

**Zeitschrift:** Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

**Band:** 33 (1976)

**Heft:** 1

**Artikel:** Papyrus Bodmer XXVIII : a satyr-play on the confrontation of Heracles and Atlas

**Autor:** Turner, Eric G.

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-26396>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 06.10.2024

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## **Papyrus Bodmer XXVIII: A Satyr-Play on the Confrontation of Heracles and Atlas**

*By Eric G. Turner, London*

Dedicated to Bruno Snell, 80 years old June 1976

The fragments of a papyrus roll published and discussed in this paper were first seen by me in November 1972. I was asked by the trustees of the newly created Fondation Martin Bodmer to inspect and report on the library's still unpublished holdings of Greek papyri, and to make suggestions for their publication at the earliest possible opportunity. My attention was instantly captured by these fragments which I did not recognize as known, and a quick verification of a provisional transcription showed that they formed part of a hitherto unknown drama. I received photographs of them in September 1973<sup>1</sup>, and was able to work on the original in November of that year (in conditions of very bad light). A number of problems of reading and placing remained unsolved, and the manuscript had to be put on one side until I could make another visit to the library. For various reasons this had to be postponed until the end of May 1975. Meantime I had been allowed by the kindness of the library authorities to speak about the fragments to learned audiences in five centres<sup>2</sup>, and as the sequel will show have benefitted greatly from the criticism and suggestions of colleagues.

The library's inventory does not allow us to establish provenance or date of acquisition. It seems that these fragments had not been seen by Victor Martin, whose interest they would undoubtedly have caught. A happy suggestion of Dr. W. E. H. Cockle is that they may have been extracted from the binding of an

1 I should like to thank especially Dr. H. Braun, Director of the Bibliothèque Bodmer. The pieces were mounted for the initial photograph by M. André Hurst, of the University of Geneva, helped by Professor R. Kasser. M. Hurst communicated to me his readings of some difficult places (δικη col. i 20 was first clearly seen by him). The text has since been remounted and rephotographed. Plates I and II show it at facsimile size, but cut into two. Frag. B is placed one line too low, and fragment C has slipped.

2 In the U.S.A. in November–December 1973 at the Hellenic Center in Washington and at Stanford University; in spring 1974 at the Institute of Classical Studies in London and the Oxford University Classical Society; and on May 25th 1975 in Geneva on the occasion of my last visit to the Library. I should like to thank all who made suggestions or asked questions. The most important I have tried to identify by name. A special debt is owed to Professor E. W. Handley, Mr. J. H. Kells, Dr. J. R. Rea and Miss Frances Mills.

1 Museum Helveticum

early codex. Clearly observable folds run obliquely down the height of the two large fragments A and D. In A the area on the upper right of this fold, in D that on the lower right is dirtyish, and covered by a whitish powder which could be remaining traces of paste; the areas on the other side of the fold are clean and bright golden in colour. A and D have in fact been put together to reconstitute the roll as here published. It might well have been torn up and the torn pieces folded to pack behind a leather outer cover<sup>3</sup>. B. Regemorter<sup>4</sup> quoted a number of examples of bindings of early codices that had often been strengthened by sheets of used papyrus pasted immediately behind the covers. Indeed, documentary papyri were extracted in 1910 from the binding of B.M. Or. MS 7594, a fourth century Coptic codex<sup>5</sup>; and attention has recently been focussed on the papyri contained in the cover of Nag Hammadi codex I<sup>6</sup>. Dr. Braun assures me, however, on the testimony of M. Kasser, that if these pieces do in fact come from a binding case, they had been extracted from it before they reached the Bodmer library.

The surviving fragments number 6: two are fairly large (one has both upper and lower margins, probably themselves incomplete), two are narrow (but probably retain the full height of the roll), and two are tiny pieces. The measurements of the largest fragments are as follows: Fr. A 13.0 cm. B × 19.6 cm. H (upper margin 2.0, lower margin 2.2); Fr. D 11.5 B × 18.1 H. The minimum height of the roll was 20 cm., and of the 30 lines of writing in each column 15 cm. (Note that in the photograph fr. B is set one line too low.) The fragments have been put together to yield 2 columns of writing complete in their height, and at one point the initial letters of a third column. The reconstitution may be represented schematically by the diagram on p. 3.


The reasoning on which this reconstruction (which differs in one important respect from the original arrangement of M. Hurst) is based may be summarized thus: fragments A and D physically touch, and are linked by fibre continuations; fragment F cannot go immediately to the right of A. For though its l. 10  $\text{Iv}$  might well complete i 10  $\text{\theta\epsilon\mu\nu}$ , i 11 is complete ( $\text{H\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota}$ ) and therefore F l. 11  $\text{\text{I}\omega\omega\nu}$  excludes such a placing; F must be placed vertically immediately above E, since both share a pasted sheet-join (*kollesis*). Only a tiny piece of this *kollesis* is visible on F (on the projecting rectangular tongue of papyrus), more of it can be seen on E. The presence of the join (the only one in the fragments; no such join occurs on the left hand side of D) means that E too cannot

3 If so, it would be a strong indication that *all* the fragments came from a relatively small area of the original roll.

4 B. Regemorter, *Some Early Bindings in the Chester Beatty Library* (Dublin 1959).

5 E. A. Wallis Budge, *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London 1912); H. Thompson, *The New Biblical Papyrus* (privately printed, London 1913).

6 See the paper by John Barns, *Greek and Coptic papyri from the covers of the Nag Hammadi codices* in *Essays in honour of P. Labib*, to be edited by M. Krause (not yet published by November 1975).



be placed at the foot of col. i in the gap between fragments A and D. Is the combined piece F + E to be placed to the right or the left of the big fragment A + D? The reasons favouring a position to the right are: (1) in E a prominent golden-brown fibre seems to be a continuation of a similar fibre in D crossing below v. 23, and (in so far as they can be seen at all in an area where the surface of the papyrus is badly rubbed) the remaining fibre links between D and E seem to form an acceptable pattern; (2) the marginal note at the foot of E ε]παργειαπ corresponds in position to the last line of col. ii in D. These are not absolutely cogent grounds. I suppose a whole column might have been lost between D and F + E<sup>7</sup>. The sheet width from left of A to the *kollesis* on the right of F will have been about 30 cm. Sheets as wide as this are rare, but fall within the bounds of possibility<sup>8</sup>. But the alternative placing of F + E to the left of A has one positive disadvantage: the marginal note ε]παργειαπ would come 2 lines above the level of col. i 30, and the postulated column to the left of A would already have 30 verses at that point – if, that is, the projecting tongue of E that contains the opening letters τ. [ of a verse is to be inserted below the break in A and above fragment B. The short length of horizontal fibre available to the right of the *kollesis* in E + F is insufficient either to prove or disprove location. The left-hand position would allow the hypothesis of a smaller sheet width (25 cm. against 30 cm.). It would exclude the restoration of i 24 [καθε]ιλ[ον, which I like on other grounds. Fragment B is placed below A, since its first verse at least seems to show enough empty papyrus to the left to make it likely that it contains line beginnings. This fact was observed by M. Hurst; as was also the fact that of fr. C only horizontal fibres survive, and that it is conjecturally placeable above a projecting tongue of fr. A of which only vertical fibres survive.

To sum up, then: we can place the fragments to form 2 columns of a roll which contained on its → side 30 verses in each column. Of col. i the complete height (and between verses 10 and 20 its complete width also) is preserved; of

<sup>7</sup> But cf. n. 3 supra.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. E. G. Turner, *Towards A Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia 1976) chapter IV.



col. ii, also of 30 verses, slightly more than half the width survives, while at some points its verse-endings also survive. Of the next column there remain only the 2 initial letters τ [ of one verse (opp. ii 26). The papyrus is somewhat coarse in texture. The clean portions are of a bright golden colour as if they had been treated with a preservative oil. There is no writing on the back (↓), though there are offsets of ink at one place.

The handwriting is a fairly large upright rounded regular and bilinear capital of monumental appearance. The vertical strokes are thick; so are the downward obliques made at a 45 degree angle; upward obliques are very fine. φ and ψ reach above and below the notional guidelines of the scribe, ρ usually reaches below (and so does ι in ligature). δ has a remarkably broad base made in a single movement, beginning with a downward oblique and then looping to begin the horizontal; μ is deep, in either 3 or 4 movements; υ likewise is in one movement, the pen looping at the base of the left-hand oblique, and then resuming the right-hand oblique in a vertical direction; the vertical strokes of a number of letters show a marked finial, either on their upper limit (γ, κ, the first hasta of ν, ρ, τ, the second hasta of η and υ) or on their lower (τ, ρ). The hand is remarkably like that of P. Oxy. xxiv 2388, a text of Alcman (a recondite author, as is ours). Like that text it should be assigned to the 2nd century A.D.

Stops, apparently (like the tremata) written by the original scribe, are found in three positions; there are not infrequent examples of apostrophes, the rough breathing, accents (acute and circumflex), all of which may be the work of the original scribe. A certain number of *notae personarum* are added, also by the first hand (e.g. ii 14. 16), and change of speaker is also marked by paragraphus at the left-hand margin. The writer may use *scriptio plena*, or elide vowels. Iota adscript is usually written.

