

Frammenti sulla scena (online)

Studi sul dramma antico frammentario

Università degli Studi di Torino

Centro Studi sul Teatro Classico

<http://www.ojs.unito.it/index.php/fss>

www.teatroclassico.unito.it

ISSN 2612-3908

0 • 2019



NOTES ON P. OXY. XXIX 2506: COMMENT ON LYRIC POEMS

MARTIN REINFELDER

BISCHOF-NEUMANN-SCHULE KÖNIGSTEIN

GOETHE UNIVERSITY FRANKFURT

martin-reinfelder@web.de

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, Homer, 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-Literatur*?⁴ 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:

| | | | |
|---|----------|-------|----|
| | ριετικη[|] ○ | |
| ✠ | τωπιμ.[|]παις | 10 |
| | καλωσ.[|]ου | |
| | πατρος[|]. | |
| | δαμας[|] | |
| | ..οπατ[|] | |
| | [.]δη.[|] | 15 |
| | [|] | |
| | . | . | |

10 τωπιμ.[Reinfelder (one faint trace of ink visible under the microscope) : τωπιμ[Page 1963, 2 11–12 τ]οῦ | πατρός? 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 ✠ (χρηστικ)⁵ and ○ in 9. ○ was probably used to divide the lemmata. It is unclear, how long the quotation runs. The first letter in 10, τ, 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 ὠπιμελητός, or for πίμπλεια.⁶ In the first case we would print (assuming a column width of ca. 18–20 letters) ὠπιμελητ-]παις. See for the word Theocr. 10.54 κάλλιον ὠπιμελητὰ φιλάργυρε τὸν φακὸν ἔψειν with Σ Κ κάλλιον ὠπιμελητὰ: πρὸς τὸν Βουκαῖον ταῦτά φησιν ὅτι, ὦ πλούσιε καὶ φιλάργυρε, καλὸν ἂν εἶη συνήθη ἐργάτην σε ὄντα καὶ γεωργὸν φακὸν ἔψειν καὶ τούτῳ τρέφεσθαι, μὴ τρίβειν δὲ κύμινον, ὃ δεῖγμα τρυφῆς ἐστὶ, μήπως δι' ἀπειρίαν τὴν χεῖρα πληγῆς and Σ UEAT ὠπιμελητὰ: ὁ λόγος πρὸς τὸν ἐπιτατὴν τῶν θεριστῶν ὀλίγην τροφήν αὐτοῖς παρεχόμενον. In the second case we would print ὦ Πιμπ[ληϊάς]παις, or even ὦ Πιμπ[ληϊάς]παῖς. See for the adjective Orph. fr. 771b Bernabé νῦν 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 PAGE 1963, 31. See for further examples of this abbreviation McNAMEE 1981, 109. It is also possible that the abbreviation means χρηστόν, cf. McNAMEE 1981, 20-21.

⁶ But see RÖMER 2013, 144: "... vielleicht begann das Zitat mit ὄτωι nach dem Spatium in Z. 9; damit würde es sich also um das Zitat eines Attikers handeln. Möglich ist natürlich auch, dass ὁ zu παῖς gehört. πιμ[wohl eher von πίμπλημι als von πίμπρημι."

ἄγε μοι, κούρη Πιμπληιάς, ἔννεπε Μοῦσα and for Πιμπληΐδος see A.R. 1.25. Πίμπλεια, “a place in Pieria, sacred to the Muses and Orpheus” (LSJ s.v.), is also among the possibilities. See for the word Str. 7.1.17, 18, 9.2.25, Lyc. 275, and Call. *Del.* 7.

11–12 If τ]οῦ | πατρός is accepted, this might still be part of the quotation. If so, the πατήρ could perhaps be connected with παῖς (?) from 10. If τ]οῦ | πατρός is not part of the quotation anymore, the word could belong to biographical explanations (cf. also above).

