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The Würzburg Scholia on Euripides’ *Phoenissae*.  
A new edition of P.Würzb. 1 with translation and commentary

Holger Essler, Donald Mastronarde, Kathleen McNamee  
(Würzburg/Berkeley/Detroit)

1. Introduction

P.Würzb. 1 (inv. 18) represents the most extensive group of annotations on a Greek tragedy extant before the corpora of scholia available in the medieval manuscript traditions of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. On both sides of a papyrus sheet (or half-sheet from a codex or notebook: see section 5 below) a somewhat informal and partially cursive hand has written at least 26 (and possibly 30 or more) lemmata from Euripides’ *Phoenissae* along with the associated comments. These lemmata are mostly, but not entirely, in the order of occurrence in the text, and represent an irregular scattering of passages, from Phoen. 24 to Phoen. 1108.

While there are coincidences in content and sometimes language with some of the extant scholia (section 4 below), the exact nature and purpose of this collection of notes is uncertain (section 6 below). This text has also

---

1 The authors wish to acknowledge here Dr. Hans-Günter Schmidt, director of the manuscript department of the Würzburg University Library, for permission to take the papyrus to Oxford and for his generous help and support throughout our work on the edition (including granting permission for us to use the newest images), and Dirk Obbink of Oxford University for putting at our disposal the resources and expertise concentrated in his Imaging Papyri project. We also thank W.B. Henry for his expert review of our paper and for his very helpful suggestions. His new readings are recorded in the apparatus. Abbreviated references to papyri and papyrological publications follow the system of Joshua D. Sosin et al., Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets (http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/clist.html; last updated June 1, 2011). Literary papyri are identified by MP³ number, taken from the Base de données expérimentale Mertens-Pack³ en ligne (http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/; last updated October 2012).
been adduced in the longstanding dispute about the date at which ‘scholia’ were compiled in the margins of literary texts, but the issue remains unsettled.\(^2\)

The first edition of the text was published in 1934 by Ulrich Wilcken\(^3\) with the assistance of Eduard Schwartz, who had published the still-standard edition of the scholia vetera on Euripides\(^4\) some forty years earlier. Thirty years ago, using the published plates and a photograph supplied by the collection, Donald Mastronarde, Jan Maarten Bremer, and Klaas Worp examined the lemmata for use in the study of the textual tradition of *Phoenissae*.\(^5\) In the 1990s Herwig Maehler used the evidence of this papyrus in two articles\(^6\) arguing for the late origin of marginal corpora of scholia, and his student Nikolaos Athanassiou devoted a chapter of his unpublished dissertation\(^7\) to the Würzburg scholia, suggesting new readings in some of the most damaged and obscure parts of the text.\(^8\) Wilcken’s transcription is

\(^2\) See the lengthy review of the controversy in Montana 2011. Mastronarde and McNamee continue to believe that some corpora of annotations were gathered in the margins of some ancient codices and that this innovation did not have to await the introduction of minuscule script in the 9th century. We do not believe, however, that the P.Würzb. 1 scholia contribute any evidence to either side of the debate.

\(^3\) No. 1 in P.Würzb. = Wilcken 1934, 7-22, reprinted in Wilcken 1970, 43-64. Wilcken seems not to have been much engaged with the papyrus before 1932. The Director of the Würzburg University Library wrote to him on December 30, 1931 (after decades of silence) and inquired about the fate of the collection and the progress of work. Wilcken reported in a letter dated September 27, 1932 (printed in Essler 2009, 169-172): „Endlich komme ich zur Frage der Edition. Außer dem Sosylos (Hermes 41, 1906 S. 103 ff.) habe ich bisher nur wenige Würzburger Urkunden ediert (in meiner Chrestomathie Nr. 26 und bei E. Kühn, Antinoopolis S. 146, dazu einige Hinweise in meinen „Grundzügen“). Als ich in diesem Jahr mich eingehender mit Ihren Papyri beschäftigte, wurde der Wunsch in mir lebendig, doch bald einmal eine größere Auswahl von Würzburger Papyri herauszugeben.“

\(^4\) Schwartz 1887-1891.

\(^5\) See below, Part 2, where this image is designated ‘K’. See Mastronarde/Bremer 1982; Bremer 1983; Bremer/Worp 1986.


\(^7\) Athanassiou 1999, 45-58 on this papyrus, with a new transcription of lines 22-43 on 191. This dissertation is publicly accessible at: http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1348751/.

\(^8\) See also the recent discussion in Stroppa 2008, 58-60; Stroppa 2009, 306-316 and the brief treatment by Carrara 2009, 584.
adopted in the online Corpus of Paraliterary Papyri,\(^9\) and the Würzburg collection has made new images available on the internet.\(^{10}\)

The collaboration that resulted in the present study came about as follows. Donald Mastronarde was beginning work on a new edition of the scholia on Euripides\(^{11}\) in 2009-2010 and planning a presentation on this text for Dirk Obbink’s papyrology class at Oxford in May 2010, two weeks of which were devoted to the student and faculty exchange known as the Oxford-Berkeley Papyrological Seminar. Simultaneously, Kathleen McNamee was working on the Euripides portion for the series “Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta” (CLGP) and had inspected the piece by autopsy in 2008. Holger Essler had just overseen the conservation, digitization, and modern cataloguing of the papyri in the Würzburg University Library. Through this conjunction of interests, the papyrus was brought to Oxford in late 2010 to be subjected to multi-spectral imaging. In September 2011 the Oxford-Berkeley Papyrology Seminar brought the three authors together for a session in Berkeley, where they made presentations on different aspects and then agreed to produce a joint publication after further study. Subsequently, all three studied and restudied the images created by MSI and other recent and older images, and Holger Essler performed autopsy inspection, using for the first time a (newly acquired) binocular microscope. All three contributed to the process of arriving at a new transcription and commentary and then compiling and editing this article.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^9\) Record 0098 at http://cpp.arts.kuleuven.be/. See also the entries at the Leuven Database of Ancient Books (http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?quick=1002) and MP\(^3\) 419.

\(^{10}\) See http://papyri-wuerzburg.dl.uni-leipzig.de/receive/WrzPapyri_schrift_000000 40.

\(^{11}\) See http://EuripidesScholia.org. The quotations of medieval Euripidean scholia in this article are based on preliminary work for this edition. The sigla are those used in modern editions of Euripides and on EuripidesScholia.org, and thus they differ in some cases from those used in the edition of Schwartz or (for scholia not included by Schwartz) in Dindorf 1863.

\(^{12}\) The initial writing of the various sections was distributed as follows: 1 Mastronarde, 2 Essler, 3-4 McNamee (except translation), translation in 3, 5-6 Mastronarde; but we emphasize that all three contributed to all parts, and that Essler bore the major work of organizing section 3 as well as the burden of repeated autopsy of the original to recheck readings as new ideas emerged.
2. Acquisition and Imaging

P.Würzb. 1 (inv. 18) was acquired through the Deutsches Papyruskartell as part of lot B29. The lot was bought in a tin box by Otto Rubensohn in Eschmunen (Hermopolis) on November 21, 1903 for the price of one pound sterling. According to the dealer, Abd el Al Ibrahim, the papyri of this lot came from the ancient site of Hermopolis. The papyri were shipped to Germany on December 28 and fell to Würzburg in the lottery of May 27, 1904. As far as the Papyruskartell was concerned the representative of the Würzburg collection was Ulrich Wilcken; although he had left Würzburg for Halle already in 1903, all papyri were sent directly to him and he took care of their restoration and editing. Thus until 1932, when Wilcken began working on his edition, which was published two years later in his “Mitteilungen aus der Würzburger Papyrussammlung”, only 17 papyri had actually been transferred to Würzburg, whereas the others were still in Berlin waiting to be restored by Hugo Ibscher, to whom Wilcken had entrusted them. Inventory numbers were assigned in the order of Ibscher’s work, and accordingly our papyrus, although the first item in the volume, was assigned number 18. It was sent to Würzburg on May 9, 1934 and since then has been kept in the University Library’s manuscript department. The papyrus was brought to Leipzig for the period from July 21 to August 20, 2008, where it was restored, cleaned and remounted in glass by Jörg Graf.

There are several instances where the brownish ink is too faint to be distinguished from the surface of the papyrus even with the help of a binocular microscope; in fact Wilcken had already based parts of his readings on photographs, published as plates 1 and 2 in his edition (A). Since then several new series of images have been taken. The following have been taken into account in this edition: a large format slide, presumably from the

13 The Deutsches Papyruskartell was founded in 1902 in order to coordinate German purchases of Greek papyri in Egypt. During its activity, lasting until 1914, a total of 241 lots were acquired and distributed to 16 institutions and individuals. For the history of this institution see Primavesi 1996; Martin 2007.


16 The method of cleaning is described in Graf 2008, 23-27.

17 Cf. Wilcken on lines 23-29, 29-35, 36ff. and 44f. (Wilcken 1934, 15f.)
1970s, still preserved in the collection (B, plates 1 and 2). 300 dpi, 24 Bit-colour TIFF images taken in October 2003 (C); 600 dpi TIFF images from October 2007 (D), and another set of 600 dpi TIFFs taken in March 2009 after the restoration (E).\(^\text{18}\) From November 22-24, 2010 the papyrus was brought to Oxford for multispectral imaging. Two different methods were applied: Gene Ware took images with 12 filters ranging from 400 to 950 nm (F),\(^\text{19}\) and Alexander Kovalchuk took images of the papyrus illuminated by LEDs in 12 different wavelengths from 375-940 nm (G). He also produced a single enhanced image by an image-processing algorithm that utilises relative spectral intensity distribution for the areas of the surface (H, plates 3 and 4).\(^\text{20}\) Conventional infrared images were taken by Adam Bülow-Jacobsen (I) during the same period. In addition there are scans made by Mastronarde from photos acquired from the collection by Bremer in the late 1970s (K). In several places, especially for lines 25-35, our readings depend entirely on these images.

3. Transcription

The condition of the papyrus makes accurate decipherment very challenging. In some cases, a reading painstakingly arrived at after long study during one period of work no longer seems at all evident when one returns to the papyrus after an interval of weeks or months. It is worthwhile to quote the lament of Wilcken himself: „Ich habe selten meine Augen so angestrengt wie bei diesem Stück und habe selten so viel Zeit auf einen Text verwendet wie auf diesen, und doch ist das Ergebnis noch sehr verbesserungsbedürftig.\“

The rough breathing mark is written frequently, but by no means consistently; a few smooth breathings appear to forestall ambiguities. On diphthongs, these marks are written between the two letters (for practical reasons we print them over the second letter; see lines 4, 8, 11, 38, 55, 56,

\(^\text{18}\) A reduced, 300 dpi version of this is available at http://papyri-wuerzburg.dl.unileipzig.de/receive/WrzPapyri_schrift_00000040.

\(^\text{19}\) The principles of this method are described in Booras/Seely 1999.

\(^\text{20}\) Cf. Kovalchuk (2009). In citing images from the multispectral series in the apparatus we normally refer to the single image that provides the best evidence for the reading in question. Thus G375 refers to the image taken by Alexander Kovalchuk at a wavelength of 375 nm, and F950 to that taken by Gene Ware at 950 nm.
Breathing marks are also found over single vowels (principally in the forms ὦ, ἦ, ἦ but also in ὁν, ὁτ, ὁδου, ἦςαν, and ὑπερ) in 8, 9, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 30, 37, 39 (bis), 42, 47, 52 (bis), 54 (bis), 59, 61, 63, 66, 69, 71, 73 (bis), 74, 78, 82, 85. Elision is marked by apostrophe in 18, 21 (in comments), and 60 (in a lemma). In comments in 8 and 19 it occurs without apostrophe. Scriptio plena appears in 50 within a comment, and possibly in a lemma in line 6. A high stop appears in 16, 46, 55, 56. Diaeresis occurs in 3, 61, 63, 64, 74, 75. There is a horizontal stroke above the name γη in 37. Iota adscript is regularly written in inflectional endings (there may be an exception in τω for τὁ in line 18), but is absent twice in the root syllable of the word ὠδαιϲ in line 46 (a spelling also attested in the texts of late antique authors), and perhaps also in crasis, if κατα in line 6 is intended to be κᾆτα. Lemmata are usually introduced by angular marks that resemble diplai. Ordinarily these are doubled, but in lines 10, 13, 38, and 48 they are tripled. A double stroke (//, sometimes nearly horizontal) separates lemmata from their comments and marks the end of comments, except in lines 57 and 59, where the end is marked by double and triple diagonal strokes, respectively, in each case followed by a single long horizontal line, while the rest of the line is left blank. Wherever a lemma begins or ends in lacuna its full extent is unknown and so, in the diplomatic transcription, we print what is certain, plus an indication of the number of remaining letters. In the articulated transcript, on the other hand, we assume that the usual punctuation accompanied the lemmata we restore, and the number of unfilled letter spaces is reduced by the appropriate amount: we assign two letter-spaces to the double angular mark, >>, and one to the double stroke, //. This reflects the space they usually occupy in the papyrus, but the scribe’s practice is very variable.

The handwriting in lines 38-59 is smaller than in either of the two preceding lines on the page or lines 60 and following; the distance from the top of line 36 to line 37, for example, is about 20% greater than the corresponding measurement in lines 38f. There is no way to know for certain why this is. The scribe perhaps thought he was running out of space and tightened most of the spacing in the middle of the page and then, after about 20 lines, realized that he had enough space remaining to return to the normal spacing. Perhaps more likely, he originally left some or all of this

21 See Turner/Parsons 1987, 11f.
part of the papyrus blank and subsequently filled it with text (from a second source? see below on lines 38-49) that he feared might exceed the space available for it, and so entered in a tighter script. Other indications favoring this explanation are interlinear supplements at lines 44 and 45, a half-empty line at line 57, a repeated lemma (see on lines 36-39), the disorder in the sequence of the lemmata in lines 48-60, and a different mode of punctuation in lines 57 and 59. See also line 80, where a comment is left unfinished, ending with ὅτι and a blank space.

Normally, interlinear notes are inserted above the text to which they refer (the addition above line 6 is possibly displaced farther to the right than expected: see commentary ad loc.). In one instance, however, between lines 43 and 44, the interlinear addition appears under the line to which it belongs: the subject changes in line 44, with a new lemma taken from some forty lines further on in the play.

It is necessary to make a preliminary warning about the use of the terms recto and verso in relation to P.Würzb. 1. We are following the terminology of Wilcken, who used recto to refer to the horizontal-fiber side of the papyrus and verso to refer to the vertical-fiber side and presented the text as starting on the verso and continuing on the recto. If this is actually from a codex and the text was produced in the order assumed, then the vertical-fiber side would be the codicological recto and horizontal-fiber side the verso. This latter usage of recto and verso was applied in labeling the images on the Würzburg website: thus the image there listed as recto and having the name “PWuerz.Inv.0018R300.jpg” presents Wilcken’s (and our) verso.

We present here a diplomatic transcription, followed by papyrological apparatus, interpreted transcription, and critical apparatus. In the diplomatic transcript we have introduced word division (which is not present in the papyrus) but print diacritical marks only where they have been written by the scribe. Supplements are given only for almost certain restorations and the lemmata. At the beginnings and ends of lines we offer our best guess of the number of letters missing, given the size of surviving letters in the near vicinity and the probable length of the lacuna. We made decisions about word divisions between lines in the same manner. For various reasons, however (e.g., the use, or not, of scriptio continua, inherent variation in the
width of letters of the alphabet, and scribal inconsistency), the printed text does not always appear to reflect these calculations.
The Würzburg Scholia on Euripides’ Phoenissae

P.Würzb. inv. 18 17.1 x 31 cm

Verso. Diplomatic transcript

a

\[\alpha\]

1 //>> ουδε ειτ πυρος ανησυ φως// ειω[ 22-25]
[ ] [] άξαι και ήγεις ... νυμφι [ 19-22]
[4-6 ] , ν //>> ανυμεναι δε εκ δευθη ίσμινος [ 10-12]
[6-7 ] γης υτατα και λουαι το[ν] νυμφιον και παίδ[ 8-10]
[6-8 ] ον γ τη πατριδι αυτου και τουτου χαιριν φυγας γε[ 3-5]
[9-11 ] εν και ε[λ]αβεν χρημον εκ του απολλωνος που αν κ[ 1-3]
[6-8 ] και εχρησεν αυτοι α απολλων χρημον τοιουτον . [ .] [ 2-3]
[η βους αφ εαυτης απαντατα εκει κτισον πολιν ειτα λαβον τον χρ[ 4-5]
[2-3 ] ει τας θηβας βαιωτια δ’ εκληθη ο τοπος εκεινος δια το εκει π[ 3-5]
[1-2 ] ος // κιςος και εκπασαι τον δι[ 10-12]
[7-9 ] δα[ 8-10]
[7-9 ] ε καλολυντο βασχαι επειδη εχορουν [ 7-9]
[6-8 ] ευν ην ο υμος αυτων >/>> αρεο[ε] [ 7-9]
[6-8 ] γ ον του ’κτεις τας θηβας αν [ 7-9]
[30 ] [φονιος ην] δρακον’ >/>> ην δε εκει δρακον’ φ την[ 5-7]
[5-7 ] α αυτ [ ] >/>> α [ 5-7]
[α]πολαβων τους [ . . . ] >/ vacat(?)