The text is generously spaced (the maximum distance between the columns is 5 cm.), and has been corrected with some assiduity. Some of the corrections are made in the text itself, in a hand which may well be that of the original scribe, normally by lightly stroking out a particular letter, and writing a different one above (e.g. i 2 επ is altered to μεθ: the μ is added above and to left of ε, π is crossed through and θ written above). Such alterations may have been made *currente calamo* by the copyist. The marginal additions, when they are prefixed (and sometimes concluded) by an antisigma (ς), may have been intended to note corrections too; or are they variants? The purpose of the ς is not unambiguous<sup>9</sup>. After ii 20 line end τοδε follows ÷ (or ÷, probably in any case

<sup>9</sup> The traditional explanation of ς as critical sign in prose is that it is to mark passages misplaced (Diog. Laert. 3, 66, of the ἀντίσιγμα περιεστιγμένον, πρὸς τὰς διττὰς χρήσεις καὶ μεταθέσεις τῶν γραφῶν; V. Gardthausen, *Griech. Paläographie*<sup>2</sup> II 411–412). This explanation is accepted by E. Lobel in passages of Stesichorus (P. Oxy. xxiii 2359 fr. 1 col. i 6, xxxii 2617 fr. 13(a)14, fr. 19 ii 7), but it does not seem helpful in this text or in a number of others. A. S. Hunt wrote in his note on P. Ryl. i 16, 1 “the curved mark preceding αὐτας is a sign used in supplying an omission or in making a rectification”. The latter purpose could suit here. In the passage of the

to be taken as an *obelos periestigmenos*); then follows ο ατλας and then α with ν written above. Such a compendium is commonly interpreted as standing for ἀν(τὶ τοῦ), but its signification here is uncertain and is discussed in a footnote<sup>9a</sup>. All these additions seem to be the work of the first scribe.

Monumental handwriting, critical care, marginal annotation seem to indicate a text to which special value was attached<sup>10</sup>. Was that because of the author it contained or for some other reason? Discussion of this point must wait till the text itself has been examined. But one peculiarity of it may be mentioned straight away. In 60 verses (11 completely preserved, and several more plausibly restorable) there is not a single *sigma*<sup>11</sup>. That this feature is deliberate – that is, that the text is a lipogram<sup>12</sup> – is beyond doubt. This point will be established later, when the time comes to assess its significance. It is mentioned here so as to preclude any suggestions for restoration that contain *sigma*; and for a better reason, to give the credit for noticing its absence to E. W. Handley, to whom it emphatically belongs. Neither I nor two American audiences had observed this absence.

Hawara Homer illustrated in *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* Pl. 13 it certainly seems to prefix a reading from a different version or exemplar, i.e. a variant. On the obelos periestigmenos cf. *GMAW* p. 17 and n. 2.

- 9a The phrase ἀντὶ τοῦ is standard commentators' Greek for 'this (rare) word is used instead of (stands for) ...'. I do not think it ever means 'this is a variant for'. It is found both (a) inside *hypomnemata* and (b) in the margins of book texts, in both abbreviated and unabbreviated form. Examples: (a) inside the column of writing, in full, Commentary on *Iliad* ii, P. Oxy. viii 1086 ii 52 (*Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, No. 58 l. 12) μέγα ἀντὶ τοῦ μεγάλως; abbreviated α<sup>v</sup>, Commentary on Alcman, P. Oxy. xxiv 2390 fr. 2 iii 21 πρεσγ[υς] δ' α<sup>v</sup> πρεσβυτης, and Commentary on Epicharmus, P. Oxy. xxv 2429 fr. 1 ii 10. (b) in the margin, Pindar, P. Oxy. xxvi 2445 fr. 1 i 7 ]ορν̄ α<sup>v</sup> περῶν ('*margin*. δι]ορνύ(μενος) for περῶν', E. Lobel ad loc.); Pindar, P. Oxy. xxvi 2450 fr. 1 ii 22 ἌΤΗΣΦΑΤΝΗΣ]. E. W. Handley notes that this signification is not helpful at the place where the sign occurs in a text of New Comedy, P. Oxy. inv. 16 2B.52 (*Proceedings of XIVth International Congress of Papyrologists* 139 n. J and Plates XVI and XVII) because there is blank papyrus after the sign (ἀντὶ τοῦ 'standing for' should be followed by the explanation) and because it is styled differently from the note itself which it adjoins. In the Bodmer text, though the papyrus is broken, the same considerations seem to apply; besides, ο Ατλας can hardly be a reference to a word standing in the text, since it would introduce a sigma into it.

Other possibilities, which unfortunately cannot be checked because the papyrus is broken, are (1) that Ἄ is a compendium for a scholarly critic whose opinion is cited (mooted by Handley ad P. Oxy. inv. 16 2B.52 l.c.), (2) that it stands for ἄν(ω), i.e. a note or an omission set out in the top margin (on this method of rectifying omissions, usually coupled with an *ancora*, see *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* p. 38 introd. to No. 12).

- 10 See E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* p. 94.
- 11 Actually there is a *sigma* as interlinear correction at ii 30, where σοσ is written above δικαίων (? with the intention of correcting to δικαιοσόν). Moreover the correction in i 2 of επ to μεθ suggests that the uncorrected version contained επ ορκ[ι]οις. Use of the letter ξ i.e. *ks* (e.g. i 9 ἴξη) shows that the sibilant sound is not itself avoided, it is the letter σ.
- 12 *The Oxford English Dictionary* s.v. quotes from T. W. Dobson (1888): "Lipogram is the name of a species of verse in which a certain letter, either vowel or consonant, is altogether omitted".

	μοχθων·επατηνδευτερ· [	]φνμ'επαυ <sup>τ</sup>
	ειτ'ουκεπαιδηιτη <sup>μ</sup> νεπορ· [	
	αιρωνπαλαιοντ'αφθιτων[	
	μη·ωνεπόμνυνδξυρ[	
5	ϊδο·φερουτονδε·άλλοδ'ου[	
	ορκοι··ειπαν·ουτετόνδ[	
	νωτωιβαρυνμοιμοχθον[··]·[·]·[	
	διηπατημαι τᾶλλα δ'ευγενειδο[	
	κλεπτωνεπαλληνπηματωνῖξη·· [	]·αξω
10	μαρτυρομαιδετηνκατουρανονθεμιγ	
	οθουν[·]·κ'ευρωνουδικαιον ηρακλει	
	ατλαντακαιειπεφ[ [ε] ]υ[ [γ] ]·κ'εναφθιτωνάπο	
	μετειμ[·]·καιγαρειθνηταμοιταμητρο[	
	δῖων··[·]··μεναξιοιγεννητορων	
15	αλλων[··]·ταρβειν·ουκεμον·ρωμηιτε· [	
	πρωτονμεμητηργαιατιτανωντε· [	
	αυχεικρόνουθ'ομαιμον·ῶιποτειχομ[	]·αλ·...·]νγεμην
	κοινηνολυμπουτηνανωμοναρχιαν	
	ἦ τοιπάρ[·]·δρονθεωνδρομονκεκτημενη	
20	δικη·δεδορκενοξυ·καναπῆμακ[	
	··]ιδητό[··]·νπ··ξαιμεν·ήπ··αργο[	
	··]·[·]·]ναπ[·]·λλωνκοιρανωνορμωμε[	
	··]·ταπιφ[·]·εγραιγηιγενωνφρονημ[	
	····]ιλ····]η·καιτονεγγελ· <sup>ει</sup> τε[	
25	-----]λθοιμ'ειταδαιμ[	]αλλον[
Frag. B	κρα[····]·]ηρλελογχε·τ·[	
	αιβ[··]·]διδ'εχωνευν[	
	οιτην[··]·]ούτοιτ[ [η] ]ου'γδ[	
	·υχε·[··]·] [ [ο] ]·α'ι[μα]·]νο'υμ· [	
30	καιγα[····]·]·ανευγε[	

i 1 [·, loop compatible with α 4 μη followed by oblique ascending to right from the line 5 trace consistent with base of υ 6 after σκκοι peak of an oblique, top of a vertical 7 [··]·[·, base of descender formed as a loop, e.g. υ 9 [·, low horizontal trace (β, θ) 12 ε with expunging dot and also cancel-stroke, γ with cancel-stroke 14 high horizontal, low trace After ] cap of ε?, then vertical 15 [·, foot of vertical and high horizontal 16 [·, foot of vertical 17 margin νγεμην; τ for γ possible 20 δικη read by A. Hurst 21 ]·, end of low link stroke rubbed after νπ After ήπ trace of curving ink on lower fibres, then trace of vertical (ρ or τ acceptable) 22 [··]·[·, trace of vertical and high horizontal 23 ]·, foot of vertical φ[ read by G. M. Browne 24 after γελ, curve open to left, then high ink 25 [·, low dot of ink Fragment C placed and restored by A. Hurst 26 Fragment B placed by A. Hurst 27 after β, right-facing curve end, ο or ω 28 ]ό, trace of high ink before acute accent Cancel-stroke through η 29 first letter, upright and traces of horizontal [·, an upright cancel-strokes through ο and μα