13 Perhaps a form of δαμάζω or δάμασις. See for the former e.g. B. 17.41–5 οὐ γὰρ ἂν θέλοι-| μ’ ἀμβρότον ἔραννόν Αο[ῦς | ιδεῖν φάος, ἐπεὶ τιν’ ἠϊθέ[ων | σὺ δαμάσειας ἀέκον-| τα. The word appears in numerous lyric passages, cf. LSJ s.v. The latter is hardly attested, see nevertheless Σ 98b BEQ Pi. O. 13.98 ἡ δαμαῖος λέγεται Ποσειδῶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἵππων δαμάσεως. The metaphoric taming of girls⁷ certainly suits the outlines of a poetic quotation, see e.g. Anacr. fr. 346 fr. 1 PMG οὐδε . . . [.]c. φ. . . α. . . [.] . . [| φοβεράς δ’ ἔχεις πρὸς ἄλλω | φρένας, ὧ καλλιπρό[σ]ωπε παῖδ[ων]· | | καί σε δοκεῖ μενε[. . .] . . . [| πυκινῶς ἔχουσα[| ἀτιτάλλειν· c[.] . [. . .] . . . [| | τὰς ὑακιν[θίνας ἀρ]οῦρας | ἵνα Κύπρις ἐκ λεπάδνων | . . .] [.]α[κ]ατέδησεν ἵππους· | | . . .]δ’ ἐν μέσῳ κατῆξας |]ωι δὲ ἄσσα πολλοὶ | πολ]ιητέων φρένας ἐπτοέεται· | | Λεωφ]όρε Λεωφόρ’ Ἡρο[τ]ίμη,⁸ and fr. 417 PMG πῶλε Θρηκίη, τί δή με | λοξὸν ὄμμασι βλέπουσα | νηλέως φεύγεις, δοκεῖς δέ | μ’ οὐδὲν εἰδέναι σοφόν; | ἴσθι τοι, καλῶς μὲν ἂν τοι | τὸν χαλινὸν ἐμβάλοιμι, | ἡνίας δ’ ἔχων στρέφοιμί | σ’ ἀμφὶ τέρματα δρόμου· | νῦν δὲ λειμῶνάς τε βόσκειαι κοῦφά τε κιοτῶσα παίζεις, | δεξιὸν γὰρ ἵπποπείρην | οὐκ ἔχεις ἐπεμβάτην.⁹

Patricia Rosenmeyer¹⁰ explains on Anacr. fr. 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

⁷ See for a similar erotic metaphor, the hunt for a fawn, Archil. fr. 196a.31 IEG, Anacr. fr. 408 PMG, and Hor. *Carm.* 1.23 with NISBET/HUBBARD’S 1980 n., and for play as erotic metaphor Anacr. 357 PMG ὠνάξ, ὧ δαμάλης Ἔρωσ | καὶ Νύμφαι κυανώπιδες | πορφυρῆ τ’ Ἀφροδίτη | συμπαίζουσιν, ἐπιτρέρφεται | δ’ ὑψηλὰς ὀρέων κορυφάς· | γουνοῦμαί σε, σὺ δ’ εὐμενῆς | ἔλθ’ ἡμῖν, κεχαρισμένης | δ’ εὐχολῆς ἐπακούειν· | Κλεοβούλωι δ’ ἀγαθὸς γένεο | σύμβουλος, τὸν ἐμόν γ’ ἔρω-| τ’, ὧ Δεόνυσε, δέχεσθαι.

⁸ See on the interpretation of the fragment also GENTILI 1958, 182–190, KURKE 1999, 191–195, and ROSENMEYER 2004, 173–177.

⁹ See on the poem also ROSENMEYER 2004, 170–171, discussing the dubious interpretation of Anacr. fr. 346 and 417 PMG on pp. 171–173.

¹⁰ 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:

A]ιχύ[λ]οc ομ[. .] α[
 Λ]ακεδα[ι]μόνιον ἀ[ποφαί-
 νει τὸν Ἀλ[κμ]ᾶνα [
 γὰρ ἐν τοῖc Ὑακιν[θ] 5
 ἄκουca ταν ἀηδ[ον
 παρ’ Εὐρώτα .[
 ταν Ἀμυκλα[

According to Page 1963, 31, we should assume that “if Αἰχύλοc 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 τοῖc Ὑακινθίοιc | ἄκουca τᾶν ἀηδόνων | αἰ παρ’ Εὐρώτα ῥοαῖci | τᾶν Ἀμύκλαιαν ...” This, however, is convincingly proven wrong by Radt 1985, 511, explaining that “utcumque titulus scripti cuiusdam esse ideoque nomine Αἰχύλοc non poeta tragicus significari videtur [the quote by Page, cf. above, follows] at ἐν τοῖc Ὑακινθίοιc sermoni poetico vix aptum (et in oratione pedestri, si sollemnium tempus significaretur, Ὑακινθίοιc 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, Ἀλ[κμ]ᾶνα, 5, Ὑακιν[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’ Εὐρώτα .[.