35 δρακων
Recto. Diplomatic transcription

+  

[9-13] διονυμιοι θεαι πρεσβασσα και φιλα διματηρ θεα/  
[23-27] ] εκληθη γη και δημητρι και η πι[ 1-3]  
[8-12] ] περεσφονη //>>> αι διονυμιοι θεαι[ 0-1]  
[8-12 ] η θηβας ετημοντο η δημητρι και η[ 5-7]  
[4-6] πεμπη ]πυρφορους θεας//την περεσφονη και δημητρια πυ[ 6-8]  
[8-10 ] , [ ] , [ ] , [ ] , νια συνεκδοχικον το σχημα θηλυκ ... 7-9]  
[7-9] ] τερου οιον η δημητρι [ ] , [ ] , [ ] 6-8]  
[8-10 ] ηλαμπαδηφο [ ... 8-10]  

λαμπαδηφορους (inter lin.)  

[>> βαθυς γε τοι] δι[ ]ρκαιος αναχορειν πορος / διρκη κρ[ ] η ε[ 8-10]  
[4-5] ε και ποταιμος διρκη εκει ... [ ] , [ ] ] π[ ] δοκειται διρκαιος / [8-10]  
[3-4 ] ει ει σφιξ τις διπους τις τρ[ ] ης τις τετραπ[ 12-16]  
[2-3] ] ιανει τας κακομουσικοι // >>> και θεον των λευκ·οπωλων 5-7]  

[η και] του κατωρος και του πολυδευκουσ ουτοι δε ετιμων[ο 7-11]  
[λε]ς ///>>>] σεμνο δωδωνης βαθρα // εν τη δωδωνη ετι δε το[ 6-10 η-]  
[πε]ρους χωρας η δωδων ον ετιν εκει ερων [ε] νθα ήςαν τρει[ 7-9]  

[4-5] ] ντενουμεναι επανω της δρυως· οι δε λεγουσιν οτι τρ[ ] ε[ ] γρ[ ] α[ ] 0-3]  
[6-8] ] περ[ ] εστας της προφητιδος της' τελειας ονοματ· αιτινες ε[ 4-5]  
[6-8] ] ο οι ... , μαντειας//——— vacat  
[4-5] διηρες εχατον//εις τον· υψηλον τοπον και απο [τ]ον αλλων δ[ 4-6]  
[6-8] ] δι[ ] τεγον το υπερ τουτον εν τη δευτεραι ετηγι // ———  

[60] ] εβας εβας ο πτερους γας λοχεμα νερτερου δε' εξινθης //  
[3-4 ] ει λεγουσιν οτι η καταξ σεγον εκ του αιματος του λαιου αλλοι 0-3]  
[3-4] ] τι οι της καταξε γεννηθη αλλοι οι εκ του τυφωνος και της εχινθης //  
[>> μι] εξαρθενος δαιον τερας // οτι η εφιξ ειχε το ημι εκατ  

[>> χρονοι δε εβας παθαιας αποτελας αιδοπους ο τλαμον [ 7-9]  

[70] ] ει δυτι ο πατηρ αυτου απηλθεν εις το μαντειον[τ[ 7-9] ]
[8-10] τον ειτα ερχομενος απο του μαντειου ο οιδ[πους] 1-4
[8-10] οι απερχομενοι και [αι]ητοι επι το μαντειον του [6-8]
[7-10] ι ει ζηι ο υιος αυτου οιδιπους ή ου ειτα απαντων [5-7]
75 [7-10] γυ υπο του ανδρου του λαιου ///>> τοτε μεν αεμενοις [4-5]
[7-10] ιγμα ελυςεν της εφιγγος τοτε ///>> εκπολοι ος ζωοις ατα-
[λαντην κατ]ρον χειρουμενηιν αιτολον /// του οινεως θυαντος πα
[7-10] [ει] ειας ειν την αρτεμιν χωρις θυματον [και] οργιςθεια ή αρτε-
[με] 4-7 ος κυνηγετεις ουα καπρον κατα της αιτωλιας καλυδωνι
80 [7-10] κληθη οτι vacat 14-17 ειτα του καπρου ελθοντος εις
[7-10] [_
[7-10] 6-9]ε και ω μελεαγροιυ ις ους του οινεως κατος κυνηγητης
[7-10] [αντη κυνηγητεις ουα] συνηγχεθε και συνεβαλεν τον καπρον
[7-10] [ιτωλιοις και τινες μεν λεγουσιν οτι αυτη εφονευσ]εν τον κα-
85 [προν] 3-6] ο μελεαγρος ην ο φονευςα] αυτον και ερασθεις της αταλαντης
[7-10] της νικη] την κεφαλην και το δερμα του καπρου [3-4]//

Papyrological Apparatus

Verso

a λα: Written above the beginning of the comment and closer to the text than the cross or page number at the top of the recto.

1 >>: The second angle-mark no longer visible on the papyrus, although traces can be seen in B and H.

1 ειω: The papyrus shows ε with ι descending from the right extremity of the crossbar, and then a smudge that might be read as ο.

2 ] [: Speck of ink at the top of the line.

2 . . ηγεις. . . . . . ι: In the first position, a curve as from 9 to 2 o’clock, which however might continue below to form a complete circle.

After this, a rising diagonal, which at the middle of the line of writing meets another diagonal descending from above (δ, α, λ or parts of two circles). Next, some stripping followed by a dot of ink and a curve (as from 8 to 1 o’clock) that constitute parts of the left vertical and the middle stroke of η. The top stroke of γ is visible, with papyrus broken away beneath it. The letter following ε might be θ or ε: a large curve, from 4 to 10 o’clock, with a middle stroke that touches the following letter. Then perhaps αι: a loop with a projection at the top followed by
the upper half of a long descender (ι) that seems to intersect the tail of α. Next, traces of three letters after the descender just identified as the ι in the possible αι. In the first position, the upper half of a vertical and at the right, in the bottom part of the writing space, a trace of ink that may belong to an upward-sloping line. After this, a curved stroke (as from 11 to 1 o’clock) and a short diagonal from the top to the middle of the writing space and connecting with the middle of a long diagonal running in the other direction. In the second and third positions, the traces favor αι over ου. και or του suggest themselves, but the space for the first letter is rather narrow for either κ or τ. Also the sloping line, if real, runs in the wrong direction for κ, and there is no trace of the crossbar of a τ. Of ‘ . . . ’ (not reported by Wilcken) only indecipherable traces are visible now on the papyrus. Images suggest the bottom of a vertical line and part of the horizontal cap of τ followed by a curve from 4 to 9 o’clock connected with another from 2 to 7 o’clock; lastly, the bottom of a vertical line. τωι appears possible. The papyrus breaks off after the ι of νυμφι, but the broken edge has traces of ink that could suit the bottom of either ο or ω, followed by a descender appropriate to either ι or υ.

3 The reading is from images; the papyrus now shows only disconnected and illegible traces. ἰϲμηνοϲ [ in A, ἰϲμηνοϲ in BF650H.

5 Ἰγῆς: η read by Wilcken is no longer visible on the papyrus, incomplete in all images.

6 After δ, no writing is certainly visible for a space wide enough for about one letter (darker marks in B and H that appear to be a dark spot, above, and a slightly curved horizontal, below, may be only shadows, for in C they are apparently holes). At the extreme right of this patch, high in the line, there may be a short vertical line (unless it is only a shadow) curving slightly to the right at the top. This may be the right top of η, but it is unclear whether η alone was written between δ and λ or, in scriptio plena, εη (see section 3, p. 36). This is followed by a lacuna large enough for the left side of λ, the right-hand stroke of which is clearly visible on the right side of the hole.

After // is blank papyrus about the width of one letter. Following this, where we print […] , the fibers are stripped; autopsy and images show a small dark trace at the upper left edge of this space, but this is not necessarily ink but rather part of a dark brown fiber that runs through
this section. Following the stripping are two small curved strokes, as from 1 to 5 and 8 to 10 o’clock.

7 ον v: Most of the letter following ον is lost in lacuna; traces of its right-hand side suit ο or ε.

7 γε[]: The ε read by Wilcken is no longer visible in the original and only in part in B and perhaps D.

8 // ειωθαϲιν: Traces of the first five letters are legible in images, although individual letters can no longer be made out on the papyrus.

8 ότ: Only the vertical stroke of a breathing mark remains.

8 επο̣ρι̣ [: ρ, which is certain, is followed by a point of ink at the top of the line, consonant with τ.

9 τ . . . . [: The papyrus is badly damaged. After τ, the vertical surface fibers are partly stripped, except in the very center of the writing space. What remains are a slightly curved vertical line (12 to 7 on a clock) with a diagonal descending from its top (a trace of ink at the middle of this line survives between the stripped portions) and a vertical line rising from the lower right end of the apparent diagonal: α or misshapen η? In the former case, the curved line at the right must be taken as part of ς, with a curve that follows it (12 to 2 o’clock) serving as its top; in this case we might read ταϲ. If on the other hand the letter after τ is η, the subsequent 12-to-2 curve, along with a vertical that follows it, will be the middle and right-hand strokes of ν, and Wilcken’s την will have been written. In the next position, a lacuna about one letter wide, with the beginning of a horizontal at the left top and, on the other side of the hole, traces of the tip of a horizontal line at the bottom right. The traces are consistent with a small α, which sometimes begins with a nearly horizontal hook (cf. lines 6 κατα and 17 πελαγοντα). Whatever was written was made small, possibly because of crowding by the long descender of ρ from the line above. The top and bottom portions of the following round letter are separated by a hole in the papyrus, and may represent ε, θ, or o. Of the last letter preserved at the edge of the papyrus, two descenders survive. The curve of that at the left has the shape and orientation of the bottom of λ or perhaps χ.

11 ] [ ]αν: The top (vertical) layer of fibers is completely lost; a smudge of ink shaped roughly like a curve open to the left has penetrated to the
bottom layer at the left. If \( \omicron \xi \varepsilon \omicron \omicron \nu \) was written, this mark would correspond to the upper curve of \( \xi \), and we might read \( \omicron [\xi [\varepsilon] \omicron \nu \), the \( \varepsilon \iota \) ligature occupying not much more than the space of one letter.

12 Φοιβον: \( \nu \) no longer visible on the papyrus, and the second \( \omicron \) doubtful.

13 \( \xi \): A small, slightly curved line (1 to 4 o’clock) in the upper half of the writing space: \( \rho \) or \( \xi \).

15 \( \xi \): The reading is based on photographs. They consistently show a vertical met by a diagonal moving up to the right.

16 \( \xi \): Traces of a curve (as from 7 to 8 o’clock) and of the end of a downward-sloping diagonal in the upper third of the line: possibly the top of \( \varsigma \) or the upper left part of \( \nu \). Although the left and right margins are both lost on this side, the text of the verso suggests that only about 6 letters are likely missing at the beginning of line 16; at the end of 15 very little appears to be lost.

16 \( \xi \): A spot of ink in the upper left corner of the writing space: possibly the hook of the top of \( \delta \), less likely that of \( \alpha \) or \( \lambda \). This is followed by a short vertical stroke in the middle of the writing space. Then, there is a lacuna for the space of about one letter; after the lacuna, a dot of ink at the top of the writing space, consistent with the tip of \( \alpha \), \( \delta \), or \( \lambda \).

17 \( \alpha \): After \( \alpha \), dots of ink from the top of a vertical line (apparent traces below it are not ink).

18 πεϲ\( \eta \): Of \( \varsigma \) remain the upright back of the letter with a short turn-up on the line, and the cap joining the following letter at the top. Then two uprights with a very faint crossbar (both letters resemble the \( \varsigma \eta \) combination in πεϲ\( \eta \)μα in line 14). Of \( \eta \) the right-hand vertical and part of the crossbar remain. Following this is a curve in the lower part of the writing space, as from 5 to 9 o’clock. After this, only the extreme top of the writing space is preserved. Here, about one letter-space to the right of the curved stroke, are traces of a tall letter (or letters): the remains are two diagonal lines at an angle of 15 to 20° with respect to each other, converging as they descend. These are difficult to identify. If they belong to the top of \( \beta \), the top of the loop has uncharacteristically been left open. If they are the top of \( \upsilon \), they form a much narrower angle than usual (about 60°; but possible exceptions may be found at 71 του, 75 λαιου, and 78 θυματων); nor does \( \upsilon \) ordinarily project above the
line of writing (possible exceptions are 71 του, 79 καλυδώνι, 81 λυμηναμεν, 82 κυνηγετης).

19 Photographic images suggest αφ’ may have been written; the word is no longer visible on the papyrus.

22 την: traces of a vertical descender.

22 οιον: a twisted fiber above the first o gives the impression of a breathing mark, but the condition of the papyrus does not allow confirmation of any ink there.

22 δτον: The letters after δ are badly damaged, consisting of a vertical line with an attachment on its right, not inconsistent with ρ or μ; then indeterminate traces before τ.

23 ]...[: A curving line (as from 9 to 3 on a clock), perhaps the top of θ. Thereafter, indistinguishable smudges of ink. The first two letters of κιϲϲοϲ are larger than the υ at the end of the preceding comment. A long horizontal crack passes through the word.

24 The entire line is doubtful. ]...[ a curved line (as from 7 to 11), with the beginning of an attached stroke on the right in the middle (ε, θ?).

24 ην[ ]ερ: Of η, a horizontal at mid-level, from which a vertical descends at the left and another rises at the right; of ν, a vertical on the right with a descending stroke attached at the left. The lacuna is quite narrow. If there was another letter before ε it was a small one.

24 κηρομε: the end of a horizontal at mid-level, with a vertical stroke drawn toward the bottom on the right; next is a vertical on the right, probably with a descending stroke attached at the left.

25 οϲ: The papyrus is so badly abraded here that readings are based principally upon photographs, particularly the publicly available digital image (cf. n. 10). What remains of the first letter is the point of a sloping stroke just under the line, rather close to the o. Autopsy suggests it is likelier to be κ than ι (Essler). ς may be o or φ.

26 : the angle formed by a rising and a falling stroke: α or λ. Because of the poor condition of the papyrus, the reading is based principally upon photographs, particularly the publicly available digital image (cf. n. 10).

26 ]...[: A horizontal below the line and traces of a downward sloping stroke at the right; then traces of another downward sloping stroke at the right
and below the line, and traces of an upwardly inclined stroke drawn from the left, below the line.

27 Readings based on B.

28 α̣ρ̣ε̣ο̣[c: very doubtful; if correct, the full extent of the lemma is unknown.

29 Readings are based on G650 and H. About four letter spaces from the left edge is a small curve (as from 8 to 6 o’clock) and to its right a vertical and a dot at the right above.

30 Autopsy confirms ιν δρακων at the beginning of the line. The illegible writing that follows consists of a short horizontal line just above γ, which may belong to the expected punctuation mark //, for this seems not to have been written on the line, and its component strokes are frequently horizontal or nearly so.

30 ὁ̣ φ̣: Very uncertain. Something is written above ο, more probably a letter than a rough breathing mark. ο is then followed by a letter that looks like ε or, more likely, c. Before την there is room for ὁς + εφυλαςε (or ὁς εφυλαςε), but this cannot be confirmed.

31 Readings in the first part of the line are very doubtful. At the left edge are traces of a line sloping upward below the line; the fourth letter might be ε or θ; the remains of γ are traces of a stroke sloping upward below the line.

32 δε τ[ ]υτ̣ιλλα: Autopsy confirms only δ, υ, and κα; other letters are capable of other interpretations. Photographs suggest τουτο αλλα και καδμ.

33-35 No longer decipherable by autopsy.

34 [α]πολαβων τους [ ]... //?: Clear signs of writing go as far as the punctuation strokes, but there may be ink, and therefore writing, across the rest of the line.

35 δρακων is no longer visible on the papyrus and in images is very faint.

Recto

Upper margin: Above line 36 Wilcken reported only the mark he interpreted as θ, which we read instead as a cross. We detect in addition some writing, possibly erased, on two lines (a-b) across most of the page at the very top of the upper margin. We do not consider this part of the main text of scholia.
The Würzburg Scholia on Euripides’ *Phoenissae* 47

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a } \zeta & \quad \text{[ ]} \\
\text{b } \text{[ } 3-5 \text{ ]}\epsilon\chi & \quad \text{[ ]} + 1
\end{align*}\]

a \(\zeta\) is large and has a very wide, horizontal, curved lower stroke.

b For the initial cross in papyri of late antiquity, see e.g. P.Oxy. LXXVII 5126.1 (we owe this reference to W.B. Henry). \([[: a \text{ round letter (o, c?) then, apparently, } \iota ]\epsilon\chi \ldots 1\) about 1.6 cm to the right of the cross perhaps \(\epsilon\chi\nu\) or \(\epsilon\chi\omega\nu\); near the end of the line, the last two possibly intelligible letters appear to be \(\iota\) preceded by a round letter (\(\alpha\) or ?).