(Ἄτλας) μόχθων· ἐπ' ἄτην δευτέρα[ν  
(Ἡρακλῆς) εἶτ' οὐκ ἐπαιδῆι τὴν μεθ' ὀρκίῳ φάτιν  
αἴρων παλαιόν τ' ἀφθίτων[  
(Ἄτλ.) μῆλων ἐπώμνυν δεῦρο  
5 ἰδοῦ, φέρου τόνδ'· ἄλλο δ' οὐ[  
ὄρκοι διεῖπαν· οὔτε τόνδ[  
νώτωι βαρύν μοι μόχθον [ . . ] . [ ] . [  
(Ἡρακλ.) διηπάτῃμαι· τᾶλλα δ' εὐγενεῖ δόλωι  
κλέπτων ἐπ' ἄλλην πημάτων ἴξι . [  
10 μαρτύρομαι δὲ τὴν κατ' οὐρανὸν Θέμιν  
ὀθοῦν[ε]χ' εὐρῶν οὐ δίκαιον Ἡρακλεῖ  
Ἄτλαντα κεῖ πέφυκεν ἀφθίτων ἀπο  
μέτειμι[ι]· κεῖ γὰρ θνητά μοι τὰ μητρό[θεν  
Δίων γ' ἄ[ν] εἶμεν ἄξιοι γεννητόρων.  
15 (Ἄτλ.) ἄλλων [γε] ταρβεῖν· οὐκ ἐμόν· ῥώμηι τε γ[ἄρ  
πρῶτόν με μήτηρ Γαῖα Τιτάνων τεκ[εῖν  
αὐχεῖ Κρόνου θ' ὄμαιμον· ὦι ποτ' εἶχομ[εν (?)  
κοινήν Ὀλύμπου τὴν ἄνω μοναρχίαν.  
(Ἡρακλ.) ἦ τοι πάρ[ε]δρον θεῶν δρόμον κεκτημένη  
20 Δίκη δέδορκεν ὄξύ, κᾶν ἀπῆι μακ[ράν.  
[κα]ἰ δὴ τό[δ'] ἄν πράξαι μέν· ηπ[ . ] . αργο[  
[ὄρ]γ[ῆ]ν ἀπ' [ἄ]λλων κοιράνων ὀρωμέ[νην  
[κα]ἰ τὰπὶ Φ[λ]έγραι γηγενῶν φρονήμ[ατα  
[καθε]ἰλ[ον ἦδ]η· καὶ τὸν ἐγγελῶντ' ἐ[μοί  
25 . . . . . ἐ]λθοιμ'· εἶτα δαίμ[ον'] ἄλλον [  
κρα [ . . . . . ]ηρ λέλογχε· τ . [  
ἀεὶ β . [ . . ]  
οιτην[ . . . ]  
τυχεῖ[ν . ]  
30 καὶ γὰρ ]

Supplementa E.G.T. exceptis 2 φάτιν B. Snell 13 μητρόθεν, 14 γ' ἄν εἶμεν E.W. Handley  
15 γ[ἄρ] multi 21 τό[δε] M. L. West, B. Snell 25 δαίμ[ον'] ἄλλον [ frustulo addito A. Hurst

Fragm. D	Fragm. F	
και[ . . . ]μ[ . . ]νορ . [		
οπουγαρωδεχ[		
πεποιθενακ[ . . ] . [		
θυμονκαθημ[ . . . ]χθ[	]αν	
5 εγωδεμοιρων . ν . . [	] . ι	
... ουτωγεγραμμα[ . ]ων[	] .	
αρωγονευρωκ . τιδ[	] .	
φρουρημ[ . . ] <sup>σα[ ]</sup> υμ . ουτη[	]υ	
παυλαντιν'ηξεινπδ	] .	
10 αλλ'εΐα· μηλωνεξοχ[	]νιδων	
δωρημαθνητωνουκ[	]αφει·	
φυγηνδεμοχθων[ ]ων[	] . . ε	
παιδωνγαροιμαιπ . [	]ν	
ηρα <sup>λ</sup> κ <sup>ω</sup> δαιμονειχρητην[ <sup>ρ</sup>	]όνων	
15 ταξινμεολυμπ[ . ]υ[	] .	
ατλ <sup>α</sup> ουτωπατριωνελπ[	] . .	
νευωνεπατήνημαλ[	]για	εην οαλα τ[ ] η[ ]δριαν
ωδεινατολμων . δ . . [	]ν	ο τανυν ο
ξεν <sup>κακ</sup> ωντ'εποπτηνου[	]τοδε	-οατλας α[ ο υπερθωμ[
20 παλαιονεξδϋτηνδεκ . [	]ραι·	[ ] .
αλλ'ειτόδ'ηραιτερπνο[	]ριν	
παρουθενουτωταμα[		Fragm. E
... ]νοδ'ημινλ[ . ]πρ[	] .	ο φερε
25 ... ]ολμανεργω[ . ] . . [	]ου	ο μνημην
... ]δεκαμνων . υπυ[	] .	τ . [
... ]μηι . παρεργοντο . [	] .	
... ]υτα· ερημοιδ[	] .	
... ]νδ'αρωγογτο . . [	] .	
30 . . ]νουδικαιών <sup>σοσ</sup> . . [		π ]παργειαν

ii 1 κα ., upright (iota likely, ν just possible, not κ); ορ . [, low curve facing upwards 5 ν . ν ., perhaps another ν after second ν 6 There are traces of ink (3 letters?) in the left margin 7 και acceptable 8 An uncertainly read correction above the two letters missing between μ and υ 12 Fragment F ] . ε, vertical before ε, ? π 13 π . [, low ink 14 ]για uncertain; [γα, even ]για possible 18 ν . δ . . [, one broad, or 2 narrow letters between ν and δ 20 Fragment F, high trace linking to top of ο suggests τοδε 23 θ above δ of οὔθεν, as if for original οὔθεν? 25 ] . . [, upright and trace of high horizontal, then first part of ω? 30 After ων, left-facing curve, ω or ο, then high ink





Papyrus Bodmer XXVIII, left-hand side, original size



ΕΤΤΑΥ  
 ΚΑΙ  
 ΟΤΤΟΥΓΑΡ...  
 ΤΤΕΠΟΙΘΕΝΑ...  
 ΟΥΜΟΝΚΑ...  
 ΕΓΩΔΕ...  
 ΕΥΤΩΓΕΓΡΑ...  
 ΧΡΩΓΟΝ...  
 ΦΡΟΥΡΗ...  
 ΠΑΥΛΑΝΤ...  
 ΑΛΛΕΙΧ...  
 ΔΩΡΗ...  
 ΟΥΤΗΜ...  
 ΠΑΙΔΩΝ...  
 ΗΡΑΚ...  
 ΩΔΑΙ...  
 ΑΤΑ...  
 ΕΜΗΝ...  
 ΤΑ...  
 ΟΥΤΩΠ...  
 ΝΟΥ...  
 Σ...  
 ΠΑΛΛΙ...  
 ΑΛΛΕΙ...  
 ΠΡΟΥ...  
 ΜΙΑ...  
 ΔΕΚΑ...  
 ΙΗ...  
 ΧΑΡΗ...  
 ΜΑΡ...  
 ΙΟΥΔ...

ΚΑΙ  
 ΑΦ...  
 ΚΩΝ  
 ΑΡΙΑΝ  
 ΟΥ...  
 ΟΥ...

Papyrus Bodmer XXVIII, right-hand side, original size

*Translation Col. i 1–25*

- (Atlas) . . . of labours; to a second ruin . . .
- (Heracles) Then are you not ashamed of nullifying your [declaration] on oath, and . . . the old . . . of the deathless gods?
- (Atlas) I swore to [bring here the basket] of apples. Here it is, take it. Nothing else did my oaths affirm. Nor [will I take up again . . .] this heavy burden on my back . . .
- (Heracles) I have been tricked outright. In all other cases you cheated by a nobleman's trick, now it is to a different [cast] of evils that you will come. I call on Themis that lives in the sky to witness that finding Atlas unjust towards Heracles, even though his lineage is from the deathless ones, I will prosecute him; yes, even though on my mother's side I am mortal, we shall turn out worthy of Zeus as our progenitor.
- (Atlas) Others may shrink, not I. My mother Earth boasts that she bore me foremost in strength of the Titans and brother of Cronus. With him I once held the kingdom of Olympus on high.
- (Heracles) Justice that has a course as assessor of the Gods takes a sharp look, even though she is far away. This is the course she will follow: or else it would have been fruitless if I had already put down the passion generated by other tyrants, and the ambitions of the earth-born at Phlegra – and if I were not to prosecute a man who laughs at me in scorn . . .