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 ἢ που κόρασ ἄν ποταμοῦ | παρ' οἶδμα Λευκιππίδασ ἢ πρὸ ναοῦ | Παλλάδοσ ἄν λάβοι | χρόνωι ξυνελθοῦσα χοροῖσ | ἢ κώμοισ Ἰακίν-|θου νύχιον ἐσ εὐφροσύναν, | ὄν ἐξαμιλλησάμενοσ | †τροχῶ τέρμονι δίσκου† | ἔκανε Φοῖβοσ, †τᾶ† Λακαί-|ναι γᾶι βούθυτον ἀμέραν | ὁ Διὸσ δ' εἶπε σέβειν γόνοσ, if we assume the latter, we should print e.g. ... ἐν τοῖσ Ἰακιν[θίοισ σατ^v. 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.¹³

Fr. 1(d).5: Perhaps Πίν]δαροσ, if so, and if 8 still is concerned with Pindar, perhaps κλυτόν, or -κλυτόν. For the former cf. e.g. Pi. O. 10.97–98 ἐγὼ δὲ κυνεραπτόμενοσ σπουδαῖ, κλυτόν ἔθνοσ | Λοκρῶν ἀμφέπεσο, μέλιτι | εὐάνορα πόλιν καταβρέχων, I. 1.56–57 παιδάσ προσειπεῖν τὸν Μινύα τε μυχόν | καὶ τὸ Δάματροσ κλυτόν ἄλοσ Ἐλευ-|σίνα καὶ Εὐβοιαν ἐν γναμπτοῖσ δρόμοισ, and for the latter fr. 333a.4–9 Snell/Maehler Α[π]όλλωνι μὲν θεῶν | ἀτὰρ ἀνδρῶν Ἐχεκ[ρά]τει | παιδὶ Πυθαγγέλω | στεφάνωμα δαιτὶ κλυτ[ον] | πόλιν ἐσ Ὀρχομενῶ διώ-|ξιππον.

Fr. 1(k).6: Perhaps another title, if so, the possible word division would be ἐν τ]ῶι δα[-. If the letters form no work title, perhaps ἐπωιδάσ, ὠιδάσ, or φῶιδάσ. See for ἐπωιδάσ e.g. S. *Aj.* 581–582 οὐ πρὸσ ἱατροῦ σοφοῦ | θρηνεῖν ἐπωιδάσ πρὸσ τομῶντι πῆματι, for ὠιδάσ 629–631 οὐδ' οἰκτρᾶσ γόοσ ὄρνηθοσ ἀηδοῦσ | στήχει δύσμοροσ, ἀλλ' ὄξυτόνοουσ μὲν ὠιδάσ | θρηνήσει, and for φῶιδάσ Ar. fr. 359 K.-A. †παρέσο, κατέτριβεν ἱμάτια (B.) κάπειτά πωσ | φῶιδάσ τοσαύτασ εἶχε τὸν χειμῶν' ὄλον.

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

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|----|
| | | |
|]λ. | [| |
|]ημα | [| |
|]μανα | [| 20 |
|]σουδε | [| |
|]καρδι | [| |
|].μαι | [| |
|].ο | [| |
| | | |

¹³ So also HINGE 2006, 287.

Page 1963, 33 writes “possibly a reference to Alcman fr. 24 (Bergk), οὐδὲ | [Θεσσαλὸς γένος ἀλλὰ] Καρδί-|ων κτλ.” This probably is correct. Therefore one can argue for Αλκ]μᾶνα in 20. With an average line length of 18–20 letters and 23 reading] . μαι, there is not enough space for the whole fragment, the commentator certainly presents a telescoped¹⁴ version of the lines, *e.g.* reconstructions are as follows:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------|---|----|
| |].λ. | [| |
| |]ημα | [| |
| | ... Αλκ]μᾶνα | [| 20 |
| | λέγειν οὐδὲ Θεσσαλὸ]ς οὐδὲ | [| |
| | Ἐρσιχαῖος ἀλλὰ] Καρδί- | [| |
| | ων ἀπ' ἀκρᾶν] . μαι | [| |
| |].ο | [| |
| | | | |
| |].λ. | [| |
| |]ημα | [| |
| | ... Αλκ]μᾶνα | [| 20 |
| | λέγειν οὐδὲ κκαιὸ]ς οὐδὲ [| | |
| | Θεσσαλὸς γένος ἀλλὰ] Καρδί- | [| |
| | ων ἀπ' ἀκρᾶν] . μαι | [| |
| |].ο | [| |
| | | | |

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 ἀγρεῖος οὐ-|δὲ κκαιὸς οὐδὲ Θεσσαλός, | Ἐρσιχαῖος οὐδὲ ποιμήν, | ἀλλὰ Καρδίων ἀπ' ἀκρᾶν (instead of οὐκ ἦς ἀνήρ ἀγρεῖος οὐ-|δὲ κκαιὸς οὐδὲ †παρὰ σοφοῖ-|σιν† οὐδὲ Θεσσαλὸς γένος, | Ἐρσιχαῖος οὐδὲ ποιμήν, | ἀλλὰ Καρδίων ἀπ' ἀκρᾶν).

