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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 (\( \Gamma \) and \( \Pi \) project below the line, \( \Phi \) above and below). A certain cursive tendency shows in line-final \( \chi \) and \( \zeta \), which prolong their horizontal elements to the right, and in the frequent ligatures (notably after \( \alpha \), \( \epsilon \), \( \mu \), \( \tau \)). \( \epsilon \) sometimes has its upper element written in a single movement together with the cross-bar, sometimes added as a separate oblique. \( \Pi \) 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 \( \text{scriptio plena} \). 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 \(-\omega\); 5, a sign over \( \zeta \) and \( \epsilon \) struck through (\( \text{scriptio plena} \) replaced with elision?); 7 and 9 \( \epsilon \) struck through (correcting itacistic \( \epsilon \Gamma \) for short \( \zeta \)?). \( \epsilon \Gamma \) for long \( \iota \) remains uncorrected (15), and also \( \delta \omega \epsilon \epsilon \) for \( \delta \omega \nu \epsilon \epsilon \) (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 \( \text{Encomium of Hermes/Theon} \), 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 σταδίοις (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 ἱθύτονον 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 Kómos (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 πταμένα and κάρυξ, possibly also τύχας (if genitive singular) and -ριπτομένα (if feminine nominative singular), but epic-Ionic eta in νηοῖς and 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.

1. , the ligature to α suggests ι, but ι cannot be excluded. a, a low curve, fitting ι or ε; the upper part is abraded. 2. , the lower part of a curved letter, consistent with ε or θ. 3. , the end of a stroke joining δ, compatible with α 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  .ordinal, closest, but possibly the loop of  ν  4 ], a vertical on the edge, shorter than most ι, consistent with the right vertical of a  ν  4 ]), the ligature coming in high and a small trace above it favour  ε over  λ  5 ]v, the diagonal and right-hand vertical  , 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?  5, a small knot of damaged traces with a clear medial stroke:  ε or  θ  5 ], a line coming up out of the lacuna,  φ or  ι; a small trace at mid-height  5, 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  γγ, top of an upright  6 ], a descending oblique joining an upright; the height of the upright suggests  N rather than  Λ  6 ], high trace  6, remains of the base and extended cap as in ν; a small trace above the cap  7 ], a descending oblique joining an upright  8 ], deleted with a cancel-stroke in greyer ink  θθ  8 ], the top of a small bowl:  ο,  ε,  ο or  θ; a short, slightly concave upright, consistent with  N  8 ],  ε or  θ; a small trace at mid-height  9 ], 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 in greyer ink  ρ̣ο̣  9 ], the top of a small bowl:  ο,  ς, or  ρ;  ο or  ρ; a short, slightly concave upright, consistent with  ν  9 ], a descending oblique joining an upright  10 ], a curved foot, most likely  π or  η  10 ], the left-hand diagonal descends too sharply to fit  λ  12 ], a round letter, probably  ο or  ω  ω, 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  14 ], a trace on the line, perhaps the curved foot of a vertical or diagonal  15 ],  ο or  ρ  ρ, the cross-bar of  θ seems to be rewritten (corrected to or from  ε?)  16 ], high trace:  ε,  τ,  γ, or  χ, a short high horizontal trace; a long cross-bar with a suggestion of the top of the upright of  τ  16 ], a high curved trace and a horizontal just underneath the tail of  Λ: perhaps  ε

]ω[...],  6  6, ἐλνά  πελώριον
5  νηοῖϲ τε θεῶν ἐν ὑπ̣ωρε̣[...], τηλεφανήϲ  5  ελμα πελώριον
]  ἕσθω παλινεύτερον τοιαύτην τάξις  κάρυξ ἐπ̣' ὄχων
]  τηλεφανήϲ  6  ἐκατο̣ερίου ρηματομένα
10  ρηματομένα
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε εἰςων τύχαϲ
]  τιμήστε ἐν χρυσίω τύχαϲ
‘... to me, flying, a herald on a chariot... far-shining... enormous... temples of gods in... streets... Capitoline... a task... a foundation... clear-sounding... audible... harmony... strive... fortune... having given to the... goddess... below, the enormous earth... lift... bracing... herself... straight-stretched... equal to... in the stadium...’

