

ΦΑΙΔΙΜΟΣ ΕΚΤΩΡ

Studi in onore di Willy Cingano per il suo 70° compleanno

a cura di Enrico Emanuele Prodi e Stefano Vecchiato

A Boeotian Poem in *PSI X 1174*: Some Considerations

Giovan Battista D'Alessio

Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II", Italia

Lucia Prauscello

University of Oxford, UK

Abstract Since Coppola's 1931 proecdosis of *PSI 1174* = *PMG 690* (*Boeot. inc. auct.*), scholars have almost exclusively focused on the *Orestas* poem transmitted at ll. 8-13, neglecting the more lacunose seven lines at the beginning of the papyrus fragment. This contribution provides a new transcription based on autopsy of the whole papyrus and offers a new detailed study of the remains of the first poem (ll. 1-7). Among the various possible scenarios that can be envisaged, the hypothesis of a poem on Iphigenia's sacrifice in Aulis deserves serious consideration.

Keywords *PSI X 1174*. Boeotian dialect. Lyric poetry. Corinna. Iphigenia.

Summary 1 *PSI 1174*: Editorial History and Authorship. – 2 *PSI 1174*: Dating, Transcription and Palaeographical Apparatus. – 3 *PSI 1174*: Layout and Metre. – 4 Narrative Technique and Clausal Device. – 5 *PSI 1174*: The Text of ll. 1-7. – 6 *PSI 1174*: Subject Matter and Performance.



Edizioni
Ca' Foscari

Antichistica 31 | Filologia e letteratura 4

e-ISSN 2610-9344 | ISSN 2610-8828

ISBN [ebook] 978-88-6969-548-3 | ISBN [print] 978-88-6969-549-0

Peer review | Open access

Submitted 2021-05-17 | Accepted 2021-06-23 | Published 2021-12-16

© 2021 | Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution alone

DOI 10.30687/978-88-6969-548-3/014

235

1 *PSI 1174*: Editorial History and Authorship

PSI 1174 (Bibl. Med. Laur. inv. 18111= *TM* 59470)¹ is a small papyrus scrap (6.6 cm wide and 10.1 cm high) written on the perfibral face only. It is broken on all sides and preserves the remains of 12 lines, fragmentary both to the right and to the left, separated between lines 7 and 9 by an indented title, Ὀρέτασ, in line 8. The lower margin is preserved for 3.4 cm. Lines 1-7 and 9-13 belong to the end and the beginning of two poems written in Boeotian dialect. The papyrus was bought on the antiquarian market by Evaristo Breccia in March 1930 from the Coptic dealer Mankarius, based in Medinet el-Fayûm, and immediately sent to Medea Norsa in Florence.² Goffredo Coppola published a proecdosis in the appendix of his 1931 book on Pindar.³ In 1932 followed the *editio princeps* by M. Norsa and G. Vitelli (henceforth N-V) in the tenth volume of the *Papiri della Società Italiana*.⁴

Coppola, who offered only a diplomatic transcription of the first poem in a footnote,⁵ unhesitatingly ascribed both texts to Corinna: the attribution is not secured by external data, but it is strongly suggested by language, style and content. Twenty years later Lobel questioned Corinna's authorship on the basis of some orthographical divergences from the norms generally followed in *P.Berol.* 13284 (= *PMG* 654), a feature shared by the new bunch of *Boeotica* preserved by *P.Oxy.* 2371-2374, whose attribution to Corinna Lobel also doubted.⁶ Lobel's scepticism was accepted by Page in his *Poetae Melici Graeci* (where *PSI 1174* = *PMG* 690 is relegated among the *Boeotica incerti auctoris*) but was effectively countered in detail by West 1970: minor orthographical differences in dialectal matters carry little evi-

It is a pleasure to dedicate to Willy Cingano the printed version of this paper, first presented in 2016 at Ca' Foscari, Venice / Venice International University under his auspices. Our sincerest thanks to G. Ucciardello and A.C. Cassio for commenting on an advanced draft of the paper, and to T. Spinedi for making us aware, at proof stage, of the existence of her 2018 unpublished doctoral dissertation on Corinna, available online since April 2021. While both Authors contributed equally to this paper and the responsibility of the contents lies with both, for practical purposes §§ 1-4 are to be attributed to G.B. D'Alessio and §§ 5-6 to L. Prauscello.

1 A digital image is available here: <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/psi;10;1174>.

2 Cf. Morelli, Pintaudi 1983, 398-9, 446-57, 498, 501, 523, 607 (on Mankarius) and 468, 471-2, 476 (on this papyrus); Canfora 2005, 26-7.

3 Coppola 1931, 231-42.

4 Norsa, Vitelli 1932, 140-1.

5 Coppola 1931, 231 fn. 1.

6 Lobel 1956, 60 with a list of the "anomalies" (esp. the genitive in -ου = -οιο and interlinear hiatus); Lobel regarded Corinna's authorship of *PSI 1174* as "untenable". The ascription to Corinna was accepted by N-V, Bowra 1936; Körte 1939; Page 1942, 378 (the *Orestas*) and Page 1953, 27-8 (both texts).

dential value since they are external features of the paradosis.⁷ While Corinna's authorship for *PSI 1174* cannot be proved beyond doubt, the fact that the Alexandrian grammatical tradition consistently cites only one author, Corinna, for instances of Boeotian literary dialect, strongly supports West's view of the inherent unlikelihood that in first centuries CE readers of Hermopolis and Oxyrhynchus "had any Boeotian poetry to read other than Corinna". For the present purpose we shall thus consider Corinna's authorship of *PSI 1174* as a likely, if by no means certain, working hypothesis.

The intermittent attention that *PSI 1174* has attracted so far has been directed almost exclusively toward the second of the two poems preserved, the *Orestas*, and especially toward two of its most remarkable aspects: the relevance of its title to the landscape of Boeotian mythology in general and of Theban myth and cult in particular;⁸ and the interpretative reconstruction of its first lines, that seem to provide a description of the context of its own performance.⁹ The remains of the preceding poem have instead been almost entirely neglected, with the exception of some brief notes in the apparatus of Ernst Diehl's 1936 *Anthologia Lyrica*.¹⁰ Our contribution is based on a new inspection in Florence of the original papyrus, that, to the best of our knowledge, has not been the object of a first-hand collation after the work of Coppola and Norsa and Vitelli in the early 1930s.

2 *PSI 1174*: Dating, Transcription and Palaeographical Apparatus

First, some bibliographical data. *PSI 1174* is written in a not too elegant and somewhat uneven upright hand, mostly bilinear (φ and ψ , being taller than the other letters, break bilinearism; so also, but less frequently, the apex of δ). Most upright are drawn as straight verticals (only the descender of π is occasionally slightly curved); α is always

⁷ West 1970, 278-9; in favour of the attribution of Page's *Boeotica incerti auctoris* to Corinna, see also Palumbo Stracca 1993, 407-9 (esp. with reference to *PSI 1174*), Cingano 2017, 45-7 (on *P.Oxy. 2732 = PMG 692*) and more generally Vessella 2012, 816 and Rodríguez Piedrabuena 2015. Torres i Ribé et alii 2005 include *PSI 1174* in their edition of Corinna (29-30 on our papyrus; text at 80-1).

⁸ Pindar's *Pyth.* 11 and *Nem.* 11.33-38 (Orestes, together with the Spartan Pisander, leading the multi-ethnic expedition known as the Aeolian migration) also reflect a tradition linking Orestes to Boeotia and more specifically to Thebes. On Orestes and the Aeolian migration, see Angeli Bernardini 1997 with previous bibliography and Fowler 2013, 597-602; cf. also Hornblower 2015, 474-6 (on Lycoph. 1374-1377) on the traditions about Orestes and his descendants colonizing the north-western part of Asia Minor.

⁹ On the *Orestas*: Bowra 1936, 130-2; West 1970, 283; Palumbo Stracca 1993, 407-9; Finglass 2008, 32-4.

¹⁰ Page's 1953 edition relies heavily on that of Diehl.

angular and μ is drawn in four strokes. Round letters are oblong and rather narrow, creating a modular contrast; ω is drawn with its middle part reaching as high as the notional upper line; the middle bar of ϵ occasionally slants upward, touching the extremity of the arc. Many letters display marked serifs at the bottom of their first upright; τ at the left-hand margin of the horizontals; υ and ψ at the start of the first stroke. The descending oblique of κ starts not from the vertical but from the middle of the rising oblique. The rising oblique of μ meets the descender at two thirds of its height. The title at line 8 is provided apparently by the same hand, but in a smaller module (note the very small initial \omicron , hanging from the upper line, a feature typical of more ancient Ptolemaic hands). Coppola dated the papyrus doubtfully to the 2nd century CE, without arguments. Norsa and Vitelli opted rather for the 1st century CE.¹¹ Its general appearance, however, would suggest to us a somewhat earlier date, in the 1st century BCE, without ruling out the first decades of the following century: compare, above all, *P.Fay. 7 (Odyssey 6 = Brit.Lib., inv. 817 = P.Lond.Lit. 31)*, which displays most of its features,¹² and the more squarish, but still somewhat comparable hand of *P.Oxy. 4099 (= Cavallo, Maehler 2008, no. 71, dated to the end of 1st BCE/beginning of 1st CE)*.¹³ If we are correct in suggesting this new dating (1st BCE/first decades of the 1st CE), *PSI 1174* would be to-date the earliest extant papyrus of Boeotian poetry.¹⁴

11 Crisci in Cavallo et al. 1998, 96 (but cf. already Crisci 1996, 45). Crisci compares the Corinna papyrus to other papyri he dates to the 1st century BCE or the turn of the 1st CE (*P.Lond.Lit.* 134, the London Hyperides, and *P.Oxy.* 2545, a less close match than those quoted above), but confirms the 1st CE date.

12 Roberts 1956, 9 and Plate 9b finds features in *P.Fay. 7* suggesting that it “may antedate the Roman conquest of Egypt”, and we concur with his judgment. Cf. Cavallo, Maehler 2008, no. 68. Cavallo 2008, 68 dates *P.Fay. 7* “fine 1 a.C. se non già 1 d.C.”. Another Homeric papyrus with somewhat similar features is *P.Med. inv. C.N.R. 68.2 (Odyssey 22)*, published by Daris, who compares its hand to that of several pieces dated between the end of the 1st BCE and the first half of the 1st CE, including the Corinna papyrus (Daris 1967, 95 and fn. 1; we are grateful to G. Ucciardello for pointing this out to our attention).

13 For documentary hands with some (though more vaguely) similar features, cf. e.g. *BGU IV1054* and *1053 recto* (both 13 BCE), and *P.Oxy.* 2979 (4 BCE), less squarish, with rounded alphas, and various cursive traits; *O.Ber.* 2 (33 CE) provides an interesting comparison from several other points of view.