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 Ctephisontem* 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[ένειοι | τὴν ἠ]λικίαν ὁ [Ἀγ]η[ε]ί[δα]μοι. 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[ρ]ω|μ[α] probable.” Though no quotation can be tracked down with certainty, the whole passage seems to be concerned with ἠλικία, and in the first part of the fragment perhaps a reference to ἠλικία 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.¹⁵ The whiteness of girls and women can either be used to show that the persons are dead, or that they are fair.¹⁶ Comparable might be E. *Med.* 1147–1149 ἔπειτα μέντοι προυκαλύψατ’ ὄμματα | λευκὴν τ’ ἀπέστρεψ’ ἔμπαλιν παρηίδα, | παίδων μυσαχθεῖς εἰκόδοις with Page’s 1964 n. ad loc. and Irwin’s 1974, 118 explanation (with a discussion of textual authenticity following in 118–119): “Since Glaucē 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 Ἀσκληπιάδεω καλῶι καλὸν εἶκατο Φοῖβωι | Γόργος ἀφ’ ἰμερτᾶς τοῦτο γέρας κεφαλᾶς. | Φοῖβε, σὺ δ’ ἴλαος, Δελφίνιε, κοῦρον ἀέξοις | εὐμοῖρον λευκὴν ἄχρως ἐφ’ ἠλικίην and for a similar theme from the sphere of animals see Arist. *HA* 501b11–13 Τοὺς δὲ κύνας διαγιγνώσκουσι τοὺς νεωτέρους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους ἐκ τῶν ὀδόντων· οἱ μὲν γὰρ νέοι λευκοὺς ἔχουσι καὶ ὄξει τοὺς ὀδόντας, οἱ δὲ πρεσβύτεροι μέλανας καὶ ἀμβλεῖς and (similarly) 575a5–12 Ὀδόντας δὲ κύων οὐ βάλλει πλὴν τοὺς καλουμένους κυνόδοντας· τούτους δ’ ὅταν ὦσι τετράμηνοι, ὁμοίως αἶ τε θήλειαι καὶ οἱ ἄρρενες. Διὰ δὲ τὸ τούτους μόνους βάλλειν ἀμφιβεητοῦσι τινες· οἱ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τὸ δύο μόνους βάλλειν ὄλωσ οὐ φασι (χαλεπὸν γὰρ ἐπιτυχεῖν τούτοις), οἱ δ’ ὅταν ἴδωσι τούτους, ὄλωσ οἴονται βάλλειν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους. Τὰς δ’ ἠλικίας ἐκ τῶν ὀδόντων σκοποῦσιν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ νέοι λευκοὺς καὶ ὄξει ἔχουσιν, οἱ δὲ πρεσβύτεροι μέλανας καὶ ἀμβλεῖς.¹⁷

5(b).15 perhaps ἀγερώχως, though this is hard to restore, cf. Page 1963, 33–34. Add to Page’s passages *Hist. Alex. Mag.* 1.36.3.4.

¹⁵ IRWIN 1974, 112–116.

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 colours, e.g. of hair, and *Thphr. CP* 3.22.2.

Fr. 17.2: either concerned with Lydic poetry, or with Lydia. In the first case perhaps another lyric poet, in the second case a restitution is e.g. λέγει Ἀνδράμυτον ἐν Λυδοῖς βασιλεύοντα], cf. fr. 102.2–3 (=A1c. fr. 306. A f.2–3 Voigt)]ο τῶν Λυδῶν βα-|σιλεύς, καθ' ἣν [.

17.3: As Page 1963, 35 remarks, “Δακκύ|[λ(ε)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 ... μίγνυσθαι τῶι τὸν Ἐκτορα ἀπεκτονότι, but more probable seems]εκτον ὅτι | [Ἄλκ]μὰν ἐν Λυδοῖς | []σαιτο[.] μέλουσ | []κλα[ε]ῖναί Κάρο-|διδεσ[?].

17.7: perhaps ἄρξι|σαι το[ῦ] μέλουσ, cf. Plut. *de Musica* 1136 C 3 εἰς δ' οἱ Μελανιππίδην (fr. A 3 del Grande) τούτου τοῦ μέλουσ ἄρξαι φασί. See for the misspelling ξ > ξς, appearing in papyri from the first century on, with examples, Gignac 1975, 141.