*Commentary*

**Col. i 1** The alternation of speakers is reckoned back from the certain evidence provided by vv. 10–14.

ἄτην recurs ii 17. The marginal note μ' ἐπ' αὐτ(ην) is probably intended as a correction of it.

**2** εἴτ' οὐκ ἐπαιδῆι; the phrase is Sophoclean, Ant. 510 σὺ δ' οὐκ ἐπαιδῆι ... εἰ

Assuming ορ.[ to be part of ὄρκ[ια, the supralinear corrections are no doubt intended to remove a sigma: ἐπὶ would require ὄρκίοις. The fact that the scribe wrote π, not φ suggests inattention, and possible substitution by him of a more familiar preposition.

[φάτιν], e.g. B. Snell.

**3** Supplement with a participle (e.g. φθείρων) or noun/epithet with ἀφθίτων followed by e.g. νόμον. ἄφθιτος (cf. 12 below) is not a common adjective/noun in Aeschylus, Sophocles or Euripides, and is not applied by them to the Olympians, but rather to heroes (A. fr. 99, 12 Rhadamanthys) or beasts, the horses of Achilles ἐξ ἀφθίτων ἄφθιτοι E. Rhes. 185.

**4** μήλων must depend on a collective noun, masc. as τόνδε l. 5 shows: e.g.

δεῦρ[ο φορμὸν αὖ φέρειν (? κρανεῖν) (φορμὸν, E. W. Handley). The apples are the apples of the Hesperides (on which see the note of J. G. Frazer, Apollodorus [Loeb ed. I pp. 220–222]). It is not clear where our author placed the gardens of the Hesperides. In the famous Olympia metope (p. 15 below) Atlas carries the apples loose in his hands.

5 Restore at end e.g. οὐ[πόθ' οἱ γ' ἔμοι or οὐ[δὲν οὐτ' ἔμοι (E. W. Handley).

6 διεῖπαν: for διεῖπον cf. S. Tr. 22, OT 854 alibi. The first aorist form occurs at E. Cycl. 101 προσεῖπα, from which R. Kassel (Maia 25, 1973, 101) has recently emended it away, and in Theodectas F 6, 8 (εἶφ', 1st person).

The sense of the lines is clear, 'I am unwilling' τόνδ[ε βούλομαι] or 'I have refused' τόνδ' [ἔδεξάμην] (E. W. Handley) 'to [place] this heavy burden on my back [once more]'. In l. 7 the trace visible after μόχθον looks like the foot of υ and therefore excludes [ἀναλαβεῖν πάλιν] (B. M. W. Knox), while the space is too long for any form of [α]ῦ.

8 διηπάτημα: the word is not found in tragedy, but cf. Plato, Laws 738e and other references to prose use in LSJ. For postponement of δέ in τᾶλλα δέ see Denniston, Greek Particles 187–8.

τᾶλλα ... ἐπ' ἄλλην. Normally different cases of ἄλλος are used in idiomatic distributive juxtaposition. Here both examples are in the accusative, and the article τᾶλλα complicates the artificiality. I have not therefore translated 'It is one thing to cheat ... another to come, as you will, to ...'. The closest parallel (not very close) to the present artificial juxtaposition is perhaps E. Heracles 726 τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἴσως | ἄλλω μελήσει.

εὐγενεῖ δόλω: paradox, almost *adunaton*, particularly effective with κλέπτων. εὐγενής is normally used of persons and animals rather than abstractions (but cf. S. Phil. 874 εὐγενής γὰρ ἢ φύσις κᾶξ εὐγενῶν). I can think of no Aeschylean parallels for such a collocation as this. The phrase is similar to that in E. I.A. 1595 (if that verse is Euripidean) ὡς μὴ μιάνη βωμὸν εὐγενεῖ φόνω. One is reminded of what is commonly called Plato's 'noble lie'; this phrase is linguistically more audacious. Plato (Rep. 414b) does not couple γενναῖον with ψεῦδος but writes γενναῖόν τι ἐν ψευδόμενος. The whole phrase picks up the discussion, as old as Pindar fr. 169 Snell (Plat. Gorg. 484 + P. Oxy. xxvi 2450) on the justice of Heracles carrying off the cattle of Geryon. κλέπτων here, no doubt, refers to the golden apples of the Hesperides. With ἴξηι the blame is put on Atlas. But what were his other thefts?

There is now a huge literature on Pindar fr. 169 Sn., of which I quote only M. Ostwald, Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil. 69 (1965) 109–138; H. Lloyd-Jones, Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil. 76 (1972) 45–56.

9 For κλέπτω 'cheat' E. W. Handley refers me to Jebb's note on S. Ai. 188f.

ἴξηι: the marginal note (ο ἄξω or τ]άξω or the like) appears to contain a correction to this word. A first person indicative future signifies that Heracles, as subject of κλέπτων, takes responsibility for the trickery in this and all his other



exploits, and should perhaps be adopted in the text. The juxtaposition of this admission and the invocation to Themis in the following verses are skilfully managed by our author. We must further remember that Heracles stands with the sky containing Themis poised on his shoulders.

After ἴξι a feminine noun. Taking the traces to represent β, I tentatively propose β[ολήν.

**10** μαρτύρομαι, three times with object clause introduced by ὡς in Euripides, once and without object clause in Sophocles, once (possibly twice) in Aeschylus with infinitive.

**11** ὀθούνεχ': introduces an indirect statement 9 times in Sophocles (see Ellendt, *Lexicon Sophocl.* s.v.); similarly twice in Euripides (after σαφ' οἶδα or the like), but not as introductory particle in Aeschylus.

εὐρών: οὐ δίκαιον presumably stands for ἀδικοῦντα or ἀδικήσαντα.

There is a disconcerting change from invocatory first person μαρτύρομαι to third person participle (apparently) and back to first person, menace μέτειμι. Is it legal phraseology, as if in an indictment Ἄτλας ἀδικεῖ? Cf. the parodied indictment of Socrates in Plato *Ap.* 19b Σωκράτης ἀδικεῖ καὶ περιεργάζεται κτλ. μέτειμι (l. 13) however, is not a technical legal term for 'prosecute' (as J. H. Kells reminds me), good tragic word though it is (e.g. *A. Ch.* 273).

**13** καὶ εἰ presumably scriptio plena for the crasis κεῖ. Inattentiveness to this point is no doubt responsible for the intrusive γάρ between καὶ and εἰ in 13, metrically objectionable, but easily corrected.

μητρό[θεν, E. W. Handley.

**14** Δίωv: Δῖος = 'of Zeus', used by all three classic tragedians, most often by Aeschylus, *Suppl.* and *Prom.*

γ' ἄ[v] εἶμεν, E. W. Handley. For plural 'fathers' cf. *E. Ion* 735 (paedagogus to Creusa) ὃ θύγατερ, ἀξί' ἀξίων γεννητόρων | ἦθη φυλάσσεις (the reference is also due to E. W. Handley). The 'softening, urbane touch' (Kühner-Gerth II 417) applied by optative with ἄv in apodosis following εἰ with indicative consorts oddly with the pluralis maiestatis and the plural genitive of origin. It would be hard to beat this line for bombast and artificiality. But to a composer abstaining from sigma Διός, ἐσμέν, ἐκφύς, γεννητόρος are all banned.

Boasting of one's pedigree is a common element in the verbal interchanges of challenging champions. Cf. the exchanges between Theseus and Minos in *Bacchylides xvii* 29ff. 57ff.

**15** Either γε or τό may be restored (cf. Kühner-Gerth II 373 for examples of infinitive with and without article in this construction). With either, the sentence is asyndetic. γε emphasizes the contrast Atlas draws between himself and others.

Atlas is not to be frightened by Heracles' boasting. In any case his pedigree goes back two generations further than Heracles's. For this pedigree our author adopts the later account (e.g. in *Diod.* iii 60) that Atlas is son of Ouranos and

Ge, not that of Hesiod Theog. 507 (Iapetos and Clymene). This pedigree is in virtual agreement with that of Aeschylus, Prometheus: The Titans are Οὐρανοῦ καὶ χθονὸς τέκνα (205); Atlas is brother of Prometheus (347ff.); Prometheus himself is son of τῆς ὀρθοβούλου Θέμιδος (18, cf. 874), but states of himself (210–11)

ἔμοι δὲ μήτηρ οὐχ ἄπαξ μόνον Θέμις  
καὶ Γαῖα, πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφή μία.

Atlas is termed δαίμων by Heracles (ii 14) just as Prometheus is θεός in Aeschylus, 29. There were many other pedigrees current in antiquity, cf. Roscher, Lexikon d. gr. u. röm. Mythologie s.v. Atlas 707–8.

17 ᾗ: with κοινήν l. 18. εἰχομῖ may be supplemented as pluralis maiestatis εἰχο[μεν], or less probably as εἰχό[μην]. I have no suggestion about the relevance of marginal comment ἵγερμην. If τ is read for γ, we are no further forward. (-ίερμην, -εθερμην are the only verbal forms possible in -ερμην, so that it seems to indicate a feminine accusative + γ'(τ')ἐμήν).