14 The handwriting of *P.Oxy.* 2373 = *PMG 693 Boeot. inc. auct.* (Johnson’s scribe A2: cf. Johnson 2004, 17-18) is now securely dated to the end of the 2nd/beginning of the 3rd century CE (Vitelli mistakenly dated *PSI 1090*, written by the same copyist, to the 1st BCE): see Colomo 2008, 14 with fn. 66. In his analysis of poem-titles in the papyri of Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides Prodi 2020, 463 suggests that in lyric oeuvres “inset titles” (as opposed to marginal titles) are “a later fashion, emerging between the first and the second century CE and becoming prevalent only with the ‘severe style’ that straddles the second and the third”. The inset title *Orestas* of *PSI 1774* would thus be an exception (cf. possibly also *P.Oxy.* 659, Pindar’s *Partheneia*, with D’Alessio 1991,

Sparse lectional signs are provided, possibly by a later hand, but in an undistinguishable ink. These include a sign similar to a *diastole* at line 3, and an angular rough breathing and an acute accent at line 10; another problematic sign appears at line 6. The only punctuation signs are some ἄνω στιγμαί, apparently added at a second stage, at lines 4, 11 and 12. Elision, as far as we can see, is unmarked (certainly so at ll. 7, 11 and 13; on ll. 4-5 see below § 5). The lines of the second poem, at the bottom of the column, are slightly more densely packed than those of the previous poem, which may also explain the smaller module of the title.

Even if in this contribution we shall focus only on the first poem,¹⁵ we give here a new diplomatic transcription of the whole of PSI 1174 followed by a palaeographical apparatus

] ιδου . (.) [
]αυτοφονει [
] . καρδιη'σφαδδ . [
]κτονιν·κρουσεδε [
] . δεδωκεδ'ορε . [5
]υπυρικηνοειδα .]τ [
]παντεσεπ'ωκουπορωζ [
ορεστας	
]αμνωκιανωλιπωσαπ [
]ιαρ'ονφαοσεελανασπασα [10
]ω·ωρηδεσδιοσαμβροτυ [
] . φεαρ'οενανθεσι·γεγα [
] . υνχοροσανεπταπουλογ [

1] . bottom of upright with little serif protruding to the right, and, 2 mm to the right, a descending diagonal meeting at roughly mid-height an upright with a leftward pointing serif at its bottom: ν (Coppola, N-V) or η (Diehl): normally ν's diagonal meets the upright at its bottom, but 13] υν provides a very good match; η's cross-bar is often inclined downward and meets the upright at the right place; the serif at the bottom of the second upright is slightly anomalous on both interpretations, but it is frequent in other uprights. ιδου only the lower parts are preserved, but shape and dimensions do not seem to allow really viable alternatives; of ν (Diehl), only the lower part remains: it is narrow (but there are several similar ones) and its first upright starting with a curve rather than with a serif would be slightly anomalous, but it seems compatible, and there are no other plausible alternatives (contrast the markedly different spac-

107-8 and his further work-in-progress on this papyrus). Prodi himself, however, recognised the limited statistical value of such a small sample.

¹⁵ We shall discuss the *Orestas* poem in a different venue.

ing of λ₁ at l. 9; the reading λ proposed by Spinedi 2018, 123, who articulates the whole sequence as δ'ό λ₁π . [is therefore unlikely). If we accept this, the two following feet of uprights (the first serifed, the second slightly curved to the right) will most probably belong either to a π or to ιτ (for the right-facing hook at its base cf. the τ at l. 13 and – most probably – l. 6 too): there might be also part of the horizontal on disturbed fibres to the right, but this would work with either alternative; . [uncertain traces on damaged fibres, either the lower arc of a somehow flattened roundish letter (ο more likely than c or ε) or a rising diagonal with a marked seriph at the bottom, that is, α (cf. the α of κ_αρδ at l. 3 and that of επ_τα at l. 13 2]α: λ also possible (N-V); ι[: an upright: no visible traces of high horizontal, or of cross-bar (but, however unlikely it is, it cannot be ruled out since the papyrus breaks immediately to the right) 3] . the foot of an upright; κ is practically certain; between κ_αρδ_ιη and the next word a right arc has been inserted *supra lineam*; . [left upper arc: its shape could seem too wide and open for an ο (but cf. αμβ_ρο at l. 11), more like an ε, but there is no trace of cross-bar (the only case of ε with a cross-bar not touching the arc is 12 α_νθ_εα but, even there, there is a smaller gap than the one required here and the surface is partly damaged) 4]κ bottom part of descending oblique and tiny remains of the upper part of ascending oblique: shape and distance from the following letter make κ very likely: N-V consider (as their first option) also c, and, as less likely, α or λ, but all of these would be incompatible with the (admittedly tiny) remains of the ascending oblique; there is no reason to doubt the following τ (with Diehl): the start of the horizontal is actually visible; ε[left part of round letter, perhaps thickening toward its middle (thus possibly suggesting ε, but ο not ruled out) 5] . traces suggesting a descending oblique, possibly preceded by an upright, but they are on misplaced fibres, and could well be misleading; κ: traces of upright and two diagonals: there is also some ink not accounted for at their junction, but the fibres are disturbed here; δ: top of triangular letter with the rising oblique joining the descending one well below its top, which suggests very clearly δ (note that the fibres show that this portion of the papyrus should be slightly rotated clockwise to be aligned with the rest of the text); Spinedi 2018, 126 reads this as a χ but the shape, the inclination and the height of the trace are not compatible with the start of the descending diagonal of χ as preserved at l. 13); the following letter is far too narrow for ω (all editors), and must have been an ο; . [a thick dot, slightly higher than mid-height, fairly close to the preceding letter, and 1 mm to its right on the line a dot possibly belonging to the foot of an upright (arguably too high to be part of an interlinear sign pertaining to line 6): reading these traces as belonging to ι would be problematic, as the first trait is too low for its top, and the second too far to its right; the first objection would apply to υ too (but cf. 11 αμβ_ροτ_υ []); c could be a possible interpretation, taking into account that sigma (just as ο and ε) is often drawn with an angular shape in its left part, and can reach even slightly further than the bottom line (as e.g. at l. 10 cε_λα_να_ς); π would be a theoretical alternative, but linguistically intractable 6]υ (V-N) rather than ι (Coppola), as traces of the diagonal joining the vertical are visible; ρι: of ι visible only the upper end of the vertical and part of the finishing stroke to the left level with

the bottom line; to the right of ι, always at bottom line, possibly foot as if of a descending oblique (but fibres are disturbed): it could be a sign marking the deletion of iota but we would expect to find its continuation higher and to the left above the letters ει there is a trait looking like the flattened half side of a δ, far too squeezed and angular to be a rough breathing; the last letter is pretty clearly τ and should probably not be under-dotted 7]. base of an upright thickened toward right in a small serif, and traces on two twisted fibres: the intermediate one seems to be a continuation of the upright while the upper one seems to be a horizontal: V-N read c or β, but the traces seem to be more compatible with Diehl's π; επωκ: the π is fairly well preserved (top of first upright; horizontal ending with the thickening from which the second upright starts); of κ only top and foot of upright and bottom of descending oblique: both letters are practically certain; the last preserved letter is represented by the central part of a left arc, compatible with c (V-N) 9]. start of a horizontal high on the line, compatible with π or τ (N-V) 10]., remains of a vertical; the rough breathing (very much squarish) is placed between ι and α, while the acute accent between ρ and ο (of which only the upper part is preserved); note that the first α of πααα is so narrow as to show no cross-bar; N-V write: "Dopo πααα, prima della lacuna, non c'è traccia di altra lettera". In the current state of the papyrus, though, as well as in that of the photograph reproduced along with the edition of N-V, the papyrus breaks immediately to the right, so there is no way to confirm that this was the end of the line 11]. the first letter is almost certainly ω (Diehl), even if only its right half is preserved: ο (Coppola) would be very anomalous, since the letter is open at the top; if it were a ν the second upright would be outward curved, and there are no parallels for this; the following letter too is probably ω, even if its second half is anomalously closed at its top: cο as an alternative (N-V) would be still more problematic, as its first half is clearly an all-round shape, open only at its top, and the supposed ο would be in full contact with it; at the end of the line the horizontal line *supra lineam*, probably a macron, starts already above the τ; note that the trace with the foot of υ seems to be farther to the left than we would expect 12]. middle part of upright (looks too straight for a right arc); ανθεεε: θ looks corrected from ε; after ανθεεε a high dot (N-V), not the same sign as in line 3 (Diehl) 13]. υυ: of the first letter we can see the bottom and the left-hand part of a round letter open to the right, compatible with c or ε (but there is no trace of a cross-bar), not with ξ (Coppola: no comparisons are available); Diehl and West read it as δ, in which case we would have the horizontal and the final part of the descending oblique, drawn as a concave curve by this hand; a further dot of ink, higher and to the right probably belongs still to this letter as it looks to be too low to be already part of a following υ (the only possibility, if the preceding letter was δ); of the υ the lower part of the base is visible, starting with a thicker dot: the letter may look a bit squeezed (and we considered ι as an alternative), but traces on disturbed fibres above it seem to belong to its upper 'chalice', so, on the whole,]çυ, rather than]çι or]ϕυ.

3 PSI 1174: Layout and Metre

Apart from the very lacunose state of the first lines (on which see below), one of the main difficulties in reconstructing the text of our papyrus lies in determining the original width of the column and thus the metre, as both side-margins are missing. If we assume that our papyrus was regularly arranged into κῶλα (see below), a potential clue could be provided by comparing the position of the title at l. 8 (inset by at least 4-5 letters) with other lyric papyri with inset titles. In these cases, the indentation of the titles ranges from 2 to 9 letters, but titles are usually longer and *cola* arguably shorter than in our case (with the exception of PSI 1181 = Bacchyl. fr. *dubia* 60 and 61 M: on which see below).¹⁶ If, on the other hand, we consider the possibility that PSI 1174 had no colometrical layout, which would be very unusual, if not unique for a lyric papyrus of the late 1st BCE, the comparative evidence suggests that even so we should probably not expect that the title was indented more than about 10 letters. A Ptolemaic comparison with an inset title accompanying lyric poetry not divided into κῶλα is provided by the anthology of *P.Berol.* inv. 9771 (3rd century BCE) where the parodos of Euripides' *Phaethon* is disposed in irregular lines of 35-40 letters (oscillating between a minimum of 31 and a maximum of 43)¹⁷ and is preceded by a title with an indentation of ca. 10 letters. Also a comparison with the position of intracolumnar titles in non-lyric Ptolemaic papyri, such as the Posidippus papyrus (*P.Mil.Vogl.* VIII 309, where the title are followed by hexameters, line i.e. up to 17-syllable long) and the indication of the chorus-section between acts III and IV of Menander's *Sikyonioidi* in *P.Sorb.* inv. 2272+72 (where the title is followed by iambic trimeters, 12/13 syllables, and the preceding lines are trochaic tetrameters, 15 syllables) shows that even in these cases titles were usually placed much closer to the left-hand margin, with an indentation ranging from 7 to 12 letters, than to the end of the first following line (ranging from 13 to 19 letters).¹⁸

In the case of PSI 1174 the difficulty of determining the column's width is further compounded by the fact that there are two cases of interlinear hiatus (l. 6 πυριεκηον; l. 11]ω·ωρη): in the former case

¹⁶ See the survey by Prodi 2016 with the relevant data (for an occasional central position of the inset title cf. Prodi 2016, 1151, 1155 and 1172). PSI 1174 (which arguably provides the earliest occurrence) is not included in Prodi's study.

