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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 and άμ and 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 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, 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 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 apokrhoa (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 Komas (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?), note 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 παταμένα and κάρυξ, possibly also τυχας (if genitive singular) and τυπτομένα (if feminine nominative singular), but epic-Ionic eta in νηοῖς and πελώρης (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.

1 , 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 ά or ε πτ, 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 ο, ο likelyest, but possibly the loop of π 3 , a vertical on the edge, shorter than most τ, consistent with the right vertical of a ν 4 , the figure coming in high and a small trace above it favour ε over Λ 5 . ν, the diagonal and right-hand vertical ̣ , traces of a slanted left-hand upright and two small traces at letter-top level ̣ , 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 ο or a very round apostrophe ε deleted with a cancel-stroke γγ rather than τγ [], top of an upright 6 , a descending oblique joining an upright; the height of the upright suggests Ν rather than Λ, ̣ , remains of the base and extended cap as in 3; a small trace above the cap 7 , a descending oblique joining an upright ε[], deleted with a cancel-stroke in greyer ink θθ [], the top of a small bowl: ο, c, or π; o or p; a short, slightly concave upright, consistent with Ν [], o or ω 8 , end of a high horizontal stroke: τ, r, x 9 , joined to a, the tail of Λ, ο, ω; the height best suits µ [], lower parts of the first stroke and bridge, too low for Λ [], a foot of a stroke ascending steeply from left to right, e.g. N ̣, deleted with a cancel-stroke in greyer ink 10 , a curved foot, most likely π or η, the left-hand diagonal descends too sharply to fit Λ 12 , a round letter, probably ο or ω 13 , 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 ̣ 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 p θθ, the cross-bar of θ seems to be rewritten (corrected to or from ε?) 16 , high trace: ε, τ, γ, or ξ, 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]... [she] understood harmony... strive... fortune... having given to... 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. 16.486–9 ὧμήρησε δὲ μοι παρ' ἑταίρων ἄγγελος ὄντις, / κήρυξ. It may have been a verb of arrival, like ὧμηρησα, or ἥλθε (cf. Sapph. 44.2 V. κάροξ ήλθε θείοιτι; B. 18.16–17 ἥλθεν... )... κάροξ) or a *verbum dicendi* like ἐπιστάμενος (cf. Tim. PMG 1802). 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. Av. 574 αὐτίκα Νικη πέτεσα πτερόν χρυσών, Paus. 5.17.3 ἔχοντα Νίκη πτερά. But I know of no passage where Nike is referred to as κήρυξ. Φήμη 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 (τικτον) φήμη κηρούσε. 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 Chorelykren (1992) 88–93’ (GBD'A). Maehler on Bacch. 2.1 compares Ebert, Epygr. auf Sieger 59.11–12 (= SGO I 06/02/21) and 72.7–9, both victory poems.

... ἄθλος. 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 Epigr. auf Sieger compares Ebert, 59.11–12 [= SGO I 06/02/21] and 72.7–9, both victory poems.

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

4 [έ]λμα. Several words end thus, e.g. (-)άγγελμα, δόξα, εὐλογία, τέλμα. Archimedes, SH 202.1 (FGE 89) has εὐλογία πέλαφον, ‘giant deck’, of Hiero II’s monster ship. In epinician context, Pind. Ol. 10.21 πέλαφον... κλέος.


ἐν ὑπωροφίῳ: the traces between υ and ω match no letter perfectly, but the rounded π comes closest; ε sometimes partly closed, like ω. Then, after a damaged patch, a vertical trace high above the line. In itself, ὑπωροφίῳ would suggest ὑπωροφίῳ or ὑπωροφίῳ. ὑπωροφίῳ [i]i] 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 a written normally, and [i] would have to be abnormally tall. ὑπωροφίῳ would introduce a word familiar from poetry, and φ would fit the high trace perfectly. However, φ does not match the ink (unless the word stroke is a mark of deletion), or the gap that follows.