18 ἄνω: possibly 'of old', instead of 'above'. The meaning is not in the tragedians, but (to judge from LSJ) is common in 4th century prose: Plato Tht. 175b, Critias 110b and Dem. 18, 310. The division of the throne between Atlas and Cronus is narrated by Diodorus iii 60.1 and that Atlas was once a great king is commonplace in Latin literature (e.g. Ovid Metam. 4, 631ff.). Aeschylus, Prom. 148, like Hesiod (Erga 110–11, Theog. 112–13) had already placed Zeus's predecessors on Olympus.

19 Heracles counters with a reminder that Justice has sharp eyes. For θεῶν monosyllable cf. e.g. E. Cycl. 624, Androm. 575 (πρὸς θεῶν) and for παρεδρον Eur. Hec. 616. The verse as it stands is almost impossible to translate, because of the application of πάρεδρος as adjective to δρόμον. πάρεδρος offers no difficulty. A metaphor from government (at Athens each archon proper on appointment chose 2 πάρεδροι as assessors, Aristot. Ath. Pol. 56, 1) is applied to the gods, and literature and cult readily adopt the phrase (πάρεδρος, ξύνεδρος, ξύνθακος, σύνναος, etc.). Δίκη is regularly the πάρεδρος of Zeus: Hes. Erga 259; Aeschylus P. Oxy. xx 2256, 10 ἴξω Διὸς θρόνοισιν [ώρα]ισμένη (ώραῖσιν-Kakridis); Soph. O.C. 1389 (cf. Ant. 451); Orphic Hymn 62; Arrian iv 9, 7; Plut. Alex. 52; Plut. Mor. p. 781b (cf. Roscher s.v. Paredros). All would be well if δρόμον could mean a 'runner', like ἡμεροδρόμον in Hdt. ix 12 (the form of the word is guaranteed by Diod. xv 82), but the normal word for such is δρομεύς and the proposed extension of meaning unacceptable. Essentially δρόμος means either a 'run' (e.g. a 'lap' in a race) or the ground run over (hence by extension e.g. the avenue leading to a temple). Several scholars have proposed the easy emendation θρόνον, to be rejected because of its banality. M. L. West calls attention to the *figura etymologica* illustrated by δρόμον in Plato, Crat. 397a ἄτε οὖν αὐτὰ ὀρῶντες πάντα ἀεὶ ἰόντα δρόμῳ καὶ θέοντα, ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς φύσεως τῆς τοῦ θεῖν θεοῦς αὐτοῦς ἐπονομάσαι, and argues from the usage that

the play is Hellenistic (cf. n. 17 below). At the Hellenic Center, Washington, attention was also called to the ὁδός of which Dike speaks in Parmenides fr. 1, 24–26

χαῖρ' ἐπεὶ οὔτι σε μοῖρα κακὴ προὔπεμπε νέεσθαι  
 τήνδ' ὁδόν (ἧ γὰρ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐκτὸς πάτου ἐστίν),  
 ἀλλὰ Θέμις τε δίκη τε.

20 A. C. Pearson on Soph. fr. 12 collects passages on the eye of Justice.

21 Text and restoration become less certain from here onwards. In l. 23 Heracles seems to be alluding to his past exploits as reason why he will succeed now, a not uncommon gambit in drama. But should the articulation in 21 be πράξαι μὲν (of Dike) or πράξαιμεν (pluralis maiestatis of Heracles again)? I have adopted τό[δε] (scriptio plena το[δε]αν) from B. Snell and M. L. West with some hesitation, since it is not well-defined by what follows. ἦ so accented presumably points to ἦ, but the accent is false if either ποτ' or περ follow (either is acceptable palaeographically). Neither is suitable, and ἦπερ is restricted to epic and Ionic prose (Denniston, *Greek Particles* 487; Kühner-Gerth II 302 n.). For ἦπερ adscript iota would be expected, ἦ γὰρ involves emendation. ἀργο[ suggests ἀργό[ν] εἰ (which I prefer to ἀργό[ν] ἦν, ἀργό[ν] ἄν, or even Ἄργό[θεν]). For ἀργόν 'useless' the parallels are from prose rather than verse, e.g. Dem. 27, 7 (ἀργυρία) τὰ τ' ἐνεργὰ καὶ ὄσ' ἦν ἀργά. An alternative articulation in l. 22 is ]να π[ο]λλῶν – e.g. [ἀλ]γ[ι]νὰ (iotacistic) π[ο]λλῶν ... ὀρμωμέ[να]. For [καθε]ιλ[ον] l. 24 cf. P. Oxy. xxxi 2452 fr. 2, 11 (Theseus in order to meet a coming ordeal recounts his past victories).

22 κοίρανοι: such as Eurytus of Oechalia.

23 Phlegra, the scene of the Gigantomachy. For Φλῆγρα cf. A. Eum. 295.

24 ἐγγελῶντ' ἐ[μοί]: a similar collocation in E. Med. 1355, cf. Rhés. 815 for the personal dative. In Sophocles with κατὰ and genitive (O.C. 1339) or with impersonal dative (El. 277).

25 If a new clause begins at εἶτα, then a satisfactory restoration at the beginning could be [εἰ μὴ μετέ]λθοιμ', εἰ looking to ἀργό[ν]. But the articulation of this line is hazardous. ]αλλον[ is on a separate fragment (cf. introduction p. 3 above) and that some phrase like εἶτα δαίμ[ον]' ἄλλον [αὔ] | κρα[τεῖν ἀ]ήρ (or πατ[ήρ] λέλογχε stood here (a first suggestion of A. Hurst) is far from assured. Specific alternatives, which I mention simply to show their possibility, are δαῖμον (vocative), ἄλλο ν[ῦν] κρα[τῆμ' ἀν]ήρ. The beginnings of vv. 26–29 are also on a detached fragment, which did not certainly stand here. Furthermore, if col. ii is correctly placed to follow col. i without a break, there must be a change of speaker at some point between i 20 (25–6?) and ii 14, which is marked as spoken by Heracles after a paragraphus.

There are other uncertainties: 27, whatever its articulation (e.g. ἔχων εὐν[ήν, cf. A. Agam. 12–13. The δέ preceding looks as if it were postponed. Preceded by βε[βαι]οί?), offers a metrical problem; 28 and 29 have been consi-



derably altered by supralinear correction. I therefore offer no restoration. 28 might begin with a reference to Οἴτην (E. W. Handley).

**Col. ii** Restorations linking Fragments D and F are suggested below for vv. 10, 16, 17, 22. None are cogent, but that at 10 is attractive, and if accepted defines the space between the fragments at that point as 5 letters. Where so much is uncertain I have preferred to indicate possibilities rather than supplement with private verses.

**1–13** Presumably Atlas (note 13 below) alone could mouth such sentiments as survive. The rebellious spirit of the Titan is not dead. A rough paraphrase of the sense might be: ‘And now to raise me upright ... where/as/now [trouble looms] ... he trusts in his courage ... his spirit, idly sitting (?) ... Thus have I inscribed myself ... as of the part (Fates?) ... [so that I may] find a helper ... bulwark (of? against?) Olympus ... [a hope] that some relief would come to me ... But there now! The most excellent gift of apples, made by mortal (?) maidens, won’t you [take them?] Flight from labours, however [is not to be expected] ... for from children, as I suppose [no help can come].’

1 καὶ [νῦν] (or και[νόν]) μεῖνονορθ[οῦν] will suit the spacing.

2 ὅπου γὰρ ὄδ’ ἔχ[ει], ὄδε χ[ρή] (or χρῆμα), ὄδ’ ἐχ[θρ]- etc.

3 πέποιθεν ἀλκ[ῆ]ι

4 θυμὸν καθήμ[εθ’? Not καθῆ, for which adscript iota would be expected. Followed by ἄχθ[ος], ἐχθ[ρός] etc.?

**5–6** If only one letter is lost between  $\mu\alpha$  and  $\omega$ , either γραμμά[τ]ων or γέγραμ[μ]α[ι]. In the latter case, there is uncertainty whether α[ι] is scriptio plena for γεγραμ[μ]ων or the articulation should be e.g. γέγραμ[μ] α[ι]ῶνα or γέγραμ[μ] ἀ[φ’] ὄν. In neither is the elision good tragic practice (but see P. Maas – H. Lloyd-Jones, *Greek Metre* 74), but greater licence might be expected in a satyr play. M. L. West suggests the connection of μοιρῶν (Μοιρῶν?) γέγραμ[μ]α[ι], in the idiom of S. O.T. 411 οὐ Κρέοντος προστάτου γεγράψομαι.

7 ἀρωγός: twice in Euripides, frequent in Aeschylus and Sophocles.

8 Ὀλύμπου is an acceptable reading. The supralinear corrections may have been intended to clarify a mistaken omission due to intended scriptio plena φρουρημ[α] Ολ]υμπού, for which there would not have been room.