¹⁷ For the layout of *P.Berol.* inv. 9771 and other lyric Ptolemaic papyri, see D'Alessio 2016, 438-40.

¹⁸ The only case in the Posidippus roll in which the title is almost centred is that at col. xiv line 29, where the title starts at the level of the twelfth letter of the following line and ends around 14 letters before the end of that line. In all the other cases (six) the title is considerably closer to the left margin.

it could be either a colometrical or a scribal mistake;¹⁹ in the latter one can again posit either a colometrical slip (West 1970, 279, according to whom the punctuation after the first ω suggests *verse-end*) or *correptio in hiatu*. While false or corrupted colometry may be on the cards,²⁰ in both cases an alternative explanation is equally available and one should not assume a priori colometrical mistakes or, more radically, lack of a colometrical layout when alternative explanations can be found.

If we start from the hypothesis (1) that nothing is missing at the beginning of line 7]ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΕΠΩΚΟΥΠΟΡΩΣ[, alignment with the other lines would imply either (a) just a single letter missing at line 6, and no letter missing at lines 9-10 (with the edge being placed, very unusually, slightly further to the right, compared to what happens in the preceding lines), or (b) just a very slim letter missing at lines 9-10 (with the left-hand margin moving further toward the left: Maas' law).²¹ It is immediately evident that hypothesis (1a) cannot work; as for (1b), no satisfactory solution along this line has been found so far. This, along with the assumption that the indentation of the title *Corinna papyrus* might have been of up to 10 letters, would allow (2) the possibility that at least one syllable is missing before the first letter of line 7. As outlined above, attempts at finding convincing supplements of a single, slim letter at the beginning of the first two lines of the poem have proved so far elusive, and we have no reason to suppose that the left-hand margin in the *Orestas* was in εἰςθετικ in comparison with the preceding poem. It seems therefore safer to go for (2) and assume that at least one syllable (2/3 letters, but, theoretically, up to 5/6?) is missing at the beginning of line 7. If this is so, the κῶλα of our papyrus would have been at least about 11/12-syllable long. This is more than the average length of the κῶλα (about 10 syllables) usually found in colometric lyric papyri, including those of *Corinna*, but there are a handful of comparable cases, such as the *Lille Stesichorus* (dactylo-epitrites), *Pind. Nem. 11* (dactylo-epitrites), and *Simonides frs. 4 and 12 Poltera = PMG 519 frs. 79 and 92 (Epinicians)*.²² In these cases, we can suppose that different poems (or group of poems) might have been arranged according to different

19 Cf. above palaeographical description of l. 6. See West 1970, 279 with various suggestions of correction (π<ο>υρ ἔκλον, π<ο>υρὶ κῆον, π<ο>υρὶ κῆον) and below §5.

20 See West 1970, 283 for the *Orestas* poem.

21 As West 1970, 283 supposed: cf. his supplement ἄ]αc μὲν at l. 9 and π[αγὰ|c] ἰαρόν at ll. 9-10 (an articulation which goes against scribal practice).

22 See D'Alessio 2017, 241-2 and 2020, 165 for comparative data on the length of the κῶλα in the ancient papyri and in the medieval mss. of *Pindar's epinicians*, to be supplemented taking into account the two *Simonidean* passages mentioned above. In *Corinna* in *PMG 654* (a) we have cola of 8 syllables followed by a clausula of 10 syllables; in *PMG 654* (b) we find again cola of 8 syllables followed by a clausula of 7 syllables.

colometrical criteria. Unlikely as it seems at this later date, anyway, we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that the text of these poems had no colometric lay-out at all. All this, together with the very uncertain state of ll. 1-5 makes extremely haphazard to try to reconstruct a possible colometry out of the few words preserved. At any rate, line 7 shows a clear dactylic (prosodiac?) sequence, and a similar double-short rhythm can be detected at lines 2 and, perhaps, in the first half of line 6 (if we get rid of the augment, see below). A single-short rhythm appears in lines 3 and 4 and in the second half of 6, but we cannot go further than this in our analysis.

4 Narrative Technique and Closural Device

The first seven lines, however, fragmentary as they are, do preserve some elements that allow reasonably informed conjectures on their possible content. Before reviewing line by line our poem, let us first point out an obvious though interesting feature in terms of narrative technique. Quite independently from individual supplements, before the title *Orestas* we have a poem ending in *mid narrative*, probably with a mythic narrative (in or out of direct speech), cf. l. 7 ἵππάντες ἐπ' ὤκουπόρωσ [. That is, we do not have a framing device bringing the audience back to the immediate context of the song or the present occasion of the performance. This is not a very frequent closural type but one attested in a small group of extant lyric poems of the classical era (mainly epinicians and dithyrombs, but there is also the well-known precedent of Sappho 44.33-36 V and the 'old age' poem as transmitted by the new Cologne papyrus (58.11-22 V), where it ends with the Tithonus *exemplum*).²³ Most (but not all) of these instances have already been discussed in detail by Rutherford and Bernsdorff:²⁴ for Pindar one can think of *Ol.* 4 (ending with the direct speech of the Argonaut Erginus at ll. 24-27), *Nem.* 1 (ll. 61-72: the prophecy of Tiresias in indirect speech), and probably the end of *Pae.* 4 (= fr. 52d M = D4 Rutherford) if Euxantius is speaking.²⁵ This closural device seems to have been particularly loved by Bacchylides too: we find it in Bacchylides' *Odes* 15 ('Antenoridai') and 16 ('Heracles'), both dithyrombs. Ode 15 ends with Menelaus' direct speech (ll. 50-63) and 16 terminates in full narrative slant with a reference to the δαιμόνιον τέρασ, the portent of Nessus' drug. To Rutherford's examples one can add what is possibly an even closer parallel to our

²³ On the 'open' closure of Sappho 58 as in *P.Cologne*, see Bernsdorff 2005. Lardinois 2009 and Edmunds 2009 are unduly sceptical in this regard.

²⁴ Rutherford 1997, 53-5; Bernsdorff 2005 (especially for the Latin examples).

²⁵ Rutherford 2001, 288 with fn. 26.

papyrus: PSI 1181 (= TM 67233), variously ascribed to either Simonides or Bacchylides.²⁶ Just as in our papyrus also PSI 1181 shows the co-presence, in the same column, of a poem (= Bacchyl. fr. *dub.* 60 M) ending with a mythical narrative (out of direct speech) and the beginning of a second poem (= Bacchyl. fr. *dub.* 61 M) that opens, as usual, with a description of its performative context (cf. the *incipit* of the *Orestas* in our papyrus). PSI 1181 preserves the beginning of a poem entitled *Leucippides* (probably a dithyramb) opening with a clear reference to the *hic et nunc* of the performance, describing a group of female performers “setting up a beautiful chorus of new songs for violet-eyed Cypris” (Ἰοδερχεῖ τελλόμεναι | Κύπριδι νεοκέλαδον | εἰδυεῖδα χορόν): the performers of the song, female and male, may have here re-enacted their mythical models (the twin-sisters Leucippides and the Dioscourai). As in the *Orestas* papyrus, this ritual frame is preceded in the column by the ending of a poem in mid-narrative (even if in PSI 1181 we must acknowledge the presence of the ritual refrain ‘iē iē’ at l. 37 which would have brought the audience back to the present cultic performance). It is difficult to recover a consistent plot but it is clear that in this first poem (Bacchyl. fr. *dub.* 60 M) we have a group of women who, after sailing away from Troy as refugees (ll. 24-25 ἐπ[ε]ὶ πολυ[δεν]δρέ[ω]ν ἀκτῶν | κύμα πό[ρευς] ἀπ’ Ἰλίου), have at last reached, by the help of a god or hero, a place where they can be relatively safe. The poem ends with a sequence of (women’s?) cries (ll. 29-30: ἐ[πασσ]ύτεραι δ’ ἰα[χαί] | οὐρανὸν ἴξοι [] and we are told that also the mouth of the men did not remain silent (ll. 33-35 οὐδ’ ἀνδρῶν | [...] [τόμα] | ἄναδον ἦν). What does this tell us about the narrative technique employed in PSI 1174? Coppola, with great insight, saw in the *Orestas* papyrus “a unique instance [...] of a bridge between pre-Homeric lyric and epic-lyric narratives of the types of Bacchylides’ dithyrambs”.²⁷ He also went on to define Corinna’s narrative technique as “Stesichorean” (with a particular attention to Stesichorus’ *Oresteia*). Though inexact in other ways, Coppola did hit on something remarkable. We know in fact from the *Suda* (κ 2087 Adler) that Corinna composed also *lyric nomoi* (νόμοις λυρικοῦς), probably a kind of loose definition for just what we have in PSI 1174: mythical narratives with a lyric slant.²⁸ PSI 1774 thus provides us with the only extant example of closure in the Boeotian lyr-

²⁶ See D'Alessio 2013, 126-7 and the overview by Ucciardello 2020, 38-9. Bacchylidean authorship seems the most likely option: see recently Hadjimichael 2014.

²⁷ Coppola 1931, 241: “Corinna è perciò l’unico esempio [...] di un ponte tra la lirica pre-omerica e i componimenti epico-lirici del tipo dei ditirambi bacchilidei”.

²⁸ Cf. West 1970, 282 fn. 3: “‘Lyric nomos’ (*Suda*) means no more than lyric narrative poems”. On the modalities of performance (monodic and choral) attested for the *nomos* in ancient sources, see D'Alessio 2013, 117 with previous literature.

ic corpus.²⁹ Previous scholars have focused, among other things, on the *incipit* of *P.Oxy.* 2370 fr. 1 = *PMG* 655 to settle, without success, the debated issue of Corinna's date.³⁰ The end of the first poem preserved by *PSI* 1174 shows, at the very least, that its closure is perfectly at home, in terms of narrative technique, within the world of Greek classical choral lyric.