38 \[\ldots \ldots \pi: \text{ the bottoms of about 9 letters.}\]

39 \[\ldots \ldots \iota\}: \text{Possibly } \tau\alpha\iota\iota: \text{ Of } \tau \text{ the bottom tip of the vertical and the right tip of the horizontal. } \alpha \text{ very doubtful, but there is a smudge representing the loop and a diagonal above it. The } \iota \text{ may survive in a dot of ink at the bottom of the shaft, unless this is a shadow. } c \text{ is clearest of the four letters.}\]

39 \(\hat{\eta}\[\ldots \ldots \rho\]: \text{ Of } \hat{\eta} \text{ the left vertical and the diagonal are visible, as well as the vertical of the breathing mark above (the horizontal is stripped off). Then two letters are lost to stripping, which ends at the loop of } \rho, \text{ the shaft of which is stripped away. A diagonal to its right, cut off by the edge of the papyrus, could be the left top of } c.\]

41 \[\ldots \ldots \iota\nu \ldots \[\ldots \ldots \iota\nu\alpha: \text{ Traces of a round letter (c, o, e) before a lacuna large enough for one letter. After this, an arc in the upper third of the line like that between 10 and 1 on a clock. This touches a vertical which, given its position, is probably } \iota. \nu \text{ follows this. At the right of } \nu, \text{ in the upper third of the writing space, is a very long horizontal with a hook pointing upward at its left, which turns downward at the right: cursive } \eta? \text{ Next, despite abrasion, a vertical can be made out which has a horizontal drawn from the top toward the right: } \gamma, \pi, \tau? \text{ Then, just before a break in the papyrus, this horizontal stroke touches a completely circular letter: probably } o, \text{ possibly } c; \text{ not } e. \text{ Below and to the right of this circular letter is a stroke that seems to be from the tip of a sloping line – } \lambda, \iota, \tau, \chi? – \text{ but which may belong to the line below. There follows another lacuna large enough for one letter, then a vertical inclined toward the right, below the line; then, at the bottom of the line is a hook, as from } e \text{ or } c. \text{ The next letter has portions of a vertical that} \]
reaches below the line and a curve at the right, like the arc between 1 to 6 on a clock, which suggests φ or ρ. Following this is ινα.

41 ι: ι is clear; the preceding traces are better suited to η than to δ. The space seems insufficient for και.

41 θηλυκ...: Wilcken’s tentative reading of θ seems correct. Then comes a short letter, possibly a small η, of which only traces survive at the top of a hole. This is followed by two dots at the top and bottom of a notional diagonal that evidently passed through the lacuna; they are consistent with the right side of a small λ. After this, the two diagonals of the cup of υ, followed by κ and then traces of four more letters, the first two of which are possibly ον or αι.

42 η: The breathing mark is uncertain, and the letter may be overwritten.

44 There seems hardly space enough for [>> βαθυϲ γε τοι]. If this is what was written, part (>>?) may have been supralinear.

45 `...': The interlinear writing starts above the end of εκει in line 45 and extends perhaps as far as the beginning of καλειται. The actual number of letters is uncertain because of damage to the papyrus from abrasion, which has also practically obliterated writing directly above in line 44 (particularly the end of ποροϲ and the dividing sign // that follows). Above the end of line 45 εκει is a slanted vertical appropriate for the vertical of κ. Below at its right is a spot of ink that could belong to the bottom stroke of κ but seems to be written at an angle upward that would be more suitable for the bottom left corner of an α squeezed close to the first letter. On the other side of a small lacuna is another diagonal drawn in the opposite direction which looks like the bottom right part of α. The diagonal stroke which we take to be the tail of the supposed α makes a nearly perpendicular angle with another diagonal, possibly ι, giving αι (although the supposed ι leans rather far from the vertical, its combination with α is similar to that of καλειται and αιτωλιϲ, lines 45 and 79, respectively). This letter could, however, also be the ‘vertical’ of τ (cf. αματοϲ, line 61) or the left stroke of λ (cf. αλλων, line 58). Part of a curved letter follows and, after this, what appears to be υτ, very faint. The worst abrasion follows this, but comparison of G with B shows traces of ink above and below the place
where two horizontal fibers meet, for a space of two or three more letters.

47 τις is barely visible now.

50 Above the first ο of ουτοι is a sloppy dot of ink. We would expect a rough breathing here, but if that is what the scribe intended, he did not execute his intention well or fully.

50f. Before λειμωνα in line 51 what seems to be a dot or two of ink from the angle-sign may in fact be shadow. The preceding sign //, if present, would lengthen the rather short line 51. If the restorations suggested in lines 49-51 are correct, these lines varied in length, with 49, 52, and 46 letters, respectively.

52 The papyrus is now very difficult to make out here, and the reading derives mainly from photographs. It produces a rather long line (58 letters, whereas the usual number is generally a little over 50), but the smaller writing in lines 50-59 may accommodate this much additional text.

57 Line 57 is a half-line, terminating in a vertical double stroke, possibly intended as //, which the scribe orients in various ways. It is followed by a single long, horizontal stroke with a slight slope upward to the right. Compare line 59, where the comment is followed by nearly vertical /// and a long horizontal stroke. Before ο, an angle formed by a rising and then falling stroke (κ, χ); after ο, a short vertical at the left and traces on the right, about the middle of the writing space (very likely ν); after this, a combination of a curved stroke (as from 5 to 7 on a clock) which connects with another curve (as from 10 to 7 o’clock) on the right: ω; then, where the fibers are slightly stripped, is the trace of a vertical line (which may however belong to the first ρ of περιϲτεραϲ in the line above; the two lines of writing are very close, and in fact the second ρ of περιϲτεραϲ interferes with the letter that precedes μαντειαϲ in line 57). Before μαντειαϲ, a short blob of ink appears a bit below the line curved as from 4 to 8 o’clock; above it, another curve, as from 9 to 1 o’clock.

58 ν[: A short diagonal stroke slanting down at the top of the writing space, consonant with the beginning of δ or λ.

59 ] δ[: An indeterminate smudge of ink on a horizontal fiber. This is followed by an angled stroke that might belong to the bottom left
corner of δ at the left edge of a lacuna. It is written at the same level as the suprascript c on the right side of the hole. /// nearly vertical.

62 At the beginning of the line, part of the horizontal stroke of τ and most of ι seem to be visible in G and D, although they cannot be seen through the microscope.

63 [>> μ]ξοπορθενος: The beginning of the line may be able to accommodate more text, so μεΙ- is not excluded. Wilcken’s ήμυϲυ is a simple misreading: the right diagonal of μ abuts the slanted iota and gives the impression of upsilon. The scribe’s orthography is good. The ν of ήμυϲυ here and in line 64 lacks a tail. In both cases, either the letter was written in the shape of a V or the ink has flecked or rubbed off.

66 On some images there seems to be a heavy dot after εντευθεν touching the final letter. Since the line continues punctuation is unlikely.

69 Before πυθιαιϲ Wilcken’s diagonal stroke, which is not to be expected in mid-lemma, is part of π, which is malformed.

71 ἶνον: The final letter appears to have been originally ν, converted currente calamo to ν.

73 ὁ: The breathing mark may have been added subsequently.

73 ειτα: reading taken from BD; in the present state of the papyrus, what is visible is ειτα.

78 εἰαϲεν corrected to ἐάϲανοϲ (ει deleted, ε added above the line, the second ε converted to α, and τοϲ added above the line after αν). The correction coordinates with the deletion of και later in the line.

81 τ: short steep diagonal moving down toward the left in the bottom of the writing space, as for the bottom of the shaft of τ or κ; from its top, possibly another, also steeply angled line moving up to the left, but this may be a crack in the papyrus; from the point where these two supposed lines join, two horizontals extend to the right: the upper seems to be the edge of a crack, and the other, which has a shallow curve with the concave side upward, resembles the lower arm of κ (see line 62). It may, however, be the edge of a crack, in which case the horizontal just above it must be the crossbar of τ, which also seems to extend slightly to the left of the uprights. Next α. Next, after a short space, a diagonal sloping downward connected with another diagonal sloping upward: ν? μ? Next, a smudge of ink, possibly a small circle: ο? After this, the top curve of c
or ε, and at its bottom edge either the bottom of c or the crossbar of ε. Finally, η.

81 Supralineation: two strokes resembling the arms of υ, followed by something indecipherable.

82 μελεαγρο[υ]τς: The scribe altered an original υ to c.

86 The final punctuation strokes are about 1.4 cm. to the right of the final letter of καπρον. No additional text is strictly necessary after that word, but an unwritten gap between the end of a comment and its terminating symbol would be unique in the papyrus. In fact, however, there appear to be traces of ink after καπρον. Wilcken interpreted them as //, but they seem rather to take the form of a curve (as from 9 to 11 o’clock) connected with a horizontal line at mid-level, as for ε or θ. Perhaps 2 or 3 letters follow before the final punctuation mark.
λα

1. 344 οὐδὲ κοὶ πυρὸς ἄνηψα φῶς εἰο[θ]·
[ ] ἐξ[ξ]άζαι καὶ προηγεῖταθα τοῦ νυμφίου [ ]
5 ή ἀπὸ πη[γῆς] ὑδάτα καὶ λυοῦσα τό[ν] νυμφίον καὶ παιδ[οποιούνεται νεῦ]
[χειθαῖς ἐκ τῶν] γάμων. 417 κατὰ δ[ή] ἤλθεν αὖ φυγάς ἤλθ[εν] [ὁ Τ]υ[δέως ποιή-]
[ῆς φό]νον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦτο ἄρετα φυγάς γε[νόμεν]-

[θρακελής μόθος ἄδα]ξ[α]στον πέτσμα Κάμδος βουλομένος κτίσα[ ε] πό-

15 [λιν ἡράτηεν καὶ ἡλ]αβεν χρησμόν ἐκ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ποῦ ἦν κ[τί-]
[καὶ πόλι]ν καὶ ἔχρηςεν αὐτῶι ὁ Ἀπόλλὼν χρήσμων τοιοῦτον• [ ] 2-3
[ἡ] βοῦς ἀρ' ἐστύτης, ἀπαντάντας ἐκεῖ κτίσιν πόλιν. ἐστὶ λαβόν τὸν χρησμόν]

20 ἤλθεν ε[ἰ]ς τὰς Θῆβας τῆς Βοιωτίας καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐπεμένει ἡ βοῦς καὶ ἐκτ[ε]ίς
[ἐκ]εῖς ἡς Θῆβας. Βοιωτία δ᾽ ἐκλήθη ὁ τόπος ἐκεῖνος διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖ π[ε]εὲι
[αὐτ]τομάτος ν π ου. 651 κις[σδὸν περιστερφή[ε]ς] 3] [ ] 5-7
[1-2 ] [ ] [ηγ[ε]ρ[ε] ν[ ] κρομποε ] [ ] 10-12

Translation

344 Nor did I kindle the light of fire for you: they are/were accustomed to bring out ... and lead the way ... (of) the bridegroom ...

347 And Ismenus was given a relationship by marriage without wedding song and without the luxury of bearing the ritual bath: the ancients had the custom of putting forth water from local rivers or from a (local) spring and of bathing the bridegroom and praying for offspring from the marriage. 417 and then in turn came an exile: Tydeus came, [having committed a murder] in his homeland and having become an exile because of this ...

574 and (how) will you inscribe the spoils: the ancients were accustomed, when they provided [victory], to [inscribe] upon clothes (bimatia) that so-and-so provided ... and to dedicate the clothes to the gods. 631 and you, lord Phoebus [Agyieus]: ... the ancients, placing at their doorways [an image] of Apollo, used to call him Phoebus Agyieus [for this god was guardian?] of the street.

638 Tyrian Cadmus came to this land, for whom a four-legged heifer an unforced fall: Cadmus, wanting to found [a city, enquired] and obtained an oracle from Apollo about where to found a city, and Apollo proclaimed to him an oracle like this: [go...] to a cowherd named Pelagon and [ask for/buy] a cow when they provided [victory], to [inscribe] upon clothes (himatia) that so-and-so provided ... and to dedicate the clothes to the gods. 631 and you, lord Phoebus [Agyieus]: ... the ancients, placing at their doorways [an image] of Apollo, used to call him Phoebus Agyieus [for this god was guardian?] of the street.

... 651 whom an encircling crown of ivy: ... [comment mostly unreadable]

35 δράκων

P. Würzb. 1, Recto


[ταῖς] cūν φῶςας ταῖς αἰνιγματώδεσιν φῶςας· ἐλέγεν [ἐμμετρῶς ὡς-] [ρωτῶ]· ἡ Κύριος· τίς δίπος, τίς τρίπος· οὔτε τῇ τριτάπ[ους. ἀμουσοτάται] [οὐ] ἀνεί ταῖς κακομουσικαίς. 606 καὶ θεῶν τῶν λευκωπόλων δόμαι- [τα] τοῦ Ζήθου καὶ τοῦ Αμφιόνος, οὗτοι δὲ ετίμων[το ἐν Θήβαις] [5-7] [ἐξτι δὲ καὶ ποταμῶς Δήρκη ἐκεῖ καὶ οὗ[τος ὁ] [τὲρος καλεῖται Δηρκαῖος. 807 [άμουσοτά-]

[ταῖς] cūν φῶςας ταῖς αἰνιγματώδεσιν φῶςας· ἐλέγεν [ἐμμετρῶς ὡς-] [ρωτῶ]· ἡ Κύριος· τίς δίπος, τίς τρίπος· οὔτε τῇ τριτάπ[ους. ἀμουσοτάται] [οὐ] ἀνεί ταῖς κακομουσικαίς. 606 καὶ θεῶν τῶν λευκωπόλων δόμαι- [τα] τοῦ Ζήθου καὶ τοῦ Αμφιόνος, οὗτοι δὲ ετίμων[το ἐν Θήβαις] [5-7] [ἐξτι δὲ καὶ ποταμῶς Δήρκη ἐκεῖ καὶ οὗ[τος ὁ] [τὲρος καλεῖται Δηρκαῖος. 807 [άμουσοτά-]
ivy (as a subject) and to cover Di[onyus?] ... 656 and to women of the evoi
cry: [bacchants. The maenads?] used to be called bacchants, since they danced
for [Dionysus, and evo]i evan was their hymn. 658 Ares [(bloodthirsty?)]
guardian:] ... of founding Thebes ... 657 [there was a murderous] ser-
pent: there was in that place a serpent which was guarding the... 659?: ... this
but also Cadm[us] ... Cadm[us]... from the serpent ... taking away the teeth. ... serpent

683f. [...]goddesses of twin names.] Persephassa and dear goddess De-
meter: [they are/were called of twin names because Demeter] was called Ge
and Demeter and P[ersephone was called] Kore and Persephone. 683 the god-
desses of twin names: [for thus in] Thebes Demeter and [Persephone] used to
be honored ...

40 687 [send the] fire-bearing goddesses: Persephone and Demeter: ... in order
that it be synedochic. The formation is feminine ... from the other, on the one
hand, as if to say, Demeter (as subject) ... fire-bearing. ... 687? fire-bearing: ...
torchbearers (as subject) ... torches: ..., (added below the line) ?other
women/goddesses carry torches ... 730 deep, as you know, is the ford of
Dirce to retreat across: Dirce is a spring; and there is also a river Dirce there:
and this ford is called Dircean. 807 with [most unmusical] songs: riddling
songs; the Sphinx spoke [in meter asking] what creature [is] two-footed, what
three-footed, what four-footed. Most ... music. 606 and the [houses] of the white[-horsed] gods: of Zethus and
Amphion; these two were honored in Thebes; or else of Castor and Polydeuces;
these two (were honored) in Lacedaemon. ...
[vi] 24 λειμώνα ἐκ "Ἡρας τόπος ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Κιθαρώ[ν] [ἀλλάδης τῇ Ἡραί] [ἀν]ακείμενος. 43 θεὸν τὸ τάκτοκό τὸ περιττά, ἐλ[βαρά. πῶς, ὁ π[εριττὸν ἐστὶν.] [λέγου; 982 εινῷ θεόν ἠδράνα ἐν τῇ θεον. ἐστὶ δὲ τῷ τὸς τῆς Ἡ-] [πειροῦ χώρας ἡ Δωδώνη. ἐστὶν ἐκεῖ ιερόν, [ἐν]θα ἦσαν τρεῖ[κε πελαια-]

55 [θέκ] μα]ντεύομεναι ἐπάνω τῆς δρούς· οἱ δὲ λέγοιν ότι τρ[e][c γραμ] [ἐκάλουν π]ηρ[ερ]τεράς τῆς προφήτιδος τῆς Πελείας ὀνόματι· αἰτίνης ἐπ[ 4-5]
[6-8 ] ...]. [ ]. ][1028 ἐλευρ] [Α]μφι μοῦσ[άι] τὸ αἰνίγαμα λέγει. vact


[1043σ. χρόνου δ’] ἔβας Ποθίας ἀποστολοῖς Οἰδίπουσ ὁ τλάμων [ὁ Οἰδίπουσ]
[πευκόμενον] εἰ ξῆ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἀπήλθεν εἰκὸ τοῦ μαντευον, τ[ὸ δὲ εἴπεν] [ὅτι κτανεί αὐτόν. εἴτα ερχόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ μαντεύοι τὸν Οἰδ[ believers ύπήν]-[της τῶι Λαίοι] ἀπερχομένου καὶ αὐτοί ἐπὶ τοῦ μαντεύον τοῦ [θεοῦ] [πευκομένω] εἰ ξῆ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Οἰδίπους ἡ οὐ. εἴτε ἄπαντον [κατὰ τὴν] [χιςτῆν ὅ]δον τὸν Οἰδίπους ἀναίρει Λαῖον τὸν αὐ[t]ού πατέρα δι[α τὸ τετυ-]

75 [θεῖα αὐτοῦ ἱπ τοῦ ἄνδρος τοῦ Λαίου. 1046 τότε μὲν ἀμένοις [ὅτι αὐ-] [κοι τὸ αὐ]νίγαια ἐλύετος τῆς Σφιγῆς τότε. 1108 ἐκβολάους τὸξοις Ατα-[λάντην κάτρ] βον χειρομενήν Αιταλόν τοῦ Οἰνέως θεοπνοσ πᾶ-[κα τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ] εάνατον τὴν Ἄρτεμιν χωρίς θυμάτων ὅργιόςθεος ἡ Ἁρτε-

24 to the meadow of Hera: it is a [woodland?] place on Cithaeron dedicated [to Hera]. 43 wherefore, why the things outside: the extraneous, violent; how am I to say what [is extraneous]? 982 hallowed ground of Dodone: in Dodone; and Dodone is [a place in] the region [Epi]rus; there is there a shrine where there were three [doves (peleiades)] giving prophecies upon the oak tree; some say that [they used to call] three [old women] doves (peristerai) by the name of the prophetess, Dove (Peleia); (women) who... prophecies.