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

| | |
|---------------------------------|----|
| Αἰσχύλο[σ μὲν γὰρ] | |
| Ὀρέτ<ε>[ια]ν ποιήσα[σ | |
| ·ιαν [Α]γαμέμνον[α | |
| Χ]σηφ[όρ]ουσ Εὐμεν[ίδασ | 10 |
| ...] ..[.] τὸν ἀναγ[νωρι- | |
| μὸ]ν διὰ τοῦ βοστρύχο[σ | |
| Σ]τησιχόρωι γὰρ ἔστιν [| |
| ..] , Ε[ὐ]ριπίδης δὲ τὸ τ[όξον | |
| τὸ Ὀρέτου ὅτι ἔστιν δε[δο- | 15 |
| μ]νον αὐτῶι δῶρον πα[ρὰ | |
| τ]οῦ Ἀπόλλωνοσ | |

7 Αἰσχύλο[σ μὲν γὰρ] Lobel in Page 1963, 11 : Αἰσχύλο[σ γοῦν] Sicherl 1984, 9 et 10 8 Ὀρέτ<ε>[ια]ν Page 1963, 11 : Ὀρέτ[ε]ια]ν Sicherl 1984, 9 et 10 8–9 τριλο|γίαν Page 1963, 37, [σ τριλο-]|[γ]ίαν ... Sicherl 1984, 9 9–10 [Α]γαμέμνον[ά τε καί] | [Χ]σηφ[όρ]ουσ Εὐμεν[ίδασ] Sicherl 1984, 9 et 10–11, vix recte : “forse [Α]γαμέμνον[α λέγω,] | [Χ]σηφ[όρ]ουσ Εὐμεν[ίδασ]?” Maltomini 1988, 91

7–9 Perhaps [τριλο]|γίαν or [τετραλο]|γίαν, cf. Page 1963, 37: “τριλο|γίαν seems obvious, although the trace does not suggest γ.” Αἰσχύλο[σ μὲν γὰρ] | Ὀρέτ<ε>[ια]ν ποιήσα[σ δευτε|ρίαν ... would suit the traces better. One has,

¹⁸ Cf. WEISKOPF 1994 and RÖMER 2013, 152.

however, to admit that there is no evidence for any of the possible explanations of this text:¹⁹ Ὀρέτ<ε>[ια]ν ποιήσα[ς δευτε]ρίαν 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 Ὀρέτ<ε>[ια]ν ... [δευτε]ρίαν by the papyrus' author.

10–1 Though Radt denied it (A. test. 63 *TrGF*), perhaps Πρω]τέα (κατ^v) 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 Satyrus. 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): Εὐριπίδ]ης δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰφ[ιγέ]λνειαν ἐ]ποίησε γαμουμέ[νην | Ἀχιλλεῖ ± 4] . . . Κα[τυ]ρο[--- 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 Satyros 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 ... Ἀχιλλεῖ ἐν τοῖς τίτ]λε Κα[τύ]ρο[ις δὲ ...

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 ὀν]όματος, 6]ω δ' ὀνόμ[ατι, 8 ἐ]ξ ὀνόματος, and 9 ὀνό]ματος. This fr. has not been adopted in *PMG*. θ in 9 might refer to a book number²⁰, or might indicate that the explanations were concerned with aspiration. If so the first dotted letter is perhaps τ, later θ. 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 *ἰάμβος/ἰάμβοι* against women (fr. 1 *IEG*) and Simonides, who wrote *κατευχαί* (fr. 537–538 *PMG*)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.²² If so, fr. 83 reading]οἰγυναικ[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.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|------------|---|------|---|---------------|---|----|
| · | · | · | · | · | · | · | · | · | · |
| |] | · | μ[| |] | · | μ[| | 1 |
| |]ει | · | μαλ[| |]ει | · | μαλ[| | |
| |]αι | · | τινα[| |]αι | · | τινα[| | |
| |]· | · | δεκα[| |]· | · | δεκα[| | |
| |]ο | · | ματοςμ[| | ὄν] | · | όματος μ[| | 5 |
| |]ω | · | δονομ[| |]ω | · | δ' ὄνομ[ατι | | |
| |]χει | · | οἰγυναικ[| | τοι] | · | χεις γυναικ[α | | |
| |]ξ | · | ονοματος[| | ε] | · | ξ ὄνοματος | | |
| |]μα | · | τος θ δ .[| | ὄν] | · | όματος θ δ .[| | |
| |]· | · | α κατευχα[| |]· | · | α κατευχα[- | | 10 |
| |]και | · | ·]τους[| |]και | · | ·]τους[| | |
| |]νκα | · | ·]να .[| |]νκα | · | ·]να .[| | |
| |]α | · | το[| |]α | · | το[| | |
| · | · | · | · | · | · | · | · | · | · |

5 ὄν]όματος et 6]ω δ' ὄνομ[ατι Page 1963, 44, alia in 5–7 Reinfelder | in initio]ω aut]ω<υ> 7]δ Page 1963, 24 :]ϕ Reinfelder 8 ε]ξ ὄνοματος et 9 ὄν]όματος Page 1963, 44, alia Reinfelder 10 in initio τ aut π

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, 22–28.

