

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

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

Band: 70 (2013)

Heft: 2

Artikel: A New Fragment from Herodas' Mimes and a Snippet of Homer (P.CtYBR inv.457)

Autor: Ast, Rodney

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-358002>

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: 04.05.2025

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

A New Fragment from Herodas' *Mimes* and a Snippet of Homer (P.CtYBR inv. 457)

By Rodney Ast, Heidelberg

Abstract: The fragment of Herodas *Mime* 2.69–83 published here is the second and earliest witness to these lines and the third known papyrus containing verses by the Hellenistic poet. The text as it stands on the papyrus diverges in a couple of places from the standard edition and in one passage (line 71f.) makes us reconsider an important scene in the poem. The Homeric text on the back of the fragment (*Iliad* 6.232–248), which was described in P. Yale I 8 and partially published elsewhere (see below n. 2), is also edited here in full.

A transcription of P.CtYBR inv. 457 recto first appeared under the publication number P. Yale I 8 (p. 27–28) where the editors mistakenly described the verses as unidentified hexameters. It turns out that the lines are neither hexameters nor unknown: they are the ends of Herodas *Mime* 2, lines 69–83, from a roll of indeterminable original length.¹ Whether this roll contained all the *Mimes* or only a selection is impossible to say. On the papyrus' verso are remains of *Iliad* 6.232–248, written against the fibers in a round bookhand dated to the Augustan period.²

Our understanding of Herodas' *Mimes* depends for the most part on a single papyrus, Brit. Mus. Pap. 135 = P.Lond. Lit. 96 (2nd c. AD).³ It was first published in 1891 by F.G. Kenyon in a volume of literary papyri from the British Museum in which the Herodas papyrus, now kept in the British Library, holds pride of place.⁴

* I wish to express my gratitude to R. Babcock for granting me permission to publish a photo of the Herodas fragment and to E.C. Schroeder for arranging, on very short notice, for me to inspect the original. I also thank C. Römer, J. Lougovaya and an anonymous reader for helpful comments.

1 Not every piece of literature preserved on papyrus came from a book roll, but there is nothing in this papyrus that might lead us to believe that it was part of, for example, a simple sheet with poetic excerpts.

2 G. Cavallo and H. Maehler provide a partial transcription (lines 2–10) and photo of the Homeric text in *Hellenistic Bookhands* (Berlin 2008) no. 72. The recto text corresponds to Leuven Database of Ancient Books (LDAB) no. 6805 and Mertens-Pack³ no. 1981.3; the verso is LDAB 2330 and Mertens-Pack³ 785.1.

3 LDAB 1164 = Mertens-Pack³ 485.

4 *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, Including the Newly Discovered Poems of Herodas* (London 1891). Additional pieces belonging to the London papyrus were published later in F.G. Kenyon, "Some new Fragments of Herodas", *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 1 (1901) 379–387. The London papyrus shows the hand of at least one corrector, and probably more. For an extensive bibliography covering the late 19th and first three quarters of the 20th c., see I.C. Cunningham's Teubner edition, *Herodas Mimiambi* (Munich/Leipzig 2004) XIII–XXV. For more recent bibliography, see the new edition with translation and commentary by G. Zanker, *Herodas*

Since publication of the London papyrus, one other Herodas fragment has come to light, P.Oxy. XXII 2326 (2nd c. AD) (= *Mime* 8.67–75).⁵ The papyrus offered here thus represents the third known witness to the poet's work.⁶

P.CtYBR inv. 457r has unfortunately suffered from significant abrasion and darkening, and the fibers are stripped in places, with legibility decreasing markedly in the bottom half of the fragment. Bottom, left, and upper margins are absent, and 20–25 letters are missing in each line to the left of the break. There are no lectional signs. The text is written along the fibers in a relaxed bookhand that is earlier than the hands of both the London and Oxford papyri. The editors of P.Yale I 8 assign it to the 1st c. BC, and this assignment is supported by comparison with the scripts of a couple other 1st-century papyri, P.Lond. II 354, p. 163, a document dated between the years 7 and 4 BC, and P.Herc. 1676 cr. 4 (= LDAB 3606) (1st c. BC).⁷ A date in the early 1st c. AD also cannot be excluded.

