

NIKOLAOS GONIS – CLAUDIO MELIADÒ

BKT IX 23: EARLY OR HELLENISTIC HEXAMETERS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 214 (2020) 15–16

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

BKT IX 23: EARLY OR HELLENISTIC HEXAMETERS

BKT IX 23 offers a new transcription of a fragmentary papyrus codex, a piece of which was first published by H. Maehler, *ZPE* 6 (1970) 161–3. Here we present a new edition of the side where the writing runs along the fibres.¹ The other side is badly rubbed, and only two words may be read with certainty, ἄνακτα[(l. 6) and κούρη[(l. 7).

The script is an informal bookhand, a congener of the ‘sloping pointed majuscule’; it has been assigned to the fifth century. With the exception of the apostrophes, the lectional signs were added by a second hand, as indicated by the different colour of ink (black, as opposed to brown). The same second hand is presumably responsible for the marginalia.

A clue to the composition date of the poem is provided by the metre. Much depends on the metrical position of ὦς/ὡς at → 4: Maehler argues that ‘das lange Monosyllabon an dieser Versstelle [= the fourth biceps] spricht eher für frühe, “homerische” Hexameter als für ein hellenistisches oder kaiserzeitliches Werk’ (162). What little has survived shows no evidence for the metrical refinements of Callimachus and Nonnus, but there is also nothing that would exclude a poet of the Imperial period; as Maehler points out (162 with n. 2), this particular metrical feature is common in Quintus, though cf. e.g. AR 1.1297 ὄκλιγγε μαλεροῖο πυρὸς ὡς ἰνδάλλοντο. However, if this were an Imperial poet, the heavy lectional apparatus and especially the marginal annotation (in the additional fragment, not known at the time of the first edition) would be curious. These features would have been more at home with a copy of an early or Hellenistic poem.

] ικοα[
] ικτοιοάνα [ἀμει]λίκτοιο ἄνακ[τος
] εὠδ' ὑπέδεκτομε[. . .]βωι		κε]νεῶ δ' ὑπέδεκτό με [τύμ]βωι
4] ὦς ἱερά ρέζ[]] ὦς ἱερά ρέζ[]
] ιαπληξειεναεθλον <small>οὐκ' εἶπε</small>		δ]ιαπρήξειεν ἄεθλον <small>οὐκ εἶπε</small>
] ιθ' ἵπποτροφο ἀργος <small>ποίησιν</small>		(-)ικ]οιθ' ἵπποτρόφον Ἄργος <small>ποίησιν</small>
] θ' ἱερευσεναθηνη] θ' ἱερευσεν Ἀθήνη
8] ε . οὐδε . η . .] θέε . οὐδέ οἱ ἦε
] τερον α . λο		κύν]τερον ἄλλο

BKT IX offers a semi-diplomatic transcription, dividing the words but without offering restorations. The following readings of the BKT IX transcription have been revised:

4 ρεζῶ 5 mrg ουκ· 7 Αθηνη 8 . . ουδ αινη . 9 α . λο

1 Perhaps Φοί]γικός ἀ[γαυοῦ, as in Hes. fr. 141.7 M.–W. (at verse end). If this is correct, lines 1–4 may contain a reference to Adonis, son of Phoenix according to Hes. fr. 139 M.–W., or to another offspring of Agenor, e.g. Cadmus, who, after he built Cadmea, sacrificed a cow to Athena (cf. l. 6).

2 ἀμει]λίκτοιο ἄνακ[τος. The restorations are Maehler’s. For the metrical position, cf. also [Opp.] *Cyn.* 3.10 ἀμειλίκτοιο Κρόνοιο (sim. 3.223). Clausulae of the type -οιο ἄνακτος are common in early hexameter poetry, but also in Quintus and the *Sibylline Oracles*. One could think of reference to Eurystheus (cf.

¹ For images and metadata, see <http://berlpap.smb.museum/04333/>. N. Gonis examined the original at Berlin in August 1997, August 1999, and July 2019, and wishes to record his thanks to the late William Brashear, to Günter Poethke, and to Marius Gerhardt for the hospitality. We are grateful to Ben Henry for comments and criticism, most importantly on the reading of lines 8 and 9.