5 *PSI* 1174: The Text of ll. 1-7

Let us now go back in details to *PSI* 1174 lines 1-7. Though the text is very fragmentary, among the preserved words there are nevertheless some key terms that, as we shall see, significantly restrict the range of possible candidates for its subject, especially if we bear in mind the preference of Boeotian vernacular poetry for mythical narratives with a distinctly Boeotian ring.

l. 1]ιδov̄ (.),[: the first letter after the lacuna is likely to be either ν or η ; after $\iota\delta\omicron\nu$ we have two options: (i) $\pi\omicron$ [or $\pi\alpha$ [or alternatively (ii) $\tau\alpha$ [($\tau\omicron$ [is to be ruled out because \omicron would be too squashed against the preceding τ). The former (i) would entail reading ν at the beginning of the lacuna if we are to have an intelligible sequence at all,³¹ that is,] $\nu\iota\delta\omicron\nu\pi\omicron$ [. This could be segmented either as (a)] $\nu\iota\delta\omicron\nu\pi$. [or as (b)] $\nu\iota\delta\omicron\nu\pi$. [. In both cases it must be born in mind that the iota in $\iota\delta\omicron\nu$, if long, could be the Boeotian spelling for Attic $\epsilon\iota$. In the case of (a), the most immediate interpretation is to take $\iota\delta\omicron\nu$ as either a form of the unaugmented indicative aorist of $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$ (first person singular or third person plural: $\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$) or as the Boeotian spelling ($\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$) for the augmented form of the same verb, that is, Att. $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$. Lack of initial digamma, however, would be problematic: cf. *P.Oxy.* 2370 (= *PMG* 655) fr. 1. 21 = *PMG* 655 $\phi\iota\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$.³² The same problem resurfaces

29 The end of the 'contest of Helikon and Kithaeron' (*P.Berol.* 13284 = *PMG* 654 coll. i-ii) is too poorly preserved: the only inference that can be drawn is that it probably ended with an aetiological element (cf. the marginal scholion at col. ii. 2 $\epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\zeta\epsilon\epsilon\theta\alpha$).

30 West 1970, 283-4 (following Lobel 1956, 61) and 1990, 553-4 suggested that *PMG* 655 fr. 1 was designed by the author herself to be the introductory poem (to be read, not sung) of her collection, a practice not attested for an archaic or classical author. For a different view, see Davies 1988, 186-7 and Palumbo Stracca 1993, 404-7.

31] $\nu\iota\delta\omicron\nu\pi$. [would not do, especially if we take into account that Boeot. η = Att. α .

32 Initial digamma is usually consistently recorded in our papyri in Boeotian dialect: in *P.Berol.* 13284 the only sure exception is at col. iv.16 $\epsilon\delta\nu$ [: see Page 1953, 47 and West 1970, 287. West 1970, 287 suggested a possible omission of initial digamma also for *P.Oxy.* 2730 (= *PMG* 655) fr. 2.2 (] $\eta\epsilon\phi\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\mu$ [). For word internal digamma, probably a graphic archaism, at *P.Oxy.* 2373 (= *PMG* 693) fr. 5.8 $\alpha\phi\upsilon\delta\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$, see Lobel 1956, 60 ("a piece of ancentry"); for *PMG* 655 fr. 4.3 $\tau'\epsilon\phi\iota\delta\omicron\nu$, a form apparently with a word-internal hiatus, but that could be also reinterpreted as a scribal wrong segmentation of an original $\tau\epsilon\phi\iota\delta\omicron\nu$, see Vessella 2016, 8-10.

with (b) if we assume a compound of ὀράω (e.g. συνοράω or ἐνοράω); with (b) another articulation, possible but very unlikely, would be the rare adverbial form αἰφνιδόν ('suddenly', spelled ἠφνιδόν in Boeotian) attested by Pseudo-Herodian, *Partitiones* p. 38 l. 11 Boissonade πλὴν τοῦ αἰφνης· αἰφνιδόν· αἰφνιδιον, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ἐξαίφνης).³³

The difficulties highlighted for the reading (i), that is,]νιδοντ[(especially in the (a) variant: lack of digamma) might seem to favour the reading (ii), palaeographically equally possible, that is,]_ιδοντῶ[. This sequence, if we have to avoid once again an aoristic formation of ὀράω without digamma (see above), almost unavoidably entails an articulation including a form of the verb δονέω, attested for Corinna in *PMG* 675 (e) πελέκεσσι δονῖτη (δονεῖται mss). Possible articulations are (a) δονῖτ' ἀ[, that is, the Boeotian unaugmented middle-passive imperfect for Att. (ἐ)δονεῖτο;³⁴ (b) δόνι τα[(unaugmented active imperfect for Att. (ἐ)δόνει; (c) δονῖ τα[(present indicative for Att. δονεῖ).³⁵ The sequence of past tenses in the following lines (κρούψε at l. 4, ἔδωκε or δῶκε at l. 5, ἔκηρον at l. 6), if we assume that at l. 1 we are already within a narrative section, seems to exclude (c)³⁶ and to favour either (a) δονῖτ' or (b) δόνι. The semantic field covered by δονέω (of unknown etymology) seems to be primarily that of 'setting into motion', 'shaking/agitating';³⁷ in Homer it is used twice with reference to the agency of winds (*Il.* 12.157 ἄνεμος ζαῖς νέφεα κκιδόντα δονήσας, 17.55 τὸ δέ τε πνοιαὶ δονέουσι | παντοίων ἀνέμων; cf. also *Bacchyl.* 5.68 οἶά τε φύλλ' ἄνεμος [...] δονεῖ and *Theoc.* 24.90 ἀνέμῳ δεδονημένον αὔρον ἄχερδον) and once of a gadfly chasing cows (*Od.* 22.300 τὰς μὲν τ' αἰόλος οἶτρος ἐφορμηθεὶς ἐδόνησεν) but it can be extended to any motion (e.g. of chariots at *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 279; of waves in *Pind. Nem.* 6.56) and, metaphorically, emotion (e.g. of love in *Sapph.* 130 V, cares in *Bacchyl.* 1.179 and fear as in [*Hes.*] *Sc.* 257). Given that the association of δονέω with winds is already Homeric and at l. 7 we have a reference to the sea (ἐπ' ὠκουπόρωσ[), it is tempting to connect the possible forms of δονέω at l. 1 with either

³³ The *TLG E* records only one literary occurrence of the form in the 12th century author Georgius Scylitzes, *Can. in sanctos Dem. et Greg.* 2. p. 490 l. 23 Pétridès. Other words as e.g. Κ]νιδον or λυχ]νιδόν seem unlikely.

³⁴ For unmarked elision without *scriptio plena* in our papyrus see § 2 above.

³⁵ The middle-passive present δονεῖται is excluded because the Boeotian form would have been δονῖτη.

³⁶ An alternative would be to consider the present δονῖ as part of a simile.

³⁷ Cf. *Lfgre* s.v. "δονέω", where Theresa Führer rightly questions the acoustic 'meaning' of 'murmur', 'buzz' recorded by both *LSJ* and *DEG* s.v. Scepticism in this regard is expressed most recently also by Thomas 2020, 460 at *Hom. Hymn Herm.* 563b. For δονέω with reference to song and musical instruments in *Pind. Nem.* 7.81 (πολύφρατον θρόνον ὕμνον δόνει) and *Pyth.* 10.38-39 (παντὰ δὲ χοροὶ παρθένων | λυρᾶν τε βοαὶ καναχαὶ τ' αὐλῶν δονέονται), see Cannatà Fera 2020, 471.

sea-waves (supplementing e.g. κλούδω]νι for Att. κλύδω]νι at the beginning of the line) or hostile winds/weather (e.g. χιμῶ]νι for Att. χειμῶ]νι). Another possibility worth considering would be also]ῆι (= Att. αἰεῖ; cf. *PMG* 654(a) col. i. 9 and *Boeot. inc. auct. PMG* 692 fr. 1.2) δονῖτ(or δόνι): something (winds?) whirling incessantly.

l. 2]αυτοφονεῖ[: most probably a form of αὐτοφονεύς, e.g. αὐτοφονεῖ[α, -oc = Att. αὐτοφονῆ[α, -oc³⁸ or of the (unattested but morphologically unobjectionable) αὐτοφονέω rather than an elided form of the well-attested adjective αὐτοφόνος (a possibility already considered by Diehl). αὐτοφονεύς is attested only once in Hesychius as a gloss of ἀτεπίβουλος “plotting against himself” (Hsch. α 8379 Latte-Cunningham), but nominal and verbal compounds in -φονεύς/-φονέω are well attested from Homer onwards (e.g. πατροφονεύς and βουφονέω etc.) and the form is perfectly plausible in terms of word-formation. αὐτοφόνος (and related words: e.g. αὐτοφονία, αὐτοφόντης, αὐτοφόνευτος, αὐτοφονευτής etc.) can refer either to murdering one’s own kin (the majority meaning in the earliest occurrences of the word), or (but less frequently) to an act of suicide.³⁹ The alternative reading considered by both V-N and Diehl, λυτο is much less satisfactory: we would have to assume either another spelling mistake on the part of the copyist (Boeot. λ<ο>ῦτο = Att. λῦτο, since in Boeotian phonetic /u/, long or short, is spelt as ου: cf. ll. 4 κρουψε, 7 ὠκουπ- and 14 -πουλον; πυρι at l. 5 is the exception)⁴⁰ or to accept an optative form (Boeot.]λυτο = Att.]λοιτο: πῆ]λοιτο? ὄ]λοιτο? θῆ]λοιτο?), that would sit awkwardly within an otherwise apparently straightforward narrative context.

l. 3] καρδιη'cφαδδ[: the right arc *supra lineam* between η and c resembles in shape and function that of a diastole;⁴¹ its function

38 Whether or not the scribe of *PSI* 1174 would have noted intervocalic digamma (αὐτοφονεῖ[ρα, -oc) as the copyist of *P.Oxy.* 2373 fr. 5.8 (an antiquarian choice: epigraphy shows that word-internal Ϝ was dropped in Boeotian inscriptions before the end of the 5th BCE) is an unanswerable question.

39 Cf. *DEG* and *LSJ* s.v. On the meaning of αὐτοφόνος in early and classical Greek literature, see Fraenkel 1950, 494-5 (on Aesch. *Ag.* 1091 ff.) with previous bibliography. Frankel rightly observes that in Aeschylus αὐτοφόνος is attested only in the sense of ‘killer of his own kin’ (*Ag.* 1091; *Sept.* 859 and *Supp.* 65). All the earliest occurrences of this word presuppose the meaning of ‘murderer of one’s own blood’: cf. also Ar. *Thesm.* 850. A possible early exception is the Iliadic anthroponym Αὐτοφόνος (4.395), on which see Williger 1928, 5 fn. 1 (“der Tod selbst”, discarding the meaning “mit eigener Hand mordend” since “das gibt doch keinen Sinn”); differently Kanavou 2015, 147 (“killer by his own hand”), following von Kamptz 1982, 71 (“mit eigener Hand tötend”).