The fact that the verso contains a literary text unrelated to that on the recto and written also in a practiced hand arouses interest. As a rule, papyrus rolls with literary texts were not reused.⁸ When they were, they were more likely used for documentary texts than for unrelated works of literature. Exceptions exist, of course, as seen for example in the reuse of a third-century papyrus containing an epitome of Livy⁹ for a copy of the “Epistle to the Hebrews”¹⁰; Homer appears on the verso of an unidentified prose text in P.Oxy. III 448 (= LDAB 10690 = Mertens-Pack³ 1148) (3rd c. AD) where the prose, however, has been thoroughly expunged; and Hesiod is written on the back of P.Tebt. III 696 (= LDAB 2338

Mimiambis (Oxford 2009) 240–248, and Mertens-Pack³ 485. There are a number of commentaries on the *Mimes*: in addition to Zanker's, there is the classic edition of W. Headlam, *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments* (ed. by A.D. Knox, Cambridge 1922), as well as I.C. Cunningham, *Herodas Mimiambi* (Oxford 1971) and the two-volume Italian edition by L. Di Gregorio, *Eroda Mimiambi*, vol. 1: I–IV; vol. 2: V–XIII (Milan 1997, 2004). Further bibliography related to the poet, which has been compiled by Martine Cuypers, can be found in electronic form at <http://sites.google.com/site/hellenisticbibliography/hellenistic/herodas> (accessed February 2012).

- 5 This fragment was described as “Scazons in Ionic Dialect” in the *ed. pr.* A. Barigazzi identified it as a fragment of Herodas in “Un nuovo frammento di Eroda”, *Museum Helveticum* 12 (1955) 113–114 (LDAB 1163 = Mertens-Pack³ 486).
- 6 Few references to Herodas's poetry survive in ancient authors. For treatment of all known witnesses, see Cunningham, *op. cit.* (1971, above n. 4) 1–3 and 17–19.
- 7 A picture of P.Lond. II 354 is printed in Cavallo/Maehler, *op. cit.* (above n. 2) no. 88. For an image of part of P.Herc. 1676 cr. 4 see GMAW² (= E.G. Turner/P.J. Parsons, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* [2nd ed., London 1987]) no. 78. In particular, *upsilon* and *eta* show similarity to the Herculaneum papyrus, other letters less so. The narrow forms observed in the Herculaneum text and discussed in GMAW² no. 78 are absent from our papyrus, as one would expect for a text from Egypt dating to this period.
- 8 For more on the subject, see T.C. Skeat, “Was Papyrus Regarded as ‘Cheap’ or ‘Expensive’ in the Ancient World?”, *Aegyptus* 75 (1995) 82–85, repr. in J.K. Elliott (ed.), *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat* (Leiden 2004) 94–98.
- 9 P.Oxy. IV 668 + PSI 12.1291 = LDAB 2574 = Mertens-Pack³ 2927.
- 10 P.Oxy. IV 657 + PSI 12.1292 (late 3rd or early 4th c.) = LDAB 3018 = Van Haelst 537.

= Mertens-Pack³ 1022) (2nd c. BC), a fragment of *Odyssey* 1.81–102.¹¹ What we more commonly encounter are literary works containing subliterate or other “casual” texts on the back, frequently in less practiced bookhands or in more cursive scripts.¹² In these cases, the papyri were probably private copies recycled out of personal need and no longer of commercial value.¹³ This also appears to have been true for documents that were recycled in order to accommodate literary texts on their versos. A teacher, for instance, might give his pupil an old account so that the aspiring scribe could practice copying a passage from, for example, the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* on the blank verso. While by no means representing a norm, there in fact survive a surprisingly large number of Homeric texts on the backs of documents, which were probably copied for personal use, whether because of limited access to papyrus, the frugality of the owner, or some similar reason.¹⁴ Who that owner might have been – whether teacher, student, average bibliophile, etc. – and the precise circumstances surrounding the copying of the text are in most cases impossible to determine.

