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This paper presents notes on P. Oxy. XXIX 2506 (in the following “2506”), a manuscript of the first or early second century A.D. containing a commentary concerned with Alcman, Stesichorus, Sappho, Alcaeus and quotations from the authors above, Homerus, Hesiodus, Aeschylus, Euripides, Epicharmus, and Sophron, maybe written under the auctoritas of Aristoteles, Chamaeleon, Dicaearchus, Aristarch, and Satyrus.¹ The first editor, Denys Page, noted: “This is not an easy text …”² and, in fact, it is still a matter of debate which kind of text or commentary the papyrus contains and to which category of work 2506 belongs, since “the work seems not to have been a commentary in the strict sense, but rather a series of discussions of individual problems, for the most part biographical.”³ The question remains if this text is a commentary, a treatise, or περὶ-Literatur⁴. This question is, with all due respect, for others to answer. My

¹ See e.g. PORRO 2004, 198.
² PAGE 1963, v.
³ LLOYD-JONES 1965, 71.
⁴ DAVISON 1966 raised this question. Similarly TREU 1966, 10 n. 4: “Das Überwiegen peripatetisch-biographischer Daten vor grammatischen scheint, wie Pfeiffer (mündlich) betont, die Klassifizierung als “comment” näherzulegen denn die als “commentary”.” See also CONTIADES-TSITSONI 1988, 1: “Der Kommentar ist nicht nach gewöhnlicher Art abgefasst; er enthält nämlich
aim in this paper is to share some observations I made on the piece, both on the passages concerned with Lyric as well as the passages concerned with Drama.

Fr. 1(a) col. ii.9–16:

\[ \text{ρικτική[} \text{τωπίμ[} \text{καλως[} \text{πατρος[} \text{δαμας[} \text{οπας[} \text{δη[} \text{ου[} \text{πατρ[} \text{δαμ[} \text{οπατς[}} \]

10 \text{τωπίμ[ Page 1963, 2 11–12 τ[ου[ πατρος? Reinfelder 13 δαμας[?] Reinfelder

10 contains the beginning of a quotation from poetry, probably lyric (a choral song from tragedy, e.g. by Aeschylus, also remains within the possibilities), as indicated by \( \text{κάλλιον ὠπιμελητὰ φιλάργυρε τὸν φακὸν ἕψειν} \) and \( \text{κάλλιον ὀπιμελητά: πρὸ τὸν Βουκαῖον ταῦτα φησιν ὦ Πιµπληήας} \) in 9. \( \text{ο[} \) was probably used to divide the lemmata. It is unclear, how long the quotation runs. The first letter in 10, \( \tau \), has an unusual appearance: on the lower, preserved part of the letter there are remains of a stroke running diagonally (/) visible. If this is the rest of a stroke indicating deletion, one could argue for a form of \( \text{ὠπιμελητό} \), or for \( \text{πίµπλεια} \). In the first case we would print (assuming a column width of ca. 18–20 letters) \( \text{ὠπιμελητ-} \) \( \text{παίς} \). See for the word Theocr. 10.54 κάλλιον ὠπιμελητὰ φιλάργυρε τὸν φακὸν ἕψειν with \( \Sigma \text{κάλλιον ὠπιμελητά: πρὸ τὸν Βουκαῖον ταῦτα φῆςιν ὦ πλούς καὶ φιλάργυρε, καλὸν ἂν εἴη συνήθει ἑργατὴν ς οόντα καὶ γεωργόν φακὸν ἕψειν καὶ τούτω τρέφειν, μὴ τρίβειν δὲ κύμινον, ὃ δεῖ γεωργὸν φακὸν ἕψειν καὶ τούτω τρέφειν, µὴ τρίβειν δὲ κύμινον, µὴπω δι' ἀπειρίαν τὴν χεῖρα πλήγης καὶ \( \Sigma \text{UEAT ὠπιμελητά:} \) ὁ λόγος πρὸ τόν ἐπιστάτην τῶν θεριστῶν ὀλίγην τροφήν αὐτοῖς παρεχόμενον. In the second case we would print \( \text{ὦ Πιµπληήας . . . . . . . παίς} \) or even \( \text{ὦ Πιµπληήας . . . . . . . . . . . . . παίς} \). See for the adjective Orph. fr. 771b Bernabé vūν δ´

keine fortlaufende Exegese zu einem Autor, zu einzelnen Gedichtbüchern oder Gedichten, sondern erörtert bestimmte nicht zusammenhängende Themen, und bringt dazu Zitate.” For the most recent account of the nature of the text see PORRO 2004, 197-198 and the discussion in DE KREIJ 2019 forthcoming (also in relation to other sources like P.Oxy. 1800 and 2438).