40 This word is problematic also in another respect: the hiatus with the following ἔκηνον: see above § 4.

41 On the function of the diastole (separating both syllables and words) in Greek papyri and mss, see Scappaticcio 2009, 371-2, and Cribiore 1996, 85. Dorandi *NP*, s.v. *Punctuation* § 8 distinguishes between “apostrophe”, used “between syllables within a single word, esp. in compound words (*P.Oxy.* 2458), or between consonants, esp. in dou-

may have been that of disambiguating word division (καρδίη cφαδδ- rather than καρδίηc φαδδ-⁴² so already Diehl). Boeot. καρδίη (= Att. καρδίαι) could be either dative singular or nominative plural. Since the reading cφαδδε[is marginally more satisfactory palaeographically than cφαδδo[, καρδίη as dative singular seems a slightly likelier option, though it cannot be ruled out that with cφαδδo[, a new sentence started and a nominative plural καρδίη was syntactically linked to what preceded. The accumulation of past tenses in the ensuing lines (ll. 4-6) within what looks like a narrative section would suggest taking cφαδδε[as an unaugmented imperfect (cφάδδε = Att. cφάζε).⁴³ What is however clear is that we have here some kind of slaughtering, possibly in the context of a (perverted? Cf. the mention of the murdering of one's kin or of suicide at l. 2) ritual sacrifice.⁴⁴

l. 4]κτονιν· κρουψεδε[; Diehl preferred reading γονιν after the lacuna⁴⁵ but printed κτονιν; in fact, there is no reason to doubt the soundness of κτονιν (as already suggested by N-V). Diehl himself recognised that the beginning of l. 4 admitted many possible supplements but eventually opted in favour of ἀρχιτε]κτονῖν (Att. -νεῖν: 'to build' > 'to contrive'), positing an allusion to the construction of the Wooden Horse within a narrative connected with the Trojan war (cf. Corinna PMG 675 (a) δώρατος ὄστ' ἐπ' ἵππῳ).⁴⁶ Diehl's supplement is indeed idiosyncratic yet it represents to date the only interpretative attempt to make a sense of the poem as a whole.⁴⁷ A compound verb

ble *mutae* or double *liquidae* (*P.Bodmer* 2; *P.Oxy.* 1016)" and "diastole" used "to separate individual words from each other (*P.Oxy.* 852)". For a diastole high in the line separating words, not only syllables, see the examples quoted by Fournet 2020, 150 with fnn. 27 and 28.

42 The Greek grammatical pathological tradition (e.g. Philoxenus, Heraclides, Herodian, Orion etc.) recognises the existence of a verb φάζω 'to say' (otherwise unattested) derived from φῶ. Eust. *Il.* 887.12 (= III, p. 339 l. 13 van der Valk) fantasises about φάζω = φονεύσαι. It is very doubtful, though, that our scribe may have had this tradition in mind.

43 Boeotian orthography (εἰ = Att. η) rules out a present tense.

44 On the marked semantics of cφάζω (and related words), if compared with θύειν, often in a context of sacrificial violence, see Henrichs 2000, 180-8 and Casabona 1966, 155-67 (esp. 160).

45 Diehl 1936, 201: "mihi ne de τ quidem constat, lego γονιν".

46 Diehl 1936, 201: "potes multa: αὐτο-, πηδο-, πατρο-κτονῖν, παιδογογεῖν al. sed ne [ἀρχιτε]κτονῖν quidem abhorret. Cf. Ar. *Pax* 305 fr. 195 (e Daedalo) et Ditt. *Syll.*³ 1185 (Tanagrae) κατασκευάτη τὸ ἱερὸν ἐν πόλει βωλενομένως πεδὰ τῶν πολεμάρχων καὶ τῷ ἀρχιτέκτονος, Eur. *Trö.* 14 δούρειος ἵππος κρυπτῶν ἀμπίτχων δόρυ."

47 Diehl 1936, 201: "loquitur C. de sacrificio quodam, de aedificando sive occidendo, occultando, donando, igne cremando, de navibus conscendendis: si [ἀρχιτε]κτονῖν verum est, argumentum fragmenti spectat ad ἵππον δουράτεον". For a criticism of Diehl's supplement ἀρχιτε]κτονῖν, see Körte 1939. Diehl's hypothesis (a Trojan Horse narrative) seems unlikely on several grounds: (i) the linguistic register of the supplement ἀρχιτε]κτονῖν looks suspicious in a lyric poem (see already Körte: in the poetry of the classical and Hellenistic period is attested with certainty only 3 times, all in comedy:

in -κτονεῖν (= Boeot. -ῖν) would not be out of place (e.g. αὐτοκτονεῖν, μητροκτονεῖν, πατροκτονεῖν, ξιφοκτονεῖν, ξενοκτονεῖν, παιδοκτονεῖν to mention only a few), yet a sequence at ll. 4-7 of 3rd person singular indicative aorist forms is on the whole more appealing. One could think of segmenting, e.g.]κτο νιν, a sequence that would give us the possibility of supplementing a 3rd person singular indicative past ending of a verb with velar stem, followed by the enclitic accusative of the 3rd personal pronoun ('him/'her'). On possible supplements, depending on the context envisaged, see below § 6.

1. 5] δεδωκεδωρε. [: all the other editors of the papyrus read δωρε, seeing in this line a reference to a gift exchange⁴⁸ but between the remnants of δ and ρ there is clearly not enough space for ω. The correct reading is therefore δωρε (for a discussion of Spinedi's alternative reading, cf. above § 2). The new reading entails that δ is likely to be the elided particle δ(ε), since it is difficult to imagine suitable words in δωρε-. Theoretically one could think of δόρε (but the dual of δόρυ would be puzzling, and the form, though unobjectionable, is not actually ever attested; for the dual form δοῦρε see Wackernagel 1916, 172); or δόρεος, a rare form of the genitive attested only once in Herodian (Lentz *GG* III,2, 768, ll. 28-29 εῖρηται καὶ δορός καὶ δουρός καὶ δούρατος καὶ δόρατος καὶ δόρεος);⁴⁹ or even of an alternative (and unattested) form of the adj. δούρειος; yet all of them are on the whole quite unlikely. As for δ' ὄρε. [, several supplements are possible, including, e.g. (i) the dative plural of ὄρος (ὄρεσι or epic ὄρεσσι); (ii) various nouns and adjectives compounded in ὄρεσ-; (iii) a form of ὄρυσσι (e.g. the aorist infinitive ὄρεσθαι); (iv) taking into account the title of the next poem, a form of Ὀρέστας would also be an intriguing option.⁵⁰

Reading the previous word as δέδωκε (perfect) would be a problematic articulation, as it would imply a 'presentive' anchoring of the speech, at odds with the other narrative tenses. If we choose to read ἔδωκε, it follows that] δ after the lacuna should be articulated as an elided]αδ(α) or]αδ(ε);⁵¹ if instead we have the unaugmented form of the aorist, we have the sequence]αδε δῶκε. In both cases, if one

twice in Aristophanes [fr. 201 K-A and *Pax* 305] and once in Sosipater fr. 1.16 K-A); (ii) the mention of a kin-murder or suicide at l. 2 (]αυτοφονει[) would remain without an immediate reference; (iii) the new reading at l. 5 (] δεδωκεδωρε.]) rules out the 'giving gift' motif (ἔδωκε δῶρ' as printed by Diehl).

48 Diehl 1936, 201 printed ἔδωκε δῶρ' quoting in apparatus *Hom. Hymn Herm.* 442 δῶρον ἔδωκεν.

49 A dative plural δόρεσσι is never attested, only the Ionic form δούρεσσι.

50 A form of ὄρομαι 'to keep watch' seems less likely since only the compound ἐπόρομαι is attested (always with ἐπί in tmesis: cf. *LSI* s.v.).

51 As observed above, our papyrus does not note elision. One would however expect a punctuation sign here if with δῶκε δ' or ἔδωκε δ' we have the beginning of a new sentence.

chooses to supplement τ]άδε, the neuter cannot be the object of δῶκε or ἔδωκε, since after the aorist of δίδωμι we have the postpositive δ(έ).

l. 6]γπυριεκηον: even if the general sense can be divined (we are probably dealing with either a burnt sacrifice or a funeral pyre, given the mention of a form of αὐτοφονεύς at l. 2), the *Wortlaut* remains obscure. πυρι must be a scribal mistake for a form of π<ο>ῦρ but the hiatus following this word poses an unresolved problem. As observed in the palaeographical apparatus above, to the right of the iota the fibres are disturbed but there are traces of what looks like the foot of a descending oblique. One would be tempted to interpret them as the base of a diagonal marking the deletion of the iota: the scribe would have written πυρι εκηον and then struck through the iota. The original text would thus have been ποῦρ ἔκηον; yet there is no projection of the oblique further up to the left as one would expect. Alternatively, as suggested to us by A. Cassio, one could read ἐμπύρι (elided form of the neuter plural ἐμπύρια) ἔκηον (cf. Call. *Lav. Pall.* 107 ἔμπυρα καυσεῖ). This is not impossible but unlikely: (i) we would have expected the assimilated spelling ἐ]μπι- and not ἐ]νπι-; the adj. ἐμπύριος is attested only later and with the meaning of 'belonging to the empyrean', different from that of ἔμπυρος (burnt offering): in Hesych. ε 2518 Cunningham (ἐμπυρία· ὄρκος ὁ δημόσιος. καὶ μαντεία, παρὰ Βοιωτοῖς) ἔμπυρία would seem to be nominative singular. If the hiatus is due to textual corruption, various solutions can be proposed (the first three already suggested by West): π<ο>ῦρ ἔκηον ([they] lit the fire),⁵² π<ο>υρὶ κῆον ([they] burnt with the fire/on the pyre),⁵³ π<ο>υρὶ Φέ κῆον ([they] burnt him/her with the fire/on the pyre), π<ο>ύρ' ἔκηον ([they] lit fires).⁵⁴ Alternatively, though overall less likely, the hiatus may indicate that something went wrong in the colometrical articulation (either a mistake of the scribe of *PSI 1174* or a mistake already present in the antigraph).⁵⁵

52 In this case the hiatus might have been due to the scribe's wrong insertion of the syllabic augment in an original unaugmented κῆον.

53 Cf. *Il.* 24.38 ἐν πυρὶ κήαιεν (of Hector's prospective funeral by his people).

54 καίω + πυρά (neuter plural) is already well attested in Homer, cf. *LSJ* s.v. τὰ πυρά. In this case the hiatus could have been the result of the confusion, on the part of the copyist, of the sign of elision or of the deletion mark above alpha with an iota. The case of Pind. *Parth.* fr. 94b l. 77 Μ δψωντέα in *P.Oxy.* 659 may provide an example for the genesis of the mistake: the vowel in hiatus (epsilon) was apparently deleted with a sign above it which looks as an iota: a scribe copying such a text could very naturally have substituted the epsilon with the iota.

55 Unless one opts (unconvincingly, in our view) for allowing intralinear hiatus in Greek lyric as a matter of fact: see e.g. Gentili, Lomiento 2008, 43-4 with fnn. 2-4 (with previous bibliography) for choral lyric and most recently Neri 2020 on hiatus in Lesbian lyric (all the cases examined, though, are from the indirect tradition, which is notoriously unreliable in such cases).