9 παῦλα: S. Tr. 1255, O.C. 88, Ph. 1329, not Aeschylus or Euripides. Not uncommon in 4th century prose.

10 εἶα: for the aspiration cf. Soph. Ichn. 87 ἀγ’ εἶα, 168 ἀλλ’ εἶ’ and Pearson’s note, Herodian I 495, 8 Lentz.

Supplement e.g. ἀλλ’ εἶα· μήλων ἔξοχ[ον νεα]νίδων

δώρημ’ ἀθνήτων οὐκ [ἀπάξετ’ . . . ]άφει;

For the termination ]άφει of verse 11 I have found no supplement (for οὐ plus future after εἶα in sense of imperative cf. E. I.T. 1423, Hel. 1597).

ἔξοχος: A. Prom. 459, Agam. 1622 (superlative); S. Tereus fr. 518; E.

Suppl. 889 (superlative). I do not find the form ἄθνητος anywhere, but the alternative articulation δώρημα θνητῶν implies that the custodians of the golden apples (the Hesperids) were no more than mortal. The ‘gift’ of the apples to Atlas by the Hesperids (the fact stands whatever the restoration) is in line with Apollodorus’ narrative, Bibl. II 5, 11 Ἄτλας δὲ δρεψάμενος παρ’ Ἑσπερίδων τρία μῆλα (δεξάμενος cf. Frazer, from Pherecydes FGrHist F 17). As Atlas’ remark is sarcastic, its content need not be taken as historical truth.

12 δέ suggests a prohibition, ‘Don’t expect flight’.

13 παίδων: a general gnomic reference, Papposilenus’ children i.e. the satyrs dancing on stage, Atlas’ children (for which see Roscher), the Heraclids?

14 ὦ δαῖμον, presumably to Atlas. The *nota personae* shows Heracles is the speaker, as is Atlas of vv. 16–17. Paragraphi show the dialogue now proceeds in pairs of verses, perhaps even after l. 22 where the margin fails.

Heracles presumably makes a new threat – what he will do when he takes up (as he is to) his station in Olympus.

16 ἐλπ[ίδων, then ἁμαρτάνων? But τε after νεύων would then be expected.

17 μάλλ[λον

I can make nothing of the marginal note, which is clearly read (last line ἦ [ύ]δριαν).

18 e.g. ὦδε χ[ρή after τολμῶν, the whole a question – is that how you scorn ...? Marginal τανῦν will be a variant.

19 κακῶν seems a shabby alternative to ξένων. ἐπόπτης, only in Aeschylus (a spectator who comes to gloat).

20 The original reading implies μὴ κάμνε μοχθῶν (participle). From the correction and the marginal obelos periestigmenos followed by ὁ Ἄτλας ἄν(τι τοῦ) (?; see note 9a above) ὑπερθῶμ[εν (or -μαι), one might infer a text such as

μὴ κάμνε· μόχθον κα[ινὸν ἀντιθοῦ] τόδε  
παλαῖον, ἐξ οὗ κ.τ.λ.

‘Don’t weary. Substitute another labour. That’s an ancient habit, arising from ...’ τήν or τήνδε, to judge from Heracles’ reply, is a reference to Hera. Since the golden apples were Earth’s wedding-presents to Hera, the allusion has considerable point.

22–23 e.g. ἀλλ’ εἰ τόδ’ Ἥραι τερπνό[ν, ἢ φθόνου χ]άριν  
παρ’ οὐδὲν οὕτω τὰμὰ [ποιεῖται κακά]

24 [ἐκεῖ]νο δ’ ἡμῖν λ[υ]πρ[όν]. The speaker may be Atlas. I should guess that ἐκεῖνο is not in explicit contrast to τόδε. Apollodorus makes Atlas offer to carry the apples to Argos. Marginal ε[παργειαν] l. 30 suggests this detail was taken up. I cannot account for the π superscript over its final ν.

25 ... τ]όλμαν ἔργω[ν] τω[

26 e.g. κάμνων οὐ πύ[θοιο

The subject-matter of these two columns is the scene between Heracles and Atlas represented in the famous metope from Olympia (see most recently B.

Ashmole, N. Yalouris, A. Franz, *Olympia: the Sculptures of the Temple of Zeus*, London 1967, pp. 28. 183–184 – where reference is made to a vase-painting of the scene on an Athenian lekythos of about 480 B.C. – and plates 186–193), but (as in the vase) Athena is not present, and Heracles has no cushion at the back of his neck. Apollodorus' *Library* II 5, 11 (J. G. Frazer, *Loeb* I p. 230–1) offers a convenient prose narrative (supplemented from the scholia on Ap. Rhod. 4, 1396, which quote Pherecydes – FG<sub>GrHist</sub> F 16 – as authority):

'Now Prometheus had told Heracles not to go himself after the apples but to send Atlas, first relieving him of the burden of the sphere; so when he was come to Atlas in the land of the Hyperboreans, he took the advice and relieved Atlas. But when Atlas had received three apples from the Hesperides, he came to Heracles, and not wishing to support the sphere (he said that he would himself carry the apples to Eurystheus, and bade Heracles hold up the sky in his stead ...'

On the stage, then, Heracles stands holding up the sky; Atlas refuses to take it back, and is not to be intimidated by the blustering of Heracles. Heracles, after all, is impotent as he bears his burden. The papyrus assumes that it was Atlas' normal task to hold up the sky; and reference (i 17–18) to the lost kingdom shared with Cronus (and *a fortiori* to the Gigantomachy) shows that this task has been imposed on him as punishment for leading the Titans against Zeus (the fragmentary verses 1–13 of col. ii suggest that the thought of relief or rebellion is still present in Atlas' thoughts).

What genre of drama is involved? Clearly the language is too ponderous for it to be comedy. Though the text itself furnishes no firm indication<sup>13</sup>, there can be little doubt that it was a satyr-play. The way out of the impasse in the story, though not recounted in our columns, was no doubt that told by Pherecydes (Apollodorus l.c.):

'Heracles promised [to hold up the sky], but succeeded by craft in putting it on Atlas instead. For at the advice of Prometheus he begged Atlas to hold up the sky till he should) put a pad on his head. When Atlas heard that, he laid the apples down on the ground and took the sphere from Heracles. And so Heracles picked up the apples and departed.'

Such a ruse would be inconsistent with the dignity of tragedy, but compatible with the *σπουδαιογέλοιο*ν of satyr-drama (on the nature of which see most recently L. E. Rossi, *Il dramma satiresco Attico* (*Dialoghi di Archeologia* 6, 1972, 248ff.). The scene itself is not set out as a tragic conflict. The language, it is true, is 'tragic'. It is the 'serious' element, and its pomposity and artificiality is in

13 The only possible foothold is *παίδων* ii 13. At the London seminar it was suggested that satyrs might be dancing with Heracles' bow and club (as in the Moretti crater), and that ii 1–13 might be spoken by Silenus. It is hard to reconcile such phrases as *ἀλκῆ πέποιθεν, μοιρῶν ... γέγραμμαι, ἀρωγὸν εὐρῶ* with a speech of Silenus; or (as Dr. Rea has pointed out) to suppose that Heracles could address Silenus as *ὦ δαίμον* (ii 14; but see note ad loc.).

piquant contrast to the Heracles we see on the stage, legs straddled to support the sky, and powerless to act against Atlas' taunts.

Moreover, Heracles holding up the sky is a well-known theme of satyr-plays. It is illustrated in the vases. An Apulian bell-crater in Milan has it (A. D. Trendall, T. B. L. Webster, *Illustrations of Greek Drama*, fig. II, 13 p. 38):

'Heracles is shown in the centre of the picture, standing on rocky ground, his lion-skin knotted in front of his chest and hanging down his back, with both hands upraised to support his globe. While he is thus occupied two satyrs have crept up, one has taken his bow and quiver, and the other his club; the latter dances off with a mocking gesture of farewell to Heracles, whose anguish at being unable to prevent the theft of his equipment is clearly expressed in his face.

'The Scene is probably taken from a lost satyr-play, perhaps entitled *Atlas*. The vase is of particular interest, since the other side (IV 18) shows a scene from a *phlyax*-play.'