5. τῇ[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 ὑπωροφίῳ [ε]ε[ε]ν τ' ἄγνηκαίει, or εν ὑπωροφίῳ[είς] τ' ἄγνηκ'αίει [JF], ‘roofed streets’ referring to the four stoai of the Oxyrhynchus town-centre, LXIV 4441), but neither version explains all the ink; see previous note.
\[ \alpha \gamma \nu: \] perhaps \( \delta \gamma \nu \).

6 \[ \epsilon \nu: \] the first trace would suit \( \nu \). -\( \epsilon \nu \) would most likely be the last syllable of a third person singular verb in the imperfect or aorist. Possibilities include \( \epsilon \kappa \rho \alpha (i) \nu e v \) 'accomplished/provided', \( \epsilon \varphi (a) i (v) e v \) 'showed', and \( \epsilon \pi \epsilon r (a) (i) \nu e v \) 'accomplished'.

\( \kappa a p i t o \bar{\nu} l o s \) (sometimes \( \kappa a p i t o \bar{\nu} l o s \)) occurs occasionally as a proper name, but more commonly as an epithet of Zeus: \( \zeta \kappa a p i t o \bar{\nu} l o s \) = Jupiter Capitolinus. For his cult in the Greek East generally, see J. P. Oleson et al., \( \zeta P E 140 \) (2002) 108–9 (and SEG 52:1707); for Roman Egypt, G. Ronchi, \( L e x i o n \ t h e o n y m o n \) \( \alpha \) (1974) 401; for Oxyrhynchus, J. Whitehorn in \( A V R I I \) 18.5 (1995) 3084. The Capitoline Games were celebrated in his honour, and \( \epsilon \tau \sigma \alpha \delta i o s \) in 16 suggests that this was the context here. In that case we have to choose between two different festivals. (1) The Ludi Capitolini at Rome, founded by Domitian in AD 86, held prime place on the athletic and musical circuit. See M. L. Caldeli, \( L \alpha \gamma o n \ C a p i t o l i n u s \) (1903). (2) Imitations of the Roman model, called \( K a p i t o l i a \) or \( \alpha \gamma o n K a-\pi t o l i a k o s \), 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 \( K a p i t o l o n o s \) (see J. C. Quinn and A. Wilson, ‘Capitolia’, \( J R S \) 103 (2013) 117–73, at 149). For the documentary evidence see P. Frisch, \( Z a h n \ a g o n i s t i c a P a p y r i \); LXIII 4352 introd.; below pp. 194–3, 196 [Remijien].

a [ . . . ] e: the high trace above the bowl best matches a preceding slanted epsilon (cf. the \( \epsilon \) of \( \theta \epsilon \omega \) in 5), which suggests the neuter of an adjective in -\( \epsilon \nu \) to go with \( \epsilon \gamma \gamma o n \) (e.g. \( \dot{\alpha} [v] i [k] e \), cf. II. 14.13 etc. \( \epsilon \gamma \gamma o n \) \( \alpha \nu e k e \), 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. \( \dot{\alpha} [v] [\acute{\epsilon} c] e \) (GBD'A).

7 \( \epsilon \pi \beta \beta \alpha \beta r o n \) or \( \epsilon \pi \beta \beta \beta \alpha \beta r o n ? \) If the former, perhaps \( \epsilon \pi \beta \beta \beta \alpha \beta r o n \) \( \alpha \nu o \delta i \) (\( \alpha \nu o \delta i \delta i \) \( \alpha \nu o \delta i \delta i \)), where the genitive would represent \( \alpha \nu o \delta i \) rather than \( \alpha \nu o \delta i \), since \( \lambda \gamma \gamma o p \) \( \alpha \nu o \delta i \) is so common a conjunction from \( O d . \) 12.44 and 183 onwards. In Claudian, \( A P 9.140.3 \) \( \epsilon \pi \beta \beta \beta \alpha \beta r o n \) \( \alpha \nu o \delta i \), the word has the concrete sense ‘support’, of a stool for the poet; so in \( A P 9.661.3 \) (Jul. Aegypt.) of a tree where birds perch; Call. fr. 196.23 of a statue-base (A. Kerkechever, \( C a l l i m a c h u s’ B o o k \) of \( \lambda \gamma \mu o n \) (1999) 153–4). It can also mean ‘fee paid when embarking on a ship’, \( O d . \) 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. \( O b . \) 659 \( \epsilon \beta \theta a \) \( \mu e \) \( \tau o \) \( \pi \rho \omega \tau o n \) \( \lambda \gamma \gamma o p \) \( \epsilon \pi \varepsilon \beta \beta \iota \epsilon \gamma o n \) \( \alpha \nu o \delta i \)), which might be the \( \epsilon \gamma \gamma o n \) of 6? Or, in the other sense, ‘a fee for clear-sounding songs’, if that would somehow fit the context?

