



---

The Lille 'Stesichorus'

Author(s): P. J. Parsons

Source: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 1977, Bd. 26 (1977), pp. 7-36

Published by: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20181382>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

## THE LILLE 'STESICHORUS'

Another remarkable find from Lille: we owe the first edition to M. Gilbert Ancher and his colleagues, CRIPEL<sup>1)</sup> 4 (1977) 287 (PLille 76) and to M. Claude Meillier (above, p.1: PLille 73, an additional scrap). The three fragments of papyrus, recovered from cartonnage, are datable to the early second century BC. They contain parts of a triadic poem, in literary Doric and primitive dactylo-epitrite, which describes, at a leisurely pace and with strong Homeric colouring, how Polynices and Eteocles divided the estate of Oedipus. The authorship remains strictly unknown; we have no external evidence. Theme, manner, metre and dialect suit Stesichorus. But there are other considerations both objective and subjective - the Homeric clichés and especially the Homeric prosody (p.10); the drab repetitious flaccidity of the composition - which discourage a hasty attribution.

This paper concerns itself entirely with the constitution of the text. Professor Lloyd-Jones had suggested to the first editors, that the three fragments combine to form four consecutive columns. The first editors could not accept the suggestion (CRIPEL 4 p.304). I believe that it is correct. In what follows I argue for it, and then discuss some problems of the combined text.

With the encouragement of MM. Meillier and Ancher, and by the courtesy of MM. Vercoutter and Boyaval, I have examined the papyrus on three different occasions. Accordingly, this paper appears over my name. But the notes will make it clear, how much of the fundamental work is due to Mr Barrett and Prof. Lloyd-Jones, and at a later stage to Prof. Sir Denys Page and Prof. M. L. West: these contributions were available to the first editors, except those of Sir Denys Page, which by his kindness I publish for the first time.

I am grateful to seminars in Oxford and Cambridge which discussed the text and clarified many of its issues.

---

1) Cahier de recherches de l'institut de papyrologie et d'égyptologie de Lille, 4: Etudes sur l'Egypte et le Soudan ancien: Publications de l'Université de Lille III, 1977.

### 1. The Papyrus

PLille 76 consists of three fragments:

A (including PLille 73, which joins at the right and supplies the ends of 201–213 = col.ii 1–13 and the beginnings of 235–247 = col.iii). Remains of three columns: i full height, line-ends only; ii full height, nearly complete; iii upper part only, line-beginnings only. Maximum height of papyrus 23.3 cm; maximum width c.17 cm, comprising three vertical strips (width c.6, c.5 and c.6 cm; the third is PLille 73) which, but for warping, would make an exact join. Upper margin (col.ii–iii) 2.65; written height (col.ii) 17.4; lower margin (col.ii) 3.00; written width (col.ii), including the right-hand intercolumnium, c.12. Column (col.ii) of 34 lines.

B. Remains of one column, full height, line-beginnings lost. Maximum height of papyrus 23.25 cm; maximum width 5.7 cm. Upper margin 2.9; written height 17.5; lower margin 2.85. Column of 34 lines.

C. Remains of two columns, full height: col.i line-ends, col.ii line-beginnings. Maximum height of papyrus 23.5 cm; maximum width 6.4. Upper margin (col.i) 2.9 (to the first visible line-end: but see below p. 8); written height 17.5 (from the first visible line of i to the last visible line of ii: but see below p. 8); lower margin (col.ii) 3.00. Column (col.i) of 34 lines minimum.

There is a regularity about these shapes, as if the papyrus had been roughly torn into strips c.6 cm wide. The same is true, though less obviously, of the Lille Callimachus. Did the cartonnage-maker dismember his material in this way?

The first editors wish to arrange the fragments thus: B, A, C; between B and A, and between A and C, gaps of four or five columns.

Prof. Lloyd-Jones wished to arrange them thus: A, C, B, so that A i, A ii, A iii + C i, and C ii + B should make four consecutive columns; between A and C a gap of c.4 cm (assessed from the corresponding arrangement of the verso text), between C and B a gap of c. 2.5–3.00 cm (calculated from the supplements in 291 and 303).

The first editors bring forward the following arguments (CRIPEL 4 pp.304–5, cf.348–9):

- (1) The colour and texture of the papyrus favours the order B A C.
- (2) The line-spacing varies from fragment to fragment, both in average width and in average irregularity: if we put the variations in ascending sequence, we have again the order B A C.
- (3) The top line of B stands distinctly lower than those of the other columns: there-

fore B at least must be widely separated from the other fragments.

(4) The fibres of B do not continue those of C, and the fibres of C probably do not continue those of A: therefore the three fragments must be widely separated one from another.

(5) The lines of B stand on different levels from those of C ii: therefore they cannot continue them.

None of these arguments carries much weight:

(1) Physical appearance, especially colouring, is not a safe guide; much depends on the accidental conditions of preservation. PLille 76 A consists of two strips: these certainly join, yet they look completely different.

(2) The variations are small; and, small as they are, there is no reason to think that they should conform to some predictable sequence. Scribes are human: they vary the spacing and even the number of lines in a column of fixed height, without regard for mathematical symmetry.

(3) If the lower edge of B is alined with the lower edge of C, then certainly the first line of B stood lower than the first line of C ii. But there is no way of being sure, in either fragment, that the lower edge has been perfectly preserved. The only safe guide is the written height (the measurement from the tops of letters in the first line, to the feet of letters in the last line): and here A, B and C match almost exactly. - In any case, it remains possible that consecutive columns began at different heights: thus in two rolls of the same period, PSorb.inv.2272d (Menander, Sicyonius: *Rech. de Pap.* 3 [1964] pl.xi) and PLouvre inv.9331 (Hyperides, *In Athenogenem*: ed. Revillout, 1892, pl.iii), we have irregularities of a line and a half-line respectively.

(4) The observation is correct. It follows that A, B and C come from different sheets (*kollemata*) of the roll; it does not follow that these sheets were widely separated; for even a narrow gap would be enough to contain the missing sheet-joins (*kolle-seis*). In fact, one join survives, with an overlap of c. 2.5 cm: its rough edge can be seen c. 2.5 cm in from the left of A, just before the line-beginnings of col.ii. We can easily reconcile this and the other data with Lloyd-Jones' reconstruction. Suppose that the roll consisted of sheets 21 cm wide, with overlaps of 2.5 cm: then sheets 1-4 accommodate the six columns of writing lost before A ii (allowing 12 cm per column, and a short initial blank); the right edge and join of sheet 4 duly appears

at the left of A; the right edge and join of sheet 5 will be lost between A iii and C i; the right edge and join of sheet 6 will be lost after B. But many such hypotheses could be devised. There is no way of saying, what was the likely size of a sheet; and no good reason to suppose, that all the sheets were of the same size, especially at this early date. (Cf. E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* 173 n.21)

(5) This objection would be decisive, if true. But I do not think it is true. (a) C ii apparently has the same number of lines as B. (b) C ii has the same written height as B (in appearance, 0.3 cm more; but if you close up the split in the papyrus below 279 = C ii 10, the difference vanishes). (c) Certainly, if you put the last lines of C ii and B on a level, and measure upwards, you find that some lines of B stand as much as 0.3 cm lower than their presumed beginnings in C ii. But this is not significant. If you make the same measurements for A ii, you find that some lines have their middles as much as 0.45 cm below their beginnings. The irregularities are explained by the scribe's shaky hand; perhaps also by erratic warping of the papyrus.

I conclude that the arguments against Lloyd-Jones' reconstruction are very weak. But the arguments in favour are overwhelmingly strong:

(1) The three fragments were found together. If combined as consecutive columns, they fit precisely the metrical scheme which has been deduced independently from A ii. Can this be coincidence?

(2) This reconstruction requires only one assumption, namely, that one line, corresponding to A iii 1, has been completely lost at the head of C i (line 235 below). There is nothing against this assumption. (a) Metre shows, that it would have been a short line; it therefore fits easily in the lacuna. (b) It apparently stood half a line higher than the first line of C ii (and so increased the written height of its column to c. 18 cm). But the irregularity is not surprising: above p. 7. (c) It gives a column of 35 lines, although A ii and C ii + B both have 34 lines. But again, such trivial variations are commonplace.

(3) This reconstruction squares with the stichometric figure at C ii 31. This figure is gamma (not pi), ie line 300; and it stands at the sixth line of a strophe, ie fourteen complete triads of 21 lines have preceded ( $14 \times 21 = 294$ ;  $294 + 6 = 300$ ). Reckoning back, we find that A ii 1 = 201; and deduce that 1-200 could have occupied six complete columns, averaging  $33\frac{1}{3}$  lines, which corresponds well enough to the column-heights (34 and 35 lines) of the preserved section.

(4) This reconstruction combines C ii and B; and the combination is confirmed by the supplements which it allows. In particular, the very probable supplements in 291 and 303, and the plausible supplements in 276 and 293, do not merely satisfy metre and sense: they are spatially consistent to within one letter.