\(^5\) \text{PAGE 1963, 31. See for further examples of this abbreviation MCNAMEE 1981, 109. It is also possible that the abbreviation means χρητόν, cf. MCNAMEE 1981, 20-21.}

\(^6\) \text{But see RÖMER 2013, 144: “... vielleicht begann das Zitat mit οτῶν nach dem Spatium in Z. 9; damit würde es sich also um das Zitat eines Attikers handeln. Möglicher ist natürlich auch, dass ο zu παίς gehört. πιμ[ wohl eher von πιμπλήμι als von πιμπλήμι.”}

202
11–12 If τῷ ἵππον | παίζει is accepted, this might still be part of the quotation. If so, the παίζει could perhaps be connected with παίζει (?) from 10. If τῷ ἵππον | παίζει is not part of the quotation anymore, the word could belong to biographical explanations (cf. also above).

13 Perhaps a form of δαµάζω or δαµάσκω. See for the former e.g. B. 17.41–5 οὐ γὰρ ἀν θέλω- | μ’ ἀµβρότον ἔραννόν Αο[ύς] ἐπιτρέπειν, ἐπειδ’ ἐπακούειν· | Κλεοβούλωι δ’ ἀγαθὸ γένεο | κύμβουλο, τὸν ταύτας | ἐπιτρέπειν· | δ’ ὑψηλὰ ὀρέων κορυφὰ· | γουνοῦσαι ἦ, καὶ δ’ εὐµενὴ ἔλθ’.

Patricia Rosenmeyer explains on Anacr. frs. 346 and 417 PMG, and mainly in regard to the word παίζειν that “we see young girls imagined as horses, playing in a meadow; the narrator sets their playful innocence in a natural setting and contrasts it with his more sophisticated knowledge ... Horace and Anacreon (and Homer before them) take advantage in their poetry of that brief moment in a young girl’s life when she is unaware of her own sexual potential, something that is quite obvious to older and wiser observers ... it is impossible to return to that

---


9 ROSENMEYER 2004, 177.
former state of whether as a reader or as an active participant in the game of intimacy.” Besides, many details of Greek girls’ training can be found in the myths around Artemis, even though they tend to concentrate on the most dramatic part of the story, the final passage into life as a married woman. One girl’s “taming” is expressed in a number of myths circling around her resistance to “domestication”, e.g. the pursuit of the Proetides, the capture of Thetis by Peleus or of Persephone by Hades, the races to win Atalante, and the capture of Helen by Paris.

If one of the proposals is accepted, the word is probably part of a quotation, either running from 9 (in this case also 11–2 τ]οῦ | πατρός is part of it), or a new lemma.

Fr. 1(c).col. ii.2–8 (=A. fr. 489 TrGF, partly). The text as Page prints it:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Αἱ} & \text{ίχυλος ο.getenv [., ], α[}\n\text{Ἀ} & \text{μ} \text{εκάδα } \text{μο} \text{νιον α[πωράι-} \\
& \text{νει τ} \text{όν Α[κμ]άνα [}
\text{γάρ ἐν τοὶς Ἄκινθ[θ} \\
& \text{άκουσα τ} \text{αν ἁρ[ον}
\text{παρ’ Εὐρώτα [}
\text{ταν Αμυκλα[}
\end{align*}\]

According to Page 1963, 31, we should assume that “if Αἰ[χύλος is correct, the tragedian is surely meant” (but see Radt 1985, 511: “fort. Aeschylum tragicum significari verbaque eius afferri censuit Page, vix recte”).11 Page 1963, 31 furthermore assumes that “a chorus in Aeschylus might say something like ἐν τοὶς Ἄκινθιοι | ἁκουσα ταν ἁρδονον | αἰ παρ’ Ευρωτα ουαοι | ταν Αμυκλαιαν ...” This, however, is convincingly proven wrong by Radt 1985, 511, explaining that “utcumque titulus scripti cuiusdam esse ideoque nomine Αἰ[χύλος non poeta tragicus significari videtur [the quote by Page, cf. above, follows] at ἐν τοὶς Ἄκινθιοις sermoni poetico vix aptum (et in oratione pedesti, si sollemnium tempus significaretur, Ἄκινθιοις sine praepositione et articulo exspectaveris).”

