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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 ε, which prolong their horizontal elements to the right, and in the frequent ligatures (notably after ά in 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 iii?) 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 -ων; 5, a sign over η and ε struck through (scriptio plena replaced with elision?); 7 and 9 ε struck through (correcting itacistic ι for short ι (?). ι for long ι remains uncorrected (15), and also δοντεϲ 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/Theom, 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 responson 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 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 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 2 πτα̣μένα and κάρυξ, 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 ο̣, ọ likelyest, but possibly the loop of ρ 3], a vertical on the edge, shorter than most ι̣, consistent with the right vertical of a N 4], the ligature coming in high and a small trace above it favour e over ι̣ 5], the diagonal and right-hand vertical , traces of a slanted left-hand upright and two small traces at letter-top level ω̣, traces of a clear medial stroke: e 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 o or a very round apostrophe ι deleted with a cancel-stroke γγ rather than γγ], top of an upright 6], a descending oblique joining an upright; the height of the upright suggests Ν rather than Λ], high trace ], remains of the base and extended cap as in 3; a small trace above the cap 7], a descending oblique joining an upright , deleted with a cancel-stroke in greyer ink θθ, the top of a small bowl: o, c, or Ρ̣; ο̣ or p̣; a short, slightly concave upright, consistent with N , ο̣ or ω̣ 8], end of a high horizontal stroke: τ, r, x g, joined to a, the tail of λ, ο̣, or μ̣; the height best suits μ̣, lower parts of the first stroke and bridge, too low for λ], foot of a stroke ascending steeply from left to right, e.g. N 9], 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 ο̣ or ω̣ ι, 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 ε̣: perhaps 1 with a smudge of ink 14], a trace on the line, perhaps the curved foot of a vertical or diagonal 15], ọ or p̣, the cross-bar of o seems to be rewritten (corrected to or from ε̣?) 16], high trace: c, τ, ι, or x . . . 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 ̇
2 κάρος seems more likely than κάρος’.

The female flying messenger might be Nike. For Νίκα . . . πταμένα, see Eur. Ιον 457–60; here Athena is addressed as Nike. See also Ar. Ατταίκα Νίκη πέσται πτερών χρυσών, Paus. 5.17.3 ἔχουσα Νίκη πτερά. But I know of no passage where Nike is referred to as κάρος. 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. Αv. 720, Nonn. Dion. 44.123, 18.1 and 24.179 (winged); GVI 805.3 (πταμένα πτερόν κηρύκεια). 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) 38–93 (GBD’A). Maehler on Bacch. 2.1 compares Ebert, Επιγρ. auf Sieger 59.11–12 [= GSO I 06/01/21] and 72.7–9, both victory poems.

δόχων. 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, Σιγλα και Σελεκτ Μαργιναλα (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 τ’ δέχων from ἐποχήν (ἐποχή or ἐποχέω)?

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. Φιλ. 139 ἀχω τηλεφανήϲ, where the meaning seems to be ‘making its appearance from far away’.

4 [ἐ]λμα. Several words end thus, e.g. [(-)άγγελμα, δέφλαμα, σέλμα, τέλμα]. Archimelus, SH 202.1 (FGE 93) has σέλμα πέλωρον, ‘giant deck’, of Hiero II’s monster ship. In epinician context, Pind. Οl. 10.21 πέλωρον . . . κλέος.


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

[τ’] [τ’: originally it seems ]: then someone, using lighter ink, added an elision mark and struck out ε. We may consider a word-ending [τ’: (the first trace an upright), or the particle τ’: perhaps ἐν ὑπωρήϲ[ια]:[ε] τ’ δέγαναι, or εν ὑπωροφ[ια]:[ε] τ’ δέγαναι [PJP, ‘roofed streets’ referring to the four stoai of the Oxyrhynchus town-centre, LXIV 444], but neither version explains all the ink; see previous note.

4591. LYRIC
αὐτ. [: perhaps ἀγνω-.

6] εὐ: the first trace would suit Ν. -νευ would most likely be the last syllable of a third person singular verb in the imperfect or aorist. Possibilities include ἐκφαν(ί)νευ 'accomplished/provided', ἐφα(ί)νευ 'showed', and ἐπέφα(ί)νευ 'accomplished'.