²² This mix-up occurs from antiquity on, cf. Athen. 14.620b–d and Semon. test. 19 Pellizer-Tedeschi (= Tzetz. Chil. 12.42.47). See also WEST 1992, 98: “Auctorum qui fragmenta donant codices ubique Cμ.- praebent.” I owe these references to Enrico Emanuele Prodi, Claudio Meliaddò, and Giacomo Mancuso. See further for another mix-up Suid. s.v. Cίμμιας (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.

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
|]τοςμεναυτονταις[|]τος μὲν αὐτὸν ταις[|
|]τουβίωνο.[|]ε τοῦ βίωνος [|
|]προυχοντος.[| ἐπὶ] προύχοντος ἐ[ρείας |
|].ω[|].ω[|
|]ε[|]ε[|

If this is correct, the fragment might contain references to two works of Moschus, in 2 the *Ἐπιτάφιος Βίωνος*, and the *Μέγαρα* in 3, cf. ἐπὶ] προύχοντος ἐ[ρείας contained in the poem's line 101: αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ παντὸς ἀφίκετο πρὸς τέλος ἔργου | καρτερόν οἰνοφόροιο πονεύμενος ἔρκος ἀλωῆς, | ἦτοι ὁ λίστρον ἔμελλεν ἐπὶ προύχοντος ἐρείας | ἀνδήρου καταδῦναι ἅ καὶ πάρος 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 *Ἐπιτάφιος Βίωνος* or that he thought the author of the line was the Bucolic poet Βίων ὁ Cμυρναῖος, Bion of Smyrna.

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

..[...]ικαιοτ[
 εν ξτταικαλλ[
 καιεντοιςπρ.[
 ταςπρεσβ[.]τ[
 [
 νημενος..[
 τοιςπεριτην[
 το[.]πε[
 ως[
 ου.[
 ω[

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 πρ. [, we can extract a new fragment from a play: since there are not many poetic work titles beginning with Πρ..., I would argue for Eupolis' *Προσπάλτοι*, *Men of Prospalta* (= frr. 259–267 K.-A.).²³ The very name Εὐπολις 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, . . . [. . .]ικαιοτ[might also refer to Εὐπολις, 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).²⁴ If this is correct, there are two possibilities to understand 4: 1. There might be a connection between our ταςπρεβ[.]τ[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 πρεβύτης ὁ λέγων τᾶπη τῆι βακτηρίαι / τύπτει τὸν παρόντ’, ἀφανίζων πονηρὰ κώμματα (“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):

. . . [. . .]ικαιοτ[
 εὐ . . . εἶπαι ἀλλ[ὰ λέγει
 καὶ ἐν τοῖς Προ[σπαλτίοις
 τὰς πρεβ[ύ]τ[ε]ρας παιδιᾶς / τὰς πρεβ[ύ]τ[ε]ρου παιδιᾶς

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.²⁵ 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 πρέβειε from Eup. fr. 259.10 K.-A. or the χορὸς δ(ὲ) Προ[σπαλτίων 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:

. . . [. . .]ικαιοτ[
 εὐ . . . εἶπαι ἀλλ[ὰ λέγει
 καὶ ἐν τοῖς Προ[σπαλτίοις
 τὰς πρεβ[ύ]τ[ε]ρων δεήσεις

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 *Haliéis*.

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

²⁵ Cf. Eup. fr. 259.3–4 K.-A. and STOREY 2003, 56, 65, 174, etc.

Some minor remarks:

Fr. 1(i) and (j).5: ἀλ[λὰ Λα]κεδα[ιμονιός?

Fr. 4.1:]c οὐ γάρ δ[comes immediately to mind, in 3 word division after ω, then perhaps a form of φράζειν.

Fr. 6(b).3 perhaps Τευθο]ανίδην [(cf. *Il.* 6.13), or Δαρδ]ανίδην [(cf. *Il.* 24.631), 6(c).1]ευκω[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] ὑπολαβόν[τες, 5 perhaps infinitives; if so a probable word division is]ναι καὶ τυ .[, 6 perhaps word division between αα, cf. e.g. Pl. *R.* 609e3 *cōμα ἀπόλυθαι*, *Crat.* 417b8 *ἀνάλωμα ἀπολύηι*, etc., 7]ἐπὶ φωνῆc[, 8] φέρομεν [?, 9: probably either *κολάσεων* or *κολάσεως*, 7–9 seem to be concerned with blandishment in the voice, though no safe connections between the words can be established.