A scenario in which the papyrus was recycled out of personal need can perhaps also be postulated for the Yale papyrus. The Herodas text was copied first. This conclusion is supported by what appears to be a slightly earlier hand on the recto and by the fact that the Homeric text was written on the back against the fibers. Why the papyrus was reused for another literary text is as unclear here as it is in the cases discussed above. Perhaps a teacher or advanced student (the hand is too practiced for a neophyte) had no other blank sides available. Whatever the reason, the fact that the papyrus was reused does not necessarily

11 The Hesiod text corresponds to P.Tebt. III 690 (= LDAB 1279 = Mertens-Pack³ 524).

12 See P.Oxy. LXIX 4738, p. 174.

13 This may not be the case with P.Oxy. III 448, where the recto text was entirely removed. The Hesiod papyrus, however, does not appear to be in a fine bookhand. For discussion of the Hebrews text, see P.M. Head and M. Warren, “Re-inking the Pen: Evidence from P. Oxy. 657 (P¹³) Concerning Unintentional Scribal Errors”, *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997) 469–473; A.M. Luijendijk, “Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus”, *Vigiliae Christianae* 64 (2010) 251–252.

14 Here are a few examples of documents that were reused for Homeric texts: P.Oxy. III 536 (= LDAB 1996 = Mertens-Pack³ 579) (3rd c. AD); P.Oxy. III 540 (= LDAB 1995 = Mertens-Pack³ 664) (3rd c. AD); P.Oxy. IV 753 (= LDAB 2043 = Mertens-Pack³ 722) (3rd c. AD); P.Tebt. II 425 (= LDAB 1556 = Mertens-Pack³ 600) (2nd c. AD); P.Tebt. II 427 (= LDAB 1768 = Mertens-Pack³ 698) (late 2nd or early 3rd c. AD); P.Tebt. II 680 (= LDAB 4532 = Mertens-Pack³ 848.013) (2nd c. AD). The reuse of papyri for literature is not a topic that has, as far as I know, gained much attention, and no attempt has been made to study it systematically here. Skeat, *op. cit.* (above n. 8) cites some figures for reused literary papyri relying on data provided to him by Paul Mertens, who at the time was preparing a new edition of R.A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt* (2nd ed., Ann Arbor 1965), which is now available online as Mertens-Pack³. At the moment, however, it is not possible to call up such data easily in Mertens-Pack³ (last accessed October 2012), although a forthcoming update to the website should make this type of search request easier to perform (I thank Gabriel Nocchi Macedo for this information). For the time being one can consult Pack², *passim*, where it is noted, for example, when a literary text appears on the back of a document.

mean that Herodas' poetry had ceased being of interest to the owner. There are no external signs, such as erasure or other kinds of destructive interference, that would signal this type of devaluation.

What follows is a diplomatic transcription of the Yale papyrus along with a reconstructed text supplemented for the most part by Kenyon's edition of Brit. Mus. Pap. 135. Lectional signs appearing in Brit. Mus. Pap. 135 have not been reproduced and no attempt has been made to collate the reconstruction against other editions of the London papyrus. Places where the Yale papyrus differs from Kenyon's edition (Pap. 135) are noted in the *app. crit.*, while relevant interpretations found in other editions are considered in the discussion that follows.