90 to the outermost upper storey: to the high place and one [separated from] the others, [or] the second storey, the one above this (place?) in the second storey. 1019f. you came, you came, o winged maiden, offspring of Earth and Echidna below: [some] say that the Sphinx was born from the blood of Laius, others that she was born from Earth, others that (she was born) from Typho and Echidna.

1023 part maiden, destructive monster: because the Sphinx had half of it(self) from a maiden and the other half from a lion it is called destructive monster … 1028 with lyreless song: he means the riddle. 1033 [ialemoi (mourning songs)] of mothers: the dirge is termed ialemos for the following reason. When Ia[lemos] was completing his marriage rites [in front of the (?) shrine (?), a … fell on top of him [and] he died, and hence the dirge was called ialemos.

1043 [in time] there came, sent by Pythian oracles, Oedipus the wretched: [Oedipus, intending to find out] whether his father was alive, went to the oracle, [and it said that he would kill h]im. Then proceeding from the oracle Oedipus [met up with Lai]us, who was himself too going to the oracle of the [god to find out] whether his son Oedipus was alive or not. Then meeting (him) [along the Split] Road Oedipus kills Laius, his (own?) father, because [he had been struck] by the man of Laius. 1046 at that time to their relief: [because for them] he solved the riddle of the Sphinx at that time.

1108 Atalante, with far-shooting arrows overcoming the Aetolian boar: Oeneus having sacrificed to all the gods and] having left1 Artemis without sacrifices, [and] Artemis, becoming angry,

1 Before correction, indicative was used, ‘he left’. 
[μιϲ ἀφῆκεν] ὡς κυνηγήτιϲ οὖϲα κάπρον κατὰ τῆϲ Αἰτωλίαϲ. Καλυδώνι-
80 [οϲ δ᾿ οὗτοϲ ἐ]κλήθη ὅτι vacat 14-17 εἶτα τοῦ κάρπου ἐλθόντος εῖϲ
[7-9 ] [. . . . . . . . η καὶ λυμηναμένου τῆν γῆν συνήγοντο οἱ κυ-[νηγοῦντε]ϲ καὶ ὁ Μελέαγροϲ υίὸς τοῦ Οἰνέωϲ καῦτοϲ κυνηγήτηϲ
[ὁν. καὶ Ἡ Αταλάντη κυνηγήτιϲ οὖϲα συνή[γ]θη καὶ συνέβαλεν τὸν κάρπο
[6-9 Α]ἰτωλίοιϲ. καὶ τινεϲ μὲν λέγουϲιν ὅτι αὐτὴ ἐφόνε[υ]ϲ εἰϲ τὸν κά-
85 [προν οἱ δ᾿ ὅτι] ὁ Μελέαγροϲ ἦν ὁ φονεύϲαϲ αὐτὸϲ καὶ ἐραϲθείϲ τῆϲ Αταλάντηϲ
[αὐτὴι ἅθλα] τῆϲ νίκηϲ τὴν κεφαλήϲ καὶ τὸ δέρμα τοῦ κάρπου ἐ[φῆκε].

79 ἀφῆκεν McNamee: ἐπέμψεν Wilcken 79s. Καλυδώνι[οϲ δ᾿ οὗτοϲ ἐ]κλήθη Mastronarde: δὲ ὁ
cucus ἐκλ. Essler: Καλυδώνι[ον, οὗτοϲ δ᾿ ἐκ]λήθη Wilcken 82s. κυ[νηγεῖϲ πάντε]ϲ Wilcken:
Schwartz: [ἐφείϲα vel ἀφείϲα τοῖϲ Α]ἰτ. Mastronarde: [ἡ θεὰ τοῖϲ Α]ἰτ. Essler 84s. κυ[προν,
80 [sent], since she was a huntress, a boar against Aetolia. [This boar] was called Calydonian because [space of 14-16 letters left blank, for filling in explanation later]. Then, when the boar had come to ... and had ravaged the land, [the hunters] were gathering together; and Meleager, son of Oeneus, [being] himself too a hunter, (joined them) [and Atal]ante, who was a huntress, joined them, and [...] set to fight (or engaged in battle?) [...] the boar [...] Aetolians. And some say that she herself killed the boar, but others (say) that Meleager was the one who killed it, and, because he had fallen in love with Atalante, as[signed to her the prize] of the victory, the head and hide of the boar.
4. Commentary

1-3 treat Phoen. 344

Cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 344 ἐγὼ δ’ οὕτι κοί: ἐθὸς γὰρ ἦν τὴν νύμφην ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ γαμοῦντος μετὰ λαμπάδων εἰσάγεθαι Μ'B'CVMn'S'.

a Possibly the note in the upper margin supplies a form of λαμπάς missing from the explanation. Alternatively, it may indicate the subject matter of lines 1f., namely, discussion of Jocasta’s regret not to have carried a wedding torch. As an indication of contents, it would serve the same function as δράκων at the foot of the page. If this was its purpose, it resembles indications of contents found (usually at the top of the text) in several papyri of the Roman and late antique periods. The practice is most prevalent in prose, in which the undifferentiated blocks of text made it difficult to locate a particular passage: so in MP³ 339 (Did. in D., 2nd cent. C.E.), 536 (Hierocl. Stoic., 2nd cent. C.E.), 543 (Hp., 3rd cent. C.E.), 543.3 (Hippocrates, 6th cent. C.E.), 1327 (comm. on Nic., 1st cent. C.E.), 1505 (Thuc., 1st cent. C.E.), but also in 60 (Alc., 1st-2nd cent. C.E.) and 1857.1 (anthology of epigrams, 3rd cent. C.E.). By contrast, mediaeval scholia tend to use more generic labels (ἰστορία, σύνταξις, ἀπορία, λύσις) for this purpose.

1 εἰώθι: cf. line 4. If the subject is the bride’s mother, perhaps restore δοῦναι at the end of line 2.

2 After εἰώθασιν, the scribe’s style leads one to expect the καί following ἐξάζαι to connect with a second infinitive.

For προηγεῖθαι in the context of a torch-lit procession as in the lemma, cf. Timaeus (Jacoby F 3b.566.F) fr. 26a.87 ... ὄν ποιησάντων τὸ προσταχθέν, καθ’ ὁν καιρὸν ἦγετο ἡ νύμφη, προηγουμένων πολλῶν τῶν τὰς δίκιας φερόντων, ἡ μὲν πόλις ἔγεμε φωτὸς, τὸ δὲ συνακολουθοῦν πλήθος.

νυμφίωι ορ νυμφίου.
3-6 treat Phoen. 347

3-6 The sch. vet. in Phoen. 347 give a lemma followed by glosses of ἀνυμέναια and then, after ἄλλως, a metaphrase of the text and explanation of the custom: ἀνυμέναια δ’ Ἰσμηνός: ἀνυμεναίως ἀχορεύτως. MMVCVBs. ἄλλως: οὐ μετέχει τῶν εἰς ὑμεναίων οὐδὲ οὐνήκη τῇ εἴ πρὸς τὸν Ἀδραστὸν ἐπιγαμμερίαν: οὐ γὰρ ἐδέξω τὰ παρ’ αὐτοῦ λουτρά. εἰώθεσαν δὲ οἱ νυμφίοι τὸ παλαιὸν ἀπολούεσθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις ποταμοῖς καὶ περιρράινεσθαι λαμβάνοντες ὕδωρ τῶν ποταμῶν καὶ πηγῶν συμβολικῶς παιδοποιίαν εὐχόμενοι, ἐπεὶ ξυποιοῦν τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ γόνιμον... MCVMnS.

In the papyrus, if Wilcken is correct in assuming that the lemma extended into line 4, the lemma presumably ended with χλιδᾶς and εἰώθαϲιν is the first word of the comment (cf. lines 1 and 8). A lemma of such length is not out of the question: that for Phoen. 638 (lines 13f.) is also much longer than the lemma in the scholia for the line. Alternatively, if the lemma on Phoen. 347 concluded with Ἰσμηνός, the end of line 3 and beginning of line 4 were presumably occupied by glosses on ἀνυμέναια. Something akin to what is offered in the scholia would fit the space available.

4 Cf. lines 1 and 8 for other explanations beginning εἰώθαϲιν.

εἰβαλεῖν may be preferable in sense, but autopsy and the image based on the original negative (B) support reading προ-.

5f. For εὐχομαι in proximity to γάμος in the genitive, cf. Lib. Decl. 42,1,6: παῖδαϲ ἡνξάμην ὁ δυστυχὴϲ ἐκ τούτων μοι γενέϲθαι τῶν γάμων.

6-8 treat Phoen. 417

6-8 Very likely the note began by identifying the fugitive as Tydeus. Cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 417 κἀτὰ γ’ ἠλθεν ἄλλος: ὁ Τυδεύς· φαςὶ γὰρ ὅτι τὰ
The older mss. and some recentiores have καίτα γ’ ἦλθεν ἄλλος αὖ φυγάϲ, which recent editors approve. The lemma here matches the text καίτα δ’ ἦλθεν attested in some recentiores. There is no room for the pi reported by Wilcken, who may have been unduly influenced by Nauck’s edition (ἐπῆλθεν is Nauck’s conjecture, but Nauck’s critical notes are not printed beneath his text).

The scribe’s κατα instead of καίτα leaves open the possibility that he intended κατά, in which case we should understand the following verb as κατῆλθε in tmesis; the reading has no manuscript authority, however. Our translation assumes the traditional καίτα, which will in any case have been the writer’s intention if he was aware of the meter of what he wrote.

The suprascript ηλθ at the end of the line is problematic. Given its position to the right of the punctuation marks, it presumably belongs to the explanatory note. This is at the basis of our restoration. A comment such as this, however, would be more likely to start with a simple identification, e.g., (οὗτοϲ) ὁ Τυδεύϲ, as in the sch. vet. in Phoen. 417 (quoted above ad 6-8).

7 For ποιήϲαϲ φόνον cf. Bas. Ep. 188, 11: ὁ δὲ τὸν ἄκουϲιον ποιήϲαϲ φόνον ἀρκοῦϲτοϲ ἔξεπλήρωϲ τὴν δίκην ἐν τοῖϲ ἐνδέκα ἔτεϲι and Sch. 419 [= 417 in Schwartz I.298.8]: τυδευϲ ὃν οἰνέωϲ: οὕτοϲ ἔφυγε διὰ τὸν φόνον τῶν συγγενῶϲ †Αλθαίαϲ Μ’Β’C’VMnRfS

8-10 treat Phoen. 574

8-10 The comment discusses inscribed clothing dedicated to the gods. ἐπορζ[ον l νίκην ἐπιγράφε[ι]υ in lines 8f. is preferable to Schwartz’s

22 For errors shared by ancient papyri and recentiores see Mastronarde/Bremer 1982, 66-69.
ἐποίο[ν] εκύλευσιν καταγράψαι, which entails three problems. First, the space at the end of line 8 and the beginning of line 9 seems insufficient for εκύλευσιν καταγράψαι. Second, καταγράφω does not appear in scholia with the meaning intended, namely, “inscribe on cloth” (the word used is ἑπιγράφω); the choice of καταγράφω presumably necessitated the restoration of ἐν, which cannot be read here, after the verb. Finally, a phrase like πορίζειν (or ποιεῖν) εκύλευσιν is evidently unparalleled. πορίζειν νίκην, for its part, is a fairly rare expression, but its pedigree is good: in Ar. Eq. 593f. (πορίσαι εἰς νίκην), J. AJ 5,42 (νίκην αὐτοῖς ἀεὶ πορίσεϲθαι), Lib. Thes. 2,7 (πορίσαϲθαι νίκην), sch. in Hom. Il. 7,284 (ἦν τῷ πορίζει νίκην), and some later writers. In lines 9f., Wilcken’s απολα[βων also is too long for the space available and not necessary to the construction.

9 The absence of iotacistic spelling elsewhere in the papyrus makes Wilcken’s νείκην improbable; and although it would be satisfying to restore ἐπόριϲεν τὴν νίκην (cf. the examples cited above), neither this nor the plural fits the traces well (the ὁς of τάϲ would need to be squeezed into a space sufficient only for a little more than one letter, and νικαϲ cannot be read). Although θλ is a plausible reading in the last two positions, a form of ἀθλ- preceded by the appropriate article is also impossible to confirm.

The papyrus explanation is extremely odd, and it diverges from explanations in the scholia, which locate such inscriptions on the weapons themselves: sch. vet. in Phoen. 572: τὸ δὲ καὶ εκύλα γράψεις ἀντὶ τοῦ τὰ ὀπλα ἑπιγράψεις ἦτοι τὰ ἀναθήματα τῶν πεφονευμένων BRfRw; sch. Thom. in Phoen. 572: ... τὰς ἀσπίδας τῶν πολεμίων εκυλεύοντες τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνετίθουν ὡς αἰτίοις τῆς νίκης, ἑπιγράφοντες εἰς αὐτὰς ἀ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τροπαίοις ZZaZmT. The papyrus explanation considerably softens the bloody facts of tradition as presented in the scholia, perhaps to make the commentary more suitable for school children.
10-13 treat Phoen. 631

10-13 The sch. vet. in Phoen. 631 give Ἀγυιεῦ: προπύλαιε. τὸν ἀγυιέα πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν ἱςταϲαν. κίων δὲ οὗτος ἦν εἰς ὀξὺ ἀπολήγων MBCVMn RfRfRW샌. ἐπεὶ πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν ἱςταϲαν ἀγάλματα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὡς ἀλεξικάκου καὶ φύλακος τῶν ὀδῶν. διὰ γὰρ τούτῳ Ἀγυιεῦς MCVMnRfS. Wilcken’s reconstruction was presumably suggested by the scholia but is an improbable phrase.

11 The writer’s βαλόντεϲ is a curious choice for describing the setting up of a column; a form of ἱϲτημι or τίθημι would be expected. Presumably ἰαν at the beginning of line 11 is its object. A possible alternative, however, is to reconstruct the note by beginning with εἰώθεϲαν and assuming an object and infinitive are lost in the lacuna at 11f.; in this case the sentence ends with Ἀπόλλωνοϲ in 12, and a new sentence begins in asyndeton with ἐκάλουν (compare perhaps the asyndeton in 46, 47, 52 and assumed in 27).

13-22 treat Phoen. 638f.

13-22 With lemma drawn from 638 only, the sch. vet. in Phoen. 638 supplies similar information: Κάδμοϲ ἔμολε τάνδε γὰν: Κάδμοϲ ζητῶν τὴν ἀδελφὴν Εὐρώπην μαντεῖον ἔλαβε περὶ τῆϲ ἀδελφῆϲ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ σημαῖον, ἀλλὰ ἠτε αὐτὸν ἐξελθόντα ἔπεθαι βοître καὶ οὗ ἄν αὐτόματοϲ πέϲῃ κτίζειν πόλιν. ἔχει δὲ ὁ χρηϲμὸϲ τοῦ Πυθίου θεοῦ οὕτωϲ: ἡφάζεο δὴ τὸν μῦθον, Ἀγήνοροϲ ἐκγονει Κάδμε· ἥμος ἐγρόμονος προπλῆν οἴτι Πυθῶ δίαν ἡθαὶ ἐχων ἐκθῆτα καὶ αἰγανέην μετὰ χερϲὶ τὴν διά τε Φλεγυῶν καὶ Φωκίδοϲ, ἐχετ’ ἂν ἱκήαι βουκόλον ἱδὲ βόαϲ κηριτρεφέοϲ Πελάγοντοϲ. ἔνθα δὲ προσπελάϲας συλλάμβανε βοῦν ἐρίμυκον τὴν ἥ κεν νόϲουιν ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέροιϲιν ἔχετι λευκὸν σήμερον ἄριφραδὲϲ, οὐδέ σε λήϲει·
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16-19 A paraphrase of the oracle. The traces in line 16 do not favor Schwartz’s ἄ[π]ι[θ], but it seems an imperative of some verb must have been present in the lacuna to be associated with line 19 κτίςον. At the end of line 17 an imperative is again needed, followed by the plural masculine direct object modified by στρογγύλο[υ]ς (line 18). The traces favor reading αἰ[τη]σαί rather than λ[α]βέ. As object, φακοῦς, e.g., would suit the sense (see below on 18 στρογγύλο[υ]ς). Although it is a little too long for the space available it might have been squeezed in, and if the verb was αἰ[τη]σαί the fit will have been easier.