(5) This reconstruction produces a coherent plot. A ii concerns the division of Oedipus' estate; B concerns Polynices' journey to Argos, which is the consequence; therefore B cannot precede A.

(6) This reconstruction allows an equally satisfactory arrangement of the verso text, a list of names and numbers. The one complete column (PLille 73 vso col.ii + PLille 76 A vso col.i = A col.ii) has a width of 7 cm, with intercolumnia of 3 cm. Assuming this pattern, we can readily combine the versoes in four consecutive columns: (I) B (line-beginnings) - gap of 3 cm - C i (line-ends); (II) C ii (line-beginnings) - gap of 4 cm - A i (line-ends); (III) A ii; (IV) A iii.

### 3. Scribal Practice

- (i) Accents, breathings, punctuation: none.
- (ii) Paragraphi: paragraphus marks the end of strophe and antistrophe, paragraphus with coronis marks the end of a triad.
- (iii) Marginalia: only  $\overline{\Gamma}$  (stichometric) at 300 and  $\chi$  (nota bene) at 302 (and 247 ?). On  $\chi$ , see E.G.Turner, *Greek Papyri* 116 f.
- (iv) Elision: the elided vowel is simply omitted (ten certain instances): no example of apostrophe, no example of scriptio plena.
- (v) Iota adscript: used correctly and consistently (five certain instances, 219, 224, 285, 293, 296; probably 231, 289): no example of false insertion, no example of careless omission.

### 4. Dialect Spellings

- (i) Participles: 217 ἀλοῖσαν, 232 ἐνεποῖσα, 233 -οῖσα, but 257 πιθήσας. The poet himself may well have been inconsistent: see M.Nöthiger, *Die Sprache d.Stesichorus u.d.Ibycus* (Zürich 1971) 89 ff.
- (ii) Infinitives: 180 ἐνθεῖν, 214 ἐκιδεῖν, 220 νατεῖν, all in -εῖν. There is no

certain example of an infinitive in -εν : only 197 ἐγειρεν, 272 ἴγεν?, 283 ἔχεν, 295 στείχεν, ambiguous in their damaged contexts. Cf Nöthiger, p.96 ff.

### 5. Prosody

(i) 'Doric' accusative feminine plural in -ᾶς 303 Κλεωνᾶς. There is no verifiable example of -ᾶς (in 209 (F)ἄναξ may make position). See Nöthiger, p.99; M.L. West, Hesiod, Theogony p.85.

(ii) Digamma is observed in the following cases: (a) it prevents hiatus in 203 (F)ελπίδας, 224 (F)ἑκατι, (b) it makes position in 217 (F)αλοΐσαν, 267 (F)ἑλικας (and perhaps also 209 (F)ἄναξ). It is disregarded in other cases: (a) 228 καὶ ἄστυ; (b) 211 παῖδάς ἰδέσθαι. In one form the transmitted text is inconsistent: 229 -ου (F)ἄνακτος, 275 and 280 -οι ἄνακτος; see 229 note. - For the treatment of ἰσθμός see 299 note.

(iii) Mute and liquid always lengthen a preceding short vowel: there are eight certain examples (212 ἐπειλώσαν, 215 δακρυόεντα, 226 πότμο[υ, 231 πέπρωται γενέ[θ]λαι, 275 Ἀδράστοι, 281 Ἑτεο[υ]λ-, 291 ὀλυνυμάλυτος) and a very likely supplement (222 [πατρός), all within the word. There are no contrary examples. This poet therefore follows strict Homeric practice, quite contrary to Stesichorean practice as the fragments show it (Nöthiger, p.112 ff). This accords with his heavily Homeric diction. And it is the chief evidence against Stesichorean authorship.

### 6. Metre

str./ant.	1	- υυ - υυ - $\bar{\omega}$ - υυ - υυ - $\bar{\omega}$	D x D -
	2	- υυ - υυ - ε - υ - ε	D x e -
	3	- υυ - υυ - $\bar{\omega}$ - υυ - υυ - $\bar{\omega}$	D x D -
	4	- υυ - υυ -	D
	5	υ - υυ - υυ - $\bar{\omega}$ - υ - -	x D x e -
	6	- υυ - υυ -	D
	7	$\bar{\omega}$ - υ - υ - υ - υ - σ	x e x e -

epod.	1	- ∪ - ∪ -	D
	2	∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - -	x D x e -
	3	- ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪	e x e -
	4	- ∪ - ∪ ∪ <sub>∪</sub> - ∪ - ∪ - -	D x D -
	5	∪ - ∪ - ∪	x e -
	6	- ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - -	D x D -
	7	- - - ∪ - -	- - e -

(i) Hiatus proves period-end after str.2 (see 212) and ep.3 (see 227); and after str. 3, if the supplement in 234 is correct.

(ii) Brevis in longo occurs at the end of str.1 (232, 239), str.2 (240), ep.3 (206, 290), ep.5 (208, 229); possibly also at the end of str.3 (241 ?) and ep.4 (249 ?).

(iii) - ∪ - ∪ - (D) is contracted to - - - ∪ - at 230 and 249 and perhaps 211. All three examples occur in the 'quasi-hexameter' D x D -.

(iv) Medial anceps (x) appears as a double short in str.1 (211, see note), ep.4 (207, 291), ep.6 (230, 272, 293). All examples occur in the quasi-hexameter. (This is hardly coincidence. The quasi-hexameter feels the pull of the normal (epic) hexameter; and therefore favours the forms D ∪ D - and D - D -, in which it is indistinguishable from the model. The form D ∪ D - occurs in only six of the nineteen verifiable instances). The one exception is 215 (str.5), where the reading and prosody are doubtful.

(v) In all verifiable cases, the quasi-hexameter has a caesura: usually 'masculine' (D | x ...), occasionally 'feminine', dividing a bisyllabic anceps (D ∪ | ∪ ... : 211, 230, 293). (This observation is due to Barrett, Haslam and West). In all verifiable cases, it observes the usual bridges at the line-end (no example of word-break after the 'fourth trochee' or 'fourth spondee').

(vi) In the verifiable instances of the colon (x) D x e -, word-break often precedes the medial anceps (exceptions 212, 215, 275), never follows it.

(vii) In the verifiable instances of the colon (x) e x e -, word-break sometimes precedes the medial anceps, never follows it.



7. Homerisms

The poet's language shows many similarities with the Iliad and Odyssey, especially in stock epithets (188 μέγα νεῖκος, 205 θεοὶ ἀθάνατοι, 209 ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων, 213 θανάτου τέλος στυγεροῖο, 222 φίλου πατρός, 232 μύθοις ἀγανοῖς, 239 χρυσὸν ἐρίτιμον, 241 κλυτὰ μάλα, 249 στήθεσσι φίλοισι, 272 ἔλικας βόας, 276 περικαλλέα κούραν, 295 μέγα τεῖχος, 303 ἐϋκτιμένας] Κλεωνάς). This makes a useful guide in the devising of supplements.

It may also be an indication of authorship. The Homeric clichés are of a piece with the Homeric prosody (p.10) and the Homeric hexameters (p.11). Stesichorus was the most Homeric of poets (Long., de subl. 13.3): but all this goes well beyond what might have been expected from his other fragments.

8. Text

desunt vv. 1 - 175

(PLille 76 A i)	[—]	
176		] Κρονίδας μὲν
		]
		] c υἱός
		]
180		] ac ἐνθεῖν
		]
		].
	[—]	
		]
184		] υτας
		]
		] ...πρὶν
		]
188		μ]ἔγα νεῖκος
		]
	[=]	

- 192 ] ..εν εἴω  
] ...  
] παῖδας  
]  
]  
]  
] ...  
] [ ]  
[—]  
] ..ος ἔγειρεν  
]  
] ..  
] ..  
200  
(PLille 76 A ii + 73 i) ἐπ' ἄλγεσι μὴ χαλεπὰς ποιεῖ μερίμνας  
μηδὲ μοι ἐξοπίσω  
πρόφαινε ἐλπίδας βαρείας.  
—  
204 οὔτε γὰρ αἰὲν ὁμῶς  
θεοὶ θέσαν ἀθάνατοι κατ' αἶαν ἱρὰν  
νεῖκος ἔμπεδον βροτοῖσιν  
οὐδὲ γὰρ μὲν φιλότατ' ἐπιδά .....α νοο .....  
208 θεοὶ τιθεῖσι.  
μαντοσύνας δὲ τεάς, ἄναξ, ἐκέρχον Ἀπόλλων  
μὴ πάσας τελέσσαι.  
==  
212 αἶ δέ με παῖδας ἰδέσθαι .....α.....αμ..τας  
μόρσιμόν ἐστιν ἐπεκλώσαν δὲ Μοῖρα[ι],  
αὐτίκα μοι θανάτου τέλος στυγερό[το] γέν[οι]το,  
πρὶν τόκα ταῦτ' ἐσιδεῖν  
ἄλγε<c>ι πολύστονα δακρυόεντα[ - -  
216 παῖδας ἐνὶ μμεγάροις  
θανόντας ἢ πόλιν ἀλοίσαν.