Fr. 7.2: cτυγερο[. perhaps a form or compositum of cτυγερός. If so, fr. 7 might contain a poetic quotation, cf. the passages quoted in LSJ s.v. cτυγερός. 7.2–3 perhaps οὐ] | κέτι δο[κεῖ / οὐ] | κέτι δο[κοῦσι for which see e.g. Σ *Ar. Pl.* 873, or οὐ] | κέτι δο[ξεῖ for which see e.g. *Ar. Lys.* 775, 7.4: word division prob. between ρον and λεγ, so print ρον λεγ .[.

Fr. 10 E. *El.* 673–674 Πρ. οἴκτιρε δῆτα σοῦ γε φύντας ἐκγόνους. | Ορ. Ἥρα τε βωμῶν ἢ Μυκηναίων κρατεῖς 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]παρεκπε[ε[, cf. A. fr. 31 *TrGF* κάπειτ' Ἀθήνας Διάδακ παρεκπερῶν, 15.3 probably ν]εκρόν.

Fr. 18(a).6, 10, 12, and 15 are either marking poetical quotations, or are line fillers. 18(b).2 word division probably between οῖαιc and ζ, cf. e.g. *Isocr. Nicocles* 16.9 ... ὄσσιπερ ῥαῖόν ἐστιν ἐνός ἀνδρός γνώμηι προέχειν τὸν νοῦν μᾶλλον ἢ πολλαῖc καὶ παντοδαπαῖc διανοῖαιc ζητεῖν ἀρέσκειν, Pl. *Lg.* 857b7 ... οἷc δεῖ ποικίλοιc οὔcιν ἔπεσθαι τὸν νομοθέτην μηδὲν ὁμοῖαιc ζημίαιc ζημιοῦντα, and the rather late *Symeon Hymn.* 143–145 ταῦτα δὲ μὴ λόγοιc ὄλωc | μηδὲ ἐπινοῖαιc ζήτει, | ἀλλὰ πῦρ λαβεῖν ἐξαίτει ...

Fr. 21.2:]αcανα .[is a rare letter combination. Print]αc ἀνα .[, τ]ὰc ἀνα .[, cf. perhaps *Str.* 17.3.13 Κίρτα τέ ἐστιν ἐν μεσογαίαι, τὸ Μακανάccου καὶ τῶν ἐξῆc

διαδόχων βασίλειον, πόλις εὐεργεστάτη καὶ κατεσκευασμένη καλῶς τοῖς πᾶσι καὶ μάλιστα ὑπὸ Μικίψα, ὅστις καὶ Ἑλληνας συνώικισεν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ τοσαύτην ἐποίησεν ὥστ' ἐκπέμπειν μυρῖους ἰππέας, διπλασίους δὲ πεζούς, or Σ II. 6.78b.2 A b (BCE³E⁴) ἐγκέκλιται: ἐρήρεια, ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν καμνόντων ἀρρωστίαις καὶ προσαναπαυομένων ἰσχυροτέροις σώμασιν, ἢ τῶν ζυγοστατουμένων.

Fr. 25.2: In]αντ^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]αν 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]ζεις τον, cf. e.g. E. *Hyp.* 230 στάζεις, τὸν and Ar. V. 695 cὺ δὲ χασκάζεις τὸν κωλακρέτην, τὸ δὲ προαπτόμενόν σε λέληθεν.