18 ἐν τῷ νότω[ι]: Reading ἐν, which suits the traces better, entails the assumption that the scribe omitted iota adscript here, against his normal practice (but see ω[δα]ς in line 46 (twice); and κατα in line 6 is another case, if κατα was intended). Wilcken’s reading of ἐπὶ induced him to see τωνωτω as an error of haplography, with the second ν omitted.

cτρογγύλο[υ]ς καὶ: The space between the second ο and καὶ is too broad to have been filled only by ν (ετρόγγυλον Wilcken); the scholia quoted above also discourage reading a singular here, as they record a verse oracle mentioning at least two marks as being νότοις ἐπ’
ἀμφοτέροιϲι and ἑκάτερθε. A plural ετρογγύλο[υ]ϲ indicates that there was a plural noun at the end of line 17 for it to modify. If, after βοῦν, we read ἀγόραϲον or αἴτηϲον, the remaining space in line 17 could accommodate about six letters: φάκουϲ, perhaps? επίλουϲ might be squeezed in, but it scarcely gives satisfactory sense, since the spots commonly seen on cows are not ‘blemishes’. One might also expect the oracle to have mentioned a specific number of spots, but there hardly seems room for a numeral as well.

Scholiasts use ὅπου γε (at sch. vet. in Eur. Phoen. 100, 402, e.g.), although more often in a non-topographic sense.

There are three approaches to πεϲ̣η̣[ι]: the subjunctive might be followed by either the feminine article or by ἦ (“or”) or by a word that begins with eta (which would account for Wilcken’s wish to restore ἡγηϲαμένη).

If the word following ἦ began with β one might restore ἦ β[οῦϲ, although this would leave the curved stroke preceding it unexplained, and the recurrence of the same word at the start of line 19 seems awkward. The 5-to-9 curve might, alternatively, belong to the loop of alpha. Normally this has a more oval shape, sloping up from its lower extremity, but the scribe’s practice is not uniform, and an alpha with a similarly flattened bottom loop may be seen, e.g., in line 77 Αἰτωλόν. If in fact υ followed, α[ηϲ[τομάτωϲ] is possible and would also fit the space available at the end of the line (for the adverb cf. sch. Thom. 658 ... ὅτι ὃν ἐκείνη αὐτομάτωϲ καὶ μηδενὸϲ δαμάϲαντοϲ πεϲεῖται... ZZaZmGu).

With the eta interpreted instead as “or”, Essler’s proposal πέϲ̣η̣[ι] ἦ κα[θίζηι would have the author using a form of glossing common in medieval scholia but not used elsewhere in this text.

22f. treat Phoen. 640

22f. Cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 640 ἀδάμαϲτον πέϲημα: τὸ μὴ ύπο τινοϲ ἡναγκαϲμένον πτώμα, ἀλλʼ αὐτορριϕέϲ. πέϲημα δὲ τὸ κώμα ἀπὸ τοῦ
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παρεπομένου MCVB. ἄλλως: ἀδάμαστον: ἀντὶ τοῦ· αὐτόματον ἔβαλε τὸ σῶμα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. δίκειν γὰρ τὸ βάλλειν, ὅθεν καὶ δίκος. τινὲς δὲ ἀδάμαστον πέςμια τὸ μηδέπο διμασθὲν ξεύγηλη σῶμα. ἐμφαίνει δὲ τὸν νέον μόσχον MBCVMnRfRwS, partial Sa.

22 The lemma partially repeats that of lines 13f. For discussion of similar occurrences, see below on lines 38f. and on lines 40 and 43.

[ἀ]δραϲτον: In its usual sense ἄδραϲτοϲ, from διδράϲκω (“unlikely to run away, not fleeing, immovable”) is extremely rare and unsuitable here. In Philo and a few other late texts the word might mean “inescapable” ([*de somniis* 2,141 τὸ ἀδραϲτον καὶ ἀνίκητον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτοϲ; cf. [*Phlp.*] in *catenas sancti Petri* 19 ἐκ μέϲου τῶν ἀφύκτων τοῦτων καὶ ἀδράϲτων ἄρκων), but this gives no better sense in the papyrus. If the commentator intended the word in one of these meanings, his purpose is unclear. Better, perhaps, to take [ἀ]δραϲτον (if correctly read) as deriving from δράω and meaning something like “not managed, not involving action,” which is how Hesychius defines it, s.v. α 1193 ἀδραϲτον· ἀπρακτον, ὁ οὐκ ἂν τιϲ πράξειεν; cf. Phryn. PS (2nd cent. C.E.) ἀδραϲτο (from Hermippus): ἀποίητα. ἢ γὰρ πεποίητα, δέδραϲται. If this is correct, it refers to something – in this case the cow’s stumbling – as an event that occurred without action having been taken (as opposed to δραϲτικοϲ, of the “effecting” of an event). Thus it would be synonymous with αὐτόματον or αὐτομάτωϲ, “without external agency,” which may appear later in the comment (in line 23). We considered for a time alternatives like ἀδμητον and ἀβίαϲτον, but the traces do not suit either.

23 [1-2 τοµ . . . . . . . v . π . . . οὐ //]][/]: At the beginning, apparently not αὐτορριφέϲ (offered, in addition to αὐτόματον, by the sch. vet.). At the end, perhaps αὐτοῦ, but between τοµ and οὐ the writing is too damaged to confirm any of this.

After οὐ, which ends an explanation, the symbol // (not read by Wilcken) should appear, followed by >> before the next lemma. Either
the symbols were written very close together, or the scribe omitted one of them, for the available space is rather narrow to hold both. Because the ink is smudged and a long crack begins above υ and cuts horizontally through the place where the symbols should be written, however, neither possibility can be confirmed.

23-26 treat Phoen. 651

23-26 The comment perhaps begins with an explanation of the protective ivy which, after the palace of Cadmus was struck by lightning, twined around the infant Dionysus to protect him. Cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 651: κιςκός ὁν περιτεφή: ὁ πανταχώθεν αὐτὸν στέψας. τοῦ γὰρ οίκου κεραυνωθέντος ἐξήμβλωσεν αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ φοβηθείσα, κιςκός δὲ περιέλιξεν MBCVMnRwS. ἀλλας: ὄντινα, Διόνυσον, κιςκός ἔξωθεν περιπλακεῖε ἐτι βρέφος ὄντα κατὰ τοῦ νότου ἐκάλυψεν. ἱστορεῖ γὰρ Μναεέας [Mnaseas Fr. 18 Müller] ὃτι τὸν Καδμείων βασιλείων κεραυνωθέντον κιςκός περὶ τοὺς κίονας φυεὶ ἐκάλυψεν αὐτὸν, ὅπως μὴ αὐθημερὸν καὶ ἐν μηδενὶ τὸ βρέφος διαφθαρῇ [καλυφθέν κιςκῷ]. διὸ καὶ περικιόνιος ὁ θεὸς ἐκλήθη παρὰ Θηβαίοις MBCVMnRwS.

24 ήρομε: Following these letters there is no more discernible ink. If the commentary here is dealing with protection of the infant Dionysus by ivy, a form of κρύπτω or the scholia’s περιελίϲϲω or καλύπτω (see on line 23) might be appropriate to the context, but none of these words is legible in the next traces.

If Wilcken’s reading is correct, line 24 perhaps contained a reference to Hermes, who saved Dionysus from Semele’s corpse (D.S. 4,2,3; Luc. D.Deor. 12; Nonn. D. 8,406; Et.Gen. s.v. Βρόμιοϲ (= EM 214,40)).

25 The last phrase of sch. vet. quoted above suggests restoring περικιόνιος δὲ ἐκλήθη, but the traces hardly support it.

26-28 treat Phoen. 656? Cf. sch. rec. (Thom.?) in Phoen. 656: ἔγουν ταῖς βάκχαις Gus, Za; also sch. Thom. 649 at end: διὰ τοῦτο οὖν αἱ βάκχαι πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κιςκοῦ κλάδους ἔφερον χορεύονται ψαρὶ τὸν θεὸν
καὶ βοῶϲαι· εὖ οἰ· οἴ εὖ υῖς, ἤγουν υἱὲ τοῦ Διός. τούτῳ γάρ ἐστι τὸ εὐίοις. ZaZmTGu and sch. vet. in Phoen. 651 ταίϲ περὶ τὸν Διόνυϲον χορευούϲαι καὶ τὸ εὐίοι εὐάν ἐπιφθεγγομέναις MB'C'VRw; μυτικαῖς M'Vs.

26 καὶ γυναιξίν εὐίοις (Phoen. 656), a new lemma. There is nearly room for the entire phrase, but it cannot certainly be made out.

28f. treat Phoen. 658

28f. The sch. vet. that deals directly with Phoen. 658 (quoted below) is not relevant, but the sch. vet. in Phoen. 662 may contain a parallel: … ἐλθὼν ὁ Κάδμοϲ ἐπὶ τὴν κρήνην τοῦ νύηϲαϲαι ἕνεκα ἀπώλεϲε λίθῳ βαλὼν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ χειρί. χερνίβαϲ … MCVMnS; … ἐβούλετο γὰρ θύϲαι τοῖϲ θεοῖϲ, ὅτι ςύμβολον αὐτῷ αὐτόθι γέγονε τοῦ κτίϲαι τὴν πόλιν. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἐλλανικὸϲ λίθῳ φηϲὶν ἀναιρεθῆναι τὸν δράκοντα, ὁ δὲ Φερεκύϲης ξίϲει. MBCVMnRwSSa; μολὼν Κάδμοϲ: ἕνεκα τοῦ πρὸς τὴν θυϲίαν ὧϲῳρ λαβεῖν μολώϲ· ἔθυε γὰρ τῇ γῇ τὴν βοῦν MBV.

28 For the incomplete lemma proposed in McNamee’s suggested restoration compare sch. vet. in Phoen. 658 ᾽Αρεωϲ ὁμόφρων φύλαϲ: ὡϲ τὸ ‘βαϲιλέωϲ ἄρχωϲ’, ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ βαϲιλέωϲ καταϲταθείϲ ἄρχωϲ MB'CVMn (lemma thus in M, but in CVMn only ᾽αρεωϲ φύλαϲ).

29-31 or 30f. treat Phoen. 657 (out of order)

30f. Cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 657: ἕνθα φόνιοϲ ἦν δράκωϲ; ἔνθα, παρὰ τῇ Δίρκη, δεινὸϲ ὑπῆρχε δράκωϲ, ὡμὸϲ τὴν φύϲιν, φύλαϲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ᾽Αρεωϲ καταϲταθείϲ τῆϲ Δίρκηϲ πρὸς τὸ μηδένα ἀτʼ αὐτῆϲ ὑδρεύϲαϲται MBCVMnRfRwS.

The sch. Mosch. in Phoen. 657-669 seems less relevant: ἕνθα φόνιοϲ: ἕνθα δράκωϲ ἦν τοῦ ᾽Αρεοϲ φονικὸϲ ἄγριοϲ ὑπηνῆϲ φύλαϲ, τῆϲ πηγῆϲ δηλονότι, τὰ νάματα τὰ εὔυδρα καὶ τὰ ύγρὰ ἑξῆϲα ἑφορῶν ὁφθαλμοῖϲ
ἐπὶ πολλὰ διάγουσι τὸ βλέμμα καὶ σκοπούμενοι … XXaXbXoGrTY YfGrF².

30 ἐκεῖ seems to correspond to ἐνθα (Phoen. 657) which may have started the lemma at the end of line 29, where it might have been either written in full or split between lines 29 and 30 (there is enough room in line 30 for -θα).

31-35 treat a new lemma, perhaps Phoen. 659 (and other lemmata?)

31 A new lemma, just possibly from Phoen. 659, begins in the second half of the line. The poor condition of the papyrus makes it impossible to know whether there were other lemmata in lines 32-35.

Recto

36-38 treat Phoen. 683f.

36-38 Cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 683 διώνυμοι δὲ παρόσον ἢ μὲν Κόρη καὶ Περσεφόνη, ἢ δὲ Δημήτηρ καὶ Γῆ ὀνομάζεται … MBCVMnRwSSa.

38f. treat Phoen. 683

38f. The presence of two lemmata and two comments dealing with διώνυμοι θεαί is unusual, especially as the comments apparently treat material that a single commentator would probably have consolidated (first, identification of the two names of each goddess that warrant their being called διώνυμοι and, second, the information that διώνυμοι was their cult title at Thebes). Either the writer or his source is evidently combining material from two sources. Similar repetitions of whole or partial lemmata occur in the comments at lines 13f. and 22 and in those at lines 40 and 43. Each of the three pairs also involves at least one lemma that is introduced by a triple angle mark instead of the usual double, but there is no discernible pattern in play: at line 13 >>> introduces the first lemma and >> the second; in lines 36 and 38 the beginning of the first lemma is missing and >>> introduces the second; in
lines 40 and 43 the same apparently occurs. See also, in general, the introductory comments in section 3 above.

38 The new lemma may repeat part of Phoen. 683f., already quoted in line 36. ἄι would not be excluded, but since αἱ is more to be expected than ἄι, it might be odd if the scribe troubled to add a breathing mark, but not to clarify that the word was not the article. Wilcken interpreted as νται some or all of the dividing signs that end the previous lemma and begin this one; this was then followed by αἱ διώνυμοι ἡ [καὶ. In his commentary he notes the presence here of a second explanation for διώνυμοι, but the presence of the second, reduplicative lemma evidently eluded him.

39 Whether text continued in line 39 after [Πε]ρξεφόνη is unknown.

40-43 treat Phoen. 687 (perhaps with additional lemmata for same line?; see also below, pp. 89-94).

40f. The writer deals with four points: he identifies the πυρφόρουϲ θεάϲ, mentions the Eleusinian torchlit ritual, explains πυρφόρουϲ as a synecdoche (which is the point of the comment ὅθεν καὶ etc. in the sch. Thom., see below), and identifies its gender.

Cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 687: πυρφόρουϲ δὲ εἶπε Δήμητρα καὶ Κόρην, ἐπειδὴ διαδοχίας αὐτάς γίνονται ... MBCVMnRfS; sch. Thom. in Phoen. 687: πυρφόρουϲ δὲ καλεῖ, ἐπειδὴ ἐν νυκτί γινομένων τῶν μυστηρίων οἱ μυούμενοι πῦρ ἔφερον, ὅθεν ταύτας πυρφόρουϲ εἰκόνιζον ... ZZaZmTGu.

41 συνεκδοχικοῦ: It is uncertain where to end the ἵνα clause. It could be ἵνα συνεκδοχικοῦ ἢ τὸ σχῆμα, “in order that the figure be synecdocic”, with a new clause starting at θηλυκόν (if that is the correct reading). Or the punctuation may belong after ἢ, “in order that it be synecdocic”, with “the formation (is) feminine” following as a new clause (without a conjunction). The use by itself of συνεκδοχικοῦ is odd. In scholia,
concealed is far more common, although the adjective is occasionally found following and further explaining a simple gloss. For the use of εχήμα with ἐστι and adjective see S.E. P. 2,254; Bas. Hex. 2,8,51.

If correct, the word θηλυκόν presumably refers to the gender of πυρφόρος; but the usage of εχήμα θηλυκόν is somewhat doubtful. In the TLG texts, εχήμα θηλυκόν occurs only in Apollonius Dyscolus, Adv. (Gramm. Gr. 2,1,1 p. 151,17-19): ἐστι τι ὄνομα οὐδαμός, ὃ παράκειται ἐπίρρημα τὸ οὐδαμῷ καὶ οὐδαμόθεν, ὃ ἀπὸ θηλυκοῦ πάλιν εχήματος ἐπίρρημα παράκειται τὸ οὐδαμῆ, where the sense is “the feminine form of the word οὐδαμή” (as distinct from the separate masculine form οὐδαμός). The need for a comment on the gender of πυρφόρος is also a bit peculiar, since it is adjacent to the obviously feminine θεάς, and since compound epithets normally have a common masculine and feminine form. In making explicit what should be obvious this note has the quality of a schoolteacher’s observation.

42 New lemma or continuation of the previous comment?

οἷον presumably introduces a longer paraphrase, e.g., “that is to say / in other words” (supply “let Demeter and Persephone come bearing torches” or “with torchbearers”?).

43 Before λαμπαδηφόροι, perhaps read πυρφόρος] … α. If this is correct, then line 43 repeats the lemma of line 40, at least in part; cf. similar repetition of lemmata in lines 13 and 22 and in lines 36 and 38.

λαμπαδηφόροι: cf. Hsch. s.v. Π 4473: πυρσοφόρος· ἄγγεῖον … ἦ ὁ τὸ πῦρ φέρων … εἰσαύει δὲ τὴν λαμπαδηφόρον.

44f. treat Phoen. 730

44f. Sch. vet. in Phoen. 730 … Δίρκη δὲ ποταμὸς ὀμώνυμος τῇ κρήνῃ MBCVMNwS.
45-48 treat Phoen. 807

45-48 A two-part comment – factual (providing the terms of the riddle) and lexical (glossing a rare word). It combines information and language also found in the sch. vet. and the argument to the play.

Sch. vet. in Phoen. 807: σφιγγὸς ἀμουστάταις: σὺν κακόμοιοις προβλήμα καὶ σοφέματι τῆς σφιγγὸς. φθήν δὲ κακόμουσον τὸ αἴνιγμα φησιν, ἐπεὶ ἐμμελῶς τε καὶ ἐμέτρως ἐλέγετο, ἀπώλλυε δὲ πολλοὺς τῶν Ἰηβαίων· μὴ εὐρίκοντες γὰρ τὸ αἴνιγμα κατηχόντω MBCVMnRwS and sch. Thom. in Phoen. 801-817: … ἐν ὕδαις ἀμουστάταις καὶ κακαῖς … ZZaZmTGu; cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 50; Arg. Phoen. (e) Diggle = 5 Mastronarde: τὸ τῆς Σφιγγὸς αἴνιγμα: ἔστι δύπουν ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ τετράπον, οὐ μία φωνῇ, καὶ τρίπον ….