8 \( \epsilon k a \tau o [ . . . ] e i o n \): perhaps \( \epsilon k a \tau o [\gamma] \chi \varepsilon i o n \) (or \( \epsilon k a \tau o [\nu] \)-, as transmitted in Acusilaus fr. 1088 Fowler), but this looks a letter short \( \{ \) perhaps a diastole was written between \( \gamma \) and \( \chi \); see GMAPV- p. 11 n. 50.\) An alternative might be \( \chi k a \tau o [\nu] \varepsilon i o n \), compare LXIII 4352 fr. 5 ii 18, where Zeus Kapitolios gives the empire to Diocletian \( \alpha \kappa t e i a r o s \) \( \gamma \gamma e n \) \( \ldots \) \( \dot{\alpha} [\nu] \delta \rho a \). \( \tau \) is a doubtful reading, since we might expect the cross-piece to extend rightwards and touch the following \( \epsilon \), but it matches the trace slightly better than \( \chi \). If \( \tau \), then e.g. \( \dot{\alpha} [\nu] \varepsilon i o n \) or \( \epsilon k a \tau o [\nu] \varepsilon i o n \) (‘rousing the far-shooter’ [sc. Apollo]; cf. II. 1.385).

9 \( \mu \alpha \theta e n \): the initial trace favours \( -[\nu] \mu \alpha \theta e n \) over \(-[\nu] \lambda \alpha \theta e n \). Perhaps \( \mu \alpha \theta e n \) (without augment); \(-[\nu] \lambda \alpha \theta e n \) is unlikely, since it would give three successive short syllables.

\( \dot{\alpha} [\nu] o [\varpi] o n \) suits the space. The fourth letter visible from the end appears to be a cancelled epsilon; presumably the scribe first wrote the itacistic spelling -\( \epsilon \omega a v \). However, the process may have been more complicated, since \( \epsilon [\nu] o [\varpi] o n \) and perhaps also the preceding \( \mu [\nu] \) are written in a hand that, while basically similar to the rest, slopes strongly to the right.

JJP speculates that the author has in mind Pindaric references to the children of Gaia: \( P y t h . \) 1.15–16 Typhos fears the Muses’ song; \( P y t h . \) 8.16–18 Typhos and Porphyreon subdued \( \delta \mu \alpha \theta e n \), which would fit the traces in 9, but not the metre as analysed above). Typhos and music reappear in Nonn. \( D i o n . \) 1.376 ff.; see Rutherford in \( A g o c s \) et al. (edd.), \( R e c e i v i n g \) the \( K o m o s \) 103–4.

10 \( \epsilon [\pi] \varepsilon i o d e \)‘ or \( \chi [\nu] \varepsilon i o d e \), indicative or imperative. The apparent acute accent would exclude the articulation \( \chi [\pi] \varepsilon i o d e \), \( \chi [\nu] \varepsilon i o d e \). If imperative, addressed to the external audience or to some group within the framework of the poem?
εἰς εἰς ιὸν τύχας (Eur. El. 1185), possible in itself, would leave εἰς stranded. εἰςω (from εἰςεἰςεἰςι) 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 δοῖντες goes with εἰςοῦς. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of αἰειω (see for εἰς instead of αἰ 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 |λούχῳ . . . θεᾶ. Perhaps στο[λούχῳ, often applied to Athena but elsewhere also to other tutelary deities. However, it may be worth considering πῆδα[λούχῳ, as PJP suggests, if θεᾶ (or θεά) refers to 10 Τύχας: for Tyche as pilot (often in art) cf. Pind. fr. 40 δίδυμοι ετρέποις πελώρρας, Dio. Chrys. Οἰ. 63.7 τὸ δὲ πελώρας δηλοὶ ἄτι κυβερνά τῶν τῶν ἄνθρωπων βιῶν ἡ τύχῃ, So GVI 1516.5 τύχης . . . σάκκοι (Orchomenos, ii/1 bc).