Καπιτώλιος (sometimes Καπστώλιος) occurs occasionally as a proper name, but more commonly as an epithet of Zeus: Ζεὺς Καπτώλιος = Jupiter Capitolinus. For his cult in the Greek East generally, see J. P. Olsen et al., ZPE 140 (2002) 108-9 (and SEG 52.1707); for Roman Egypt, G. Ronchi, Lexicon theonymon ii (1974) 401; for Oxyrhynchus, J. Whitehorne in ANRW II 18.5 (1995) 3084. The Capitoline Games were celebrated in his honour, and ἄνδρῶν is unlikely, since it would give three successive short syllables.

The Capitoline Games were celebrated in his honour, and ἄνδρῶν is unlikely, since it would give three successive short syllables. (-)εὐαθεν. Perhaps ἐκφαν(ί)νευ 'accomplished/provided', ἐφα(ί)νευ 'showed', and ἐπέφα(ί)νευ 'accomplished'.

Καπιτώλιος (sometimes Καπστώλιος) occurs occasionally as a proper name, but more commonly as an epithet of Zeus: Ζεὺς Καπτώλιος = Jupiter Capitolinus. For his cult in the Greek East generally, see J. P. Olsen et al., ZPE 140 (2002) 108-9 (and SEG 52.1707); for Roman Egypt, G. Ronchi, Lexicon theonymon ii (1974) 401; for Oxyrhynchus, J. Whitehorne in ANRW II 18.5 (1995) 3084. The Capitoline Games were celebrated in his honour, and ἄνδρῶν is unlikely, since it would give three successive short syllables.

Il. 1.385). If trace slightly better than χε we might expect the cross-piece to extend rightwards and touch the following, but it matches the Kapitolios gives the empire to Diocletian.

οἰκτείραϲ γενεὴν . . . ἀνδρῶν κατοικτείρων, compare LXIII p. 11 n. 50). An alternative might be Caldelli, L’Agon Capitolinus (1993). (2) Imitations of the Roman model, called Καπστώλια or ἀγῳν Καπστωλιακός, 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 Καπστώλιον (see J. C. Quinn and A. Wilson, ‘Capitolia’, JHS 103 (2013) 117–73, at 149). For the documentary evidence see P. Frisch, Zehn agonistische Papyri, LXIII 4352 introd., below pp. 194–5, 198 [Remijsen].

a [. . . ] c: the high trace above the bowl best matches a preceding slanted epsilon (cf. the ε of theoω in 3), which suggests the neuter of an adjective in -ηε to go with ἕργον (e.g. ἀ[ε]ικός, cf. J. 14.13 etc. ἔργον ἀσκεῖε, 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. ἀφ[ε] (GDB’A).

7 ἐπίβαθρον αὐτή βάθρων? If the former, perhaps ἐπίβαθρον [ἀοιδή]ων, where the genitive would represent αοιδή rather than ἄοιδε, since ληγμός αοιδή is so common a conjunction from Od. 12.44 and 183 onwards. In Claudian, AP 9.140.3 ἐπίβαθρον αοιδής, 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. Kerckheer, 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. ΟΠ 659 ἐνθα με το πρώτων ληγμοσ ἐπώθηκα αοιδής, which might be the ἕργον of 6? Or, in the other sense, ‘a fee for clear-sounding songs’, if that would somehow fit the context?

8 ἕκατον ἐγείρων: perhaps ἕκατον [χείρων [or ἕκατον[v]-, as transmitted in Acusilaus fr. 1488 Fowler), but this looks a letter short (perhaps a diastole was written between γ and ι; see GMW II p. 11.50). An alternative might be [ε κατω[σ tzείρων, compare LXIII 4352 fr. 5 ii 18, where Zeus Kapitolios gives the empire to Dioctetian ἀκτείραϲ γενεὴν . . . ἀνδρῶν. 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 η. If τ, then e.g. ἀντικήρων or [ε κατω[σ tzείρων (‘rousing the far-shooter’ [sc. Apollo]; cf. R. 1.385).

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

Ἀρμόνιον [viaw suits the space. The fourth letter visible from the end appears to be a cancelled epsilon; presumably the scribe first wrote the itacistic spelling -ειων. However, the process may have been more complicated, since [ειων 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 Porphyromus subdued (διαθέαυ, which would fit the traces in ι, but not the metre as analysed above). Typhos and music reappear in Nonn. Dion. 1.376 ff.; see Rutherford in Agocs et al. (edd.), Receiving the Komos 103–4.