1. Herodas 2.69–83

P.CtYBR inv. 457(B) Recto
Provenance unknown

9.4 × 4.8 cm

1st c. BC – early 1st c. AD



Diplomatic Transcription of 2.69–83:

]αιανωθε	
]ούτος	70
]κειηι	
]εφυσησεν	
5]...ριγκος	
]αρνευμαι	
]τιχωπα[.....]	75
]μβρικκος	
]εκηταλκησ	
10]...ιη	
]ενδ[...]ον	
]εξει[...]	80
]ον	
]ιμ[]ν	
15]κωςχρηζεισ	

Reconstructed text:

	ιτα τιλματ αυτης και κατωθεν κ_αι ανωθε	
	ιως λια ταυτ επιλθεν ωναγησ_ ουτος	70
	ιθ ιλκεν αυτην καβιαζετ_ [ca. 2]κειηι	
	ισοι θυετω επ_ τον μαν εξ_εφυσησεν	
5	ιωσπερ φιλ_ εν Σαμωι κοτ_ ο βρι[[ε]]γκος	
	ιγελαισ κιν[αι]δ[ος] ειμι και ουκ απ_αρνευμαι	
	ικαι Βατταρος μοι τουννομ_ εσ_τι χω πα[ππος]	75
	ιην μοι Σισυ[μ]βρας χω πατηρ Σισυ_μβρισκος	
	ικηπορνοβοσ[κ]ευν παντες αλλ_ εκητ αλ_κης	
10	ιθαρσεων λε_ [] []οιμαν ι θα_...ιη	
	ιεραισ συ μεν ισω[ς] Μυρταλης ουδ_εν δ[ειν]ον	
	ιεγω δ_ επυρεον ταυτα δους εκιν_ εξει[ς]	80
	ιη νη Δι ι σευ θ[α]λπεται τι των εν_δον	
	ιεμβυσσον εις την χιρα Βα[ττ]αριωι τιμ_η]ν	
15	ικαυτο[ς] τα σαυτου θλη λαβων ο_κως χρηζεισ	

1 κανωθεν Pap. 135 3 ω γηρας Pap. 135 5 ο βρεγκος Pap. 135; ο βρι[[ε]]γκος: bowl-shaped concave stroke at bottom of letter preceding *rho* consistent with *omicron*, *theta*, and *beta*; to right of *epsilon* is a horizontal bar perhaps from a deletion mark (see discussion below) or, albeit less likely, the upper left handle of *upsilon* or *tau* 10 λ_ [λεγ_] οιμ_αν ι Kenyon suppl.; traces do not contradict *Θαλης ιηι*, the reading of Pap. 135, nor are they clear enough to confirm them 12 εξεις Pap. 135

The Yale papyrus offers several new readings of varying interest and significance. Noteworthy are those that appear in lines 3 and 5. In 3, where the London text has γῆρας, we find]κειηι instead, probably the end of the word αἰ]κεῖηι, the dative singular of ἡ αἰκείη (Attic ἡ αἰκία), “violence” or “injury”.¹⁵ This word offers a new and not unreasonable interpretation of a difficult passage in this *Mime* and deserves closer attention, even if it brings with it its own set of ambiguities. Here is the text of 2.68–72 according to Cunningham’s Teubner edition:

ὁρῆτ’ ἄνδρες,
τὰ τίλματ’ αὐτῆς καὶ κάτωθεν κᾶνωθεν
ὥς λεῖα ταῦτ’ ἔτιλλεν ὠναγῆς οὗτος,
ὅτ’ εἰλκεν αὐτὴν κάβιάζετ’ – ὦ γῆρας,
σοὶ θυέτω ἐπ[εῖ] τὸ αἶμ’ ἄν ἐξεφύσησεν
ὥσπερ Φίλιστος . . .

70

“Look men,
at her hairs above and below
how smooth he was plucking them, this good-for-nothing,
when he dragged her and forced her – Old Age!
thanks to you, since otherwise he would have spewed blood,
like Philistos . . .”