δοτεϲ is probably a mistake for δώτεϲ (cf. XLI 3017 3 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(εδωκὸς)δοτεϲ. For the construction, cf. Eur. Π 820 μητρὶ δοῦτεϲ εὐθὺν τὸν τόνον normally print (2007)

εὐθὺτονοϲ . . . ἀπὸ σταλίκων ('straight' or 'upright'). However, as GBD'A points out, the equivalent ῥιπτόμενα is excluded by the space, while ΡΙΟΝ πελώριαν (two-termination) is excluded by the traces.

πελώριοϲ In Homer the longer form πελώριοϲ in line 4. But in 12 is the norm, and our author has ῥιπτόμενα instead of the cross-bar of (ϲυν)έριθοϲ SH, would fill the space, and give sense; cf. Dorieus, 159) 396.1 (FGE ἤρατο βρῖθοϲ the left of ρ.

ποδῶν δ' ὑπένερθε traces (cf. 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 γαῖ[α]ν here, rather than γάν, where in any case we would expect γῆν. For the Ionic vocalization in πελώρην νῆοῖϲ (Doric feminine) or (neuter plural), η ῥιπτομένα. Since the context is unknown, the possibility of a dual |λούχῳ δ' ὤτ' εἰς θεά ('and when to the . . . goddesses'), though unlikely, cannot be excluded.

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

πελώρην γαϊ[α]ν γαϊα 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 γαϊ[α]ν here, rather than γάν, where in any case we would expect γῆν. For the Ionic vocalization in πελώρη cf. 5 νηοῖϲ. In Homer the longer form πελώρων is excluded by the space, while ροὐς (two-termination) is excluded by the traces.

13 ] |βοϲ ἄφρα: ἄφρα optative or ἄφρα 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 β, would fill the space, and give sense; cf. Dorieus, SH 396.1 (FGE 159) ἵππος βρῖθοϲ. If e.g. (ε)ιεροϲ, the cross-bar of ε must have been unusually prolonged.

14 ] ῥιπτόμενα: ], η ῥιπτόμενα (Doric feminine) or ῥιπτόμενα (neuter plural), e]χηριπτόμενα or e]χηριπτόμενα. 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 -εα, though the author is not necessarily in full control of his dialects.

15 εἰθύτονοϲ, l. ιηθύτονοϲ. The word occurs only at AP 6.187.4 (GP 3359), Alpheus, ιηθύτονοϲ . . . ἀπὸ σταλίκων ('straight' or 'upright'). However, as GBD'A points out, the equivalent εἰθύτονοϲ is transmitted at Pind. Ol. 10.64–5 στάδιον μὲν ἀρίστευϲεν εἰθύτονοϲ / τοϲι γῆς (where edd. normally print εἰθύτον τῶον: WBH refers to W. S. Barrett, Greek Lyric, Tragedy, & Textual Criticism (2007) 73–4). The scholia understand it to qualify στάδιον, τὸ μὴ ἐχὼν καμήν, τῶν ἀπλών ῥόδων, and so here στάδιοϲ appears in the next line.

16 ἴολοϲ: has a diaeresis, as expected at word-beginning. Its dative probably preceded, e.g. θεαίϲ ἴολοϲ.

στάδιοϲ refers to the racecourse as a place or as an event (cf. Pind. Ἰσ. 1.22–3 λάμπεϲ . . . ἄρετά ἐν . . . γεμνοῖϲ στάδιοϲ; 1015 δ’ Ἕρμην δ’ ἐν στάδιοϲ ἐναγώνων ἀθλητήϲεϲ [sc. κλῆξοϲ]). The word following στάδιοϲ begins with a, then indeterminate traces: in this context ἄθη[β]α is worth considering.
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