εἶδα[.]τ[The supralinear sign above the iota remains inexplicable. εἶδ was interpreted by Diehl as epic ἦδ(ε). At line end ατ[, αρτ[, αλτ[possible (not enough space for ακτ, αντ, αστ?).

l. 7]ΠΑΝΤΕΣΕΠΩΚΟΥΠΟΡΩΣ[: the last line of the poem clearly implies a setting by the sea: the adjective ὠκύπορος refers, in the vast majority of its occurrences and invariably so in Homer, to ships (cf. *LfgreE* s.v.), hence Diehl's supplements νᾶαc + a verb of movement, e.g. ἴσαν, ἔβαν, ἴκοντο, ἔδραμον. In Pindar we find it twice, once with reference to ships (*Pyth.* 1.74) and once with reference to winds and waves (*Pyth.* 4.194),⁵⁶ as it does in Aeschylus (Aesch. *Ag.* 1557 ἀντιάααα πρὸς ὠκύπορον πόρθμευμ' ἀχέων).

6 *PSI 1174*: Subject Matter and Performance

What can we make of all this? We have seen that the lack of a closural frame indicates that we have a poem ending with a mythical narrative section. The most important clues on the possible content of our poem are provided by l. 7 (a very likely seaside setting) and by ll. 2-3. At l. 2 there is a high likelihood that we have a word related to αὐτοφον- and in the following line the presence of a form of σφάζω points to a ritual form of slaughtering. We have also observed that words related to αὐτοφον-, since their earliest attestations, and with only few and late exceptions, indicate in the very first place the murdering of one's own kin, or (less frequently) an act of suicide.⁵⁷ As for σφάζω, violent forms of ritual slaughtering are predominantly linked, especially in the earliest texts, to sacrificial killing, including narratives of mythical human sacrifices. These two elements point very strongly toward a reconstruction of these lines as narrating either a suicidal act, represented in terms suggesting a sacrifice, or the ritual or quasi-ritual killing of a member of one's own family. Narratives of this kind are not rare in Greek mythology, but in the case of Corinna or, which does not make any significant difference, in the case of Boeotian 'vernacular' lyric (if one doubts the ascription to Corinna) the focus, at least at a first stage, can plausibly be restricted to things Boeotian. In fact, with the only seeming exception of the second poem preserved in *PSI 1174*, the *Orestas*,⁵⁸ there is no example

⁵⁶ See Braswell 1998, 278-9: on the proleptic use of the adj. ὠκύπορος referring to both κυμάτων ῥιπᾶc and ἀνέμουc.

⁵⁷ See above § 5.

⁵⁸ The exception might be in fact only partial: ancient evidence is split unequally between a tradition (i) having Orestes leading personally the Aeolian migration (Pind. *Nem.* 11.34 and Hellanicus *FGrHist* 4 F 32 = Σ Pind. *Nem.* 11.43b p. 189 Drachm.); (ii) another claiming that Orestes started the enterprise (Strabo 13.1.3 ἄρξαι τοῦ στόλου) but died in Arcadia and the actual expedition was led by Orestes' descendants; and (iii)

of mythical narrative in the extant fragments of the Boeotian lyric corpus that does not involve somehow regional themes.⁵⁹

There are several potential candidates in Boeotian mythology that fit the bill of a kin-murder or suicide linked to sacrificial violence. Among the tales attributed by our sources to Corinna perhaps the most promising is that (i) of the so-called Coronides, that is, Orion's daughters Metioche and Menippe, who committed suicide by slitting their throat open with a weaving shuttle⁶⁰ in order to save their country from a plague, in the first book of the *ἑροῖα* (*PMG* 656 = *Ant. Lib. Met.* 25; cf. *Ov. Met.* 13.685-699 where the setting is Thebes)⁶¹ and who were venerated at Orchomenos.⁶² The detail of a funeral pyre (cf. *PSI* 1174 l. 6: *ἵπυριεκρον*) is not present in Antoninus Liberalis' version but is briefly referred to by Ovid at *Met.* 13.686 ... *exequiae tumulique ignesque rogique* and 696 ... *cremari*. Antoninus mentions instead the catasterism of the Coronides: interestingly for us, this posthumous compensation for the sacrifice of the two virgins takes the form of an act of 'occultation/hiding' by divine agency (*Ant. Lib. Met.* 25.4 *Φερσεφόνη δὲ καὶ Ἄιδης οἰκτεῖραντες τὰ μὲν σώματα τῶν παρθένων ἠφάνισαν*) that might find an equivalent in the elusive *κρούψε* (l. 4) of our papyrus fragment. On the other hand, where the Coronides fall short of a possible match with *PSI* 1174 is the lack of a seaside setting, strongly suggested in our text by

a third strand stating that Orestes made it to Lesbos but died before founding it (*Σ vet. Lycoph.* 1374c *Leone ... ἤλθεν εἰς Λέσβον· καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν ταχὺ ἀποθανὼν πόλιν κτίσαι οὐκ ἠδυνήθη κτλ.*): see Fowler *EGM* II, 598-9. Cf. also above n. 8. It is however worth remembering that no ancient extant source seems to firmly collocate Orestes' activity as such in Boeotia, if we except the fleeting mention of Orestes passing through Thebes at *Pind. Nem.* 11.34 and the fact that according to *Strabo* 9.2.3 the forces gathered by Orestes from all over Greece camped at Aulis (*εἴτ' ἀνέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ἧδη τοῦ Αἰολικοῦ στόλου παρεσκευασμένου περὶ Ἀύλιδα τῆς Βοιωτίας*), which would be interesting in consideration of the possible link to Aulis we envisage for the first poem.

59 This is not meant in any way to undermine the creative ways in which Corinna's treatment of myths negotiates the tension between local (Boeotian) and supra-local traditions. Much has been profitably done in this respect (cf. e.g. Collins 2006; Vergados 2012; Kousolini 2016; McPhee 2018); it is only to emphasise that even when Corinna engages with panhellenic traditions her point of departure is usually a local one.

60 *Ant. Lib. Met.* 25.3 *ἐπάταξαν ἑαυτὰς τῇ κερκίδι παρὰ τὴν κλεῖδα καὶ ἀνέρρηξαν τὴν φαγῆν*.

61 On the Ovidian version of this piece of Boeotian lore, see Schachter 1990, 104 and 105.

62 The locality (Orchomenos) is not entirely unproblematic since Orion is usually linked to eastern, not western Boeotia: see Schachter *CoB* II, 117 with fn. 3, where Schachter himself however recognises that there is another Orchomenian legend with links to Hyria (eastern Boeotia) in *Paus.* 9.37.5 (Trophonius and Agamedes building a 'treasury' for Hyrieus). For the Boeotian cult-type of a pair of maidens who kill themselves to avert evil (e.g. the Leuctrides at Leuctra and the Antipoinides at Thebes), see Schachter 1972, 19-20 and Larson 1995, 102-3 on the pattern, in myth and cult, of "sacrificial sisters" in Attica and Boeotia.

the adjective ὠκύπορος at l. 7. Another possible, though less plausible, candidate within Corinna's transmitted corpus is (ii) the tale of the Minyades (*PMG* 665 = *Ant. Lib. Met.* 10; cf. *Ov. Met.* 4.1-42 and 389-415): punished by Dionysus for neglecting his cult, the ill-fated daughters of Minyas are taken by a supernatural terror and one of them, Leucippe, sacrifices to Dionysus her own child by tearing him apart in a frenzy (*PMG* 665).⁶³ We have here sacrificial slaughtering and kin-murder but again no setting by the sea. Internecine slaughtering within family members and suicides figure of course prominently also (iii) in the Theban saga of the Labdacids, covered, for example, in Corinna's *PMG* 659 (ἐπὶ τὰ ἐπὶ Θήβης) and 672 (Oedipus killing the Sphinx and the Teucmesian fox) as well as in the Boeotian *adespota* *PMG* 692 (the names of Melanippus, Tydeus and Mecisteus clearly show that we are dealing with a narrative linked to the *Seven against Thebes* and hence to *PMG* 659).⁶⁴ Yet also in this case it is difficult to imagine a setting by the sea. Another Boeotian myth of intrafamilial murder(s) and suicide is (iv) that of Athamas and Ino and their sons Learchos and Melicertes: the setting is again in western Boeotia or Thessaly; in the Thessalian version (where Athamas is from Halos, not from Orchomenos) Ino and Melicertes' leap into the sea (the Pagasean Gulf) could provide a possible though very slender link to a seaside scene.⁶⁵ Of the hypotheses (i)-(v) the most encouraging is probably (i) but, as we have already seen, the story of the Coronides too does leave at least one detail unexplained (the reference to ships/sea at l. 7 of *PSI* 1174).

If we broaden our horizon to the Trojan saga, there are at least two cases that come to mind but only one of them fits the bill from all points of view (a narrative of a suicide or of a ritual killing of a relative in the vicinity of a fleet, or, at least, of the sea) and offers a local 'anchoring'. The first is the story of the suicide of Ajax. It would not be impossible to find potential parallels for some of the fragmentary details of our poem: for example, the description of the suicide in term of a sacrifice (*Soph. Aj.* 815 ὁ μὲν σφαγεύς said of the sword, 841 ἐμὲ ἰ αὐτοσφαγῆ πίπτοντα, 898 Αἴας ὄδ' ἡμῖν ἀρτίως νεοσφαγῆς), and the theme of the 'hidden' sword (*Aj.* 658 κρύψω τόδ' ἔγχος τοῦμόν, 899 κρυφαίῳ σφαγάνῳ) are notoriously important in Sophocles' *Ajax*. It would be however odd, but perhaps not entirely beyond the realm of the possible, to find elements that have a structural role in the elaborate dramatic construction of the play accumulated in a much short-

⁶³ Schachter *CoB* II, 143.

⁶⁴ See Cingano 2017, 46-7 on *P.Oxy.* 2372.

⁶⁵ Furthermore the reference to sacrificial killing would fit Phrixus' death plotted by Ino (but again in this case the setting would be firmly in Thessaly and not in Boeotia) but not Learchus' one, mistakenly killed by an arrow by Athamas while hunting.

er lyric rendition of the episode. The final focus on a group of people going to the ships (or the sea) would also not be altogether obvious in the context (an allusion to his burial at the Rhoeteion promontory?).⁶⁶ More crucially, to the best of our knowledge there is no clear Boeotian link for the Ajax myth. Of course, we should not rule out a priori the possibility that (Corinna's) Boeotian vernacular lyric poetry may have ventured on narrative territories without epichoric links: this might be the case of the *Orestas*, whose link to a Theban ritual is explicit in the fragmentary 'proem', but for which no entirely convincing Boeotian mythical background has been identified.⁶⁷ All in all, the difficulties outlined above somehow weaken the Ajax hypothesis.

