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 ζ, which prolong their horizontal elements to the right, and in the frequent ligatures (notably after Ά ι Ά 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 ιι?) and in GBEBP 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 -ον; 5, a sign over η 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?). ιo 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, ΖPE 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 al-
ways) limited to verse-end. Professor DʼAleccio 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 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 εοδιοϲ (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 ἰθύτονοϲ 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 πτα̣μενα and κάρνξ, 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 ἀγών 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 \( \omega \); first, specks; second, a slightly curved vertical on the right suits the rounded \( \pi \) \( \varphi \) likelyest, but possibly the loop of \( \rho \), a vertical on the edge, shorter than most \( \iota \), consistent with the right vertical of \( \alpha \); the figure coming in high and a small trace above it favour \( \varepsilon \) over \( \lambda \); the diagonal and right-hand vertical \( \upsilon \), traces of a slanted left-hand upright and two small traces at letter-top level \( \omega \), a small knot of damaged traces with a clear medial stroke: \( \varepsilon \) or \( \theta \), a line coming up out of the lacuna, \( \phi \) or \( \iota \); a small trace at mid-height \( \eta \), an oblique, grave accent or circumflex with left-hand part lost in hole? \( \epsilon \), a small knot of damaged traces with a clear medial stroke: \( \varepsilon \) or \( \theta \), also \( \iota \) or \( \rho \); a short, slightly concave upright, consistent with \( \nu \); a small trace above the cap \( \omega \), a descending oblique joining an upright: \( \epsilon \) or \( \theta \), a round letter, probably \( \omicron \) or \( \omega \); \( \omicron \) or \( \rho \); a short high horizontal trace: \( \tau \), \( \gamma \), \( \chi \), joined to \( \alpha \), a ligatured to an upright slanting to the right \( \gamma \), rising from letter-top level, an ascending oblique, slightly curving at the top, with papyrus surface abraded to the right and missing below \( \iota \) appears to have a low horizontal, but does not look like an \( \epsilon \); perhaps \( \iota \) with a smudge of ink \( \iota \), a trace on the line, perhaps the curved foot of a vertical or diagonal \( \iota \), \( \omicron \) or \( \rho \) \( \theta \), the cross-bar of \( \theta \) seems to be rewritten (corrected to or from \( \epsilon \)?) \( \iota \), a high curved trace and a horizontal just underneath the tail of \( \lambda \): perhaps \( \epsilon \)
‘... to me, flying, a herald on a chariot... far-shining... enormous... temples of gods in... streets (?)... Capitoline... task... a foundation (?) of clear-sounding [songs]... [s]he 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 κάρυξ'. If this is nominative, the lacuna probably contained a finite verb: cf. Od. 16.488–9 ύπωρείας δὲ μοι παρ' ἑταίρων ἄγγελος ὑμίκος, / κήρυξ. It may have been a verb of arrival, like ὑμνήρια, or ἵλθε (cf. Sapph. 44.2 Τ. κάρυξ ήλθε θεί; B. 18.16–17 ἵλθε(ν)...

The female flying messenger might be Nike. For Νίκα... πταμένα, see Eur. Ion 457–60; here Athena is addressed as Nike. See also Ar. Αι. 574 αύτικα Νίκη πέτεται πτερών χρυσών, Paus. 5.17.3 ἡ Νίκη πτερά. But I know of no passage where Nike is referred to as κήρυξ. 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. Αι. 720, Nonn. Dion. 44.123, 18.1 and 24.179 (winged); GVI 805.3 (τυχ θεομ κηροῖς). 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 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, Ephgr. auf Sieger 59.11–12 (= SGO I 06/02/21) and 72.7–9, both victory poems.

ἀδελφός. 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 ἐπ' ὄχων from ἐποχῆν (or ἐποχήω)?

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


ἐν ὑπωρή;: 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, ὑπωρή- would suggest ὑπωρεί- or ὑπωροβ-. ὑπωρη[ί]ς 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 α written normally, and [i] would have to be abnormally tall. ὑπωροβ- would introduce a word familiar from poetry, and Φήμε 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.