ἀλλ' ἄγε παῖδες ἐμοῖς μύθοις φιλα[ - υ υ - -  
 τᾷδε γὰρ ὕμ<μ>ιν ἐγὼν τέλος προφαίνω,  
 220 τὸν μὲν ἔχοντα δόμους ναίειν π[ υ υ - υ υ - -  
 τὸν δ' ἀπίμεν κτεάνη  
 καὶ χρυσὸν ἔχοντα φίλου κύμπαντα [πατρὸς  
 κλαροπαληδὸν ὅς ἄν  
 224 πρῶτος λάχῃι ἕκατι Μοιρᾶν.

τοῦτο γὰρ ἄν δοκῶ  
 λυτήριον ὕμμι κακοῦ γένοιτο πότμο[υ  
 μάντιος φραδαῖσι θείου  
 228 αἰτενεον Κρονίδας γένος τε καὶ ἄστ[υ - -  
 Κάδμου ἄνακτος  
 ἀμβάλλων κακῶτατα πολὺν χρόνον [- υ υ - -  
 πέπρωται γεν[ ] . . ι.

232 ὥς φάτ[ο] δῖα γυνά, μύθοις ἀγ[α]νοῖς ἐνεποίσα,  
 νεῖκεος ἐμ μεγάροις [ . . . ] κα παῖδας,  
 οὐν δ' ἅμα Τειρ[ε]σί[α]ς [ . . . . . ] ος, οἱ δ' [ε]πιθό[ν]το  
 (PLille 73 ii + 76 C i) α[ ]  
 236 το[ ] ηβαν  
 γαία[ ]  
 καὶ [ ] α

240 τογ[ χρ]υσοῦν τ' ἐρίτιμον ἔχοντα  
 πα[ ] cθηνησαν  
 ηδος[ κ]λυτὰ μάλα νέμοντο  
 ...[ ]  
 [ ] μ[ ] ιρας ἵππους  
 244 [ ]  
 [ ]

	.	[		]
	.	[		] . ους ἀκάμους
248				]
				] ι στήθεσσι φίλοις
				]
				] ος, ἀν δ' ἔθορ' αὐτὸς
252				]
		[=]		
				μῦθον ἔειπε
				] . . ως
				] . ε βουλὰν
256				]
				] σ πιθήσας
				]
				]
		[—]		
260				] ε πολλὰ . . . . .
				]
				]
				]
264				] σας
				]
				]
		[—]		
				]
268				] αἰς
				]
(PLille 76 C ii + B)	.	[	c.10	] υῖν θέντες μεγάλας ε . . . .
	.	[		] γος
272	.	[		] εν ἔλικας βάας ἡδὲ καὶ ἵππους
	.	[		] αἶσαν
		=		

	..[	c.9	]οι τὸ μόρσιμόν ἐστι γεν[ - -
	...[		]ον 'Αδράστοι' ἄνακτος
276	.[		]ος δώσει περικαλλέα κοῦραν
	.[		]α
	.[		]τον δωκοῦντι δᾶμος
	..[		]ου
280			]οι' ἄνακτος
	[—]		
			]ω διαμπερέως ἔτεο[ηλ-
			]εν στήθεσσιν αἰνώ[
	θ.[		]ν ἔχεν Πολυνείκεος [ - -
284	ω.[		].
	τευξ[		]ταν πόλει τε πάσαι
	μα.[		]ν
	ἀεὶ π.[		]ε πένθος
	—		
288	του[		]ν
	θεω[		]ρηι μάλιστα παντῶν
	..[		]τοισιν.
	ὥς φάτ[ο Τειρεσίας δ]νυμάνλυτος, αἶψα δ'α[ - -		
292	δόμω.[		]
	ωιχετ[		]το φίλῳ Πολυνείκεϊ τ[ - -
	Θηβαι.[		]
	==		
	...ομ..[		]ν στεῖχεν μέγα τεῖχος - - -
296	.....[		].... αὐτῷ
	.....[		]εππο...τισαν.η...[
	ανδρε.[		]
	πομπ.[		]δ' ἵκοντο Ἴσθμόν
300	Γ ποντιο.[		]
	ηραι..[		]υχαις
	—		



197 ]oc: gamma or perhaps tau (not νεῖ]κος). Hom.II.13.58 Ὀλύμπιος αὐτὸς ἐγείρει.

199 An unsolved problem. The hand looks different from the rest; yet it occupies precisely the place, where the last syllables of 199 would be expected to show. At the end perhaps ας or αῖς; not enough strokes for περὶ Θήβας.

201-231 A speech. The speaker is a woman (232), who intervenes in a quarrel (206, 233) involving her sons (192, 211, 216, 218, 233); a seer (227) has predicted (203, 209) disaster (226, 230) which fate has in store (212, 231), namely the death of the sons and (or) the capture of the city (216-7); the speaker suggests a solution (226), one son to rule at home, the other to withdraw with the herds and the gold (220-2), whichever has this fall to his lot (223-4).

The city is Thebes (228-9, 294), the seer Tiresias (234), the sons Eteocles (281) and Polynices (283, 293). The speaker is the Queen, their mother.

The background to all this is lost in 1-200. Several details remain obscure:

(i) It is clear that Oedipus has ceased to reign. Is he dead (Hom.II.23.679 f, cf. Od.II.271 ff; Hes.fr.192 MW)? or exiled (as in the usual tragic version)?

(ii) It is clear that the mother of Eteocles and Polynices survives him. Is she the second wife Eurygane/Euryganeia (Oedipodea fr.1 Kinkel, as understood by Pausanias 9.5.10 f; Pisander, FGrH 16 F 10 [8]; cf. Pherec. FGrH 3 F 95)? or the incestuous wife Epicaste/locaste (as in Euripides, Phoenissae)?

(iii) It is clear that Tiresias has prophesied (203, 209 f) disaster, the mutual (211) slaughter of the sons (216) and (or) the capture of Thebes (217); perhaps he began by saying, that the enmity between them would prove perpetual (204-8). Behind this lies the destiny of the house (230 f). But was there anything more concrete? (a) The brothers' quarrel is often attributed to Oedipus' curse (so already Thebais fr.2 Kinkel). But there is no hint of this here. (b) The oracle of Apollo, which Laius received and disregarded, can be held responsible for the deaths of his grandsons (e.g. Pind.Ol.2. 38 ff; Aesch.Septem.742 ff, 801 f). Perhaps Tiresias has been glossing this oracle for the new generation.

In describing the division of the estate (220-224), the poet follows roughly the same lines as Hellanicus, FGrH 4 F 98; Meillier compares also Pind.Pyth.4.147 ff, where Jason makes a similar proposal to Pelias. Neither passage has the choice determined

by lot, as in 223 f; but the lot does figure in another version of the fraternal compact, that of alternating kingship (Statius, Theb. 1.164, 2.309 and 428).

201 'Do not add (fresh) worries to our (present) sorrows.' She addresses Tiresias. ἄλγεα may refer simply to Oedipus' death, or the circumstances of it; or to the whole train of disasters which followed the incestuous marriage (Hom.Od. 11.275 f ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν Θήβῃ πολυηράτῃ ἄλγεα πάσχων | Καδμείων ἦνασσε θεῶν ὄλοα̃ς διὰ βουλάς... 279 f τῷ δ' ἄλγεα κάλλιπ' ὀπίσσω | πολλὰ μάλ', ὅσσα τε μητρὸς Ἑρινύες ἐκτελέουσι).

μερίμνας : the supplement now confirmed by PLille 73. For χαλεπάς, cf. Hes.Op. 178, Sapph. fr.1.25 f (West).

205 ἱράν : the supplement now confirmed by PLille 73. ἱερός often applies to particular places (e.g. Hom.II. 1.366 Θήβην, ἱεράν πόλιν 'Ἡετῶνος, Stes. PMG 222 ii ὁ f ἱεράν Βοιωτῖδα ... χθόνα, Bacch. 9.34 f ἱεράν νᾶσιν Αἴγιναν); but I have not found it elsewhere applying to 'earth' in general.

206-7 Cf. Hes. Theog. 224 f Φιλότης ... Ἔρις; Emped. B 17 DK, where Νεῖκος and Φιλότης are the fundamental forces of the cosmos.

207 ἐπιδά ..... νοο ..... :: first trace is μ or λλ; second, base of circular letter (middle and right-hand side abraded); third, point at line-level, then another trace to the right and level with the tops of letters, perhaps accidental but perhaps the end of a cross-bar (as of gamma, tau); then probably the left foot and left-hand cross-bar of alpha; then (after the join with PLille 73) an uncertain trace, perhaps close enough to represent the right-hand side of the alpha, but possibly including a horizontal at mid-height joining the next letter; then nu or possibly eta (not alpha iota). After νοο, first is an upright with part of an oblique descending from left to right, ie mu or nu; fourth perhaps a triangular top (as of alpha etc); fifth and sixth perhaps ον (hardly εν or ων; not οικ; if αι rather than ν, I can make nothing of what precedes); this whole stretch is partly obscured by stray ink, visible also in the blank line-ends above and below.