One should follow Radt’s argumentation, the lines certainly do not contain a poetical quotation, though they seem to give information concerning Aeschylus, Alcman, and Sparta, as indicated by 3, Α[κμ]άνα, 5, Ἄκινθ[θ. and 8, Ἀμυκλα]12. Hyacinth, whom was given various parentage in mythology, provides local links, as the son of Clio and Pierus, or of king Oebalus of Sparta, or of king Amyclas of

11 See on the problem also RÖMER 2013, 142-146.
12 David Weidgenannt remarks per litteras (27/12/2018) that this might also refer to Ἀμύκλαι, situated in Laconia on the right or eastern bank of the Eurotas, cf. in favour of this proposal also 7 παρ’ Ευρωτα [.].
Sparta. A possible link between these pieces of information might be a chorus in honour of Hyacinth singing in an Aeschylean tragedy, or a satyr play, which might have had the festival for Hyacinth in Sparta (or a journey there, cf. A. Theoroi) as subject. See for the former e.g. E. Hel. 1465–1474 ή ποῦ κόρας ἀν ποταμοῦ μαρτύρια λαβοπίται, Πιλαλάδος ἀν λάβοι | χρόνῳ ξυνελθοῦσα χοροῖς ἧ κόμως Ὕακιν-θου νύχιον ἐς εὐφροσύναν, ή ὄν εὔαμμηλλάμενον τροχο XPath δέκουτ | ἐκανε Φοιβος, ίάτατ Λακαί-λαναι γαί βουθυτόν ἀμέσαν ἐν Δίως δ᾽ εἴπε εἴσευν γόνος, if we assume the latter, we should print e.g. ... ἐν τοῖς Ὅακινθοιοσ σατρατεύεται. One has, however, to admit that no (satyr) play by this title is known and that the quotation fits the linguistic register of Alcman better.  

Fr. 1(d).5: Perhaps Πίνδαρος, if so, and if 8 still is concerned with Pindar, perhaps κλαύτον, or -κλαύτον. For the former cf. e.g. Pi. O. 10.97–98 ἐγὼ δὲ εὐφροσύνανος επούνδαι, κυτόν ἐθνός | Ἀσκρών ἀμφέπειοι, καὶ εὐάνορα πόλιν καταβορέχουν. I. 1.56–57 παύδασ προσετείν τὸν Μινύα τε μυχὸν καὶ τὸ Δάματος κυτόν ἄλοσ Ἐλευ-ίειν καὶ Ἐὔβοιαν ἐν γναμπτοίς δρόμοις, and for the latter fr. 333a.4–9 Snell/Maehler Α[πολλο]μνείν μὲν θεῶν | ἄταρ ἀνδρῶν Ἐφεσία[ται | παιδὸν Πυθαγγέλω | ετεφάνωμα δαίτικα]τον | πόλιν ἐς Ὀρχιμένῳ διῶ-[]ἐπιπον.

Fr. 1(k).6: Perhaps another title, if so, the possible word division would be ἐν τῇ ἐπικρασίᾳ, ὁδασ, or φωίδας. See for ἐπικρασία e.g. S. Aj. 581–582 οὐ πρὸς ιατροῦ σοφοῦ | θηρηνεῦν ἐπικρασία πρὸς τομώντι πήματι, ἐν ὁδασ 629–631 οὐδ' οἰκτρὰς γόνον ὧν ὄριος ἄρθου | εὐχές ὑψωμορος, ἀλλ' ἐξυπνόους μὲν ὁδασ | θηρηνεῦει, and for φωίδας Ar. fr. 359 K.-A. παρέχο, κατέτριβεν ἱμάτια (B.) κατεπιεῖ πῶς | φωίδας τοσαύτα εἴχε τὸν χειμών' ὅλον.

Fr. 5(b).col. i.18–24 (= Alcman fr. 16 PMGF)

[λ,][ημα][μανα][ου][και][μαι][ο] 20

13 So also Hinge 2006, 287.
Page 1963, 33 writes “possibly a reference to Alcman fr. 24 (Bergk), οὐδὲ | [Θεσσαλὸς γένος ἄλλα] Σαρδί- | οὐν κτλ.” This probably is correct. Therefore one can argue for Αλκ]μάνα in 20. With an average line length of 18–20 letters and 23 reading ], μα, there is not enough space for the whole fragment, the commentator certainly presents a telescoped\textsuperscript{14} version of the lines, e.g. reconstructions are as follows:

Considering these telescoped versions of the poem in the e.g. reconstruction and the practice of telescoping (and the fact that notes written beside poems make their way into the text), one might have a look at the corrupt lines 2–3 of Alcman fr. 16 PMGF. The corruption here might be due to some notes or parallels that made their way into the text and one (or more) ancient manuscript(s) might in fact not have had the text as it is presented in the modern editions, but οὐκ ἦς ἀνήρ ἀγρείος οὐ-|δὲ οὐδὲ Θεσσαλὸς, | Θεσσαλὸς | Σαρδί- | οὐν ἀπ’ ἄκραν . . . . . , μα | , o | [...