10 [ειθέδες': or ], ειθές', indicative or imperative. The apparent acute accent would exclude the articulation [ειθέδε τ', ειθέ τ'. If imperative, addressed to the external audience or to some group within the framework of the poem?
591. LYRIC

ere: ιῶ τύχας (Eur. El. 1185), possible in itself, would leave ϵε stranded. εκ (from e(ι)ειναι) 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 δό(ν)τεϲ goes with ε[π]εθερ. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of αίειο (see for ι 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 | λοι̣[νχ̣)]ς . . . θεά. Perhaps στωλοι̣κχω, often applied to Athena but elsewhere also to other tutelary deities. However, it may be worth considering πυθάλοικχω, as PJP suggests, if θεά (or θεά) refers to 10 Τύχας: for Tyche as pilot (often in art) cf. Pind. fr. 40 δίδυμοι επέθεσε πυθάλων, Dio. Chrys. Θ. 63.7 τὸ δὲ πυθάλων δηλοὶ ὑπεριπτόμενα τῶν τῶν ἄνθρωπων βίον ἡ τύχη. So GVI 1516.5 τύχης . . . σικα (Orchomenos, 11/1 bc).

dότεϲ is probably a mistake for δώτεϲ (cf. XLII 3017 3 δότεϲ, 1. 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. δότεϲ for δ(ε)δωκότεϲ. For the construction, cf. Eur. Η 920 μητριάδος δέ ευθύτονον (2007)

In Homer the longer form πελώριον is the norm, and our author has πελώρην than πελώριοϲ. However, as GBD'A points out, the equivalent is excluded by the space, while ριον πελωρίαν (two-termination) is excluded by the traces. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of ἀπό πελώρην ('straight' or 'upright'). However, as GBD'A points out, the equivalent is excluded by the space, while ριον πελωρίαν (two-termination) is excluded by the traces.

In line 4. But in 12 ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων δῆττε 'εκ θεά (κυρίων), 'giving honour to the god(dess)', as at Eur. Ba. 342 μεθ' ἡμῶν τῶι θεῶι τιμὴν δίδου [νιλιούχῳ δ']. Since the context is unknown, the possibility of a dual |λοι̣κχω δ' δόντεϲ ς[π̣εύδετ'] does not seem to make no obvious sense, particularly if 11 δό〈ν〉τεϲ ς[π̣εύδετ'] exists as a form, and the internal diaeresis has parallels elsewhere in the writing of compound words. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of αίειο (see for ι instead of αι Gignac, Grammar i 192–3), but this would be the only example of such a spelling in the text.

But it seems to make no obvious sense, particularly if 11 δό(ν)τεϲ goes with ε[π]εθερ. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of αίειο (see for ι instead of αι Gignac, Grammar i 192–3), but this would be the only example of such a spelling in the text.

519. Lyric

μητριάδος δέ ευθύτονον (2007)

But it seems to make no obvious sense, particularly if 11 δό(ν)τεϲ goes with ε[π]εθερ. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of αίειο (see for ι instead of αι Gignac, Grammar i 192–3), but this would be the only example of such a spelling in the text.

But it seems to make no obvious sense, particularly if 11 δό(ν)τεϲ goes with ε[π]εθερ. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of αίειο (see for ι instead of αι Gignac, Grammar i 192–3), but this would be the only example of such a spelling in the text.

519. Lyric

μητριάδος δέ ευθύτονον (2007)

16 ἵκελον: ἰα has a diaeresis, as expected at word-beginning. Its dative probably preceded, e.g. θεά[ε] ἵκελον.

eπαίδος refers to the racecourse as a place or as an event (cf. Pind. Ισθ. 1.22–3 λάμπει . . . ἄρετά ἐν . . . γεμνοῖϲι επαίδοιϲ; 1105 Ἠρμήν δ' ἐν επαίδοιϲι ἐναγώνων ἀθλητήρεϲ [sc. κληξίουϲ]). The word following επαίδοιϲ begins with a, then indeterminate traces: in this context δέ[θ]α is worth considering.

M. DE KREIJ