Articulation: ἐπὶ δ', and then νόον, look very likely. φιλότατ' like νεῖκος will depend on θέαν; then the new clause will repeat in the positive what has already been asserted in the negative, the inconstancy of human emotions. But I have not found a satisfactory reading. Two approaches:

(i) ἐπὶ δ' ἀλλοτῶν νόον ...ον. This is palaeographically possible so far. But I can



think of no noun for the line-end which would suit either the traces or the sense. Conversely, ἐπὶ δ' ἄλλοτον νόον ἄλλοις might make sense, but cannot be read.

(ii) ἐπὶ δ' ἀμέρα[ι] ἐν νόον ἄλλον. Here ἀμέρα is a possible reading; so too is ἄλλον (suggested by Meillier), allowing for a good deal of stray ink. The sense fits the context: for ἐπ' ἀμέραι, 'each day' cf. Hom. Od. 14.105 τῶν αἰεὶ φιν ἕκαστος ἐπ' ἡματι μῆλον ἀγινεῖ (whence Soph. OC 688), Heracl. B 6 DK ὁ ἥλιος ... νέος ἐφ' ἡμέρη ἐστίν; for νόον ἐντιθέσθαι, Theogn. 429 φρένας ἐχθαῖς | ἐνθέμεν, Pherecr. fr. 146.6 (CAF I p. 191) νῦν δ' ἄρτι μοι τὸ γῆρας ἐντίθησι νοῦν, Hom. Il. 9.639 οὐ δ' ἴλαον ἔνθεο θυμόν, Theogn. 966 ἐνθέμενοι θυμὸν ἐφημέριον. But there is a serious objection in the spacing. The join between PLille 76 A and PLille 73 is very close (so that in 201 (με)ρ(ιμνας), 205 (ι)ρ(αν), 212 μ(οιραὶ) a single letter overlaps both fragments), although warping now makes it difficult to attach the pieces physically; the expected space allows e.g. ἀμεραννοον, but not apparently ἀμερα[ι]εννοον.

209 ἐκέρχρος Ἀπόλλων : the supplement now confirmed by PLille 73. ἄναξ may be nominative, of Apollo (Hom. Il. 15.253 and often); or vocative, addressed to Tiresias (Hom. Od. 11.144, 151; M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* 42 ff). I have chosen the second, doubtfully; it provides an anchor for τεῖας, which otherwise must take its reference from 201-3.

211 ff Professor Kassel compares especially Hom. Il. 24.244-6 (Priam) αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε | πρὶν ἀλαπαζομένην τε πόλιν κεραιζομένην τε | ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν, βαίην δόμον Ἄιδος εἴω, cf. 6.464-5; and for the use of αὐτίκα, Il. 18.98, Od. 18.203, 20.63.

211 ἰδέσθαι .....α.....αμ..τας : first trace, foot of upright, more ink above to left and right, level with the tops of letters; second, two uprights, remains of horizontal above, level with the tops of letters; third, oblique left side (as of α, δ, λ, μ ?); fourth and fifth probably μ or λλ. After α, rubbed traces complicated by stray ink. Before αμ perhaps a triangular letter; after αμ, ε or θ, then a small hole, then the foot of an upright. - Metrical considerations require ἰδέσθ' αἰ- or ἰδέσθαῖ (Barrett, Haslam, West: above p. 11). - No doubt the poet wrote ἰδέσθαι ὑπ' ἀλλάλοις δαμέν-τας. As readings, δαμέντας looks inevitable; ὑπ᾽ ἄλλα is plausible, λῶ possible; only the middle makes difficulties, even allowing for stray ink (perhaps ι<ι> rather than ι<ι>).

212 Μοῖρα[ι] : the supplement now confirmed by PLille 73.

213  $\sigma\tau\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\tau\omicron$   $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\lambda\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$  : the supplement now confirmed by PLille 73.  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\lambda$ : of  $\epsilon$ , only the semi-circular back, centre abraded; of  $\nu$ , only the first upright. Hom. Od. 24.414  $\mu\eta\kappa\tau\eta\rho\omega\nu$   $\sigma\tau\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$   $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ ; Stes.Suppl.15 ii l f  $\sigma\tau\upsilon\gamma\epsilon[\rho]\omicron\upsilon$  |  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  (Barrett); Hom.II. 3.309  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ , Od. 5.326  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$   $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$ .

214  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\kappa\alpha$  :  $\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha$  West, a certain conjecture.

215  $\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha$  : first alpha unusually large;  $\kappa\rho$  perhaps corrected, perhaps simply damaged;  $\alpha$  might be  $\lambda$ . The line is suspect for three reasons. (i) The scribe may have had to correct himself (though I can find no other reading of his final version). (ii) Metre: the medial anceps is bisyllabic (-  $\upsilon\delta$  -), which happens elsewhere only in the quasi-hexameter (above p.11): unless, as Barrett suggests, he scanned  $\upsilon\delta$  as one short syllable. (iii) Syntax: it is very hard to provide a construction for  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\epsilon\varsigma\langle c\rangle\iota$ . Possibilities are (a)  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\epsilon\varsigma\langle c\rangle\iota$   $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\varsigma\tau\omicron\nu\alpha$   $\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu\tau'$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  (Barrett): but as Mr Barrett remarks, this vague 'comitative' dative is most unwelcome, especially in so strait-laced a poet; (b)  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\epsilon\varsigma\langle c\rangle\iota$   $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\varsigma\tau\omicron\nu\alpha$   $\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}$  [ $\tau'$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\eta$  : but the familiar  $\pi\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$   $\pi\eta\mu\alpha\varsigma$  is too remote to justify this (Kühner-Gerth i 444 A.4); (c)  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\epsilon\varsigma\langle c\rangle\iota$   $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\varsigma\tau\omicron\nu\alpha$   $\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\pi'$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\eta$  (Sir Denys Page): but, as Sir Denys himself remarks, this requires us to assume scriptio plena, contrary to the practice of our scribe (above p.9); (d) one might look for a feminine accusative participle at the line-end, to mean 'adding' (cf.201) or (with  $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\varsigma\tau\omicron\nu\alpha$   $\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha$  adverbial) 'crushed by', 'lamenting at': but I have thought of nothing suitable.

218 With  $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , we expect a verb of obeying. (i) Most simply,  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon$ ,  $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$  [ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\alpha$ ,  $\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\varsigma\theta\epsilon$  (West). The repeated vocative may be tolerable in this poet. (ii) A more complex sentence results, if  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$  belongs to an expression like  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma\iota\nu$  (Hom.Od. 3.277),  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$   $\varphi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  (Od. 1.307),  $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}$   $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$   $\varphi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$  (II. 4.219): e.g.  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$   $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\varsigma\tau\epsilon$  ---,  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$   $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  --- (Barrett). But this approach, as Mr Barrett observes, runs into serious difficulties.  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$  and the like take or imply a dative of the person (in this case,  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota$  or  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ); therefore they cannot govern  $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ; therefore we must still supply a verb (imperative or participle) of obeying, which is difficult in the space, and understand a dative with  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha$ , which is awkward in the presence of  $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$ .

220  $\pi\lambda$  :  $\pi\lambda$  or  $\pi\alpha$ .  $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$   $\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\varsigma\iota$   $\Delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\alpha\varsigma$  Barrett.

221 κτεάνη: elsewhere either κτέανα or κτήνη (Frisk, GEW ii 31). Here in the specialised sense 'flocks and herds', cf. 241, 243, 272. On Oedipus' sheep: Hes.Op. 163 (West).

223-4 They are to shake lots in a helmet (as e.g. Hom.II. 3.316, 324 f; 23.861 f); the man whose lot first jumps out will take the worse portion (as at Od.10.206 the more dangerous mission). That it was the worse portion seems probable in itself; and indeed it is this portion that Jason leaves to Pelias, Pind.Pyth. 4.147 ff.

223 κλαροπαληδόν: delta is clear (not -τον). For the formation cf (a) κληροπαλεῖς HHMerc 129; (b) ὀνομακλήδην, βουετροφηδόν (Schwyzer, Gr.Gr.i 626).

224 ἔκατι: see M.Leumann, Hom.Wörter 254 ff.

227 Mr.P.A.Hansen refers to Raubitschek, Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis n.302 (=Hansen, Index of Gk Verse Inscriptions n.258) θεοῦ φραδαῖσι; n.236 (Hansen n.250) μαντέ[ι]ων φρασμοῦναι; IG I<sup>2</sup> 788 (Hansen n.333) φραδαῖσι νυμφῶν (all 5th cent.?). Bacch.19 (18). 17 φραδαῖσι ... Διός; Aesch.Cho.941 θεόθεν ... φραδαῖσι.