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{14} See for examples of shortenings and modifications in quotations from prose Wright 1948 (mainly on the gospels) and the quotation of Hes. Op. 240-247 omitting 244-245 in Aeschin. Oratio in Cepheisontem 135 (but see West 1978 on Hes. Op. 244-245: “The lines were rejected by Plutarch, followed by Proclus … Aeschines omits them, perhaps only because the misfortunes they specify were not relevant to his purpose, though the coincidence with Plutarch gives one to pause”).
Fr. 5(b).col. i: Page 1963, 33 comments “2–3 The context suggests ἀλλὰ ἀγ[ένειος] ἀνθρωποσ | τὴν ἡλικίαν ὥ [Ἀγ]η[η][δαμος. 5 ff. it looks as though here Alcman is here said to have used ἐλεφάντινος metaphorically, = “ivory-white”, a usage quoted by LSJ only from Crates fr. 29 and the Anacreontea. 5–6 χ[ω]λ[μα] probable.” Though no quotation can be tracked down with certainty, the whole passage seems to be concerned with ἡλικία, and in the first part of the fragment perhaps a reference to ἡλικία in relation to “whiteness” might be established. If so, the lines probably refer to (a) young girl(s) described as “white”: men and women, not differing much in their colour in our experience, are described as dark and light in Greek poetry. This might root in their spheres of activity (men work outside the house, women inside) and occurs since Homer. The whiteness of girls and women can either be used to show that the persons are dead, or that they are fair. Comparable might be E. Med. 1147–1149 ἐπειτα μέντοι προκυκλύσατ᾿ ὀμματα | λευκὴν τ’ ἀπέστρεψ‘ ἐμπαλιν παρηίδα, | παιδων μυσαχθεὶς εἰςόδους with Page’s 1964 n. ad loc. and Irwin’s 1974, 118 explanation (with a discussion of textual authenticity following in 118–119): “Since Glauce is the beautiful, young bride of Jason, it is reasonable to assume that λευκὴν describes her ‘fair’ youth and beauty, not her cheeks ‘pale’ with emotion. If λευκὴν means ‘fair’ in 1148, it ought to mean the same in 923.” See also Rhian. fr. 68 Powell Παῖς Ἀσκληπιώδεω καλῶι καλῶν εἰσατο Φοίβῳ | Γόργος ἀφ’ ίμερτάς τοῦτο γέρα κεφαλᾶς. | Φοίβε, ἄν, Δελφίνιε, κοῦρον ἀέξοι | ἐμοίου ἐλεφάντινο άχρος ἀφ’ ἡλικίαν and for a similar theme from the sphere of animals see Arist. Ἡ Α. 501b11–13 ὅπως δὲ κύνις διαγινώσκουσι τοὺς νεώτερους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εκ τῶν ὀδόντων: οἱ μὲν γὰρ νέοι λευκοὺς ἄχρι τοῦτο γέρα κεφαλᾶς. | ὦ δ’, ἰλασέ νεώτερον κοῦρον ἀέξοι | εὐμοίου λευκῆν ἄχρος ἀφ’ ἡλικίαν and for a similar theme from the sphere of animals see Aris. Ἡ Α. 501b11–13 Τοὺς δὲ κύνις διαγινώσκουσι τοὺς νεώτερους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εκ τῶν ὀδόντων: οἱ μὲν γὰρ νέοι λευκοὺς ἄχρι τοῦτο γέρα κεφαλᾶς. | ὦ δ’, ἰλασέ νεώτερον κοῦρον ἀέξοι | εὐμοίου λευκῆν ἄχρος ἀφ’ ἡλικίαν and for a similar theme from the sphere of animals see Arist. Ἡ Α. 501b11–13 Τοὺς δὲ κύνις διαγινώσκουσι τοὺς νεώτερους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εκ τῶν ὀδόντων: οἱ μὲν γὰρ νέοι λευκοὺς ἄχρι τοῦτο γέρα κεφαλᾶς. | ὦ δ’, ἰλασέ νεώτερον κοῦρον ἀέξοι | εὐμοίου λευκῆν ἄχρος ἀφ’ ἡλικίαν and for a similar theme from the sphere of animals see Arist. Ἡ Α. 501b11–13 Τοὺς δὲ κύνις διαγινώσκουσι τοὺς νεώτερους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εκ τῶν ὀδόντων: οἱ μὲν γὰρ νέοι λευκοὺς ἄχρι τοῦτο γέρα κεφαλᾶς. | ὦ δ’, ἰλασέ νεώτερον κοῦρον ἀέξοι | εὐμοίου λευκῆν ἄχρος ἀφ’ ἡλικίαν and for a similar theme from the sphere of animals see Arist. Ἡ Α. 501b11–13 Τοὺς δὲ κύνις διαγινώσκουσι τοὺς νεώτερους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εκ τῶν ὀδόντων: οἱ μὲν γὰρ νέοι λευκοὺς ἄχρι τοῦτο γέρα κεφαλᾶς. | ὦ δ’, ἰλασέ νεώτερον κοῦρον ἀέξοι | εὐμοίου λευκῆν ἄχρος ἀφ’ ἡλικίαν and for a similar theme from the sphere of animals see Arist. Ἡ Α. 501b11–13 Τοὺς δὲ κύνις διαγινώσκουσι τοὺς νεώτερους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εκ τῶν ὀδόντων: οἱ μὲν γὰρ νέοι λευκοὺς ἄχρι τοῦτο γέρα κεφαλᾶς. | ὦ δ’, ἰλασέ νεώτερον κο漏水 ns, though this is hard to restore, cf. Page 1963, 33–34. Add to Page’s passages Hist. Alex. Mag. 1.36.3.4.