48-51 treat Phoen. 606

48-51 On the tight spacing and smaller writing in these lines, see section 3 above. The lemma and comment are out of order and followed by four more randomly arranged lemmata and comments before the commentary resumes an orderly progression in line 60, with a note on Phoen. 1019f.

The same information is presented in papyrus and scholia, the former being a little more fully expressed: sch. vet. in Phoen. 606: Κάστορος καὶ Πολυδεύκους. ἤ Ζήθου καὶ Ἀμφιόνος, ὡπερ ἀμεινον. MBCVfMnRwS

51f. treat Phoen. 24, out of order.

51 [ 7-9 ]: The extent of the lacuna at the end of the line is unclear. It must certainly have contained the name of Hera, cf. sch. Mosch. in Phoen. 24: λειμῶν’ ἐς ἦρας] εἰς τὸν λειμῶνα τὸν ἀνατεθεμένον τῇ Ἡρα Ἡραι XXa’Xb’XoT YfGr. But since τῇ Ἡραί by itself would make a very short line (47 letters), an epithet may also have been attached. ἀλεύδης (referring to τόπος), which the sch. Thom. on Phoen. 24 and
some other passages suggest, would fit. Κιθαιρωνίαι (referring to Hera), which the sch. vet. in Phoen. 24 offer, is probably too long.

52f. treat Phoen. 43, out of order

52f.: The contents of the note correspond to the metaphrase in the sch. vet. in Phoen. 43, ἄλλωϲ: τί οὖν, φηϲί, ταὐτα τὰ περιττὰ καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸϲ τῶν παθῶν λέγω MCMnPrSSa, but not to an explanatory note on the articulation of the line in MCV. For Henry’s reading θυραία cf. the Laurentianus scholion on Soph. Phil. 158 (p. 355,25f. Papageorgius): ἕναυλον ἢ θυραίον] ἐντὸϲ ἢ ἐκτὸϲ. ἐγγὺϲ ἢ μακράν. Although θυραία would suit the context much better, it seems incompatible with the surviving traces.

53-57 treat Phoen. 982, out of order

53-57: The comment relays information provided in greater detail in the sch. vet. in S. Tr. 171f. Xenis: Δωδῶνι διϲϲῶν ἐκ πελειάδων: τὴν ἐν Δωδόνῃ τῆϲ Θεϲπρωτίαϲ φηγὸν ἐφ’ ἢ δύο περιττοὶ καθήμεναι ἐμαντεύοντο. … ; sch. vet. in S. Tr. 172 Xenis: ύπεράνω τοῦ ἐν Δωδόνῃ μαντείου δύο ἦϲαν πέλειαι δι’ ἰν ἐμαντεύετο ὁ Ζεύς, ὡς Ἀπόλλων ἀπὸ τρίποδοϲ: οἱ μὲν οὕτω λέγουϲι θετίζειν, οἱ δὲ οὕτω τὰς ιερείαϲ γραίϲ οὔϲαϲ… Ἡρόδοτοϲ δὲ ἐν β’ φηϲί (Hdt. 2,57) “Πελειάδεϲ δέ μοι δοκοῦϲι κεκλῆϲθαι πρὸϲ Δωδωναίων αἰ γυναίκεϲ, διότι βάρβαροι οὖϲαι ἐδόκουν ὁμοίωϲ ὄρνιϲι φθέγγεϲθαι, μετὰ δὲ χρόνον δοκοῦϲιν ἀνθρωπίνη φωνή φθέγξαϲθαι [ἐπείπερ ἐκ Θηβῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἦϲαν].” Εὐριπίδηϲ τρεῖϲ γεγονέναι φηϲίν αὐτάϲ, οἱ δὲ δύο…. (at 2.55, Herodotus identifies three Peleiades by name). The subject of the mantic doves was also addressed by the mythographer Asclepiades (4th cent. B.C.E.) ἐν τραγῳδουμένοιϲ (Fr. 3 = FHG 3, p. 298 Müller), quoted in the sch. in A.R. 2,328. The claim of the commentator in P.Würzb. 1 that the name of the prophetess was Peleia seems to be unique to the papyrus. In fact, however, the entire story of the Peleiades is irrelevant: at Eur. Phoen. 982, Menoeceus simply asks his father where he should go as an exile and is told “Dodona”. Euripidean scholia on that line provide only metaphrases and an explanation of Θεϲπρωτόν and are silent about the
Peleiades. Another late papyrus intended for school use, a copy of Pi. P. 1 with annotations (MPER I 23, MP$^3$ 1356, 6th cent.; McNamee 1994), also contains an unnecessary mythological digression taken from tragedy, in that case S. Ph.

56f. The somewhat tighter line spacing and smaller letter sizes here, as well as the empty half line in 57 and the unusual punctuation at the end of comments (long horizontal strokes in addition to two and three apparently vertical bars in lines 57 and 59, respectively) suggest that this material was added after the rest, in a space left blank on purpose, and that here the space turned out to be larger than needed. See the introduction to the papyrological apparatus above and the next note.

58f. treat Phoen. 90

On the spacing, see previous note. This entry, which is complete, may also be a secondary addition. Its lemma is wildly out of order, the writing is notably smaller than in most of the text, the second line is shorter by about five letters than typical lines, and the comment terminates with the same unusual horizontal stroke seen at the end of line 57. Why the scribe did not begin the note in the empty space in the second half of line 57 is unknown.

58f. Although the MSS unanimously attest ἐϲ in Phoen. 24, it is generally true that both manuscripts and papyri have εἰϲ in most places where modern editors print ἐϲ, so it is possible that εἰϲ was written in the lacuna here, perhaps because of anticipation of the following εἰϲ in line 58. Scholia and glossaries have comparable interpretations of the phrase. Restoration is based on sch. vet. in Phoen. 90: ἐϲ διήρηϲ ἐϲχατον: τὸ διηρημένον καὶ ὑπερκείμενον, τὸ ὑπερφόν. ἣ τὸ δίστεγον ... MBCVMn PrRfRwS; EM 274,27: διήρηϲ: ὁ ὑπερῷοϲ οἶκοϲ. Εὐριπίδηϲ ἐν Φοινίϲϲαιϲ, μεθήκηκε μελάθρων ἐϲ διήρηϲ ἐϲχατον. ἀπὸ τοῦ δίϲ, διήρηϲ: ἤ ἤ ὁ διστεγήϲ; Poll. 1,82,6; cf. 4,129,7: ἦ δὲ διστεγία ποτὲ μὲν ἐν οἴκῳ βασιλείῳ διήρηϲ δωμάτιον, οἶον ἄφ’ οὖ ἐν Φοινίϲϲαιϲ ἡ Ἀντιγόνη βλέπει τὸν στρατόν… ; cf. Ps.-Zonar. s.v. Δ p. 509,9 Tittmann.
59 τὸ ὑπὲρ τοῦτον: The Greek is possibly problematic. In the first place, in educated Greek style ὑπὲρ with the accusative ordinarily means “beyond” in a horizontal, not a vertical sense (possible exceptions in literature are few: Hom. Il. 24,13: ἦς φαίνομένη ... ὑπὲρ ἀλα; Plu. Arist. 10,5: οὕθ’ ὑπὲρ γῆν οὕθ’ ὑπὸ γῆν). In documentary papyri, however, a vertical relationship is implied in physical descriptions from the Hellenistic period through at least the second century C.E., e.g., in P.Petr. 1,14,15f.: οὐλὴ ἐπὶ μήλου παρ’ ὄφρυν I [ἀριστερὰν] καὶ ἄλλη μετώποι μέει καὶ ἄλλη μετώποι ὑπὲρ ὄφρυν δεξιὰν; see Mayser 1906-1970, 2, 461, §124 and Blass/Debrunner/Funk 1961, 121, §230.

Secondly, the phrase τὸν ὑψηλὸν τόπον to which τοῦτον presumably refers is vague enough to suggest the writer may have been uncertain about the topographical features he was explaining. The “high place” of which he speaks is plausibly the roof. Something that is above it would be a structure on the roof. The word he uses for this structure is the rare noun δίϲτεγον, which glosses διῆρεϲ ἔϲχατον in the scholia too: cf. the passages quoted above and also the sch. vet. in Hom. Il. 2,517, where it is used in a similar way to gloss ὑπερώιον, “upper chamber”.

60-62 treat Phoen. 1019f.

60 A relatively short line, only about 45 letters long. Here the normal sequence of lemmata resumes and the cramped appearance of the preceding lines is gone.

61f. ἄλλοι δὲ ... ἄλλοι ὅτι ... . In scholia, the statement “Some understand x, others y” is ordinarily expressed by τινεϲ (alone or with μέν or δέ) ... ἄλλοι δὲ ... . Only occasionally is ἄλλοι used without connective particle, as in fact occurs further on in this line; a parallel may be found in sch. in Arat. 16 where, as here, ἄλλοι introduces the third of three options; in sch. vet. in Pi. P. 7,4b and sch. rec. in Pi. O. 7,25, ἄλλοι without δέ introduces the second of two options.

The commentary is mythographic, offering three accounts of the birth of the Sphinx: she arose from the blood of Laius, or from the earth, or
from the union of Typhon and Echidna. The scholia on this and the preceding line offer only the second and third possibilities: the sch. vet. in Phoen. 1019 have a simple gloss, Γᾶϲ λόχευμα: γέννημα· ἐκ γῆς γὰρ ἄνεδόθη MM V⁸, but the sch. rec. try to rationalize the same information, γᾶϲ λόχευμα: παρόσον ἐν ὀρείσι διατρίβουσα τὸ πρὶν καὶ μὴ φαίνομένη ἐξαίφνηϲ ἐπέτη τοῖϲ Θηβαίοιϲ. διὰ τούτῳ ἠδοξηϲ ὅϲν ἐκ γῆς ἄναδοθήϲαι V⁸. Old and new scholia agree in the information they give for Phoen. 1020: sch. vet. γέγονε γὰρ ἡ εφίγγξ Ἐχίδνηϲ καὶ Τυφῶνοϲ MMmarg Cs V.; sch. vet. 1020 ἡ δὲ εφίγγξ γέγονεν Ἐχίδνηϲ καὶ Τυφῶνοϲ BPr RfRwS; sch. Mosch. ἐκ Τυφῶνοϲ γὰρ καὶ Ἐχίδνηϲ ἡ εφίγγξ XXa'Xb'Xo' T'Y'YP'Gr⁸ (cf. Apollod. 3,52). The sch. Thom. in Phoen. 46 (… λέγοντεϲ θυγατέρα εἶναι Τυφῶνοϲ καὶ Ἐχίδνηϲ, ἄλλοι δὲ Χιμαίραϲ ZZaZmTG) also mentions the Chimaera as a possible parent. Laius is claimed to be the father of the Sphinx in the sch. vet. in Phoen. 26, on the authority of the paradoxographer Lysimachus (4th-3rd cent. B.C.E.; Fr. 5 = FHG 3, p. 336 Müller: Θηβαϊκὰ παράδοξα), τινὲϲ δὲ καὶ Λαίου τὴν εφίγγα παραδιδόαϲιν ὡϲ Λυϲίμαχοϲ MCV; so also the sch. in Lyco-phr. 7, αὕτη ἡ εφίγγξ θυγάτηρ γέγονε Λαίου (for a discussion of the myth see L. Deubner, Oedipusprobleme, p. 12 with n. 4).

63-65 treat Phoen. 1023

63 Presumably the writer intended αὐτῆϲ and not the reflexive αὑτῆϲ, since the disyllabic forms of the reflexive are very rare in Koine and the author has not added a rough breathing. See, however, the discussion of αὐτου in the note on line 74 below.

63-65 Cf. the surviving explanations: Arg. Phoen. 11 Mastronarde, lines 4f. (= sch. 1760): ἢν δὲ ἡ εφίγγξ, ὡϲπερ γράφεται, παρθένου μὲν ἔχουϲα πρόϲωπον, οὐρὰν δὲ δρακαίνηϲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ λέοντοϲ MBV Pr MnSSa VrYf; sch. rec. in Phoen. 1023 μιξοπάρθενοϲ] ἐπειδὴ τὰ μὲν παρθένου εἶϲε, τὰ δὲ θηρόϲ Mn' PrSa' Rw; sch. Mosch. 1019-1031 ... ἐκ θηρίου καὶ γυναῖκοϲ συντεθειμένη, ξώον ξένηϲ καὶ παρὰ φῦϲιν διαπλάϲεωϲ ... XXaXbXoTYYfGr; sch. Thom. 1019-1066 ... μιξοπάρθενοϲ καὶ τὸ ἰ̣μιϲυ παρθένου ἔχουϲα... ZZaZmTG (note the use of ἰμιϲυ).
65 treats Phoen. 1028

65 Cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 1028 ... λέγει δὲ τὸ αἴνιγμα BVMnPrRwS. ἦ διὰ τοὺς γενομένους θρήνους ἦ διὰ τὰ αἴνιγματα M'B'V'Cs. Cf. sch. vet. in Phoen. 1024 ἄλλως: ... ἐφίγξ, ... ἀρπάζουσα ... τοὺς νέους διὰ τὴν ἄλυρον ... μοῦσαν, ἦτοι διὰ τὸ αἴνιγμα σου V. The papyrus commentary omits the scholia’s metaphrase and explanation of sense and offers only the same interpretation as the sch. vet.

66-68 treat Phoen. 1043

66-68 In attributing Ialemus’ death to an accident on his wedding day, the commentary again deviates from Pindar’s account (Pi. Threnoi Fr. 128c Maehler = Fr. 56 Cannatà Fera) that he died from disease. It also seems to conflate his story with that of his brother Hymænæus. Schwartz ap. Wilcken (1934,20 ad. loc.), adducing the account of Hymænæus’ death in Servius’ comment on Aen. 1,651 Hymænæus autem ... quidam invenis suìt, qui die nuptiarum oppressus ruina est, unde expiationis causa nominatur in nuptiis. falsum est autem, nam vitari magis debuit nomen exstincti, infers from the second sentence that a variant version of the story existed which identified Hymænæus with his brother Ialemus, who also died young and after whom a dirge was in fact named.

The scholia on this line metaphrase and interpret the text but say nothing about the myth: sch. vet. in Phoen. 1033 ἵαλεμοι: οἱ δὲ θρήνοι ἔστεναζον<το> ἐν τοῖς οἶκοις. ἐνιοὶ δὲ οὕτως: οἱ δὲ ἱάλεμοι τῶν παρθένων καὶ τῶν μητέρων ἐστέναζον ἐν τοῖς οἶκοις πενθοῦσαι αἱ μὲν τὰ τέκνα, αἱ δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς MBCV; sch. Thom. in Phoen. 1034 ἵαλεμοι δὲ παρθένων: ... ἦ πρὸς τὸ παρθένων στικτέον, ἦ τὸ ἱάλεμοι πρὸς τὸ ἐστέναζον συντακτέον. καὶ μὴ ξενικὴ ἄκουσον τὸ ἐστέναζον ἱάλεμοι· πολλὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα παρὰ ποιητῶν εὑρήται. ZmTGu. Glossaries and scholia on other works also explain ἵαλεμος as θρήνος; cf., e.g., Moeris i 1.1; Hesych. i 27 (cf. idem i 28 ἵαλεμος· νῦν Καλλιόπης); sch. vet. in Eur. Or. 1388; sch. in Luc. 51,24,2. The gloss survives in later etymologica as well.
69-75 treat Phoen. 1043f.

Both lemma and comment on Phoen. 1043f. are more extensive in P.Würzb. 1 than in the scholia, and the information provided is different and, in the case of the papyrus, partly divergent from tradition. The commentator recounts at length why Oedipus and Laius each went to Thebes (the former to find out whether his father was alive, the latter to find out whether “his son Oedipus” was alive) and gives a telegraphic version of their encounter (Oedipus killed Laius because Laius’ man had struck him). For a comparison of this version with Arg. Phoen. 11 Magstronarde see Deubner 1942, 14. The more concise scholia gloss Πυθίαϲι ἀποϲτολαϲίϲιν and explain that Oedipus was headed for Thebes because of an oracle: sch. vet. in Phoen. 1043 Πυθίαϲι ἀποϲτολαϲίϲιν: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ Πυθίου ἀπεϲταλμένοϲ. κατὰ χρηϲμὸν γὰρ τοῦτον ἠλθεν εἰϲ Θῆβαϲ MCV. ταϲ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοϲ παραπομπαϲίϲ M*V*MnPrS.

Although ὅτι κτανεῖ at the beginning of line 71 exceeds the space available by one letter, its two or three narrow letters (ι twice and possibly ε, depending on its form) should allow the restoration to fit.

If the dative article preceded Λαίωι, then ὑπήντηϲε was probably divided between lines 71 and 72. ὑπήντηϲε best suits the limited space at the beginning of line 72. The end of line 72 can accommodate more letters than the four of θεοῦ. Although the writer did not necessarily always use all the available space, θεοῦ καὶ or Ἀπόλλωνοϲ might also be considered as restorations.