228 αἰτενεον: I seem to see τ, not γ. These letters could be articulated, as αἰ τε or as αἴτε (with αἴτε υ-- in 230); but neither gives a clear construction, or a likely meaning of νέον. Therefore the conjecture αἴ γ' ἔτεόν (Lloyd-Jones, Barrett) is certain; at the end e.g. ἰάωσει (Barrett), ἱυλάξει (Lloyd-Jones). Compare e.g. Hom.II.8.423 f εἰ ἔτεόν γε | τολμήσειε.

καὶ ἄστυ: contrast Hom.II.17.144 πόλιν καὶ (F)άστυ σάωσῃς. On Homeric usage, see Chantraine, Gr.Hom.i 127 f. Stes.Suppl.116.4 περὶ (F)άστυ, but Ibyc. PMG 282. 2 μέγ' ἄστυ.

229 Κάδμου (F)άνακτος: contrast 275, 280 -οι' ἄνακτος. (a) The scribe was more likely to normalise -οι' to -ου, than to sophisticate -ου to -οι'. (b) A small number of Homeric lines have ἄνακτος or ἄνακτι, without digamma, at the line-end (Chantraine, Gr.Hom.i 127); Stes.PMG 187.1 ποτὶ δῖφρῶν ἄνακτι (if correctly quoted by Athenaeus) follows the same pattern.

231 γεν[ ]ι: after ν, prima facie a low oblique trace, like the left foot of alpha, lambda etc.; in ]ι, first, perhaps an oblique descending from left to right, with a point at line-level below the left extremity (all partly concealed by turned-over fibres); second, remains consistent with the right side and foot of alpha. Three readings

have been suggested. (i) γενε[ε]θαῖ: this may be excluded: ]θ at least does not suit the trace. (ii) γενε[θ]λαῖ (Lloyd-Jones, Barrett): the doubt here is in ε[: on a second look, I conclude that the trace does not exclude this reading, though it does not recommend it. The resulting sense is very satisfactory: ἀμβάλλων κακότετα πολὺν χρόνον, [α] βασιλεῖαι (Lloyd-Jones) | πέπρωται γενε[θ]λαῖ. (iii) γενε[ρ]χαῖ (West, Parsons): this suits the traces well, but the word itself lies open to objection: (a) it is first attested in Call. fr.229.1 and Lyc. 1307; (b) it there means 'founder', not 'ruler' of the γένος (so Pollux 3.19 πρόγονοι καὶ ἀρχηγοὶ γένους ... ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτοὺς καὶ γενάρχας καλοῦσι); at Thebes, this must be Cadmus; but Cadmus has nothing to do with the sinister destiny of the Labdacids, which begins from Laius.

233 .[...].ca : first trace, upright, or perhaps upright joined at the top by a horizontal from the right (ie gamma, pi); above it apparently part of a suprascript letter, perhaps the lower left arc of a circle; ], upright. π[αυο]ίca (Barrett) suits trace and space admirably, but does not explain the suprascript. Possibly π[αυο]ίca, with the variant ε[ργ] (Barrett); or ε[ργ]ca, a corrected itacism.

234 No doubt an epithet follows the name of Tiresias, then a new clause begins at the bucolic diaeresis: the same pattern in 291 and perhaps 251.

[.....] oc: first trace is zeta, pi or tau; second probably lambda or perhaps chi (on the photograph apparently kappa, but on the original it can be seen that the fibres here are displaced downwards). Barrett suggests τερασιδ[ι]λος, a new word, on the analogy of τερασιδ[ι]πος and ὄνειροπ[ι]δος.

οἱ δ' ε[π]ιθ[ι]οντο (or οἱ δ[ε] π[ι]θ[ι]οντο: cf. 251 note): δ and θ (top and cross-bar only; epsilon perhaps not excluded) are probable; after θ, apparently the top left arc of a circle (consistent with omicron but not with eta); the other traces are minimal, and partly obscured by residual plaster. Barrett suggested οἱ δ' ἐπιθοντο or οἱ δ' ἀπιθοναν. The second can be excluded, since it suits neither the plot (below) nor the final trace. The first suits ideally. For the formula cf Hom.Od. 6.71 ὡς εἰπὼν δμῶε-  
σιν ἐκέλετο, τοὺς δ' ἐπιθοντο.

235 ff Some fixed points:

- (i) 239, 241, 243 refer to the royal treasure and the royal livestock, cf. 221-2.
- (ii) These lines are narrative, as the past tenses (241; 239?) show (Barrett).
- (iii) 253 begins a speech.

(iv) This is probably the speech of Tiresias which certainly occupies 270–290.

(v) 247–252 may describe the episode, which provoked this speech (p.26 below).

(vi) 291 ff, after this speech, narrate Polynices' departure and journey to Argos.

The logic of the situation suggests further points:

(vii) The Queen's proposal (220 ff) was accepted: for Polynices does depart.

(viii) It was accepted immediately and without reserves: otherwise it would have been debated at length, and for that there is no room (Barrett, Page). This conclusion confirms, and is confirmed by, the reading οἱ δ' ἐπιθόλυτο in 234.

(ix) Since the proposal was accepted, the lots were cast; and the poet will certainly have described the casting, which is essential to the plot (Page).

Thus only 235–8 and 244–51 remain unknown territory; and one or other passage must have included the casting of the lots. Various arrangements are conceivable:

(a) 235–8 'they cast lots; and Polynices lost'. 239 ff 'so his servants collected the treasure and rounded up the herds'.

(b) 234–243 'they accepted her suggestion, agreeing that one of them (236) should keep Thebes, the other (239) take the treasure and the herds'. 244–6 'so they cast lots; and Polynices lost'. (So ed.pr., above, p.4).

(c) A compromise between these two: 235 'the lot so fell out that (236) Eteocles should keep Thebes, (239) Polynices take the treasure and the herds ...'.

No real decision is possible. The placing of τοῖς 236 and τοῖς 239 may favour (b) or (c); the practicalities of supplementation may tell against (c) (I see no easy way of fitting the name of Eteocles into 236 or of Polynices into 239). If (b) is right, the poet resumed and expanded 220–2: another epic feature. [For (c), see now p.34.]

235 αἰ: a heavy, lightly curved oblique descending from left to right: probably υ (but ν perhaps not excluded). If a connective, αὐτάρ or αὐτίκα ?

236 τοῖς: μ or ν : τὸ μ μὲν ed.pr. ]ηβαν : the trace, on loose fibres, suggests the right-hand side of an oval: Θῆβαν or Θηβᾶν very likely.

237 γαῖαν ed.pr., with Θηβᾶν.

238 καὶ: foot of upright, or of an oblique rising from left to right. καὶ?

239 ἐριτίμοιο χρυσοῖο Hom.II. 9.126, 268. ἔχοντα might refer to a box or bag (Hom.Od. 10.45), or to pack-animals; but most naturally to Polynices himself, as in 222. – What occupied the first half of the line? (a) 239 may mention both parts of

the inheritance, 'herds and gold'; then 240 may add details of the treasure, and 241 ff certainly adds details of the herds. (b) 239 (and 240 ?) may deal exclusively with the treasure, 241 ff with the herds. (a) looks more likely; and indeed the supplement τὸν [δ' ἀπόμεν κτεάνη χρ]υσοῦν τ', from 221, suits the space very well.[For (b), see p.34.]

240 πα. [ : first is λ or beginning of μ; second is an oblique rising from left to right, ie α, δ, λ, or the beginning or middle of μ. παλλ[ and παμ[ seem most promising; apparently not πάντ[α. ] cθενησαν; the crucial trace is uncertain: perhaps only two points of ink, one above the other, suited to any letter with a vertical or curving right side; but perhaps a further point, higher up and to the right, so that all three would suit υ. Possibilities: (i) πρ[όθεν ἦσαν (Lloyd-Jones); or ἔμπροσθεν, ἔκτοσθεν, ἔντοσθεν, ὅπ[ισθεν. (ii) -cθ' ἔνησαν (S.Instone), cf. Hom.Od. 2.338 νητόc χρυσοῦc. (ii) ε]ύcθενησαν, a word not otherwise attested before the fifth century. In any case, the verb is plural, and I do not see how to supply a subject. If (i), the imperfect parallels νέμοντο in 241, and the subject should parallel μάλα, if (ii), the subject might be the servants who piled up the treasure, or the kings who had amassed it.

241 ηδοc. [ : a high point of ink: ἦδ' ὅcα acceptable. κ]λυτὰ μάλα Barrett, from Hom.Od. 9.308; for the hyperdoric μάλα he refers to Forssmann, Untersuch.z. Sprache Pindars 62-5. The middle of the line perhaps specified the pasture, whether in the accusative (Hom.II. 20.8) or with a preposition (II. 15.631 ἐν εἰαμινῇ, Od. 20.164 καθ' ἔρκεα καλὰ).