16 Irwin 1974, 116–117, with passages for λευκός meaning ‘fair’ in 116, for passages for λευκός meaning ‘dead’ (often as a result of suicide) in 119–120.
17 See further Arist. Col. 798b, explaining whiteness as indicating weakness and as a result of bad food supply, similarly also HA 523a10–11, HA 799b (also naming different phases of life as the cause of different coulours, e.g. of hair, and Thphr. CP 3.22.2.
Fr. 17.2: either concerned with Lydian poetry, or with Lydia. In the first case perhaps another lyric poet, in the second case a restitution is e.g. λέγει Ανδράµην, τοῦ ᾿Απόλλωνος τοῦ [τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ] νεόν Νιδοίς βασιλέυοντα], cf. fr. 102.2–3 (=Alc. fr. 306. A f.2–3 Voigt) το Πιθήκον βασιλέυον τις καθεν [..].

17.3: As Page 1963, 35 remarks, “Δασκύλιοι[α]ιον might suit the context.” If accepted, the appearance of the word is a further strong argument in favour of the thesis that Dascylium, seated in Anatolia some 30 kilometres inland from the coast of the Propontis, was of Lydian origin.18

17.5: ἀπεκτονότι; cf. e.g. Lib. Progymnasmata 11.2.6 ... μίγνυθαι τῶι τῶν ᾿Εκτόρα ᾿Απεκτονότι, but more probable seems ἀπεκτότι | [ ᾿Αλκ]μάν ᾿ἐν Λυδοίς | [ ]αιτο[. ]μέλους | [ ] ἀσκ[α]νιαί [Σάρ-]δας?].


Fr. 26.col. ii.7–17 (= A. test. 63 TrGF):

7 Αἰσχύλο[ε] ζεν γάρ
Ορές-ε[ι]αν ποιήσα[ε]
,ιαν [Α]γαμέμονον[α]
Χρησιφρό[ν]ος Εὐμεν[ιδας]
... ] ... ] τον ἀναγ[ωμις-
μόλυ] δια το βοστρύχο[ν]
το Ορέστον ὅτι ἐτείν δε[δο-
μέλονν αὐτοί δώρον πα[ρά]
τ[ο]ύ Απάλλωνος

however, to admit that there is no evidence for any of the possible explanations of this text: \[ \text{Ὀρέ} \text{τε} \] \[ιαν \] would indicate that either someone else staged another Oresteia, or Aeschylus did, or a possible Iphigenia tetralogy by Aeschylus (A. tri b vii TrGF) might have been called \[ \text{Ὀρέ} \text{τε} \] \[ιαν \] by the papyrus’ author.

10–1 Though Radt denied it (A. test. 63 TrGF), perhaps Πρῳ[τέ]α (φατ') with the first α being written extremely low on the line.