It is uncertain whether the author intended αὐτοῦ or αὑτοῦ. Here (unlike line 63), αὐτοῦ is in attributive position, in contrast to ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ and ὁ νῦϲ αὐτοῦ earlier in the note. Given this difference in position and given the emphasis that might be expected in connection with patricide, the intended meaning may have been “his own father” with the disyllabic reflexive; but in later Greek it is also possible to use the non-reflexive αὐτοῦ in this position.
The papyrus offers less information than the scholia, but has echoes of their language: sch. vet. in Phoen. 1046 τότε ἀκμένοις: διὰ τὸ λύσαι τὸ αἴνιγμα. πάλιν δὲ ἄχη συνάπτει διὰ τὸν γάμον τῆς μητρὸς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ MB/CVMnRfS, partial Sa. ... οὐ γὰρ εὐθὺς ὡς ἐπεδήμησεν ἀκμένοι αὐτὸν εἶδον, ἀλλὰ ὅτε ἐλυσε τὸ αἴνιγμα. λείπει δὲ τὸ ἧλθεν MCV.

76-86 treat Phoen. 1108

76-86 The sch. Thom. in Phoen. 1108 covers some of the same ground: κάπρον: ὃν ἐπήγαγεν Αἰτωλοῖς ποτὲ Ἀρτέμις λυμαίνειθαι τὴν χώραν, ὀργιζομένη Οἰνεὺς θύσαντι τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς καὶ οὐ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι. ἀπέκτεινε δὲ τὸν κάπρον τούτον ὁ Μελέαγρος ZZaZmTGw, cf. sch. rec. 1108 οὗτος ὁ κάπρος ἔλεγετο Καλυδώνιος: Καλυδών δὲ ὁρος Αἰτωλίας. ἱστορεῖται δὲ ὡς τούτον τὸν κάπρον ἡ Ἀρτέμις ἐτόξευς, Μελέαγρος δὲ τῷ συκτόνῳ δόρατι περὶ τὸ μέτωπον πλήξας ἀνείλεν Gu (copied by this 14th c. scribe from sch. in Lyc. Alexandra 492 or from Tz. H. 7,102,67, which correctly have Atalante where Gu carelessly names Artemis). More detailed versions of the story are in Apollod. 1,66f. (1st-2nd cent. C.E.); Zen. 5,33 (2nd cent. C.E.); Ioannes Malalas Chronogr. 6,21 (5th-6th cent. C.E.).

77-79 πᾶσι θεοῖς ... ἀφῆκεν: Cf. sch. vet. in Ar. Ran. 1253: ... Οἰνεὺς δὲ τῇς αὐτοῦ γής εὐφορησάσης ἀπαρχάς πᾶσι θεοῖς θύσας, Ἀρτέμιδι οὐκ ἔθυσεν ὅθεν ὀργικεῖσα εῦ μέγαν κατὰ τῆς χώρας αὐτοῦ ἀφήκεν, ἵνα ταύτην λυμήνηται.

78 The scribe originally wrote the indicative εἴασε. Once he altered this to ἐάσαντος, an additional conjunction (e.g. καί or perhaps ἀλλά) was needed to link the two participles. This he must have inserted in the lacuna at the beginning of the line, presumably in the interlinear space.

79f. Wilcken’s restoration Καλυδώνι[v]ον· οὕτως δ’ ἐκ]λήθη is questionable, as ancient sources always use the article in writing about the Calydonian boar (ὁ Καλυδώνιος κάπρος / cūs, i.e.); cf. Strabo 8,6,22; Apollod. 2,133;
3,106; 3,163; Luc. Ind. 14; Paus. 8,45,6; Ath. 401b-d = 9,64 Kaibel; Eust. in II. 1,67,34, and scholia on several authors.

80 Space left for filling later, as perhaps occurred at lines 55-59 (see section 5). If so, the fact to be supplied is possibly an explanation for the epithet Καλυδώνιοϲ, as in the sch. rec. in Phoen. 1108, οὗτοϲ ὁ κάρροϲ ἐλέγετο Καλυδώνιοϲ. Καλυδῶν δὲ ὄροϲ Αἴτωλίϲ (but note that this scribe has identified Calydon as a mountain rather than a city, a claim confirmed by no ancient source). Alternatively, Maehler suggests the blank may be due to damage in the scribe’s original.23

81 What is needed here is either the destination of the boar in the accusative or the destination plus a genitive participle and possibly an object (presumably the word that appears to end in -ρη, which in such a case would be neuter plural). But there hardly seems room for the latter.

83f. The reading of the accusative τὸν κάρρον seems clear in the original, but the meaning of the whole clause συνέβαλεν Ἰτωλίοϲ is not unproblematic. Mastronarde points out that συμβάλλω of setting parties into conflict usually has as its subject someone directing events (e.g., the gods set these heroes against each other), not a participant like Atalanta. Thus restoring, e.g., τοῖϲ ἄλλοιϲ Αἴτωλίοϲ in line 84 is undesirable, and in any case begs an explanation about the identity of these other Aetolians (not Meleager?), since Atalanta herself is variously said to be Arcadian or Boeotian.

Alternatively, the beginning of line 84 may have contained a participle governing the accusative κάρρον, with συνέβαλεν being used absolutely in the sense “engage in battle” (LSJ s.v.II.1.c); but there are few choices of short verbs. Possibilities include ἔφειϲα or ἀφειϲα, which would give e.g., καὶ συνέβαλεν τὸν κάρρον Ἰτωλίοϲ, “And (Atalante) engaged in battle, sending the boar forward against the Aetolians”.

23 Maehler 1993, 111. 135.
Or we might instead, as Essler suggests, restore a subject for ςυνέβαλεν in the lacuna, e.g., καὶ ςυνέβαλεν τὸν κάπρον [ἡ θεά τοῖς Α]ῖτωλίους, “And the goddess (i.e., Artemis) set the boar to fight with the Aetolians.” This allows a normal meaning of the verb, but makes the return to Atalante as subject in the next sentence very awkward or even unidiomatic, even if demonstrative αὕτη is assumed in line 84.

Finally, one might consider that the accusative κάπρον is an error for the dative, and that something like Schwartz’s ςυνέβαλεν τῶι κάπρωι | ἐν τοῖϲ ὁρίοιϲ Α]ῖτωλίουϲ was written, “She (i.e., Atalante) engaged with the boar in the Aetolian territories” (cf. LSJ s.v. συμβάλλω II c). But such an assumption seems wrong for a text with rather few errors and, as Henry notes, the adjective would need to go between the article and the substantive.

5. Codex or loose sheet?

Wilcken assumed (and subsequent discussions have been premised on the belief) that our papyrus was a page of a codex, since he interpreted the mark at the top of the recto as the numeral theta. He speculated that eta was effaced at the top of the verso, and postulated that numbered pages of a codex had preceded this one. Origin in a codex is also a plausible explanation for why the scribe appears to have used the vertical-fiber side (of decidedly poorer quality) before the horizontal-fiber side. If this interpretation were correct, then the natural conclusion would be that if the numbering began at the start of the codex, there were four previous leaves, with the numbering beginning with alpha (1) on a verso of the first leaf; or, alternatively, there were more than four leaves bound before this one, but for some reason numeration was restarted in a new section (still on a verso). On the former assumption, with only seven pages of text lost, it does not seem likely that the author would have filled them solely with notes on Phoen. 1-343, unless the density of annotation was far different than in the pages that survive. One might further speculate that there were

24  Wilcken 1934, 9.
25  Wilcken 1934, 16.
26  Wilcken 1934, 9. 16.
notes on one of the other select plays of Euripides on those pages, or something entirely different, perhaps of pedagogical interest (notes on Homer or another standard author, lists of words, definitions of rhetorical figures, mythological summaries).

On our reading of the trace at the top of the recto, however, it is not a numeral at all, but simply a cross, such as scribes often place at the beginning of a text or section of text or on both sides of a title. All speculations about the size of the assumed codex and its numbering then fall out of consideration. Other problems remain, however, primary among them the question of which side was written first. Here four points are relevant. The first three are codicological; the fourth deals with content.

1. The presence of the cross at the beginning of the papyrological recto suggests that the papyrological recto preceded (unless the writer started each page in this way and the cross at the top of the verso has simply been obliterated).

2. The beginning of line 36 is in doubt. The start of a lemma (Phoen. 683f.) occupied some part of it, but its exact form is unknown: αἱ (or καὶ) may have been present, and either >> or >>> will have preceded. With so much text missing and a script so variable, real precision is futile. That said, the lacuna appears to be sufficient to hold something on the order of 23 to 26 letters. If it contained the longest possible combination of lemma and punctuation (>>> καὶ δυώνυμοι θεαὶ Περέφας), the space would be nearly but not completely filled. As many as 3-6 letter-spaces will have remained. Eisthesis could account for this, but if there was no eisthesis, and if the lemma began with >> διώνυμοι, a substantial space (as many as 7-10 letters) still remained. The space is unlikely to have been blank, but it is too short for another whole lemma plus comment. There are at least three possibilities for its contents: (1) an eccentric lemma; (2) a false start by the writer, subsequently crossed out; (3) a word finishing a note from a previous leaf. Since the final comment on the verso appears complete, we must entertain the possibility that the commentary occupied more than one

27 Wilcken 1934, 16 n. 2, remarked „Das θ ist sehr schmal, aber ich glaube nicht, dass es ein Kreuz sein soll.“ Under magnification and with autopsy the ductus appears to us to be incompatible with θ.

28 If eisthesis is considered as a possibility, one might also ponder whether lines 51 and 60 might have provided further instances.
leaf, and that line 36 started with the continuation of a comment from a
lost preceding leaf.

3. Writing fills the recto all the way down the page and nearly to the
bottom edge, whereas the writing on the verso stops farther from the
bottom edge. This layout also may be taken as supporting the view that the
recto preceded, and this is Essler’s thinking.

Mastronarde and McNamee are inclined to think, instead, that the
verso preceded and base their opinion on content, as follows.

4. The order of the entries from verso to recto is generally consecu-
tive. Notes deal in almost perfect order with a middle section of the play,
from Phoen. 344 to 807. At the end of this consecutive run of notes come
fifteen lines of commentary on five lemmata that are seriously inconsecu-
tive both as a group and with respect to the preceding comments. Then
consecutive ordering resumes for the last sixteen lines (starting with a note
on Phoen. 1019f.). If the recto had been written first, we would have to as-
sume that the writer started, at the top of that page, in the middle of the
group of lemmata on Phoen. 344-807, then broke away somewhat erratical-
ly from this pattern for the rest of the page, and subsequently turned his
sheet over and recorded notes on an earlier section of the play.

It is worth noting, further, that there is no carryover of text from one
side to the other: the final scholion on each side appears to end with the
typical punctuation that follows an explanation. It remains unclear, then,
which side preceded. If the writer began with the recto, perhaps he set out
to collect miscellaneous useful information from multiple sources but then,
when he reached the verso, happened to devote himself to collecting
comments from a single (consecutive) source. In this regard, it may be
relevant that all but one of the notes offering glosses and all of the notes
that contain alternative exegeses appear on the recto (see section 6; the
note on line 656, which is possibly a gloss, is on the verso). If the verso was
written first,29 perhaps the writer set out at first to copy the notes on
Phoen. 344 to 807 but then, on seeing the unused space at the bottom of

29 The custom of writing documents across the fibers re-emerged in later antiquity
and may, by the date of P.Würzb., have crept into literary and paraliterary scribal
practice. See Fournier 2007; Fournier 2009. Additionally, MP3 429 (P.Oslo inv.
1662), an excerpt from a learned commentary on Troades may also have been origin-
ally a single sheet and not a codex. It is written across the fibers and the back is
blank; see Stroppa 2009 and McNamee 2012, 521.
the recto, he took advantage of it to add several more miscellaneous comments. Neither scenario is entirely satisfactory, however. The first does not account for the disorder of lines on the recto, and the second does not explain why the scribe left so much blank space at the bottom of the verso.30

We are left with four possibilities, then: (1) that the papyrus is a loose sheet and the verso was written first, (2) that it is a loose sheet with the recto preceding, (3) that it is part of a codex and its verso preceded its recto, (4) that it comes from a codex and the recto preceded. We see no sure way to choose among these options. If (1) or (2) is correct, the text was a loose single sheet used for miscellaneous annotations by, presumably, an advanced student or intermediate-level teacher. The fact that there may have been a washed out text, some still visible in the upper margin of the recto, might be related to such use. If (3) or (4) is true, it is a folio from a codex and was broken off at the fold from the other half of a bifolium. The writing first on the vertical-fiber side then would need no further explanation, although the presence of the cross on the side with horizontal fibers would be less natural. Nor is there any way to tell how many pages preceded the surviving folio. It cannot even be excluded, for instance, that there was a text of Phoenissae preceding these notes, 31 or that there was a

30  Possibly δράκων, written by itself in the middle of line 35 was intended as a place-marker, indicating the subject of an eventual note at the bottom of the verso. Alternatively, perhaps the larger margin was standard for this writer and the recto is the side that deviates from the norm. The smaller space at the bottom of the recto might be explained, then, if we assume the scribe was determined for some reason to include comments through Phoen. 1108 on this piece of papyrus. On this view, he will have originally written the lines at the top of recto, left a blank area in the middle where he was somehow not able at that point to deal with the material that belonged there, then added notes at the bottom part of the page. These ran further down the page than usual because the scribe – uncertain about how much room the comments temporarily passed over would occupy – left a considerable amount of blank papyrus in the middle, which forced him to start and finish the comments of lines 60-86 closer to the bottom of the page than he normally would have. The compressed script of what he eventually added suggests that even so he did not leave enough room.

31  The practice of formatting scholia in a separate block following the text of the work is found in some medieval manuscripts, such as R of Euripides; for the
much fuller set of annotations on the complete play preceding some pages in which sparser supplementary notes have been compiled. More likely, however, given the modest intellectual ambition of the surviving notes, other pages of the codex will have contained similarly modest material. Annotations on the first 343 lines of *Phoenissae* might have taken only one or two previous pages, and lemmata between 1109 and the end of the play (1766) could also have been covered in only a few pages. The page may not in fact come from a formal codex but rather from a small notebook consisting of a gathering of only a few bifolia.

In his book on the format of ancient codices, Eric Turner accepted Wilcken’s judgment that this papyrus came from a codex and he estimated the full width of the page as 18.5 cm and put this example in his group 5 (18x30cm).\(^{32}\) The lower right of the recto looks like it may preserve the right and bottom edges of the sheet (the right side of the bifolium when viewed this way), and it is likely that the top edge is also close to its original state. This part of the recto also shows how small a margin there is between the writing and the right edge (whether inner or outer margin is unknown as long as we do not know which side was written first). On the verso lines 1, 19, and 20 show us the very beginning of the lines, but this coincides with the maximum leftward survival of the writing material and any left margin is entirely lost. Turner’s estimate seems fair if this margin was as narrow as the other, as it is likely to have been, to judge by the top margin, which is small on both sides, and the bottom margin, which is small on the recto. A literary text in a codex would usually have somewhat wider margins, especially on either the left or the right, but this is a practical paraliterary text and so the author evidently makes fuller use of the writing surface and is not concerned with aesthetics.

6. The nature of the P.Würzb. 1 scholia

We think it most likely that P.Würzb. 1 comes from a compilation made for private use either by a mid-level schoolteacher or by a somewhat ambitious student in such a school (perhaps one who contemplated becoming a teacher himself). The notes appear to fall into three or four clusters, each

somewhat more common medieval practice of alternating blocks of main text and blocks of scholia see Irigoin 1984, 99.

\(^{32}\) Turner 1977, 17. 105.
one starting with a group of comments on closely spaced lines in the play:

a) 344, 347 (end of a lyric passage sung by Jocasta);
b) 638, 640 (the very beginning of a choral lyric);
c) 683, 687 (from the epode of the same choral song)
d) 1019f. (the beginning of the third chorus)

To the notes on each of these closely spaced sets of lines the writer then attaches other lemmata, with comments about content and other issues attached. If our hypothesis of a school copy applies, the main focus of the lesson might have been lyric sections of the play, to which additional background information has been added.

The number of lemmata is not certain, since there are damaged areas where the detection of the dividing symbols is precarious. Our articulated version has 30 lemmata and allows for the possibility that there were one or two more in the final lines of the verso. If the uncertain cases are discounted, there are still 26 or 27 notes.

Of the apparently 30 notes, 20 are on lyric passages: two from Jocasta’s aria, 11 from the first stasimon, only one from the second stasimon, and six from the third stasimon. Only 10 notes comment on words occurring in spoken lines: two of these are from the trochaic tetrameter passage that follows the rhésis of the agon, the rest fall in iambic trimeter passages, with three from the prologue speech of Jocasta, two from the first episode (from the stichomythia between Jocasta and Polyneices, and from Jocasta’s agon speech), one from each of the next two episodes (from the stichomythia between Eteocles and Creon, and from the short dialogue of Creon and Menoeceus), and one from the first messenger speech in the fourth episode. A proper name or proper adjective is present or alluded to in the majority of the lines commented on: seven out of 10 of the spoken lines, nine out of 20 of the lyric lines. About half the selected lines (14) include the name of a god or invite the mention of a god in the explanation. We count 15 out of 30 that deal with mythological issues. They evince the strong interest in mythography and genealogy that characterized both ancient schooling and more learned commentaries on poetry, a near-obsession that continues in medieval scholars like John Tzetzes and Thomas Magister. In fact, 24 of the 30 notes are connected to gods or to
mythography or to both, leaving only six that relate to neither. The next most common shared feature is that 13 of the notes are prompted by poetic or religious compound epithets. Finally, nine scholia offer explanations of etymology or word derivation, seven refer to ancient customs, and six help to identify places. Only five or six of the scholia are straightforward glosses: $43\;\tauὰ\;\text{ἐκτός} = \tauεριττά,\;90\;\text{διῆρες},\;807\;\text{ἄμουσοτάταις},\;1028\;\text{ἄλυρον\;μοῦσαν},\;1046\;\text{ἀμένοις},$ and possibly 656 $\text{εὐίοις}$. The importance of mythography to the author or excerptor is thus abundantly evident, but it is still puzzling how sporadic the notes are: in particular, there is but a single note on the second stasimon, which is admittedly less obviously narrative than the first and third stasimons, but still could have prompted many more mythographic identifications or summaries.