242 ... [ : first probably μ or ν (narrowness favours ν); second top of stroke, perhaps upright, perhaps oblique sloping down from left to right; third π or possibly τ. [ νῆπ[ιc τ' (Hom.II. 17.134) might suit the animal context.

243 [ ] μ[ : first apparently a vertical, with a junction at mid-height (as of η or κ); second vertical. κ[α]ῖ μ[ acceptable. ] ιραc : ι looks certain; before it apparently three points of ink on the edge, suggesting the three prongs of epsilon. Thus εὐέθ]ε ιραc (West) is very plausible. Cf εὐέθειρα Anacr.PMG 418 (feminine vocative), Simon. PMG 519 fr.84.6 (feminine nominative or masculine accusative).

244 [ ] [ : first possibly φ; second remains of vertical and high cross-bar, probably τ.

245 [ : the seriffed foot of a vertical.

246 [ : perhaps the lower left quadrant of a circle.

246 ff Some fixed points:

- (i) 247 'obscure oracles' ?
- (ii) 251 someone 'mounted' (his horse) or 'jumped up' (in emotion) ?
- (iii) 253 begins a speech.
- (iv) 274–290 end a speech, which refers in the future (276, 278) to Argos (275): therefore the speaker is Tiresias, who foretells Polynices' destiny (274).
- (v) 274 hardly has room for an introductory formula: therefore 270–3 belong to the same speech.
- (vi) Therefore either (a) 253–290 contain one single speech of Tiresias; or (b) the speech of X ends, and the speech of Tiresias then begins, somewhere between 254 and 269.

Beyond this, we can only assess the economy of various arrangements.

If there were two speeches, who made the first (from 253) ? Tiresias speaks next, perhaps therefore in answer; the answer largely concerns Polynices, perhaps therefore replies to a speech of his. If so, we could restore  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta' \xi\theta\omicron\rho' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  |  $[\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\varsigma \Pi\omega\lambda\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\eta\varsigma]$  (West): 'Polynices himself mounted his horse (on the point of departure) and (253) spoke as follows ...'.

If there was only one speech (253–90), then 251 might refer to Tiresias or to Polynices. If the first, we could restore e.g.  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta' \xi\theta\omicron\rho' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  |  $[\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\varsigma \pi\omega\lambda\upsilon\tau\delta\rho\iota\varsigma]$ : Tiresias himself jumped up and (253) addressed him as follows...'. If the second, e.g.  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta' \xi\theta\omicron\rho' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  |  $[\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\varsigma \Pi\omega\lambda\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\eta\varsigma]$  |  $[\tau\omicron\nu \delta' \acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha \tau\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\varsigma\iota\alpha\varsigma \mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\varsigma \pi\omicron\tau\iota \mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\nu \xi\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\iota]$ : 'Polynices himself mounted his horse, and Tiresias addressed him as follows...'.

We have also to account for the 'obscure oracles' (247, if the restoration is correct); for the emotions perhaps implied in 249; and for the emphatic  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in 251.

A reasonably coherent scheme would be this: it fell to Polynices to leave Thebes; but he (like his father) spoke angrily against the uncertain predictions (247), which had thus driven him from his home; Tiresias, provoked by this, jumped up in person and said 'Your mother has devised a good plan (255) and you will do well to abide by it (257); take your goods to Argos, for there you will marry the king's daughter (270–80); but if you try to go back on the bargain, you will ruin your city, your family and yourself (285–287).' But I see no certainties.

247  $\text{I}_{\text{..}}\text{ouc} : \text{I}_{\text{.}}\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  likely,  $\chi\rho\eta\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  (Meillier) possible; the right side of the

first trace, and the left side of  $\mu$ , are covered by overlying fibres. Aesch.PV 662  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\upsilon\sigma\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\varsigma \tau' \epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ . In the left margin, part of an oblique descending from left to right: possibly  $\chi$ , as at 302.

249 ] $\cdot$ ι : probably  $\nu$ , or possibly  $\alpha\iota$ .  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota$  very likely. Some emotion is aroused, whether gentle (e.g. HHAp.113  $\tau\eta \theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\epsilon\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota \kappa.\phi.$ ) or violent (e.g. Hom. Od. 8.178  $\acute{\omega}\rho\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\omicron\iota \theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota \kappa.\phi.$ , 20.9  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron \theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota \kappa.\phi.$ ) ?

251 ] $\cdot$ ο $\cdot$ c: two points of ink, one level with the tops of letters, one at half-height: possibly the top and middle prong of epsilon, but not certain. If ] $\cdot$ ε $\cdot$ c, we might look for a nominative (as  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\eta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ ) or a genitive (as  $\Pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\eta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ).

$\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta' \acute{\epsilon}\theta\omicron\rho'$ : or  $\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon} \theta\acute{\omicron}\rho'$ . Stes.Suppl.105 (a) 8  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\theta\omicron\rho\omicron\nu$  (if so to be articulated); Homer generally has the unaugmented form. See Nöthiger, *Die Sprache d.Stesichorus* (1971) 122. The same difficulty in 234.- For the sense, there are at least two possibilities, corresponding to uses of  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$  in Homer: (a) Herodot. 3.64  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\iota \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\nu$ ; Hom.II. 11.237  $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \delta\acute{\iota}\phi\rho\omicron\nu \delta' \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\upsilon\epsilon$ , 19.396  $\acute{\epsilon}\phi' \acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\iota\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\nu$ ; (b) Herodot. 7.18  $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \delta' \acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\acute{\omega}\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ ; Hom.II. 1.248  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon} \aleph\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\tau\omega\rho | \eta\delta\upsilon\epsilon\pi\eta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\upsilon\epsilon$ , 9.193  $\tau\alpha\phi\acute{\omega}\nu \delta' \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\nu \acute{\Lambda}\chi\iota\lambda\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$  (always a reaction to strong emotion).

$\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  :  $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  cannot be read.

254 ] $\cdot$ ω $\cdot$ c : possibly ] $\cdot$ μ $\cdot$ c, possibly ] $\cdot$ λ $\cdot$ c first trace vestigial. ] $\cdot$ λλ $\cdot$ ω $\cdot$ c would be acceptable.

255 ] $\cdot$ ε : perhaps ] $\cdot$ αδε (hardly ] $\cdot$ ατε or ] $\cdot$ ατο). Perhaps ] $\cdot$ α δε; better  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\rho\eta\alpha\delta\epsilon$  or  $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\rho\eta\alpha\delta\epsilon$  (Barrett), cf. Hom.Od. 8.142  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon \mu\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\nu$ ; if so, then  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu$  rather than  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu$ .

257 ] $\cdot$ c: a vertical on the edge: e.g.  $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\eta\iota\varsigma$  (cf.218) possible. I take  $\pi\iota\theta\eta\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$  as the participle, rather than as  $(\acute{\epsilon})\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$ : Homer has the participle nine times, other forms of this aorist never. If the poet writes  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma\alpha$  (232), he might be expected to write  $\pi\iota\theta\eta\varsigma\alpha\iota\varsigma$ . But he need not have been consistent (above p. 9); and if he was, the scribe may have normalised. - Various lines of restoration are suggested e.g. by Hom.II. 4.398  $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omega}\nu \tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\kappa\kappa\iota \pi\iota\theta\eta\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$ ; 9.119  $\phi\rho\epsilon\varsigma\iota \lambda\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\eta\varsigma\iota \pi\iota\theta\eta\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$ .

260 ] $\cdot$ επολλα..... :  $\epsilon\pi\omicron$  is certain,  $\lambda\lambda\alpha$  likely. For what follows I have found no plausible reading. I had tried  $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \chi\alpha\rho \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$  (ie  $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ , as in 219); but the right side of  $\mu$  looks unexpectedly thick (like a double stroke). Alternatively



πολλά γὰ θυμόν or πολλά γ' ἄθυμον; this is generally better, though θ seems wide for the trace.

268 ]αιc: a horizontal level with the tops of letters, and a horizontal at line-level, both touching α: most likely ζ or ξ ? A noun, e.g. ἀμά]ξαιc ? Or an aorist participle in -ξαιc from a verb in -ζειν (Barrett)?

270 ff For the reconstruction of this column, see above p.7 ff. I have printed two supplements (291, 303) which I think virtually certain. These determine the width of the central lacuna, and the estimates of letters missing depend on them. Such estimates are naturally very approximate; when I say that a proposed supplement 'suits the space', I mean that a tracing of it, at the letter-size and letter-spacing of the original, fits the lacuna to within one letter-space.

270 ]: uncertain trace. ε ]: an upright; at the top perhaps a horizontal crossing (ie γ, π), but perhaps part of the previous letter (so that β, κ, ν, ρ could also be considered).