Fr. 26.col. ii.25–27: Montanari 1986 interpreted the letters in 27 as a reference to Satyrs. This is palaeographically possible, cf. the description of the traces in Montanari 1986, 46–47. Schorn 2004, 113 accepts this proposal and prints the text within the Satyrus fragments (his fr. 7): \[ \text{Εὐριπίδе} \] \[ιαν \] \[την \] \[Ἀχιλλεί \] \[τοριοι \] \[αι \] \[ποιή] \[εγαμουν \] \[ιν \] \[Ἀχιλλεί \] \[τοριοι \] --- and notes in his app. cr. “nomen Satyri agnovit Montanari.” He further explains in his commentary as 348: “Wie schon der Erstherausgeber Page erkannt hat, sind die hier interessierenden Zeilen 25–27 wohl so zu verstehen, daß Euripides in der aulischen Iphigenie die Reise der Iphigenie an den Ort ihrer Opferung unter dem Vorwand der Hochzeit mit Achilles dem Lyriker verdanke … In welchem Zusammenhang Satyrs mit dieser Angabe steht, ist unsicher, da der Papyrus in Z. 27 abbricht. Es ist gut möglich, daß sich der Autor für diese Information auf ihn beruft, wie in der vorangehenden Kolumne für die Existenz von zwei Palinodien bei Stesichoros bei Chamaileon. An anderer Stelle verweist der Autor auf Aristoteles, Aristarch und wohl Dikaiarchos.” One might argue for the same theme also being treated in an Euripidean Satyr Play. The text might in this case be restituted to \[ \text{Ἀχιλλεί \ en toις titl]e Ca[τυ]ζο[ιc δε} \ ...

Fr. 78: Semonides and Simonides – or just one of them? The fragment explains the different use of words or the use of different words, cf. the supplements proposed by Page 1963, 44: 5 ὀνόματος, 6 ὦ δ’ ὀνόματι, 8 ἦξ ὀνόματος, and 9 ὀνόματος. This fr. has not been adopted in PMG. \( \text{θ} \) in 9 might refer to a book number\(^{20} \), or might indicate that the explanations were concerned with aspiration. If so the first dotted letter is perhaps \( \tau \), later \( \theta \). Comparing other passages

---

\(^{19}\) On the dangers of reconstructing tetralogies (or even assuming their existence) see Gantz 1979, 1980/2007, Wolff 1957, 1958, 1959, and Podlecki 1975, explaining on p. 1: “The survival of the whole Oresteia (except for the satyr play, Proteus) seems to have acted as a sort of Siren-song, enticing otherwise sensible scholars into dangerous waters.”

\(^{20}\) Book numbers occur sometimes within the text and on a regular basis at the bottom of codex pages, at the ‘bottom’ of the roll, i.e. below the last column of writing of the roll, and sometimes at the beginning of the roll. The total amount of lines often appears in the vicinity of the book title, whose form is usually work-title in genitive (and book next to it or in a new line) and number. On the phenomenon see Caroli 2007 and Schironi 2010.
from this commentary, it is possible that this discussion refers to one or more authors. The authors who wrote poems fitting the probable supplements were Semonides, who wrote a ἱάμβος/ἱάμβοι against women (fr. 1 IEG) and Simonides, who wrote κατευχαί (frr. 537–538 PMG)\(^\text{21}\). There is also the slight chance that the author of the commentary mixed the poets up or assigned both works to either Simonides, or Semonides.\(^\text{22}\) If so, fr. 83 reading ἱόγυναῖ in 11 might belong in the neighbourhood of fr. 78. I propose the following, Page’s and my (e.g.-) supplements are marked in the apparatus, on the left side the text taken from Page 1963, 18.

5 ὀνόματος et 6 ὧ δ’ ὀνόματι Page 1963, 44, alia in 5–7 Reinfeld 1

Fr. 122: A new Moschus fragment? The fragment might be concerned with Hellenistic poetry. If so, one might print (on the left the text as printed in Page 1963, 24, my text on the right):

---

\(^{21}\) See generally on the κατευχαί PONTANI 2012: Considering the way other works are cited in the papyrus, one could argue for the κατευχαί being the title of a poem, but this cannot be established. See on the question whether the κατευχαί were a singular poem, or a book PONTANI 2012,

