The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for ***The Classical Quarterly***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Note on *Papiri Greci E Latine*, No. 131

Hugh G. Evelyn White

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 11 / Issue 01 / January 1917, pp 50 - 51

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800012015, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800012015

How to cite this article:

Hugh G. Evelyn White (1917). Note on *Papiri Greci E Latine*, No. 131. The Classical Quarterly, 11, pp 50-51 doi:10.1017/S0009838800012015

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTE ON *PAPIRI GRECI E LATINE*, No. 131.¹

IN a previous issue of this journal (*C.Q.*, April, 1915, p. 76) I proposed a tentative restoration of the first half of this papyrus, referring ll. 1-10 to the story of Amphiarus. I do not know whether any alternative restoration has been published; but it seemed worth while to improve on my earlier suggestions, both by stating more fully and more clearly the grounds for the reference to Amphiarus, and by offering a somewhat smoother restoration (as I hope) than the version originally printed.

Amphiarus, then, is suggested as the subject of the fragment first by Ἀλκμάονα in l. 1, and secondly by ll. 6-7, which, taken together, clearly indicate the Expedition of the Seven against Thebes. In l. 8 the words]Ζηνὸς παρὰ θέσφατα[greatly increase the probability that we have to do with the warrior-seer; while the remains of l. 10 occurring in such close association with these other significant points can hardly be restored otherwise than as narrating the mysterious end of Amphiarus. My supplement, moreover, for ll. 9-10 is strongly supported by Pindar, *Ol.* VI. 14:

. . . κατὰ γαῖ' αὐτόν τε νιν καὶ φαιδίμους ἵππους ἔμαρψεν.

In my original restoration two points—doubtless there are others—seem specially unsatisfactory: first, the separation of the verb (l. 5) from its object (l. 2) by two participial clauses; and, secondly, the somewhat violent reading κῦδος in l. 7, where the original editors read ΗΤΑΦΟ[. I now suggest the following for the passage under consideration (ll. 2-10):

2 τὸν ῥ' ὑπὲρ Ἀργεί]ους Καδμηίδες ἐλκεσίπε[πλοι,
 ὄμματα τ' εὐμεγε]θές τε δέμας εἰσάντα ἰδοῦ[σαι,
 θαύμασαν ἀμφι] ταφὰς πολυκηδέος Οἰδιπό[δαο,
 λυγρῶς τειρομ]ένου κ[α]κίη θ' ὑπο [κῆ]ρι [δαμέντος.
 ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἄρ' εἰς Θήβα]ς Δαναοὶ θεράποντες Ἀρη[ος
 ἦλθον ἀμυνεμένα]ι Πολυνείκει ἡ τάφο[ν εὐρεῖν,
 εἰδότα περ θυμῷ] Ζηνὸς πάρα θέσφατα [πάντα,
 Γαῖα χανοῦσα ἐ τηλοῦ] ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ βαθυδί[νρεω
 10 κάππιε σὺν θ'] ἵπποισι καὶ ἄρμασι κολλητοῖσι.

¹ The text is printed in the *Addenda* to the Teubner *Hesiod*, third (1913) edition, with No. 130: only small local restorations are there given, and the piece is labelled *ragmentum dubium*.

The restoration of l. 5 here given is intended merely to fill a gap. The remains indeed are extremely baffling owing to the variety of more or less possible combinations it suggests: thus we might read:

$$]EN OTK[E]TI NO+ \tau\pi o \left\{ \begin{array}{c} XEI \\ \Delta OT \\ KH \end{array} \right\} PI [\Delta AMHNAI$$

or

$$]ENOT \left\{ \begin{array}{c} K[A]T' IN+ \\ K[E]TIN' \end{array} \right\} OT\pi o[TE \left\{ \begin{array}{c} XEI \\ \Delta OT \\ KH \end{array} \right\} [PI [\Delta AMHNAI.;$$

but in any case there seems to be some sort of corruption immediately before the $\tau\pi o$ or $OT\pi o[TE$. I have therefore suggested $K[A]KIH\Theta$. Again three letters are needed to fill the lacuna between $\tau\pi o[$ and $[PI$; perhaps however KH , being both broad letters, may be sufficient for this purpose.

HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE.