], where in any case we would expect γάια. For the Ionic vocalization in γαία πελώρη, ب. ἐν ἀνθρώπων βίον ἥ τύχη. So GVI 15:6:3 τυχής . . . οἶκαι (Orchomenos, Π/Π bc).

13 |βρῖθος ἀειραι: βρῖθος optative or αειραί infinitive? At the beginning, the trace stands well to the left of ρ; there may or may not have been a narrow letter in between. βρῖθος, with a damaged ρ, would fill the space, and give sense; cf. Dorieus, SH 396.1 (FGE 159) ᾿πρατο βρῖθος. If e.g. (cω)[ϊ]βρῖθος, the cross-bar of β must have been unusually prolonged.

14 |γυμνοίς: γυμνοίς (Doric feminine) or γυμνοίς (neuter plural), c[ῃ]γυμνοίς (neuter plural), or c[ῃ]γυμνοίς (neuter plural). If we accept the first articulation, γυμνοίς 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 -αι, though the author is not necessarily in full control of his dialects.

15 εἰθύτονον: l. ἐθύτων. The word occurs only at AP 6.187.4 (GP 3539), Alpheus, ἐθύτωνον . . . ἀπὸ σταθίων (‘straight’ or ‘upright’). However, as GBD’A points out, the equivalent εἰθύτονον is transmitted at Pind. Ol. 10.64–5 στάδιον μὲν ἀρίστευεν εἰθύτονον / τοσοὶ τρέχον (where edd. normally print εἰθύτον, τόνον: WBH refers to W.S. Barrett, Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism (2007) 73–4). The scholia understand it to qualify στάδιον, τὸ μὴ ἐχόν καμπήν, τῶν ἀπλών ὀμόν, and so here στάδιος appears in the next line.

16 ἴκελον: ἴκελον has a diaeresis, as expected on word-beginning. Its dative probably preceded, e.g. θεά| cozy. The word following στάδιος begins with a, then indeterminate traces: in this context ἅ[ὴ]ὶ is worth considering.
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