Our second alternative provides a much more satisfactory background from this point of view too (the presence of a local, Boeotian feature). In fact, most of the elements that can be reconstructed from the fragmentary lines of the first poem of *PSI 1174* would fall into place if we suppose that their narrative theme was that of the sacrifice of Iphigenia in Aulis.⁶⁸ The context would easily account for: (1) the murder of a relative (l. 2]αυτοφονει[); (2) the use of *σφάζω* to denote a perverted sacrificial killing (cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 11.36 Ἴφιγένεια ἐπ'Εὐρίπῳ σφαχθεῖσα, Aesch. *Ag.* 209 μαινῶν παρθενοσφάγοισιν ρείθροισ πατρώους χέρας πέλας βωμοῦ, and very often in later authors); (3) the possible articulation ἔδεικτό (*vel* δέ]κτο) νιν at l. 4 and the following κρούψε at l. 5 might correspond to Artemis' acceptance of the sacrifice (as in the interpolated exodus of Eur. *IA* 1596 ἡδέως τε τοῦτ' ἐδέξατο, and, from a different perspective, 1572 δέξαι τὸ θῦμα τόδ' ὃ γέ σοι δωρούμεθα; cf. also Nonn. *Dion.* 13.106-107 ἦχι θεὰ βαρῦμητις ὀρεσσαύλω παρὰ βωμῶ | δέκτο θυηπολίην ψευδήμονος Ἴφιγενείης), followed by the goddess' concealing of Iphigenia, as, for example, in *IT* 27-30 (ἐλθοῦσα δ' Αὐλίδ' ἡτάλαιν' ὑπὲρ πυρᾶς | μεταρσία ληφθεῖς' ἐκαινόμην ξίφει. | ἀλλ' ἐξέκλεψεν ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου | Ἄρτεμις Ἀχαιοῖς). This passage would provide also a possible parallel for the mention of ritual burning at line 6] γπυρικηρον, where the reference could be to the performance of the sacrifice of the victim substituted to Iphigenia. The hypothesis that the sacrifice of Iphigenia herself was described is compatible with the versions attested in Pindar, Aeschylus and Sophocles,⁶⁹ but the use of *κρύπτω* strongly suggests that in this version (if we follow this interpretative avenue) Iphigenia disappeared. More generally,

66 Cf. *Little Iliad*, arg. 1 GEF West.

67 Orestes' involvement in the Aeolian colonisation (see above) is likely to have played a role, but we have to keep in mind that our sources privilege the connection of Orestes' descendants, not the hero himself, with Boeotia.

68 Spinedi 2018, 124-6 also supports this scenario.

69 For a survey of the different versions, see Aretz 1999.

a parallel for Artemis's act of concealment finds a typological parallel in the way in which myths of substitution and metamorphosis often focus on the disappearance of the female individuals involved, as much as on the substitution itself. Iphigenia is described as τὴν ἄφαντον εἶδος ἠλλοιωμένην in Lycoph. *Alex.* 195, and Antoninus Liberalis in his *Metamorphoses* frequently uses in such contexts forms of ἀφανίζω.⁷⁰ The whole sequence of PSI 1174 lines 3-7 with this reconstruction can be compared to that of Ov. *Met.* 12.29-38: Artemis is first moved by the situation (32 *victa dea est*), then conceals Iphigenia (32 *nubemque oculis obiecit*) and, placated by the substitute sacrifice (35 *lenita caede*), finally abandons her anger. As a result (37) *accipiunt ventos a tergo mille carinae*. Even more interestingly, some crucial details of the sequence that emerges from this papyrus find parallels in the interpolated exodus of Euripides' *IA*: first Iphigenia disappears (1585 τὴν παρθένον δ' οὐκ οἶδεν οὐ γῆρ εἰκέδν), then Artemis accepts the substitute offering, and grants favourable wind (1596: see above), and Calchas invites everybody to go to their ships (1598-1599: πρὸς ταῦτα πᾶς τις θάρρος αἶρε ναυβάτης | χώρει τε πρὸς ναῦν, for which cf. line 7 of the papyrus πάντες ἐπ' ὠκυπόρωσ). At this point in *IA* the substitute victim is entirely burnt on the altar (1601-1602 ἐπεὶ δ' ἅπαν | κατηνθρακώθη θυμ' ἐν Ἡφαιστοῦ φλογί), a most remarkable feature, that closely recalls the content of line 6 in the papyrus.⁷¹ As Stockert notes in his commentary *ad loc.*, the holocaust is a typical feature of sacrifice to "chthonian" deities, to which the winds could be assimilated. We have to keep in mind, though, that the sacrifice here is in fact still dedicated to Artemis, not to the winds. This may lend support to the idea that the sanctuary of Artemis at Aulis, where it has been variously supposed that Iphigenia too was honoured, either as a prehistoric goddess taken over in time by Artemis herself or in a kind of joint dual cult (as possibly at Megara, where she was thought to have died too, and were Iphigenia had a *heroon* obviously connected to the temple of Artemis)⁷² may have in-

⁷⁰ Cf. Pease 1942, 9 (on Iphigenia and similar cases, but without reference to the passages in Ovid and in the exodus of the *IA* quoted below) and Papatomopoulos 1968, 72 fn. 21 (on 1.5) on ἀφανισμός in Antoninus Liberalis; the verb ἀφανίζω is applied to Iphigenia in Arist. *Poet.* 1455b 3-4 ἀφανισθείσης ἀδήλωσ τοῖς θύσασιν.

⁷¹ The singularity of the detail, and the possible closeness to the situation in our papyrus should make one cautious in attributing wholesale content and form of the exodus of *IA* to a very late period. Within the general consensus about the late date of the exodus, line 1602 is considered as probably reflecting a much earlier version of the text, and as going back conceivably already to the early 4th century BCE: see Stockert 1992, 1: 83-7, and in particular 86 on this line.

⁷² Paus. 1.43.1. A sanctuary of Artemis-Iphigenia is attested also at Hermione by Pausanias (2.35.2); at Aigeira Pausanias mentions the presence of a statue thought to be of Iphigenia in a temple dedicated to Artemis (7.36.5). These sources are discarded as 'late' by Ekroth 2003, 74 fn. 73, following Hollingshead 1985, 428-9. It is however

volved “chthonian” elements.⁷³ Be this as it may, our interpretation, works also without assuming that Iphigenia was the recipient of a local cult: her story might well have been narrated within the context of a local festival (e.g. but not necessarily, for Artemis).

In this perspective, also the traces of PSI 1174 l. 1 might possibly turn out to point in the same direction. We have already seen above in § 5 that]ιδογιτϚ seems the less problematic reading of the remaining traces, and that the reference to the sea at l. 7 (ἐπ’ὠκουπόρωϚ) makes tempting to connect the possible forms of δονέω concealed in the line with either sea-waves (e.g. κλούδω]γι δονῖτ’ ρ[) or hostile winds/weather (e.g. χιμῶ]γι δονῖτ’ ρ[) or]ῆῖ δονῖτ’ (or δόνι τϚ[). The possibility that l. 1 contained a description of the effect of adverse winds shaking the coast and preventing the Achaean army to sail to Troy is an attractive proposition.⁷⁴ Lines 5-6 remain elusive and any supplement must be considered only as one possibility among many. However, if we pursue the Iphigenia hypothesis, also for these lines some interesting interpretative avenues offer themselves. We have already seen that at l. 5 the old reading δῶρ’ εἰ [must be abandoned, the only reasonable alternative being δορεϚ[. We have also seen that the less unlikely syntactical articulation of the first preserved part of the line requires that an aorist form of δίδωμι (ἔδωκε or δῶκε) be followed by the elided connective δ(έ).⁷⁵ If, as we have so far suggested, the subject of both κρούψε and ἔδωκε or δῶκε is Artemis concealing Iphigenia and offering instead a substitute animal sacrifice, one could think of supplementing ἔδωκε or δῶκε δ’ ὄρεϚ[ίτροφον vel

worth remembering that in [Hes. fr. 23a.17-26 M-W Agamemnon’s daughter (called Iphimede) is rescued by Artemis and transformed into Ἄρτεμις Εἰνοδίη and that in Stesichorus’ *Oresteia* (fr. 178 Finglass) Iphigenia was turned into Hecate by Artemis, see Finglass, Davies 2014, 5023.

73 See Schachter *CoB* I, 94-8, who leaves open the possibility of a cult of Iphigenia at Aulis, chthonic or not chthonic (similarly also Bonnechere 1994, 26 and 106 fn. 97 against the scepticism of Hollingshead 1985). For a sceptical stance, denying the existence of a cult of Iphigenia not only at Aulis but also at Brauron and Halai Araphenides, mainly on the absence of archaeological evidence in this sense, see Hollingshead 1985, followed by Ekroth 2003, esp. 67 fnn. 39, 69-74, 93-4. Cf. also Larson 1995, 104-6.

74 For contrary winds preventing the Greeks from sailing at Aulis, see *Cypria*, p. 41 ll. 44-45 *PEG* (Bernabé) = p. 74 *GEF* West μηνίσαα δὲ ἡ θεὸς ἐπέσχεεν αὐτοῦς τοῦ πλοῦ χειμῶνας ἐπιπέμπουσα, Aesch. *Ag.* 148-149 μὴ τινὰς ἀντιπνούςου Δαναοῖς χρονίῃσ ἐχενῆδας ἀπλοίας τεύξῃ, and 192-193 πνοαὶ ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος μολοῦσαι, | κακόχολοι νηστιδὲς δύσορμοι. On the semantic range covered by ἀπλοία (‘absence of winds’ but also denoting winds hostile to sailing), see Stockert 1992, 2: 199-200 on *IA* 88, and Stockert 1992, 1: 57-8 for a discussion of the archaic and classical sources; for later sources cf. also Aretz 1999, 47-8 fn. 126. Absence of wind is instead mentioned in connection to the Trojan expedition in Soph. *El.* 564; Eur. *IT* 15 δεινὴ δ’ἀπλοία (Madvig: -ῆς -ᾶς L) πνευμάσων τ’οῦ τυγχάνων (the passage is debated: see Kyriakou 2006, 56-7); *IA* 9-11, 88, 352 and 1596-1597.

75 See above § 5 for the unlikelihood that δορεϚ[may conceal an inflected form of δόρυ.

ὄρεσιβάτειν φεῖρα (= Att. ὄρεσιβάτην θῆρα) *vel sim.*⁷⁶ Alternatively, one could see here (i) a reference to Artemis granting fair sailing to the Achaean fleet (cf. Eur. *IA* 1596-1597 καὶ πλοῦν οὐριον | δίδωσιν ἡμῖν Ἰλίου τ' ἐπιδρομάς): e.g. ἔδωκε οὐ δῶκε δ' ὄρεσιβ[θη εὐανεμίαν].⁷⁷ It remains however also the possibility (ii) that δ' ὄρεσιβ[may conceal a reference, however obscure to us, to Orestes (i.e. integrating δ' Ὀρέσιβ[τ-), whose presence as a baby at Aulis is attested in Euripides' *IA*.⁷⁸ Finally, within the Iphigenia's hypothesis, one should also consider among the various possible supplements at the end of l. 6 a form of Ἄρτεμις (Ἄ[ρ]τ[-].⁷⁹

The possibility that lines 1-7 of *PSI* 1174 dealt with the sacrifice of Iphigenia would be attractive also on different grounds. Not only would this panhellenic myth provide a clear Boeotian link: its background would, more particularly, fit exactly within the political sphere of Corinna's own hometown, Aulis being in practical terms located on the coast between Tanagra's harbours.⁸⁰ The temple of Artemis at Aulis must certainly have been an important focal point for the cultic life of the local community, and even if there is no unambiguous evidence of a local cult of the goddess that involved also Iphigenia, this looks *per se* as a reasonable assumption. Analogy with the two Euripidean *Iphigenia* dramas, as well as with the cult at Brauron, would suggest that songs for Artemis and Iphigenia at Aulis might have played an important part in the festivals of Tanagran *parthenoi*.⁸¹ If we did not have papyrological evidence suggesting that the remains of one such song might indeed have been preserved, one might have conjectured the likelihood of its existence as a matter of analogy.