ἐν ὑπωρή;: originally it seems ετε; then someone, using lighter ink, added an elision mark and struck out ε. We may consider a word-ending ετε, the first trace an upright, or the particle τε; perhaps εν ὑπωρη[ί]ς ετε ἡ τε ἀγνή[ίς, or εν ὑπωροβ[ία]ς τε ἀγνή[ίς (PJP, ‘roofed streets’ referring to the four stoai of the Oxyrhynchus town-centre, LXIV 4441), but neither version explains all the ink; see previous note.
ἀγυιν.
6 [ε]: the first trace would suit μ. -рев would most likely be the last syllable of a third person singular verb in the imperfect or aorist. Possibilities include έκρα(ι)νεν 'accomplished/provided', ἐφα(ι)νεν 'showed', and ἔπερα(ι)νεν 'accomplished'.


a. [. . . ]: the high trace above the bowl best matches a preceding slanted epsilon (cf. the ε of θεῶν in 5), which suggests the neuter of an adjective in -ηϲ to go with ἔργον (e.g. δη[ε]κτείρων, cf. Il. 14.13 etc. ἔργον ἀεικήϲ, 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. δη[ε]κτείρων (GBD'A).

7 επιβαθροϲ: the initial trace favours άοιδήϲ, since λεγομυ λαοὶδήϲ is so common a conjunction from Od. 12.44 and 183 onwards. In Claudian, *AP* 9.140.3 επιβαθροϲ λαοῦδήϲ, 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; Calp. fr. 196.23 of a statue-base (A. Kerchever, *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. Οη. 639 ἐθεὰ με τὸ πρῶτον λαοῦδήϲ ἐπεβαθροϲ λαοῦδήϲ, which might be the ἔργον of 6? Or, in the other sense, a fee for clear-sounding songs', if that would somehow fit the context?

8 έκατο[ο [. [. [. ] εύρων: perhaps έκατο[ν χείρων (or έκατο[ν]ς, as transmitted in Acusilaus fr. 488 Fowler), but this looks a letter short (perhaps a diastole was written between γ and ξ); see GMH[2] p. 11 n. 50). An alternative might be έκατο[ο]ς έπιγείων, compare LXIII 4352 fr. 5 ii 18, where Zeus Kapitolios gives the empire to Diocletian οἰκτείραϲ γενεὴϲ . . . ἀνdynamic of έπιγείων? If the former, perhaps έπιγείων λαοῦδήϲ, ἐπιβαθροϲ λαοῦδήϲ, which might be the ἔργον of 6? Or, in the other sense, 'a fee for clear-sounding songs', if that would somehow fit the context?

9 μαθεν: the initial trace favours (-)μαθεν over (-)λαθεν. Perhaps μαθεν (without augment); (-)εμαθεν is unlikely, since it would give three successive short syllables. άρμυο[viαω suits the space. The fourth letter visible from the end appears to be a cancelled epsilon: presumably the scribe first wrote the itacistic spelling -εαιων. However, the process may have been more complicated, since έρμυο[viαω and perhaps also the preceding μι 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 Porphyrium subdued δμᾶθεν, which would fit the traces in q, but not the metre as analysed above). Typhos and music reappear in *Nom. Dion. 1.376 ff.: see Rutherford in Agócs et al. (edd.), *Receiving the Komos* 103–4.

10 έπιστάδιοϲ: or μαθεν, indicative or imperative. The apparent acute accent would exclude the articulation έπιστάδιοϲ, εδητε τ', if imperative, addressed to the external audience or to some group within the framework of the poem?
ἐν . . . γυμνοῖς σταδίοις θεοῖς ἤκελον
στάδιοις appears in the next line.

ςτάδιον, τὸ μὴ ἔχον καμπήν, τὸν ἁπλοῦν δρόμον (2007) 73–4). The scholia understand it to qualify εὐθύτονον (two-termination) is excluded by the traces. πελώριον in line 4. But in 12 πελώριον is the norm, and our author has εὐθύτονον normally print (2007) 

εὐθύτονον is excluded by the space, while πελώριον would fill the space, and give sense; cf. Dorieus, ἤρατο βρῖθον (two-termination) is excluded by the traces.