ἄεθλον at 5), but if a tomb is mentioned in the next line ἀμείλικτος ἄναξ may be a metaphor for death (Hades?).

3 κε]γεῶ δ' ὑπέδεκτό με [τύμ]βωι. Cf. QS 12.486 πολλὰ κινυρομένη κενεῶ ἐπαύτεε τύμβω; *Epiqr. sepulchr.* 539.5 ὦ γονέεσ, τί μάτην κενεῶ προσψύχετε τύμβω; με τύμβω at verse-end in AP 7.178.1, 310.1. The sense speaks against reading ἐῶ δ' ὑπέδεκτό με [τύμ]βωι (though cf. AP 7.536.1 ἐῶ ἐπιτέτροφε τύμβω, QS 2.438 οὐνεκά που Διόνυσον εἰοῖς ὑπέδεκτο μελάθροισ).

4 ἱερά ρέζ . Ed. pr. read ρεζω, but omega is difficult. The letter after zeta might be ε; it is unclear whether any other letter followed, but -ει would be even more difficult. The pattern for this clausula is Homeric; cf. *Od.* 1.61 ἱερά ρέζων, 3.5 ἱερά ρέζον.

5 δι]απρήξειεν ἄεθλον. Cf. AR 3.788 ἐξανύσειεν ἄεθλον (in the same position); also AP 4.3.127 ναὶ τάχα καὶ πέμπτοιο χάρις θέλξειεν ἀέθλου.

5–6 mrg. οὐκ εἶπε ποῖον. This may refer either to ἄεθλον at 5 or to Ἄργος at 6. If the latter, cf. Eustathius' commentary to *Il.* 24.437 (vol. 4, p. 928.18–21 v.d.V.): ἄδηλον δὲ ποῖον λέγει Ἄργος. δόξειε δ' ἂν μάλιτα ὡς Μυρμιδῶν τὸ Θετταλικὸν λέγειν. According to Steph. Byz. α 400, there were at least eleven πόλεις named Ἄργος, but only the first, the διασημοτάτη πόλις Πελοποννήσου, was called ἱππόβοτον διὰ τὸ Ποσειδῶνι νομῆν ἵππων ἀποδειχθῆναι (cf. ἱπποτρόφον Ἄργος at 6). For the wording, cf. also Σ Hes. *Op.* 276a ἐπαγγεῖλάμενος οὐκ εἶπε ποῖον νόμον.

6 ἴκ]οιθ' (or ἀφί]κ]οιθ') ἱπποτρόφον Ἄργος. For ἴκοιτ' in the same position, see *Od.* 17.539. For the adjective, cf. Hes. *Op.* 507 Θρήκης ἱπποτρόφον; Pind. *N.* 10.41f. Προίτοιο τόδ' ἱπποτρόφον / ἄκτυ; Bacch. *Ep.* 11.114 ἐς ἱπποτρόφον πόλιν; [Mosch.] *Meg.* 36 Θήβην ἱπποτρόφον.

7 ἱέρευεν Ἀθήνηι. Cf. Σ E. *Ph.* 1062 Ὅγκας νηὸς ὄδ' ἐστὶν Ἀθηνᾶσ, ὃν ποτε Κάδμος εἶσατο, βούν θ' ἱέρευεν, ὅτ' ἔκτισεν ἄκτυ τὸ Θήβασ.

8 θέγν' οὐδέ οἱ ἦεν. θέγν' was among the possibilities considered by Maehler, *ZPE* 6 (1970) 163. For οὐδέ οἱ ἦεν, cf. Hes. fr. 195.15 M.–W. (= *Scut.* 15), AR 2.854.

9 κύν]τερον ἄλλο. Cf. *Od.* 7.216 (at verse end), 20.18.

Nikolaos Gonis, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London, London WC1E 6BT
n.gonis@ucl.ac.uk

Claudio Meliaddò, Dipartimento di Civiltà antiche e moderne, Università di Messina, I-98168 Messina
cmeliado@unime.it