Fr. 88.4 word division prob. between]μελλε and δαιμων

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

Fr. 130.3 perhaps] τὰς ὠκυδάς .[, in 5 perhaps the ending of in infinitive -]θαι 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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CAROLI 2007 = M. Caroli, *Il titolo iniziale nel rotolo librario greco-egizio*, Bari 2007.
- CONTIADES-TSITSONI 1988 = E. Contiades-Tsitsoni, *Zu P.Oxy. 2506 fr. 115. Sappho oder Alkaios?*, "ZPE" 71 (1988), 1-7.
- DAVISON 1966 = J. Davison, *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2506*, in AA.VV., *Atti del XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Milano, 2-8 settembre 1965), Milano 1966, 98-108.
- DE KREIJ 2019 = M. de Kreij, *Dark Sappho. P.Oxy. 2506 in the biographical tradition*, in E. Cingano (ed.), *Commentaries on Greek Texts: Problems, Methods, and Trends of Ancient and Byzantine Scholarship*, Rome 2019. [Forthcoming]
- GANTZ 1979 = T. Gantz, *The Aeschylean Tetralogy: Prolegomena*, "CJ" 74 (1979), 289-304.
- GANTZ 1980/2007 = T. Gantz, *The Aeschylean Tetralogy. Attested and Conjectured Groups*, "AJPh" 101 (1980), 133-164; repr. with revisions in M. Lloyd (ed.), *Aeschylus. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*, Oxford 2007, 40-70.
- GENTILI 1958 = B. Gentili, *Anacreon*, Roma 1958.
- GIGNAC 1975 = F. Th. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. 1. Phonology*, Milano 1975.
- HINGE 2006 = G. Hinge, *Die Sprache Alkmans*, Wiesbaden 2006.
- IRWIN 1974 = E. Irwin, *Colour Terms in Greek poetry*, Toronto 1974.
- KURKE 1999 = L. Kurke, *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold. The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece*, Princeton 1999.
- LLOYD-JONES 1965 = H. Lloyd-Jones, *Review: The Oxyrhynchus Papyri by Denys Page*, "CR" 15 (1965), 70-72.
- MALDOMINI 1988 = F. Maltomini, *Stesicoro 217 Page*, "ZPE" 71 (1988), 91-92.
- MCMAMEE 1981 = K. McNamee, *Abbreviations in Greek Literary Papyri and Ostraca*, Chico 1981.
- MONTANARI 1986 = F. Montanari, *Satiro in P.Oxy. 2506 (fr. 26 II)?*, "ZPE" 62 (1986), 46-48.
- NISBET/HUBBARD 1980 = R.G.M. Nisbet, M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*, Oxford 1980.
- PAGE 1963 = D. Page, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XXIX, London 1963.
- PAGE 1964 = D. Page, *Euripides. Medea. The text edited with introduction and commentary by Denys L. Page. Reprinted with corrections*, Oxford 1964.
- PODLECKI 1975 = A.J. Podlecki, *Reconstructing an Aeschylean Trilogy*, "BICS" 22 (1975), 1-19.
- PONTANI 2012 = F. Pontani, *Le Kateyxai Di Simonide (PMG 537-538)*, "QUCC" 102 (2012), 11-28.

- PORRO 2004 = A. Porro, *Alcaeus 13*, in G. Bastianini, M. Haslam, H. Maehler, et alii (edd.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta (CLGP), adiuvante Marco Stroppa, Pars I*, vol. I, fasc. I, München/Leipzig 2004, 197-211.
- RÖMER 2013 = C. Römer, *Alcman 9*, in G. Bastianini, M. Haslam, H. Maehler, F. Montanari, C.E. Römer (edd.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta (CLGP), adiuvante Marco Stroppa, Pars I*, vol. I, fasc. II, München/Leipzig 2013, 141-152.
- ROSENMEYER 2004 = P.A. Rosenmeyer, *Girls at Play in Early Greek Poetry*, "AJPh" 125 (2004), 163-178.
- SCHIRONI 2010 = F. Schironi, *To Mega Biblion: Book-Ends, End-Titles and Coronides in papyri with Hexametric Poetry*, Oakville 2010.
- SCHORN 2004 = S. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar*, Basel 2004.
- SICHERL 1984 = M. Sicherl, *Stesichoros Fr. 217 PMG = Pap.Oxy.2506, fr. 26e*, "ZPE" 55 (1984), 9-12.
- STOREY 2003 = I.C. Storey, *Eupolis. Poet of Old Comedy*, Oxford 2003.
- TREU 1966 = M. Treu, *Neues über Sappho und Alkaios (P.Ox. 2506)*, "QUCC" 2 (1966), 9-36.
- WEISKOPF 1994 = M. Weiskopf, *Daskylium*, in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. 7/1 (1994), 85-90.
- WEST 1978 = M.L. West, *Hesiod. Works and Days. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L. West*, Oxford 1978.
- WEST 1992 = M.L. West, *Iambi Et Elegi Graeci: Ante Alexandrum Cantati: Callinus, Mimnermus, Semonides, Solon, Tyrtaeus, Minora Adespota*, Oxford 1992².
- WOLFF 1957 = E.A. Wolff, *Aeschylus' Danaid Trilogy: A Study*, Diss. Ann Arbor (Mich.) 1957.
- WOLFF 1958 = E.A. Wolff, *The Date of Aeschylus' Danaid Tetralogy*, "Eranos" 56 (1958), 119-139.
- WOLFF 1959 = E.A. Wolff, *The Date of Aeschylus' Danaid Tetralogy II*, "Eranos" 57 (1959) 6-34.
- WRIGHT 1948 = L.E. Wright, *Contextual Adaptation in Incomplete Quotation*, "JBL" 67 (1948), 347-351.