2 κάρυξ seems more likely than κάρυξ’. If this is nominative, the lacuna probably contained a finite verb: cf. Od. 16.468–9 ὤμὴρησε δὲ μοι παρ’ ἐταίρων ἄγγελος ἠνίκε, / κήρυξ. It may have been a verb of arrival, like ὄμηρησε, or ἔλθε (cf. Sapph. 44.2 V. κάρυξ ἔλθε θεί]; B. 18.16–17 ἔλθεν[ν]... καρυκι...). φιλοκρία written normally, and seems too narrow for would have to be abnormally tall.

Il. 20.218, A.R. 2.380), though more often in prose. However, the space word does occur in poetry (or. ὄμηρησε δὲ μοι παρ’ ἐταίρων ἄγγελος ἠνίκε, / κήρυξ. It may have been a verb of arrival, like ὄμηρησε, or ἔλθε (cf. Sapph. 44.2 V. κάρυξ ἔλθε θεί]; B. 18.16–17 ἔλθεν[ν]... καρυκι...). φιλοκρία written normally, and seems too narrow for would have to be abnormally tall.

Il. 20.218, A.R. 2.380), though more often in prose. However, the space word does occur in poetry (or. ὄμηρησε δὲ μοι παρ’ ἐταίρων ἄγγελος ἠνίκε, / κήρυξ. It may have been a verb of arrival, like ὄμηρησε, or ἔλθε (cf. Sapph. 44.2 V. κάρυξ ἔλθε θεί]; B. 18.16–17 ἔλθεν[ν]... καρυκι...). φιλοκρία written normally, and seems too narrow for would have to be abnormally tall.

Il. 20.218, A.R. 2.380), though more often in prose. However, the space word does occur in poetry (or. ὄμηρησε δὲ μοι παρ’ ἐταίρων ἄγγελος ἠνίκε, / κήρυξ. It may have been a verb of arrival, like ὄμηρησε, or ἔλθε (cf. Sapph. 44.2 V. κάρυξ ἔλθε θεί]; B. 18.16–17 ἔλθεν[ν]... καρυκι...). φιλοκρία written normally, and seems too narrow for would have to be abnormally tall.
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

6 εν: the first trace would suit n. -νεν would most likely be the last syllable of a third person singular verb in the imperfect or aorist. Possibilities include ἐκραίνεν 'accomplished/provided', ἐφαίνεν 'showed', and ἐπέραν 'achieved'.

Καπιτώλιος (sometimes Καπστώλιος) occurs occasionally as a proper name, but more commonly as an epithet of Zeus: Ζεὺς Καπιτώλιος = Jupiter Capitolinus. For his cult in the Greek East generally, see J. P. Oleson et al., ΖPE 140 (2002) 108–9 (and SEG 52.1707); for Roman Egypt, G. Ronchi, Lexicon theonymon ii (1974) 401; for Oxyrhynchus, J. Whitehorne in ARW II 18.5 (1995) 3084. The Capitoline Games were celebrated in his honour, and εὐδαίμονες 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. Caldelli, L'Agon Capitolinus (1993). (2) Imitations of the Roman model, called Καπιτωλιακός, 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 Καπιτώλιον (see J. C. Quinn and A. Wilson, 'Capitolia', JRS 103 (2013) 117–73, at 149). For the documentary evidence see P. Frisch, Ἰονογ.Address:  London, 2009, 194–5, 198 [Remijisen].

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 έργον (e.g. ἀεικές, cf. Il. 14.13 etc. έργον ἀεικές, 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. ἀεικές (GBD'A).