The date assigned to this vase (the 'Moretti crater') by Trendall and Webster is 380 B.C. at the latest. Heracles holding up the sky appears in an earlier vase. A neck amphora in the British Museum (F 148; A. D. Trendall, *Antike Kunst* 5, 1962, 55 and n. 2 plus Tafel 17, 4; F. Brommer, *JdI* 57, 1942, 119 n. 2) dated by Trendall to the last third of the 5th century shows 'Heracles bearing the ball of the heavens; he is bowed down under its weight, his legs placed wide apart. At the right is a girl in a tall cap (like a baker's) gesturing downwards. Heaven is painted with moon, planet and star ... On the back is Atlas and a Hesperid at a serpent-guarded tree'. Since there are no satyrs in the picture and Heracles seems to wear no mask, this vase does not necessarily show a satyr-play. It is of the so-called 'Owl-Pillar' group, semi-barbarous Campanian imitations of Attic red-figure, especially Nolan amphorae, of the later 5th century B.C. (A. D. Trendall, *The Red-Figure Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily I*, Oxford 1967, 667, where references are given to earlier literature, especially J. D. Beazley, *Greek Vases in Poland* 77, the first identification of the style). The scene occurs also on the inside of a bronze cover in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, dated to the 5th century (Gisela Richter, *Greek, Roman and Etruscan Bronzes in the Metropolitan Museum, New York* 1915, no. 760 p. 261): 'Herakles has placed his club and quiver on the ground, and is on the point of taking the weight of heaven from Atlas. He is beardless and nude, except for the lion's skin swung over his left arm. Atlas is represented as a bearded old man with long bushy hair. He wears high-laced boots with flaps at the top (endromides) and a short tunic (exomis)'. It is to be noted that heaven is here represented (as on the Attic lekythos of 480 B.C.) as a beam, not a sphere<sup>14</sup>. Of a later

<sup>14</sup> I should like to put on record that I have both learned from and been entertained by the paper of H. Wischermann, *Mazarin als Archimedes*, *Schweizer Münzblätter* Heft 93 (February 1974) 12ff. to which my attention was called by Professor Denis van Berchem.



date is the well-known 'Archemorus crater' from Ruvo now in the Naples Museum (Heydeman 3255) in which the gardens of the Hesperides are depicted and the central place is occupied by Heracles holding up the great globe of the heavens<sup>14a</sup>.

To confirm the interpretation of the Moretti crater a didascalical inscription found in the Athenian agora offers the title Atlas (in a very probably restoration by B. D. Meritt, its first editor) for a satyr-play<sup>15</sup>. The monument records victories won by dramatic actors in the archonship of Alcibiades, 255/4 B.C. according to Meritt, *The Athenian Year* 234, and lists the plays concerned. After the Old Comedy come 'Old satyr-plays'. The relevant section runs:

12 [σατύροι]ς παλαιοῖς  
 [ . . . . . ] ος ενικ' Ἑρμῆ [author, ? Ἄστυ(δάμαντος)  
 [ . . . . . ] δευ' Ἄτλαν[τ

This section is followed by 'Old Tragedy'. Since 'Old comedy' includes plays by Diphilus and Menander, the word 'Old' presumably means a 'revival', not a play specially written for this festival. The 'Hermes' of l. 13 is commonly taken to be that of Astydamos. For Ἄτλαν[τι in l. 14 Körte has pointed out that Ἄτλαν[τίδες is a theoretical possibility; female choruses in satyr-plays are apparently not entirely to be ruled out (Aeschylus' *Τροφοί* may be one such). But 'Atlas' is a much more likely supplement in itself. In this competition a satyr-play 'Atlas' is likely to be one that had achieved a certain classic status. Was it the one illustrated in the Moretti crater? Was it the one contained in our papyrus?

Whether this identification should be made depends, however, on the value to be set on the absence of sigmas from our play, a feature to which we must now turn. There is no doubt that sigma is deliberately avoided. Abstention from it means that in the case of nouns, adjectives, pronouns, participles the writer must avoid all accusatives plural, the nominative singular of the second declension and very often of the third, the genitive singular and dative plural of the third; while among verbal forms, sigmatic futures and aorists, many second person singular and third person plural forms and almost all middle and passive

14a My colleague A. W. Johnston has kindly called to my attention a much earlier representation, but one that has no obvious connection with the drama. On newly found sherds of the neck of a volute crater assigned to the Cleophrades Painter, c. 490 B.C., A. Greifenhagen identifies Atlas in a figure whose head is lost. This figure, naked but clearly carrying a heavy weight, stands by a tree from the boughs of which hangs down the many-headed snake that guards its golden apples, a snake that is being engaged by Heracles. This is the version of the story, known also in literature (Eur. *Hippol.* 741ff.), according to which Heracles himself collected the golden apples. Atlas is present to indicate that the island is at the end of the world (sherds in private possession in Geneva plus Louvre G 166; A. Greifenhagen, *SBHeidelb. Akad., phil.-hist. Kl.* 1972, 4. Abh., 35ff. and plate 25).

15 *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 116; A. Körte, *Hermes* 73 (1938) 123; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*<sup>2</sup> revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis (1968); B. Snell, *TrGF I* pp. 30-31, D I D A 4a.

infinitives are forbidden; so are such common prepositions as εἰς, πρὸς and conjunctions such as ὅπως. To introduce names such as Ἡρακλῆς, Ἄτλας will offer a challenge. A cursory examination of dramatic trimeters shows that sigma often occurs up to three or four times in a single trimeter; a random test on 100 verses in Aeschylus' 'Septem' offered only 8 verses without sigma, only 2 of which were consecutive. My colleague Professor George Goold, who investigated the absence of sigma with greater thoroughness, tells me that 92% of iambic trimeters can be expected to contain at least one sigma; that the longest stretch without them he found was 4 trimeters; and that in our piece, which has 11 consecutive complete trimeters in col. i and parts of 60 trimeters over all, the odds against sigma being absent by chance are  $10^{30}$ . Moreover, as already noted, it is the letter sigma that is avoided, not its sound, since 'double letters' ks = ξ are admitted (ιξηι i 9, αξιοι i 14). A decision to write lipogrammatically and avoid sigma means that the writer voluntarily accepts limitations in the choice of phrase, not to speak of distortions by the need to convey certain meanings. These limitations make metrical analysis and the comparison of phrase and vocabulary with that of known authors (the ordinary criteria employed) even less likely than usual to produce a firm result. In particular conviction will hardly result from the analysis of a single phrase – such as θεῶν δρόμον (which M. L. West assigns to the Hellenistic age), or my own observation that εὐγενεῖ δόλω κλέπτων is an unlikely collocation for Aeschylus. Such judgments are in part subjective, as indeed will be the answer we give as to whether any of the major dramatists are likely to have composed lipogrammatically. We can however be confident that the verses in their transmitted form are not by Euripides: their metrical monotony (no resolution, unvaried penthemimeral caesura) at least excludes that possibility.

On asigmatism itself three types of ancient testimony may prove helpful. The first concerns the undesirability or harshness in general of sibilants. Euripides was mocked by the comedians for his sigmas, e.g. by Plato Comicus (fr. 30 K.) ἔσφασα ἔκ τῶν σίγμα τῶν Εὐριπίδου, based on Eur. Med. 476–7

ἔσφασα σ' ὡς ἴσασιν Ἑλλήνων ὅσοι  
ταῦτόν συνεισέβησαν Ἀργῶν σκάφος.

(References to other parodies in D. L. Page's note ad loc.). Aristoxenus stated (Ath. XI 467a, fr. 87 Wehrli) οἱ μουσικοὶ τὸ σίγμα λέγειν παρητοῦντο διὰ τὸ σκληρόστομον εἶναι καὶ ἀνεπιτήδειον αὐλῶ; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, De comp. verb. 14, 80 p. 54 Us.-Rad. ἄχαρι δὲ καὶ ἀηδὲς τὸ σίγμα καὶ πλεονάσαν σφόδρα λυπεῖ· θηριώδους γὰρ καὶ ἀλόγου μᾶλλον ἢ λογικῆς ἐφάπτεσθαι δοκεῖ φωνῆς ὁ συριγμός.

Secondly, it is recorded that some authors avoided sigma altogether. Dion. Hal. l. c. εἰσὶ δ' οἱ καὶ ἀσίγμους ὄλας ᾠδὰς ἐποίουν. The only such poet actually named in the tradition is Lasus of Hermione, of c. 520 B.C. (Suda s.v., cf. testimonia in D. L. Page, Poetae Melici Graeci Lasus fr. 2). The tradition is transmit-



ted by three extremely confused passages of Athenaeus, a new attempt to sort out which has been made by G. A. Privitera in *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 6 (1964) 164ff. The confusion is increased by the question whether Pindar fr. 70b Sn. (in which P. Oxy. xiii 1604 supplements and corrects the book texts)

πρὶν μὲν ἔρπε σχοινοτένεια τ' αἰοιδὰ  
διθυράμβων

καὶ τὸ σὰν κίβδηλον ἀνθρώποισιν ἀπὸ στομάτων

was referring in τὸ σὰν κίβδηλον to the complete rejection of sigma from Lasus' poems or to an unobtrusive pronunciation of sibilants used by him<sup>16</sup>. We need not enter into the details of this controversy, for two points are clear: the first is that in attributing asigmatism to Lasus, subsequent critics were not dependent simply on the fragment of Pindar already quoted. Heraclides Ponticus (Ath. XIV 624 E–F, Page, *Poetae Melici* Gr. no. 702) quoted the first three verses of Lasus' Hymn to Demeter of Hermione, and elsewhere in Athenaeus (X 455c) is quoted as saying in the third book of his work on Music that it was ἄσιγμος. There is no mention of its authenticity being challenged, as was the case with the 'Dithyrambs', Page fr. 2 (on which see Privitera, *op. cit.* 160, stressing the phrase ἐν τοῖς Λάσου λεγομένοις Διθυράμβοις) and 'Centauris', Page fr. 3. The second point is that Athenaeus' principal references to asigmatism occur in a section on verbal gimmicks and riddles, and Clearchus is introduced because of his work *Περὶ γρίφων* (fr. 86 Wehrli). 'There are seven sorts of riddles ... one concerns letters ... ὁμοίως δὲ κἄν ἔχειν τι κελεύη τῶν γραμμάτων ἢ μὴ ἔχειν· καθάπερ οἱ ἄσιγμοι καλούμενοι τῶν γρίφων' – lipograms, in fact. After the riddles Athenaeus culls a number of items of gimmickry from the comedians and tragedians (Callias' alphabet tragedy; the description of the letters making up ΘΗΣΕΥΣ given by Euripides, Agathon and Theodectas; the chorus dancing the letters of the alphabet in Sophocles' *Amphiaraus*, etc.).