\(^{22}\) This mix-up occurs from antiquity on, cf. Athen. 14.620b-d and Semon. test. 19 Pellizzer-Tedeschi (= Tzet. Chil. 12.42.47). See also WEST 1992, 98: “Auctorum qui fragmenta donant codices ubique Συμ.- praeberat.” I owe these references to Enrico Emanuele Prodi, Claudio Meliadò, and Giacomo Mancuso. See further for another mix-up Sud. s.v. Συμμια (IV 360.7 Adler); the entry obviously deals with Semonides, but names Simmias. See also Choerob. ap. EM 713.17, trying to distinguish the two names using etymological criteria.
If this is correct, the fragment might contain references to two works of Moschus, in 2 the 'Επιτάφιος Βίωνος, and the Μέγαρα in 3, cf. ἔπι προύχοντος ἐφείμασε contained in the poem’s line 101: αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ παντὸ ἀφίκετο πρὸ τέλος ἔργου | καρτερὸν οἰνοφόροι πονεύµενο ἐρείπαι | ἤτοι ὃ λίτρον ἐµέλλει ἐπὶ προύχοντος ἐρείπαι | ἀνδήρου καταδῦναι ἃ καὶ πάρο εἴµατα ἔστο. It is also possible that the author of the commentary mixed some information up and thought that the line from the Μέγαρα came from the 'Επιτάφιος Βίωνος or that he thought the author of the line was the Bucolic poet Βίων ὁ Σμύρναιος, Bion of Smyrna.

Fr. 124.col. ii: A new Eupolis testimonium? The text, as Page prints it:

In 2 and 3 it seems likely that we can discern two work titles. Although I cannot come up with a satisfying solution for 2, 3 allows us to squeeze a bit more from this scrap: if we divide the words into καὶ ἐν τοῖς ποί., we can extract a new fragment from a play: since there are not many poetic work titles beginning with Πο... I would argue for Eupolis’ Προπαλτοί, Men of Prospalta (= frs. 259–267 K.-A.). The very name Εὐπολίς would be lost in lacuna, either before 1, or in 1 or 2

23 See Storey 2003, 230-246 for an overview over play and discussions, for the play possibly being an anti-war play see Storey 2003, 333-337, for a commentary of the fragments see Olson
(or at a later point). If it is lost before 1, [...]ικαίωτι might also refer to Εὔπολις, if it is lost in 1 or 2 (or at a later point), the content of 1 probably refers to another poet. If another poet was named, 1 might have been part of his name (or the name of a character). If this is correct, there are two possibilities to understand 4: 1. There might be a connection between our τακτέοις [... τι in 4, and Eup. Προσπάλτοι test. i K.-A. (= Σ Ar. Nu. 541), for text and explanation see Olson 2016, 314: “From a note on Ar. Nu. 541–2 οὐδὲ πρεσβύτητος ὁ λέγων τάπη τῇ βακτηρίαι / τύπτει τὸν παρόντ', ἀφανίζων πονηρὰ εκώματα (“and no old man who’s speaking the lines strikes the bystander with his staff as a way of concealing bad jokes”; part of a tongue-in-cheek catalogue of the nasty features Aristophanes’ comedies do not include—almost all of them, however, found in Clouds itself) … Prospaltioi included an old man who told bad jokes and hit another person with a stick … seems specific enough to be believable …” and to print the following supplements in 1–4 (of which the second postulates that ‘the old man’ was a known character from Eupolis’ comedy/comedies):

2. An alternative explanation of 4 is that it refers to the beginning of the play: Προσπάλτοι probably was staged in 429 as the first play Eupolis ever brought on stage. As Eup. fr. 259 K.-A. tells us, Eupolis was asked at the beginning of the play to give a speech in public. The persons asking for the speech (on their behalf?) might be identified as the πρεσβυίς from Eup. fr. 259.10 K.-A. or the χορός δ(ε) Προ[σπαλτίος] from Eup. fr. 259.13 K.-A. Similar plots can be found in Ar. V. 54–66 and Nu. 528. An information on an early play of a poet’s career peppered with a metapoetic quote would suit the whole biographic theme of the papyrus well. An e.g. restoration of lines 1–4 might then be:

2016, 314-364. See for further comedies named after the members of individual demes Aristophanes’ Acharnians, Strattis’ Potamioi, Antiphanes’ Thôrikioi, Philippides’ Lakaidai, and Menander’s Halieis.

24 A similar sounding character is for example Dicaeopolis from Aristophanes’ Acharnians.

Some minor remarks:

Fr. 1(i) and (j): ἀλ[λὰ Λα]κεδα[μικοῖς?]

Fr. 4.1: ἦν in 3 word division after ω, then perhaps a form of φράζειν.

Fr. 6(b).3 perhaps Τενθρανίδην [ (cf. ll. 6.13), or Δαφθρανίδην [ (cf. ll. 24.631), 6(c).1 ]ἐυκω[ might still be concerned with whiteness. If so, λ]ευκω[ would be a natural supplement and the fragment might be related to fr. 5, on which see above. 4 perhaps ] ύπολαβόντες. 5 perhaps infinitives; if so a probable word division is ]ναι καὶ τυ [. 6 perhaps word division between αα, cf. e.g. Pl. R. 609ε3 κώμα ἀπόλυσα, Crat. 417b8 ἀνάλωμα ἀπολύει, etc., 7 ]ἐπι φωνῆ[. 8 ]φέρομεν[, 9: probably either κολὰς or κολὰς, 7–9 seem to be concerned with blandishment in the voice, though no safe connections between the words can be established.