]υcιν: likely, if not certain; not ]υειν. We might look (a) for a dative (pattern γένυcιν), to agree with μεγάληc; or (b) for an accusative (pattern ἄνυcιν). Under (a) I have found nothing at all plausible. Under (b), perhaps e.g. -υυ- ἄν]υcιν θέν-τες μεγάληc ἐπ[ι λύπαιc, '(you two brothers have reached agreement), bringing an end to all our disasters: (so you, Polynices, must go to) Argos (272), (taking with you) the herds (273) which fall to your share (274)'; or ἐπ[ι βουλαῖc.

271 ]: uncertain, possibly κ. At the end, Ἄρ]γoc is one of many possibilities.

272 ]: λ or μ likely. ]εν: the end of a high horizontal (γ, ξ, c, τ ?). If ἄ]γεν, we have to reckon with an infinitive in -εν (above p.9).

273 ]: perhaps γ or π. ]: the end of a high horizontal (γ, τ etc). Very probably - - - κα]τ' αἶcαν: in this common phrase (Hom.II. 3.59 etc; Stes.Suppl.102.10, lbyc. Suppl. 166.8), αἶcα normally has no epithet.

274 ]: first c or less probably ε; second, apparently a sinuous upright (perhaps ι; but other straight-backed letters may be possible). ]οι: apparently ]τοι, though I cannot exclude ]χοι, where the first trace is the end of a high horizontal.

Metre guarantees -οι τὸ against -οιτο: above p.11.

τὸ might in principle be the article or the relative; the second looks more promising, '(I shall tell you that) which is destined ...'; at the end e.g. γεν[έθλαι or γεν[έcθαι

(Lloyd-Jones); γενέσθαι suits better, if the subject is Polynices' personal future. But if the sentence begins with the line, and if τοι is the particle or the pronoun, I can think of no supplement which explains the position of τοι and provides an antecedent for τδ. The emendation ττ solves only the second difficulty.

275 ... [: minimal traces. ]ον : λ or μ. δδ]μον likely: ἔξ[εαι ἐc δδ]μον West, reconcilable with the initial traces but c.4 letters too short.

276 [: lower arc of circle, e.g. ο. ] : probably ν, possibly αι or λι. δ[ε δε δεξάμε]νος West, which suits trace and space. περικαλλέα κούραν Hom.II. 16. 85.

277 [: perhaps γ; but perhaps a further hair-line of ink to the right, ie π.

278-80 Cf Hom.II. 6.192-5 (Proetus marries his daughter to Bellerophon) δίδου δ' ὄγε θυγατέρα ἦν, | δῶκε δέ οἱ τιμῆς βασιληΐδος ἡμῖν πάσης· | καὶ μὲν οἱ Λύκιοι τέμενος τάμον ἔξοχον ἄλλων, | καλὸν φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης, ὅφρα νέμοιτο (Lloyd-Jones, West).

278 [: apparently a vertical or oblique stroke, with a join at the top (γ, π; α, δ, λ, μ ?); but the trace is partly obscured by twisted fibres. e.g. x - τέμενος δ' ἄφα]τον δωκοῦντι δᾱμος West, see Iliad 6.194 above. δωκοῦντι may be plural ad sensum, as e.g. Hom.II.15. 305 ἡ πληθὺς ... ἀπονέοντο; or a further subject, co-ordinate with δᾱμος, may follow. The obvious pairing is with πόλις (Hom.Od. 11.14 Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμος τε πόλις τε, and often). So e.g. in 279 καὶ πόλις Ἀκρί- ci]ου; or more remotely καὶ γενεὰ Δανα]οῦ. But the initial traces of 279 are too uncertain to limit the possibilities.

279 ... [: obscure traces. ]ου : apparently not ]ων.

280 E.g. φραδαῖσιν Ἀδράστ]οι' ἄνακτος ?

281 ετεο[: above ο, apparently a suprascript letter. διαμπερῶς, if its usage parallels that of διαμπερές, might be (a) spatial 'right through'; (b) temporal, 'continuously' (Hom.II. 22.264 κακὰ φρονέουσι διαμπερές ἀλλήλοισιν); (c) in extensions of the same sense, 'completely' (Hes.Theog.402 διαμπερές ... ἐξετέλεσσ'), 'completely' or 'straightforwardly' (Hes.fr. 280.3 MW δι]αμπερῶς ἀγδ]ρευσον). At the end, Ἔτεοβληῆς, -εις, -έα, -εος, -εῖ all satisfy the metre. One pattern is ἐνέπ]ω δι-αμπερῶς Ἔτεοβλεῖ, 'I say straight out to Eteocles'; another μελῆτ]ω διαμπερῶς Ἔτεοβλεῖ, 'Let Eteocles always take care' (Hom.Od.2.304 μή τί τοι ἄλλο | ἐν cτῆ-

.θεεσι κακὸν μελέτω ἔργον τε ἔπος τε).

282 ]<sub>.</sub>εν : a high horizontal, touching ε (γ, c, τ ?); perhaps another but shorter horizontal at line-level (ie c). Probably ἐν κτήθεεσσιν, as e.g. Hom.Od. 10.329 κοὶ δέ τις ἐν κτήθεεσσιν ἀκήλητος νόος ἔστιν; for the shape (without word-division before the medial anceps) cf 275, and above p.11. At the end, αἰνῶ, αἰνῶ[ι, αἰνῶ[ν, most probably αἰνῶ[ε. In Homer the adverb refers to an excess of fear or anger: so here, Eteocles (or Polynices) is terribly angry? Teiresias is terribly afraid?

283 θ<sub>.</sub>[: trace suggests an oblique foot (as of α etc) or an oblique serif. ]<sub>.</sub>v: apparently a horizontal, at one-third of letter height, joining at right angles a vertical which rises to the level of the tops of letters: possibly ]<sub>.</sub>ιν; possibly ]ην (but the cross-bar would be low); possibly ]ον or ]ων (but unexpectedly square). Metre allows either a short or a long vowel (- υυ - υυ - υ ἔχεν; - υυ - υυ - ἔχεν).

ἔχεν: an imperfect fits awkwardly into a speech: we have to reckon with the possibility that it is an infinitive (above p. 9).

There is a major difficulty here. 285 reads like a prediction of disaster; and this disaster will arise, presumably, from a breach of the agreement. One brother, then, must be envisaged as the aggressor. Which? Various versions of the legend blame different brothers (Roscher s.v.Polyneikes 2665 ff). Here the practicalities point to Polynices. He removes the gold and the cattle to Argos; Eteocles can recover them only by attacking Argos, which no version of the story mentions. Eteocles remains at Thebes; Polynices can recover the kingdom only by attacking him there, which he does in every version of the story.

This reasoning, if correct, excludes one possible approach to 281-4, ie 'I warn Eteocles, that if he breaks the agreement, anxious to obtain Polynices' share (283 e.g. ἐθέλλων ἔχεν Πολυνείκεος [αἶσαν), he will ruin ...'. Alternatively we can assume that here, as in other details, the poet told a unique story.

284 ω<sub>.</sub>[:ε or θ. ] : upright. Neither ωε- or ωθ- looks promising; ῶ is another possibility.

285 τεύξι[ηι μεγάλην αὐά]ταν πόλει τε πάσαι | ματ[ρί τε Page, cf Pind.Pyth. 3.24 ἔρχε τοι ταύταν μεγάλην αὐάταν. The supplement in 285 is a little long (two letters) for the space.

286 μα<sub>.</sub>[: scattered ink. ] : an oblique, descending from left to right: a likely

(not ω). E.g. ματ[ρί τ' (Page) ἀμαχανί]αν.

287 π[ : apparently a slightly curving back (ie in context ε or ο); but possibly not curved enough to exclude an upright (ie in context ι, ν, ρ). Presumably ἀεὶ π- rather than ἀειπ-; one possibility is πο[ταίνιόν τε πένθος.

288 ]γ: ο or ω. I suppose that the general sense of 288-90 is: τοῦ[το ῥύοιτο κακ]όν, | θεῶ[ν ὅτις εὖνο]ρος ἦι μάλιστα παντῶν | τοῖ[ς διζυροῖς βρο]τοῖσιν (or πω[λυδακρύτοις βρο]τοῖσιν).

289 ]χη: the faint trace would allow ε or ο or ι (but hardly α or υ).

290 [ : first possibly γ or π, but very uncertain. βρο]τοῖσιν Haslam, West.

291 ὥς φάτ[ο Τειρεσίας: for the name of the speaker, see above p.26.

αἶψα : ψ is doubtful (and there is no other example of the letter for comparison), but I can find no other reading. The general structure of the line looks perfectly plausible, cf e.g. Hom.II. 1.387 Ἀτρεΐδῃ δ' ἔπειτα χόλος λάβεν· αἶψα δ' ἀναστὰς...

αἶψα δ' ... (293) ὤχετο : is the subject still Tiresias? or is it now Polynices?

Page assumes it to be Polynices, and restores as follows:

291		αἶψα δ' ἄ[ποι]κος
292	δόμω[ν ὅ γ' ἦ]ρωσ ]	
293	ὤχετ[ο· cὺν δ' ἄρ' ἔ]πολ[υ]το φίλῳ Πολυνεῖκεϊ τ[α]γοῖ	
294	Θηβαίω[ν ἄ]ριστοι.]	