At this point in the *Mime* the speaker, a brothel owner named Battaros, presents the prostitute Myrtale before a jury and argues that Thales the ship captain physically abused her by, among other things, plucking out her hairs.¹⁶ In Cunningham’s text, Battaros states that had it not been for his old age, whom he proceeds to invoke, he would have given Thales a thrashing to punish him for the offense. The appeal to old age (ὦ γῆρας) is introduced in a sharp anacoluthon that is notably absent from the Yale papyrus, where we find]κειηι in its place. Reading αἰ]κεῖηι instead of ὦ γῆρας, we understand something different:

ὅτ’ εἰλκεν αὐτὴν κάβιάζετ’ αἰκείηι

“... when he dragged her and forced her with violence.” While one might argue that ὦ γῆρας represents the *lectio difficilior* and should therefore be preferred, it seems worth while to determine if sense can be made of the text at hand, particularly since αἰκείηι fits the context reasonably well.

This is not the first time that we encounter the word αἰκείηι in this poem. Earlier, as Battaros is laying the groundwork for his charge against Thales of

15 On the spelling of the word, see Cunningham, *op. cit.* (1971, above n. 4) 89–90.

16 The joke here turns on the fact that depilation was very common among prostitutes, see Cunningham, *op. cit.* (1971, above n. 4) *ad loc.*

unprovoked abuse, he asks the court clerk (γραμματεὺς) to read out formally the νόμος τῆς αἰκείης¹⁷ which, as we learn, asserts the following:

ἐπὴν δ' ἐλεύθερός τις αἰκίσει δούλην
ἢ ἔ(λ)κων ἐπίσπῃ, τῆς δίκης τὸ τίμημα
διπλοῦν τελείτω¹⁸. (46–48)

“Should any free man do violence to a female slave
or dragging her, should he abuse her, let him pay
twice the penalty for his crime.”

Against this background, it is not surprising to find in our papyrus Battaros' assertion that Thales has contravened this law by doing Myrtale forcible violence (ἐβιάζετο αἰκείῃ).¹⁹ It is left to the jury (as well as the reader) to conclude that Thales should pay double the penalty for his crime, as stipulated by the νόμος τῆς αἰκείης recited some twenty lines earlier.

In addition to altering the meaning of line 71, αἰκείῃ also forces a reinterpretation of the next line, where we find in Cunningham's text, σοὶ θυέτω ἐπ[εῖ] τὸ αἶμ' ἂν ἐξεφύσησεν ἴσπερ Φίλιστος Previous editors have seen in this an expression of thanks to old age couched in a threat to Thales, “Old Age! thanks to you, since otherwise he would have spewed blood like Philistos.” But if we substitute αἰκείῃ for ὦ γῆρας, as the Yale papyrus compels us to, we must look elsewhere for an antecedent to σοί in order to make sense of the passage. The choices are few: Myrtale, Thales and the jury. Jury members, however, seem unlikely, since they are addressed throughout the poem in the plural, not the singular. Thales is also difficult to understand as the antecedent, because it would leave us with no clear subject of the phrase ἐπ[εῖ] τὸ αἶμ' ἂν ἐξεφύσησεν, which seems most naturally to be Thales.²⁰ Thus, Myrtale appears to be the only remaining option. But why would Battaros be thanking her? Is he saying that had she not been present he would have made Thales spew blood? Both the language used here and the scenario itself are not unprecedented. We see Herodas employ a similar technique at the beginning of *Mime* 6, when a woman named Korrito refrains from becoming physically abusive with her female slave because of the presence of her friend Metro. Korrito says to the slave:

17 καίτοι λαβὼν μοι, γραμματεῦ, τῆς αἰκείης (αἰκίης pap.)/τὸν νόμον ἄνειπε (41–42), “Go ahead, clerk, take the ‘law of abuse’ out and read it for me.”