Fr. 7.2: ἐτυγρω[, perhaps a form or compositum of ἐτυγρός. If so, fr. 7 might contain a poetic quotation, cf. the passages quoted in LSJ s.v. ἐτυγρός. 7.2–3 perhaps οὐ]κέτι δο[κεί / οὐ]κέτι δο[κούει for which see e.g. Σ Ar. Pl. 873, or οὐ]κέτι δο[ξεί for which see e.g. Ar. Lys. 775, 7.4: word division prob. between ὄν and λεγε, so print ὄν λεγε [.]

Fr. 10 E. El. 673–674 Πρ. οὐκετί δήτα σού γε φύντας ἐκγόνους. | Ορ. Ἡρα τε βωμῶν ἣ Μυκηναίων κρατεῖ προκειμένων would suit the traces, but this is only speculation. A connection with fr. 26.col. ii.7–17 would be interesting but can not be established.

Fr. 15.2 perhaps ]παρεκπερῶ[, cf. A. fr. 31 TrGF κάπετι’ Ἀθήνας Διάδας παρεκπερῶν, 15.3 probably ν]έκρων.

Fr. 18(a).6, 10, 12, and 15 are either marking poetical quotations, or are line fillers. 18(b).2 word division probably between οίας and ζ, cf. e.g. Isocr. Nicocles 16.9 … ὠφελεῖ δαίμον ἐστιν ἕνός ἀνδρός γνώμη προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν μᾶλλον ἢ πολλάς καὶ παντοδαπαῖς διανοιάς ζητεῖν ἀφέσκειν, Pl. Lg. 857b7 … οἱ δὲ ποικύλοις οὔσιν ἔπεκεθα τὸν νομοθέτην μηδὲν ὁμοίως ζημιάς ἀναγινάντα, and the rather late Symeon Hymn. 143–145 ταύτα δὲ μὴ λόγος ὅλως | μηδὲ ἐπινοίας ζητεῖ, | ἀλλὰ πῦρ λαβεῖν ἐξαίτει …

Fr. 21.2: ]ακακα[ is a rare letter combination. Print ]ακακα[, τ]ακακα[, cf. perhaps Str. 17.3.13 Κίρτα τέ ἐστιν ἐν μεσογαίᾳ, τὸ Μακανάκου καὶ τῶν ἐξης
διαδόχων βασίλειον, πόλις ευθεκτάτη και κατεκευαμένη καλώς τοῦ πάσι και μάλιστα ύπο Μικύσα, οτις καὶ Ἑλληνας ευνώκαιεν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ τοσαύτην ἐποίησεν ὡς’ ἐκπέμπειν μυρίου ἱππέας, διπλασίους δὲ πεξούς, or Σ II. 6.78b.2 Α β (BCE^E^1) ἐγκέκλιται: ἐρήσεται, ἐκ μεταφοράς τῶν καμμόντων ἀφαστίας καὶ προσαναπαυσομένων ἱσχυστέροις σώματι, ἢ τῶν ξυγοστατουμένων.

Fr. 25.2: In [ἀντ^ο], the high o is either belonging to an abbreviation, or a ‘pseudo-abbreviation’, as McNamee 1981, 31 n. 33 calls them. A possible solution containing a ‘pseudo-abbreviation’ is [ἀν τ^ο], with τ^ο representing τό. τοῦτο looks better on first sight, but I have not found any other examples in which τ^ο represents τοῦτο. In 25.3 read [ζει τὸν, cf. e.g. E. Hyp. 230 στάζει, τὸν and Ar. V. 695 εὐ δὲ χασκάζεις τὸν κωλακρέτῃ, τὸ δὲ πραττόμενον εἴ λέληθεν.

Fr. 88.4 word division prob. between [μελλε and δαμων]

Fr. 101.2 [παρθεν^] might be a reference to Alcman’s Partheneion, but this is most speculative.

Fr. 130.3 perhaps [τὰ ωνδάς, [, in 5 perhaps the ending of in infinitive -]θαί κατὰ τ]\]

Though no new approach to understanding the text can be offered here, it seems as if the number of authors mentioned in the papyrus were increased and some new fragments were added to the (particular) collections. Whether this changes our understanding of the text, is, as already written above, for others to discuss.
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