The assumption is plainly correct: (i) Polynices' departure is crucial to the plot; Tiresias' departure would be merely incidental. (ii) Polynices' departure from Thebes must be narrated somewhere; if not in 295-6 (which I suspect refer to a later stage of journey), then certainly in 292-4. (iii) Page's supplement in 293 is, at least in outline, certain: for it brilliantly explains φίλῳ (293), and conveniently leads on to the plural verbs (297 ? 299, 303). But if 293-4 introduce Polynices' escort, 292-3 must already have introduced Polynices himself.

292 δόμω[ : trace is an upright on the edge: e.g. ι, γ.

293 ]το: minimal trace, perhaps top of upright. Page's supplement (above) suits the space.

294 [ : apparently the lower left arc of a circle: Θῆβαι (Θήβαι), Θήβαις, Θη-βαιο[, Θηβαιω[ all possible.

295 ff Polynices and his companions travel to Argos. Statius, Theb. 1.324 ff, de-

scribes the same journey, though in more melodramatic circumstances:

- Ogygiis ululata furoribus antra  
deserit et pinguis Baccheo sanguine colles.  
(330) inde plagam, qua molle sedens in plana Cithaeron  
porrigitur lassumque inclinat ad aequora montem,  
praeterit. hinc arte scopuloso in limite pendens  
infamis Scirone petras Scyllaeaque rura  
(334) purpureo regnata seni mitemque Corinthon  
linquit et in mediis audit duo litora campis.

The stages here are: (i) 328–9 Thebes; (ii) 330–2 (the main road southwards) among the (eastern) foot-hills of Cithaeron, (joining at Eleusis the main coast-road from Athens to Corinth); (iii) 332–4 (turning westwards), the road across the Isthmus via the Scironian Rocks and Megara, leading to (iv) 334–5 Corinth. At this point, an epic thunder-storm submerges geographical detail; until in 380 ff the hero emerges near Lerna and Prosymna, within sight of Argos.

The same later stages are visible in our text: the Isthmus 299; Corinth 302; Cleonae (in the Argolid) 303; Argos not far ahead. We might reasonably expect 295–299 to describe the earlier stages, that is the route southward from Thebes to the coast.

295 ...ομ...[: first apparently the left-hand half of a circle, to the right a short horizontal at middle height, rising slightly towards the right; second and third, minimal remains; after ομ, an upright or curving back; then indeterminate specks. I have considered three readings: ἐρχομεν[, ορχομεν[, οιχομεν[. Since the initial traces suit epsilon (back and tongue) rather than omicron, ἐρχομεν[ looks the most likely.

]ν : scattered remains, suggesting ο or ω.

στειχεν : imperfect, followed by aorists (297 ? 299), as in HHCer. 181 ff ἡ δ' ἄρ' ὄπισθε ... στεῖχε ... αἶψα δὲ δώμαθ' ἔκοντο ? The papyrus has no secure example of an infinitive in -εν (above p. 9).

μέγα τεῖχος : Hom. II. 12.12 μέγα τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν. Which wall ? (i) The walls of Thebes: say, στεῖχεν μέγα τεῖχος ἀμείψας 'leaving the city, he pursued his journey'. (ii) The walls of some town later in the journey: ie (since the possibilities are very limited) μέγα τεῖχος Ἐρυθραῖν: Erythrae, whatever the historical reality of its 'great walls', had a place in heroic geography (Hom. II. 2.499); it lay below the main

massif of Cithaeron (Eur. Ba. 748 ff), not far off the main road south from Thebes (Thuc. 3.24 and Gomme's note); it therefore suits rather precisely the second stage of the journey as Staius describes it (Theb. 1.330-1, above p.32). With (i) we could write e.g. ἐρχόμεν[οις δ' ἀν' ὁδὸν] τεῖχεν, μέγα τεῖχ[ος ἀμείψας] (Hom. Od. 23.136 ἀν' ὁδὸν τεύχων); in (ii) τεῖχεν must govern τεῖχος, as accusative of direction.

296 [ : first possibly μ.

].... αὐτῶι : obscure traces: possibly ].. ἄμ' (or ἐπ') αὐτῶι. In outline, perhaps, 'Polynices travelled on ... (295); and with him (296) ... his men (298)'.

297 [ : second, perhaps ο; third, λλ or μ; fourth, perhaps feet and cross-bar of alpha; fifth, possibly an upright. Conceivably πολλά or πολλά [ , though π is not an attractive reading.

]εππο.τι.αν.κ. [ : apparently ]εππο or just possibly ]ειππο (not ]οππο, hardly ]θιππο), though the first π might be τι; after ο, first is foot of upright, second heavy curve (left-hand part of circle); then τι. or possibly τυ.; then a triangular top (in context, α); after ν, probably α; after κ, probably ρ (loop enlarged, as in 302 κορ); then the lower half of a circle; then possibly a long descender, perhaps no trace at all.

At the end, perhaps τ' ἔαν (Barrett) ἄκρον (Meillier) - - . ἄκρον should represent a geographical extreme, as at Hom. Od. 3.278 ἀλλ' ὅτε Κούνιον ἶρὸν ἀφ' ἰκόμεθ', ἄκρον Ἀθηνῶν; and it should belong to the coast of Attica around Eleusis, if the travellers proceed immediately to the Isthmus (299; above p.32). Eleusis itself stands at the far end of Attic territory, and its acropolis projects on a hill-top above the plain: I do not know whether it might be called ἄκρον in one or other aspect.

For the rest, I have considered πολλά[ις] ἡμίονοις θ' ἔπποις τ' ἔαν ἄκρον - - . But the supplement is two letters short; and the traces suggest ]επ or ]ειπ, not ]θιπ.

298 ανδρε [ : ἄνδρες acceptable: at the end the possibilities include an epithet (ὑπερφύλατοι, Hom. Od. 15.376) or a participle (ἀγαλλόμενοι, Hom. Il. 12.114 ἔπποισιν ... ἀγαλλόμενος).

299 πομπ. [ : more like ο than α (but α perhaps not excluded); not ε, η. ] : much ink on displaced fibres, but c rather than ν. πομπ[α]ει θεῶν (Barrett). ταχέως δ' suits the space, if α[ is allowable; otherwise perhaps a phrase in apposition, e.g.

πομπό[ι κρατεροί· ταχέω]ς δ'. - 'Ισθμόν: Barrett remarks that the hiatus is a licence already known from Pindar (Isth. 1.9, 1.32, 6.5, fr.122.13) and Bacchylides (2.7).

300 ποντιο[ : indeterminate trace, perhaps foot of upright. ποντίου [Ἐννοσίδα West (Bacch. 16.35 f ποντίωι ... Ποσειδῶνι); or e.g. πόντιον Ἰαμφιάλον (Pind.Ol. 8.48 ἐπ' 'Ισθμῶι ποντίαι).

On the stichometry, see above p.8.

301 κραι[ : first, remains of two uprights, suitable to ν (not π); second, perhaps top left arc of circle.

]υχαίς: a small indeterminate trace. The only real possibilities are ]αῦχαίς or κ]αύχαίς, and ]εὔχαίς (ἐπ-, κατ- ?).

κραίνο[ν δ' ὁδὸν πολλαῖς σὺν] εὔχαίς West, excellently for the traces, but substantially (five letters) too long.

302 αὐτ[ : an oblique, e.g. left side of alpha: αὐτά[ρ (West) likely; not αὐτί[α. αὐτά[ρ ἔπειτ' ἀφίκοντο]West, which suits the space; but we expect a caesura (above p.11); therefore e.g. αὐτά[ρ ἔπειτ' ἀπέβαν ἐπ'] ἄστεα (for ἄστυ without digamma, see 228 note).

303 [εὐκτιμένας] Barrett: Hom.II. 2.570 ἀφνειὸν τε Κόρινθον εὐκτιμένας τε Κλεωνάς.

Oxford P. J. Parsons

Addendum. Sir Denys Page writes: 'In lines 235-41 two things seem to me certain: (a) that the brothers accept Jocasta's plan; (b) that there is no place except 235 ff where this acceptance could have been stated... In outline, 'they cast lots, and it fell out that one got the land of Thebes, and the other the gold and cattle.' It is futile to guess what the words may have been, but just to show how easily it can be done, -

αἰ[ψα δὲ παλλομένων]  
(236) τὸμ [μὲν λάχε μοῖρα πόλιν πᾶσαν τε] Θηβᾶν  
γαῖα[ν ἔχοντα μένειν]  
και[ ]α  
τὸν [δ' ἔμεν ἀργύριον χρ]υσὸν τ' ἐρίτιμον ἔχοντα  
πάνθ', [ὅσα Καδμογενεῖς ἔντ]οσθ' ἔνηκαν,  
ἦδ' ὅσα [ κ]λυτὰ μᾶλα νέμοντο.'