7 επὶβαθρὸν οὐ ἐπὶ βάθρῳ? If the former, perhaps επίβαθρον ἀοιδής, since λεγουμένος ξύλος is so common a conjunction from Od. 12.44 and 183 onwards. In Claudian, AP 9.140.3 επίβαθρον ἀοιδής, 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. Kerkechev, 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. Ὄη. 659 ἐνθα μὲ τὸ πρῶτον λεγομένα επέβισθεν ἀοιδής, which might be the έργον of 6? Or, in the other sense, 'a fee for clear-sounding songs', if that would somehow fit the context?

8 έκατον: perhaps εκάτον γὰρ ἀοιδῶν, where the genitive would represent οὼδή rather than οὐδόδε, since λεγουμένος ξύλος is so common a conjunction from Od. 12.44 and 183 onwards. In Claudian, AP 9.140.3 επίβαθρον ἀοιδής, 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. Kerkechev, 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. Ὄη. 659 ἐνθα μὲ τὸ πρῶτον λεγομένα επέβισθεν ἀοιδής, which might be the έργον of 6? Or, in the other sense, 'a fee for clear-sounding songs', if that would somehow fit the context?

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

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 Porphyrion subdued (δμᾶθεν, which would fit the traces in 9, but not the metre as analysed above). Typhos and music reappear in Nomn. Dion. 1.376 ff.: see Rutherford in Agōcs et al. (edd.), Receiving the Komos 103–4.

10 εἶδοτε: or ], εἶδοτε, indicative or imperative. The apparent acute accent would exclude the articulation ['πείδε τ'], εἶδε τ'. If imperative, addressed to the external audience or to some group within the framework of the poem?
etcio: ἵω τύχας (Eur. El. 1185), possible in itself, would leave εε stranded. εἐκω (from ε(ἰ)σεινα) 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 ε[πειδε]. Therefore I have considered whether it represents a phonetic spelling of αἰκω (see for ε instead of α) 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 [λοιχυ] . . . θεα. Perhaps σο[λοιχυ], often applied to Athena but elsewhere also to other tutelary deities. However, it may be worth considering πηδα[λοιχυ], as JPJ suggests, if θεα (or θεα) refers to 10 Τύχας: for Tyche as pilot (often in art) cf. Pind. fr. 40 διδομο[ι[πέδα]ικα πηδάλιον, Dio. Chrys. Ὀ. 63.7 τὸ δὲ πηδάλιον δηλοὶ ὁτι κυβερνά τῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον ἡ τύχη. So GVI 1516.5 τύχης . . . ἄσκα (Orchomenos, π/1 bc).

dote[ς is probably a mistake for δώτες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, 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. δοτες for δ(εδοκ)ότες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 820 μητρί βρῖθος et al. The word occurs only at λιούχω δ’, δόντες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, 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. δοτες for δ(εδοκ)ότες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 820 μητρί βρῖθος et al. The word occurs only at λιούχω δ’, δόντες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, 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. δοτες for δ(εδοκ)ότες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 820 μητρί βρῖθος et al. The word occurs only at λιούχω δ’, δόντες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, 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. δοτες for δ(εδοκ)ότες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 820 μητρί βρῖθος et al. The word occurs only at λιούχω δ’, δόντες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, 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. δοτες for δ(εδοκ)ότες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 820 μητρί βρῖθος et al. The word occurs only at λιούχω δ’, δόντες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, 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. δοτες for δ(εδοκ)ότες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 820 μητρί βρῖθος et al. The word occurs only at λιούχω δ’, δόντες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, 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. δοτες for δ(εδοκ)ότες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 820 μητρί βρῖθος et al. The word occurs only at λιούχω δ’, δόντες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, 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. δοτες for δ(εδοκ)ότες. For the construction, cf. Eur. ΠΠ 820 μητρί βρῖθος et al. The word occurs only at λιούχω δ’, δόντες (cf. XLII 3017 δοτες, 1. δώτες); see Gignac, Grammar i 116–17.