18 τελείτω pap. The text provided here is that of Cunningham *op. cit.* (2004, above n. 4). For discussion of ἔ(λ)κων, see Cunningham, *op. cit.* (1971, above n. 4) *ad loc.*

19 For the language of the law, cf. Plato, *Leg.* 880e: πατὴρ γὰρ ἢ μητὴρ ἢ τούτων ἔτι προγόνων ὅστις τολμήσει ἄρσασθαι ποτε βιαζόμενος αἰκίᾳ τινί, κτλ.

20 We could conceivably take Myrtale as subject and understand Thales as the recipient of thanks (“Thanks to you, Thales, she could have spewed blood”), but the irony inherent in this interpretation is not present in the parallel passage from *Mime* 6 discussed below.

Θυέ μοι ταύτηι
ἐπεὶ σ' ἔγευσ' ὅν τῶν ἐμῶν ἐγὼ χειρέων. (6.10–11)

“Go ahead and thank this woman (scil. Metro), for otherwise (i.e. had she not been here) I would have given you a taste of my fists.”²¹

Perhaps it was little more than a Herodean convention for a character to explain his or her restraint by the fact that somebody else had been present.

Or can one go further and suggest that Myrtale was not the victim that Battaros wanted the jury to believe she was? This is never stated explicitly, but we discover in lines 79f. that Battaros' own motive for bringing charges against Thales is his desire for payment, not any injury that Thales has inflicted, ἐρᾶις σὺ μὲν ἴσω[ς] Μυρτάλης; οὐδὲν δεινόν· ἰ ἐγὼ δὲ πυρέων· ταῦτα δοῦς ἐκεῖν' ἔξεις (“So perhaps you are in love with Myrtale? There's no wonder there. But I'm in love with bread; so you give me that and you will get what you want.”) The claims of violence and victimization are merely a pretense for his financial demands.

The threat lodged by Battaros against Thales in *Mime* 2.72 is followed in line 73 by an enigmatic simile that is meant to underscore the gravity of the threat. The London papyrus is damaged and likely corrupt in this line, which adds to its obscurity, and our papyrus does little to clarify the passage. In what follows I will briefly survey readings in various editions.²² The *ed. pr.* has ὥσπερ φιλ. ἐν Σαμῶι κοτὸ βρεγκός, and a range of explanations for the line have been proposed. O.A. Danielsson, for example, suggests reading a personal name, such as Φιλ[ητᾶς], and takes ὁ Βρέγκος as a synonym for the fish ὁ βρίγκος.²³ Headlam/Knox (*op. cit.*, above n. 4) print (without any regard for papyrological editorial convention) ὥσπερ Φίλιππος ἐν Σάμῳ κοτ' ὁ Βρεῦκος and argue in the commentary that Philippos was the victim of the proverbial long-haired boxer of Samos (ὁ ἐν Σάμῳ κομήτης). Βρεῦκος (or Βροῦκος) is understood as a synonym for ἀπτέλεβος, “locust,” used pejoratively. Cunningham (*op. cit.* 1971, above n. 4) understands the simile in a similar way but prints ὥσπερ Φίλι[π]πος ἐν Σάμῳ κοτ' ὁ ἱβρεγκός. In the commentary he speculates that it might be the boxer's patronymic, the genitive of a previously unattested Βρέγξ, and in his Teubner edition Cunningham (*op. cit.* 2004, above n. 4) goes a step further, removing the dagger and printing Βρεγκός. Zanker (*op. cit.*, above n. 4) follows Di Gregorio (*op. cit.*, above n. 4) in reading Φίλιστος instead of Φίλιππος and understanding Βρέγκος as a nickname of uncertain meaning borne by Philistos.

21 The similarity between this passage and 2.72 was noted already in O. Crusius, *Untersuchungen zu den Mimiamben des Herondas* (Leipzig 1892) 43–44.

22 For detailed discussion of the line, see Di Gregorio (*op. cit.*, above n. 4) *comm. ad loc.*

23 “Zu Herondas' Mimiamben. I.” *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* (1891) 1325.