Because of the randomness of the notes and their general character, Wilcken and Schwartz were rather contemptuous of the author.\textsuperscript{33} On the other hand, Maehler and Athanassiou have tried to rehabilitate him and to show that his interests are reflective of some scholarly practices we might associate with more learned hypomnemata, and that his information has more connections with other known sources than Wilcken and Schwartz had mentioned.\textsuperscript{34} In some details, such rehabilitation seems correct. In six different notes we can be certain that the author offers alternative exegeses, such as one might expect to find both in a commentary that quotes and responds to earlier commentaries, and in $\tauὰ\;\text{μικτά}\;\text{(ὑπομνήματα)}$ mentioned in the subscription to the scholia on \textit{Orestes}. On Phoen. 606, the author points out that “white-horsed gods” can refer to the Dioscuri at Sparta as well as to Amphion and Zethus at Thebes. Two or three ways of explaining $\text{διῆρες}$ are present in the note on 90. $\text{ἄμουσοτάταις}$ in 807 is explained first with $\text{αἰνιγματώδες}$, and later with $\text{κακομούοις}$.\textsuperscript{35} The

\textsuperscript{33} Wilcken 1934, 9f.

\textsuperscript{34} Maehler 1993, 109-111; Athanassiou 1999, 45-58.

\textsuperscript{35} $\text{κακομούοις}$ is also in the medieval scholia and reflects ancient doctrine: ancient glossaries and lexica recognized that in poetry some alpha-privative adjectives were equivalent to a compound adjective with $\kappaακο-/\text{δυς}$-. For the doctrine, see sch. in Hom. II. 22,428b δεδηπλασίακε πρὸς τὴν ἐπίτασιν· τὸ γὰρ δὺς καὶ ἀ ταύτὸν δηλαοῦσιν, sch. in D.T. (Gramm. Gr. 1,3 p. 502,6-10): τὸ α μόριον πολλά σημαινεί· ἀπὸ οὖν τοῦ σημαίνοντος τὸ δὺς ἀφωνα καὶ αὐτὰ ἐκλήθησαν, ὦ τὰ δύσφωνα καὶ κακόφωνα ὄντα.
note on 982 apparently offers two explanations of the birds associated with the oracle at Dodona, one of which reflects a rationalistic adaptation. The scholion on 1019f. reports three different genealogies of the Sphinx. And the narrative of Atalante and the Calydonian boar in the scholion on 1108 indicates two slightly different treatments of why she received the aristeia of the hunt. Two other possible examples of multiple explanations are uncertain because of damage. The second explanation given for διώνυμοι in 683 may be meant as an alternative to the first, if it means the goddesses are twin-named because they form a pair rather than that each goddess has two names. And the notes on πυρφόρος in 687 may have given more than one explanation.\(^{36}\) The author thus shows awareness that the interpretation of some words is uncertain or disputed and reports different possibilities very briefly, but he has no ambition to argue for one view as superior to another, in the manner that is characteristic of ancient hypomnemata and occasionally attested in the tragic scholia, although much less frequently than in Homer scholia.

Other aspects of the notes confirm, however, their relatively low intellectual milieu. We may note what is not present in the extant notes. First, there is no mention of variant readings of the text, unlike the surviving comment in the medieval scholia that speaks of whether the αι before διώνυμοι in 683 should be read as the article αἱ or the relative adverb ἅ. Second, there is no citation of any scholar or commentator by name: such names are a sign of learned commentaries, whereas opinions have usually been rendered anonymous in scholia on tragedy that reflect the needs of schools or general readers. Third, there is no quotation of Homer or any other poet, or even a reference to Homer or another poet with the quotation omitted. Again, this reflects the normal practice in the consolidation and reduction of scholia on tragedy. It is typical to find there examples of a long version of a note containing both author’s name and a full quotation as well as reduced forms with the author’s name and a shorter portion of the quotation or no quotation at all, and, in the briefest sort

\(^{36}\) As we have reconstructed these notes, there is apparently no reference to the alternative interpretation of the epithet as “grain-bearing” (ϲιτοφόρος) instead of “fire-bearing”: sch. vet. in Phoen. 687: πυρφόρος δὲ ἐπεὶ Δήμητρα καὶ Κόρην, ἐτεὶ δρασοῦχαι αὐτῶς γίνονται τὸν φωτὸς ἐμφαίνοντος τὴν ἐκ τῶν καρπῶν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ζωῆν. ἥ τάς εἰποφόρους λέγει. ἔτι δὲ ταῦτα MBCVMnRIfS.
of reduction, neither the name nor the quotation surviving. Finally, both the scholia vetera and the scholia recentiora on *Phoenissae* include many paraphrasing or metaphrastic scholia, especially on the lyric passages such as Phoen. 347 or Phoen. 638ff.; but there is nothing like that here: the note on 347 says nothing of the recherché syntax and goes straight to the explanation of the custom, and that on 638 does not disentangle the syntax and clausal structure but starts immediately with the narration of the myth. The closest thing to a paraphrase is in 52f. on Phoen. 43, to which we return in a moment.

The notes bear comparison to some known scholia because of the long survival of the same practices in explanation and because of the similar need or desire for certain types of explanation in antiquity, late antiquity, and the middle Byzantine period. On the other hand, we doubt these notes are carefully copied from a thorough hypomnema. The surviving older scholia generally feature a decided ambition to employ learned Greek, usually in Attic dialect. There are many naïve features in P.Würzb. 1 notes that betray a lower level of ambition or competence. Note the use of rather imprecise verbs in *προβαλεῖν* in line 4 and *βαλόντεϲ* in line 11; the vague *ἔλαβεν χρῆϲ* in line 15; the fourfold repetition of *ἐκεῖ* in lines 19-21; the repetitious ring-composition in the short explanation of the derivation of *ἰάλεμοϲ* in lines 66-68; the repetition *κυνηγέτιϲ οὖϲα* *κυνηγέτηϲ οὖϲα* (79-83); and the echoing of *ϲυνήχθη*, which makes good sense as a plural, by the singular *ϲυνήχθη*, which makes less sense (81-83).

37 For an example of the process, here are three versions of the sch. vet. in Eur. Or. 371 (full version in MCVRw): ὑποῦλα πάντα τὰ ρήματα Μενελάου, ἀφ’ οὗ ὁ ποιητὴϲ τὸ ἀκτατον τῆϲ Λακεδαιμονίων γνώμηϲ κωμῳδεῖ, ὥϲ καὶ ἐν Ἀνδρομάχη [445f.]: “ὁ πάϲιν ἀνθρώπωϲιϲιν ἡχιτεϲ βροτῶϲ, Σπάρτηϲ ἐνοικοϲ, δόλια βουλευτήρια.” πρὸ γὰρ Διοκλέουϲ, ἐφ’ οὗ τὸν Ὀρέϲτην ἐδίδαξε, Λακεδαιμονίων πρεβευκαμένων περὶ εἰρήνηϲ ἀπιϲτήϲαν Αθηναῖοϲ οὐ προϲήκαν, ἐπὶ ἄρχοντοϲ Θεσπόμπου [ὁ ἐϲτι πρὸ Διοκλέουϲ]. οὕτωϲ ἔστη Φιλόχοροϲ [Philoch. Fr. 117 = FHG 1, p. 403 Müller]; (shorter version in MnPrRSA, omitting minor differences among them) ὑποῦλα τὰ ρήματα Μενελάου, ἀφ’ οὗ ὁ ποιητὴϲ τὸ ἀκτατον τῆϲ γνώμηϲ Λακεδαιμονίων κωμῳδεῖ, ‘πάϲιν ἡχιτεϲ βροτῶϲ, Σπάρτηϲ ἐνοικοϲ, δόλια βουλευτήρια’.; (extreme shortening in Ο) ὑποῦλα πάντα τὰ ρήματα τοῦ Μενελάου.

38 In collating, one is always brought up short when a Palaeologan scholar scribe suddenly uses a vernacular form, like να πράξω τάȳε.
Another oddity is the curious assimilation of Oedipus’ inquiry to the oracle to that made by Laius: “[to learn] if his father lives” (lines 70, 73). Also, the phrase “by the man of Laius” (ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τοῦ Λαίου (75) involves a usage of ἀνήρ (as “servant, attendant”) for which we have been unable so far to find a parallel (although it is impossible to check all the instances of such a common word). Finally, there is the mystery of what the author was thinking of when he mentioned ἰμάτια twice in connection with the dedication of spoils (8-10): was he merely ignorant of or confused about the ancient custom, or (as suggested in the commentary above) was this explanation meant to be less shocking to young students?

Maehler speculated that the author of these notes was transcribing them from an old commentary on a papyrus roll that was in fragments. He suggested the disorder of the notes resulted from the fact that the loose pieces were in the wrong order, and thinks the unfinished explanation of the name Calydonian boar in 80 was due to an original that became unreadable at that point. This interpretation was already doubted by the collocutors at the Fondation Hardt gathering at which he presented it. It is more plausible that when writing the note on the Calydonian boar, the author did not have the explanation at hand and was not quite sure of his facts, and he meant to look it up or ask about it and supply it later in the vacant space. As mentioned earlier, the disorder and tighter format of some of the notes on the recto, the blank space left in 57, and different appearance of the punctuating marks in 57 and 59 (vertical rather than oblique or horizontal) are perhaps another sign that these are occasional jottings for private use, not all recorded at the same time. One wonders whether the author left a gap in the middle of this page, which he later found was not needed for the only note he wanted to add between 807 and

---

39 Wilcken, p. 21, took this as an original formulation by our commentator, L. Deubner, Oedipusprobleme, p. 13 n. 1, as careless analogy to Laius’ question.
40 Other odd features of language occur in passages where the reading is extremely uncertain, so it may be the case that the decipherment is not yet accurate enough rather than that the writer uses Greek in an unusual way: e.g., ἄδραστον in 22 is very oddly used, if it is really the reading; the purpose of the mention of σχῆμα θηλυκόν in 41 is unclear.
41 Maehler 1993, 111.
42 Maehler 1993, 136.
Another possible indication of a teacher’s practice is seen in an odd detail of the scholion on Phoen. 43. In some of the scholia of the period 1280-1340 C.E., including some apparently by Planudes, the note is really about a grammatical or etymological or lexical topic that is prompted by the appearance of some particular word in the text: it is thus a lesson about the word and general usage and not about the specific usage of the poet in this passage. Medieval notes of this kind are related to a technique that many teachers still use, digressing from a text to point out some fact that will contribute to the student’s developing knowledge and pay off in their study of other texts. The P.Würzb. 1 scholion on 43 has the lemma ὅθεν τί τάκτος, which is short for the whole expression ὅθεν τί τάκτος τῶν κακῶν μὲ δεὶ λέγειν; the explanation is brief: τὰ περιττῶ· ὃ[ο]βαρὰ· πῶς ὃ π[εριττὸν ἔστι λέγω;], if we accept the restoration given above (McNamee has added ἔστι to what was already proposed by Wilcken and Schwartz). The first word is a normal gloss on the phrase in need of explanation, τὰ ἐκτός; the last words form a good paraphrase of the whole question. But the word κοβαρά is odd, and does not fit the passage of Phoenissae. Wilcken saw that περιττῶς and κοβαρὸς occur together in two passages of Plutarch, to which the TLG allows us to add a sentence that Nicephorus Gregoras uses identically in two works. It may be suggested that the word κοβαρά is there because a teacher wanted to make the general point that περιττῶ, in addition to its common meaning ‘superfluous’, could also mean ‘excessive, more forceful than usual’. This would be a lexical lesson digressing from the text. So κοβαρά in the scholion is either a shorthand reminder

43 Plu. Comp. Agis et Cleom. 10,8: τὸ ἐν μουσικῆ κοβαρὸν καὶ περιττῶν; Plu. De recta ratione audiendi 41c: οὕτω περιττῆ καὶ κοβαρᾶ λέξις ἀντιλάμπει τῷ ἀκροατῇ πρὸς τῷ δηλούμενον; Nicephorus Gregoras, Epistulae 12,68 and Historia Romana 2,839,6: οἷς γὰρ ὑπερορίους ἐκτρατεῖας παρακευάζεσθαι μεμελέτηται, τούτως καὶ περιττῶς τε καὶ μάλα κοβαρὸς ὀπλίζεσθαι ἀναγκαῖον.

44 A good example is the gloss above ἀμνημονῶ in G on Orestes 216, οὐ μιμήσκω, ἄχαριστό (only the first word is applicable to the usage in the text). Also, a late wooden codex of Isocrates has glosses that go beyond what is relevant (P.Kell. III
to himself by a teacher, or an unclear record of the teacher’s digression by a student. The idea of a student recalling what the teacher has said might also be invoked for the strange statement about ἰμάτια and other somewhat deficient or inaccurate remarks; but if we are talking about the sixth century in Egypt, such errors are not necessarily impossible for a mid-level schoolmaster himself.

In his dissertation, Athanassiou remarked upon some instances in which he found the wording used by our author and the language of Palaeologan-era scholia or prefatory material so strikingly similar that he speculated there may have been a continuous tradition accounting for it. These passages deserve brief consideration here. (1) The narrative about Cadmus in 13-22 is similar to prefatory item 10e in the Teubner edition of Phoenissae. Κάδμοϲ πεμφθεὶϲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸϲ Ἀγήνοροϲ ζητῆϲαι τὴν ἀδελφῆν αὐτοῦ Εὐρώπην εὖ τοῖϲ ἀδελφοῖϲ καὶ μὴ εὑρῶν αὐτῆν εἰϲ τὸ μαντεῖον τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνοϲ ἐν Πυθοὶ παραγίνεται πυνθανόμενοϲ ποῦ ὅφείλει κατοικεῖν· ὁ δὲ ἔφη ὅπου καθίϲει ἥ βοῦϲ αўτῆ, ἢκεὶ κτίϲον πόλιν’ ὁτὶ δὴ ἐξελθὼν τοῦ μαντείου εὗρε βοῦν, καὶ ἤκολούθηϲεν αὐτῆ, καὶ εἰϲ Θῆβαϲ ἦθηκε καὶ ἐκεῖ φικοδόμηϲε τὰϲ Θῆβαϲ (MnSHnPrYf). This seems to be a case of old commentary material or mythographic material surfacing in some of the recentiores of Euripides, but the stylistic similarity perhaps reflects the similar educational level for which these notes were intended rather than direct dependence on the same source. (2) Athanassiou compares our author’s reference to synecdoche in 40-43 to the use of the verb συνέλαβεν in the Thoman scholion on 687: πυρφόρουϲ δὲ καλεῖ ἐπειδὴ ἐν νυκτί γινομένων τῶν μυϲτηρίων οἱ μυούμενοι πῦρ ἔφερον, ὅθεν ταύταϲ πυρφόρουϲ εἰκόνιζον. ἢ πυρφόρουϲ [πυρφόρουϲ Τ] τὰϲ παραϲχούϲαϲ τὸν εἶτον. εἰ γὰρ καὶ μόνη Δημήτηρ παρέϲχεν, ἀλλὰ μετ’ αὐτῆς καὶ ταύτην συνέλαβε. κρεῖττον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ πρόϲθεν· ἐπὶ γὰρ τῷ ποιήϲαι ὀλεθρὸν τοῦ τῶν πολεμίων ετρατεύματοϲ διὰ τοῦ πυρὸϲ ἐπιβοᾶται τούτον αὐτὰϲ πέμψαι (ZZaZmTGu). But here Thomas is simply following two possibilities already given in the old scholion on the same line, although Thomas explains more fully why both goddesses are credited with responsibility for crops. Moreover, the synecdoche adduced

Gr. 95, MP3 1240.03, 4th cent. C.E., Ad Demonicum; cf. McNamee 2007, 292, note a on lines 47-55).
in our text more likely refers to the first explanation, so the kinship with Thomas is not close. (3) The narrative about Oedipus in lines 69-76 has some similarities with the verbose Thoman synopsis (arg. 12 in the Teubner edition), but parallel interests in mythography do not require dependency on one source for similar content, and Thomas is here closely following the traditional content of the myth and the information provided in the texts of *Oedipus Tyrannus* and *Phoenissae* (both members of the Byzantine triad for their authors). (4) Athanassiou was also impressed by the verbal similarity between lines 79f. on the reason for the name “Calydonian boar” and the wording of a scholion in Gu,\(^45\) which he assumed to be Thoman. Most Gu scholia in Dindorf’s edition are indeed Thoman, but not all of them, and this note is in fact found in Gu alone and is one of those due solely to the personal efforts of the Gu-scribe, who copied this note (a little carelessly) from the tradition of commentary on Lycophron. The details we find in the P.Würzb. 1 scholion are actually comparable to those in Apollodorus and other sources and have no special affinity to this last annotation. In conclusion, only the first case of similarity seems to be significant, not for a genetic relationship, but as evidence of a less polished style used in notes aimed at a less advanced audience.
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