The last general point is this: my colleague Alan H. Griffiths has called my attention to two practitioners of such gimmickry of the imperial age. They rewrote Homer as lipograms. Nestor of Laranda under Septimius Severus, according to the *Suda* (s.v. cf. R. Keydell in *RE*) rewrote the *Iliad* lipogramatically: 'In A there are no alphas, in B no betas, etc.'. Triphiodorus (probably also in the 3rd century A.D., see J. R. Rea on P. Oxy. xli 2946) performed a similar operation on the *Odyssey* (*Suda*, *ibid.* and Eustathius in *proem. Odys.* p. 1379, 54). The fact that these two named practitioners of adaptation are of the 3rd

16 A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*<sup>2</sup> 23–24; C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* 195; G. Huxley, *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast 1975) 41 'The false *san*, which cannot be a true Greek *san*- or *sigma*-sound, calls to mind the *sh*-sound found in some Anatolian languages ... It may well be that Pindar has in mind here the outlandish vocabulary and speech of early practitioners of the dithyramb who came from Asia Minor to perform among the early Greeks'.

century A.D. need not mean that such gimmickry only began at that date. Theirs is a heroic virtuosity.

This survey defines our task. We should of course like to propose an author, or at least a date of writing for our drama. But we may ask as prior question whether it was (A) deliberately written by its author without sigmas, or (B) is a reworking without sigmas of an already existing play.

In favour of A we have seen that at least one ancient poem, Lasus' Hymn to Demeter, was written without sigmas in the 6th century B.C. Though no names of tragedies or satyr-plays so written can be quoted, the possibility may be accepted in principle that a tragedian of stature in the 5th century or early 4th century could have composed lipogramatically, especially in a satyr-play. This alternative has in its favour (as already emphasized) the character of the papyrus roll itself: monumental handwriting, luxurious lay-out, interlinear alteration and the apparatus of marginal variants. Prima facie these features in a roll of the 2nd century A.D. suggest a work by a valued author. Adoption of this alternative also would make it possible to identify our papyrus with the play illustrated in the Moretti crater. The vocabulary could easily be reconciled with a late 5th or early 4th century date. It contains one possible hapax – if ἄθνητος (ii 11) is accepted – and a number of words not uncommon in 4th century prose writers (διηπάτημαι, i 8; ? ἀργός = useless, i 21; παῦλα, ii 9). As between Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides distribution is about equal, with a slight preponderance of words mainly in Sophocles (οὐκ ἐπαιδῆι, i 2; ὀθούνεκα = ὄτι, i 11; παῦλα, ii 9).

Still perhaps famous<sup>17</sup>, though no longer identifiable with the play of the Moretti crater, might be a satyr-play by an Alexandrian. Lycophron is known to have written a 'Menedemus' (TrGF I 100, 2), Sositheus a 'Daphnis/Lityersis' (TrGF I 99), and the Suda reports that Callimachus too composed σατυρικά δράματα (not accepted by Snell, TrGF I).

The argument from the type of book involved has less weight when applied to later unknowns. It is, however, worth recording that poets of satyr-plays continue to be in action in inscriptions down to the end of the 2nd century of our era<sup>18</sup>.

If in spite of these weighty considerations I myself favour alternative B, it is because of the metrical monotony already mentioned (p. 19) coupled with the

17 Professor M. L. West (letter 16 v 74): 'A Hellenistic date is probable for this play. The strictness of metre, asigmatism, availability in the second century after Christ and the play on θεῶν δρόμον all seem best suited by that hypothesis'.

18 Cf. Wolf Aly, RE s.v. *Satyrspiel*; B. Snell, TrGF I pp. 33–37 D I D A 6–13. Four titles are mentioned in an inscription from Magnesia on the Maeander of the 2nd/1st century B.C. (Θύτης, *Ajax*, *Palamedes*, *Protesilaos*). The σατυρογράφος M. Aemilius Hymettus is mentioned in a dramatic inscription from Thespieae (I G VII 1773) as late as the 2nd century A.D.

presence of a few phrases of startling expressiveness which shine like gemstones imprisoned in duller rocks. The adapting lipogrammatist could retain or slightly adapt effective parts of his author if they did not contain the unwanted letter. Thus Sophocles' σὺ δ' οὐκ ἐπαιδῆι could be kept by substituting εἶτ' for σὺ δ'. Shamelessly rewritten and distorted though it will have been, the original from time to time may show through. In the commentary I have tried to show that the scenic presentation is amusing and that the rhetoric of the situation is skilfully developed – boasted parentage met by trumping boast, Heracles' appeal to Δίκη and to his past exploits: it is the language which in general (like the metre) lacks lustre. One of the brilliant expressive phrases is that εὐγενεῖ δόλω κλέπτων already discussed in the commentary. It would not disgrace Euripides or Sophocles in his latest period (it would admirably describe Odysseus' briefing of the young Neoptolemus before meeting Philoctetes); if I am reluctant to think Aeschylus author of such a paradox, I have already admitted that the feeling is a subjective one.

For thesis B it is not necessary to name a particular Euripidean or Sophoclean play – or a play by any other author. There are suitable titles, the content of which is unknown (the 'Heracles' of Sophocles, the 'Theristae' of Euripides, for instance). In any case, as Pearson concludes from the disproportion of tragedies to satyr-plays in the total of known titles (Fragments of Sophocles p. xxii), it seems clear that several satyr-plays of Sophocles were lost before the time of Aristophanes of Byzantium; and a similar observation has been made for Euripides by T. B. L. Webster (The Tragedies of Euripides p. 5), namely that for Euripides 'we have lost all trace of the satyr-plays for 12 productions'. The same point holds for Aeschylus too.

If what has been put forward is found convincing, the new text does not offer a masterpiece, but constitutes rather a curiosity of literature. One cannot but wonder whether other such 'rewritings' lurk among the dramatic adespota furnished by the papyri<sup>19</sup>.

19 Our knowledge of the ancient book is too arbitrarily founded for us to say that because this roll is beautifully written and has an apparatus of variants it *must* be the work of a classic author. Some of the variants and corrections look suspect. The existence of a class of 'coffee table' books is suggested by me in *The Papyrologist at Work* (GRBS Monograph VI) p. 11.

### [Supplement

This paper was communicated to Professors B. Snell and R. Kannicht, so that the text could be included in the forthcoming TrGF. They have made a number of suggestions, of which a selection is included by kind permission of the editor of this journal.

i 3 B. Snell notes that ἀθάνατος (like the rejected supplement ἀναλαβεῖν i 7) would introduce resolution of a longum into a text that has no such resolutions.

**i 8** εὐγενεῖ R. Kannicht calls attention to E. Fraenkel's note on A. Agam. 1198, where also Aristotle H.A. 488 b 18 is cited for the distinction between εὐγενής and γενναῖος.

**i 17** R. Kannicht suggests that the marginal note ran ]ρ εἰ[χομέ]ν γε μήν

**i 21–24** 'If πράξαι μὲν, then perhaps [καθεῖλεν, sc. Δίκη', Bruno Snell. R. Kannicht suggests that 21 should be read as πύγαργο[ν and proposes ἦ (or ἦ) πύγαργο[ν οὖν / ἀλ]γ[ι]νὰ π[ο]λλῶν κοιράνων ὀρμωμέ[να / κα]ὶ τὰ πὶ Φ[λ]έγραι γηγενῶν φρονήματα / καθεῖλεν; οὐ δ]ή. "Can it be, then, that the pains imposed by many a tyrant and the ambitions of the earth-born at Phlegra have put down a turntail? Not so." In 21 πύγαργο[ is acceptable palaeographically, and offers a more acceptable syntax than ἦπερ or ἦ γὰρ; and there would probably be room for [εν·ου δ] in 24. πύγαργος is cited in drama only from an unknown play by Sophocles, fr. 1085 Pearson. If it were really used here, the case for a Sophoclean connection (already suggested by me) is strengthened.

**i 25** Both Kannicht and Snell prefer the articulation οἶδ' (οἶδα is frequent after the third foot caesura in Euripides).

**i 29** R.K. τυχεῖ[ν ἐπ]αίνου κ.τ.λ.]