In Homer the longer form πελώριον is usually picked up in Thgn. 9 and in Q.S. 2.225, 6.335, 10.72). This recommends restoring γαῖαν (Doric feminine) or κηριπτόμενα (neuter plural), as PJP suggests, if θεά (or θεά) refers to 10 θεάς: for Thyc as pilot (often in art) cf. Pind. fr. 40 δίδυμον εἰσάγονται πηδάλιον, Dio. Chrys. Θ. 63.7 τὸ δὲ πηδάλιον δηλοὶ ὁτι κυβερνᾷ τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον ἡ τύχη. So GVI 1516.3 τύχης . . . αἰάς (Orchomenos, II/1 bc).

 δοτεϲ is probably a mistake for δῶτεϲ (cf. XLII 3017 3 δοτεϲ, I. δῶτεϲ); 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. ΠΤ 620 μητρ ἀεὶρῶ αἰῶν ἡ τύχης . . . οἰακί (Orchomenos, ii/i bc).

The object might be e.g. τιμάν, 'giving honour to the god(dess)', as at Eur. Βά. 342 µὴ βημ' ἡμῶν τῶι θεῶι τιμὴν δίδου. Since the context is unknown, the possibility of a dual λιούχῳ δ’ ἀεὶρᾳ (‘and when to the . . . goddesses’), though unlikely, cannot be excluded.

12 ], ν νέρθε: νέρθε may be adverb or preposition. The preposition takes the genitive, which may precede it [LS] s.v. ἐνέρθε 1.1.a]: in that case perhaps read ἐνέρθε, which is not excluded by the traces (cf. II. 2.150 ποδῶν δ’ ὑπένερθε)

πελώρην γα[ι[ν: γαίᾳ 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[ι[ν here, rather than γα[ν, where in any case we would expect γην. For the Ionic vocalization in πελώρη cf. 5 νηοῖϲ.

In Homer the longer form πελώρην is the norm, and our author has πελώρην in line 4. But in 12 πελώρην is excluded by the space, while μοῦν (two-termination) is excluded by the traces.

13 ] [,][β̣οϲ ἄνω]: ἄνω optative or ἄνω 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. ἐβιθῶς, with a damaged θ, would fill the space, and give sense; cf. Dorieus, SH 396.1 (FGE 159) ἦρατο βρῖθως. If e.g. (εἰ)βιθός, the cross-bar of ε must have been unusually prolonged.

14 ] ηρπτομενα: [,] ἦρπτομενα (Doric feminine) or ἦρπτομενα (neuter plural), [ε]χρηστόμενα or [ε]χρηστόμενα. If we accept the first articulation, [,] ηρπτομενα would 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 -α, though the author is not necessarily in full control of his dialects.

15 εἰθυτονον: I. ιθυτονον. The word occurs only at AP 6.187.4 (GP 3359), Alpheus, ιθυτονον . . . απα σταδίων (‘straight’ or ‘upright’). However, as GBDA points out, the equivalent εἰθυτονον is transmitted at Pind. Ol. 10.64–5 στάδιον μὲν ἀρίστευος εἰθυτονον / ποσὶ τρέχων (where edd. normally print εἰθός τῶν: WBH refers to W. S. Barrett, Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism (2007) 73–4). The scholia understand it to qualify στάδιον, τὸ μὴ ἔχων καμπήν, τῶν ἀπλῶν δρόμων, and so here σταδίοις appears in the next line.

16 ζελωϲ: ς has a diaeresis, as expected at word-beginning. Its dative probably preceded, e.g. θεάϲ[α] ζελωϲ.

σταδίοιϲ refers to the racecourse as a place or as an event (cf. Pind. Ισθ. 1.22–3 λάμπεϲ . . . ἀρετά ἐν . . . γεμνοῖϲ σταδίοιϲ; 1015 Ὁ εἴρηϲ δ’ ἐν σταδίοιϲ ἐναγώνων ἄθλητήρεϲ [sc. κλῆξιοϲ]). The word following σταδίοιϲ begins with a, then indeterminate traces: in this context δέ[θα] is worth considering.
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