The Yale fragment unfortunately offers no obvious solution to the problem posed by the end of this line. It is clear that the word on the papyrus ends in *κος*, but what precedes these three letters is difficult to decipher. Just before *kappa* appears to be the letter *gamma*, although at the top left of the vertical shaft there are traces of a curved, slightly bowl-shaped stroke that does not conform to *gamma*. If this stroke belongs to the letter that resembles *gamma*, we might in fact be dealing with an *upsilon*, though the right horizontal seems too straight for *upsilon*. Another possibility is that the curved line belongs to a cancellation stroke or dot intended to signal a deletion of either the letter in question or the apparent *epsilon* that precedes it.²⁴ Prior to this *epsilon*, we find a vertical line that looks like an *iota*, or possibly part of a *rho*, although the shaft is probably too short and close to the following *epsilon* for *rho*. The letter *rho* does, however, seem to have been written before *iota*, giving us the following combination of letters: ΠΙΕΥΓΚΟΣ. I find it impossible to read *beta* instead of *rho*, but before the putative *rho* is the bottom of a concave stroke from either *beta* or *omicron*. Taken together, we are left with two possible readings of the word, ΟΠΙΕΥΓΚΟΣ or ΒΠΙΕΥΓΚΟΣ. If the stroke to the left of *gamma* is intended to mark deletion (an idea that I favor but am not entirely convinced of), then I think a case can be made for reading] βρ[ε]γκος, “just as Phil[] the fish once upon a time on Samos.” What the fish is supposed to highlight in the context of the simile remains as unclear as ever.

In addition to these variants, the Yale papyrus offers a minor discrepancy from the London papyrus: in line 1 (= 2.69) we find the last two words in *scriptio plena* (κ]αι ανωθε), unlike κανωθεν of the London papyrus.

24 On the use of strokes and dots to indicate deletion, see GMAW², *op. cit.* (above n. 7) p. 16. Other examples of *epsilon* look different, but it is hard to see what other letter it could be, unless it is a *sigma* that has been crossed out.

2. *Iliad* 6.232–249

P.CtYBR inv. 457(A) Verso
Provenance unknown

late 1st c. BC–early 1st c. AD



The papyrus is published as P.Yale I 8, but neither the text nor a photograph is printed under that number, hence I offer the following brief description and full transcription, which has been collated against M.L. West's Teubner edition.²⁵ The script is a round and slightly unsteady capital, somewhat reminiscent of P.Oxy. IV 659 (late 1st c. BC–early 1st c. AD; LDAB 3742 = Mertens-Pack³ 1371) and LXI 4099 (late 1st c. BC–early 1st c. AD; LDAB 6828 = Mertens-Pack³ 2451.04).²⁶ Letters are strictly bilinear except for φ (ψ is not attested); the bases of lines are emphasized by pronounced serifs (see, e.g., the letters α, γ, η, λ, μ, ν, π, ρ, τ). No lectional signs are discernible. The papyrus is Π 583 in West's edition. The lines overlap to varying degrees with the following papyri: P.Tebt. III.2 899 (2nd–1st c. BC, with lines missing; LDAB 2336 = Mertens-Pack³ 773), BKT 9.2 (2nd c. AD; LDAB 1528 = Mertens-Pack³ 784.1), P.Köln I 27 (2nd c. AD; LDAB 1612 = Mertens-Pack³ 782.2), PSI XV 1456 (2nd c. AD; LDAB 1571 = Mertens-Pack³ 783.1), J. Schwartz, *BIFAO* 46 (1947) no. 8 (2nd–3rd c. AD; LDAB 1554 = Mertens-Pack³ 785), P.Oslo II 7 (3rd c. AD; LDAB 2006 = Mertens-Pack³ 783).

]τεκαθιπ[φωνησα]τε, καθ ιπ[πων
]ν̣λ̣α̣βε̣τη̣ν̣κα[αλληλων]ν̣λ̣α̣βε̣τη̣ν̣ κα[ι
]ω̣κρονι̣δης̣φρ[Γλαυκ]ω̣κρονι̣δης̣ φρ[ενας
]διο̣μη̣δε̣α̣τε[] Διο̣μη̣δε̣α̣ τε[υχε 235
5]νε̣κατο̣μ̣βο̣ι̣ε[χαλκειω]ν̣εκατο̣μ̣βο̣ι̣ε[ννεα̣βο̣ι̣ων
]α̣τ̣ε̣πυ̣λα̣σ̣και[Σ̣και]α̣ς̣ τε̣πυ̣λα̣ς̣ και̣ [
]ω̣ν̣α̣λο̣χο̣ι̣θε̣ο[Τρω]ω̣ν̣ α̣λο̣χο̣ι̣ θε̣ο[ν
]τ̣ε̣κα̣σι̣γ̣νη̣τ[παι̣δα̣]ς̣ τε̣κα̣σι̣γ̣νη̣τ[ους
]ι̣τα̣θε̣ο̣ι̣ε̣υ̣χε[ε̣πε̣]ι̣τα̣ θε̣ο̣ι̣ς̣ ευ̣χε[σ̣θαι 240
10]λ̣λη̣ι̣σι̣δε̣κη̣δ[πο]λ̣λη̣ι̣σι̣ δε̣κη̣δ[ε
]ο̣ιο̣δο̣μο̣ν̣πε[Π̣ρια̣μ]ο̣ιο̣ δο̣μο̣ν̣ πε[ρι̣κα̣λλ̣ε
]ι̣ι̣τ̣ε̣τυ̣γ̣με̣ν[αι̣θου̣ση̣]ι̣σι̣ τε̣τυ̣γ̣με̣ν[ον
]α̣ν̣θα̣λα̣μο̣ι̣ξ[ε̣νε̣]σ̣αν̣ θ̣α̣λα̣μο̣ι̣ ξ[ε̣στο̣ιο
]ν̣δε̣δ̣μη̣με[α̣λλη̣λω]ν̣ δε̣δ̣μη̣με[νοι 245
15]μο̣ιο̣πα̣ρα̣μ̣ν[Π̣ρια̣]μο̣ιο̣ πα̣ρα̣ μ̣ν[η̣σ̣τη̣ς
]θ̣ε̣ν̣ε̣ν̣αν̣τι̣ο[ε̣τερ̣ω]θ̣ε̣ν̣ ε̣ν̣αν̣τι̣ο[ι
]α̣λα̣μο̣ι̣ξ̣ε̣στο̣ι[θ̣]α̣λα̣μο̣ι̣ ξ̣ε̣στο̣ι[ο̣
] [ca. 9] [] [ca. 9] [

1 α̣θ̣ι̣π̣ is clearly distinguishable; traces at line beginning are characteristic of the horizontal base of *tau* seen elsewhere 13 the serif at the base of *iota* joins the bottom of *ksi* 15 right vertical of *mu* at line beginning bends back forming a bow

25 A photo of the fragment and transcription of lines 2–10 can be found in Cavallo/Maehler, *op. cit.* (above n. 2) no. 72.

26 See GMAW², *op. cit.* (above n. 7) no. 21, and Cavallo/Maehler, *op. cit.* (above n. 2) nos. 71 and 84.

15 (246) παρὰ μνηστῆις ἀλόχοισι is written here instead of παρὰ αἰδοίηις ἀλόχοισι found in some witnesses, such as P.Oslo II 7; see West *app. crit.* and G.S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary* II (Cambridge 1990) *ad loc.*

Correspondence:

Rodney Ast

Universität Heidelberg

Institut für Papyrologie

Marstallstrasse 6

DE-69117 Heidelberg

rodney.ast@zaw.uni-heidelberg.de