⁷⁶ We thought also about the possibility of integrating at the beginning of l. 5 κει/μ] ἄδ'(α) ('young deer' already in Hom. *Il.* 10.361, cf. also Call. *Lav. Pall.* 112 and 163 and Lycoph. *Alex.* 190 ποτ' ἐν σφαγαίσι κεμάς with reference to Iphigenia's sacrifice and Nonn. *Dion.* 13.108-109 καὶ κεμάς οὐρεσίφοιτος ἀμεμφεὶ καίετο πυρσῶ, | ἄρπαμένης νόθον εἶδος ἀληθέος Ἰφιγενείης) or δορκ[κ]ἄδ(α), both in verbal synapheia: in both cases the accusative κεμάδα or δορκάδα would be governed by a participial verbal form, now lost, in the previous line (e.g. l. 4 κρούσε δ' ἐπιθίτσα = Att. ἐπιθίτσα *vel* ἐπιπαμβώσα = Att. ἐπιπαμβώσα).

⁷⁷ For ὄρνυμι said of the stirring of winds and other atmospheric phenomena, see *LSJ* s.v. 3.

⁷⁸ For this tradition, see cf. also Lesky 1939, 971-2.

⁷⁹ If we accept the Iphigenia interpretation, the concluding line of the poem, that is l. 7 ἴπ[άντες ἐπ' ὠκουπόρωσι], would potentially trigger a poignant intertextual dialogue with Aesch. *Ag.* 1555-1559, where Clytaemestra envisages Iphigenia welcoming her murdered father in the underworld (ἀλλ' Ἰφιγένειά νιν ἀπασιῶς | θυγάτηρ, ὡς χρῆι, | πατέρ' ἀντιάσασα πρὸς ὠκύπορον | πρόθμευμ' ἀχέων | περὶ χεῖρε βαλοῦσα φιλήσει).

⁸⁰ In the fourth century BCE and in Hellenistic and Roman times the territory of Tanagra included Aulis (Nicocrates *FGrHist* 376 F 1; Strabo 9.2.8): see Schachter 2016, 97.

⁸¹ For narrative/cyclic choral songs performed by female choruses in honour of Artemis, see D'Alessio 2013, 124-5.

There is a further papyrus of Boeotian vernacular lyric mentioning the Euripus (*PMG Boeot. inc. auct.* 693 fr. 1): it is too fragmentary to allow any reasonable conjecture on its content, but some elements point to the possibility of its belonging to an early portion of a poem (if we accept that line 19 included a plural imperative followed by δέυρο; of course, the column might represent parts of two different poems; there is an intriguing pattern of alternating sequences of long and short lines, but no obvious clues for responsion seem to emerge, at least at first sight). The occurrence of the adjective εὐάνεμος in its first preserved line is intriguing (]ενευανεμ[). This is by no means a common conventional epithet,⁸² and the possibility that it might have been used to indicate a place by the Euripus (admittedly mentioned only at line 14]δεπευριπιῦο [) potentially evokes *e contrario* one of the most famous (indeed, probably *the* most famous) mythical event that took place there.

A further potential implication of the Iphigenia hypothesis has to do with the arrangement of the poem(s) within the papyrus roll. It would be methodologically incautious, of course, to draw wide-ranging conclusions from a single case in which we have a sequence of two poems (a single one in this papyrus, that is: a further one is provided by the sequence of *The Contest of Kithairon and Helikon* and *Asopides* in the Berlin papyrus, *PMG* 654), but it would hardly seem coincidental that a poem on Iphigenia may have been immediately followed by one on Orestes. The criterion of thematic affinity (even, perhaps, of chronological and/or alphabetical order of mythical content) could then have been at least one of the guiding principles for the arrangement of this particular collection (or section).⁸³ If the reconstruction offered here for *PSI* 1174 ll. 1-7 is correct, this poem might provide, even in its very fragmentary state, another epichoric version of a panhellenic myth, embedded in the work of a poet and a genre strongly oriented toward performances of groups of young girls, and thus potentially offering a precious glimpse on an (alternative?) perspective on the figure of Iphigenia.

82 εὐάνεμος is attested only four times in the classical period: Soph. fr. 371.2-3 R εὐάνεμου | λίμνας (lyr.), *Aj.* 197 ὀρμάται ἐν εὐάνεμοις βάσσαις, Eur. *Andr.* 749 λιμένας [...] εἰς εὐάνεμους, fr. 316.2 Κ πόντου χεῦμ' εὐάνεμον; then two further times in the Hellenistic period: Theoc. 28.5 πλῶν εὐάνεμον and Heracl. perieg. (4th/3rd BCE) *Descr. Graeciae* fr. 1.21.3.

83 Aulis was also the background of the only tenuous link between Orestes and Boeotia: according to Strabo 9.2.3 it was at Aulis that the Aeolians, guided by the descendants of Orestes, gathered before moving toward the colonization of Eastern Aeolis (with a clear parallelism with the previous gatherings at Aulis under the command of his father). The fact, however, that the *Orestas* was clearly a poem composed for performance in Thebes should make us cautious in exaggerating the importance of this connection.

Bibliography

- Angeli Bernardini, P. (1997). "Oreste, gli Orestidi e il ruolo della Beozia nella migrazione eolica". Bintliff, J. (ed.), *Recent Developments in the History and Archaeology of Central Greece*. Oxford, 71-9.
- Aretz, S. (1999). *Die Opferung der Iphigenia in Aulis. Die Rezeption des Mythos in antiken und modernen Dramen*. Stuttgart; Leipzig.
- Bensdorff, H. (2005). "Offene Gedichtschlüsse". *ZPE*, 153, 1-6.
- Bonnechere, P. (1994). *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne*. Liège. Kernos Suppl. 3.
- Bowra, C.M. (1936). "Pindar, *Pythian XI*". *CQ*, 30, 129-41.
- Braswell, B.K. (1998). *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin; New York.
- Canfora, L. (2005). *Il papiro di Dongo*. Milano.
- Cannatà Fera, M. (2020). *Pindaro: Le Nemee*. Milano.
- Casabona, J. (1966). *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec: des origines à l'époque classique*. Aix-en-Provence.
- Cavallo, G. (2008). *La scrittura greca e latina dei papiri. Una introduzione*. Pisa; Roma.
- Cavallo, G.; Maehler, H. (2008). *Hellenistic Bookhands*. Berlin.
- Cingano, E. (2017). "Interpreting Epic and Lyric Fragments: Stesichorus, Simonides, Corinna, the Theban Epics, the Hesiodic Corpus and Other Epic Fragments". *Lexis*, 35, 28-57.
- Collins, D.B. (2006). "Corinna and Mythological Innovation". *CQ*, 56, 19-32.
- Colomo, D. (2008). "Osservazioni sullo scriba ossirinchita dell'omega quadrangolare (Johnson A2)". *Segno e Testo*, 6, 3-34.
- Coppola, G. (1931). *Introduzione a Pindaro*. Roma.
- Criboire, R. (1996). *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta.
- Crisci, E. (1996). *Scrivere greco fuori d'Egitto. Ricerche sui manoscritti greco-orientali di origine non egiziana dal IV secolo a.C. all'VIII d.C. (Pap.Flor. XXVII)*. Florence.
- Crisci, E. (1998). "Scrivere greco fuori d'Egitto. Ricerche sui manoscritti greco-orientali di origine non egiziana dal IV secolo a.C. all' VIII d.C.". Cavallo, G.; Crisci, E.; Messeri, G.; Pintaudi, R. (a cura di), *Scrivere libri e documenti nel mondo antico. Mostra di papiri della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana* (25 agosto-25 settembre 1998). Firenze, entry nr. 15, 96. Papirologica Florentina 30.
- D'Alessio, G.B. (1991). "Osservazioni e paralipomeni ad una nuova edizione dei frammenti di Pindaro". *RFIC*, 119, 91-117.
- D'Alessio, G.B. (2013). "'The Name of the Dithyramb': Diachronic and Diatopic Variations". Kowalzig, B.; Wilson, P. (eds), *Dithyramb in Context*. Oxford, 113-32.
- D'Alessio, G.B. (2016). "Lyric Texts on a Michigan Ptolemaic Papyrus". Casanova, A. et al. (a cura di), *E sì d'amici pieno: omaggio di studiosi italiani a Guido Bastianini per il suo settantesimo compleanno*. 2 vols. Florence, 437-48.
- D'Alessio, G.B. (2017). "Performance, Transmission and the Loss of Hellenistic Lyric Poetry". Hunter, R.; Uhlig, A. (eds), *Imagining Reperformance in Ancient Culture. Studies in the Traditions of Drama and Lyric*. Cambridge, 232-61.
- D'Alessio, G.B. (2020). "Studi fra filologia e papirologia". *Bollettino dei Classici*, 41, 151-76.

- Daris, S. (1967). "Due nuovi papiri omerici". *Aegyptus*, 47, 191-6.
- Davies, M. (1988). "Corinna's Date Revisited". *SIFC*, 6, 186-94.
- Debiasi, A. (2010). "Orcomeno, Ascra e l'epopea regionale 'minore'". Cingano, E. (a cura di), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia*. Alessandria, 255-98.
- Diehl, E. (1936). *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*, vol. 1, fasc. 1-4. Ed. altera. Leipzig.
- Edmunds, L. (2009). "Tithonus in the New Sappho and the Narrated Mythical Exemplum in Archaic Poetry". Greene, E.; Skinner, M.B. (eds), *The New Sappho on Old Age: Textual and Philosophical Issues*. Washington, D.C., 58-70. Hellenic Studies Series 38.
- E Kroth, G. (2003). "Inventing Iphigeneia? On Euripides and the Cultic Construction of Brauron". *Kernos*, 16, 59-118.
- Finglass, P.J. (2007). *Sophocles: Electra*. Cambridge.
- Finglass, P.J. (2008). *Pindar: Pythian Eleven*. Cambridge.
- Finglass, P.J.; Davies, M. (2014). *Stesichorus: The Poems*. Cambridge.
- Fournet, J.-L. (2020). "Les signes diacritiques dans les papyrus documentaires grecs". Carlig, N.; Lescuyer, G.; Motte, A.; Sojic, N. (éds), *Signes dans les textes. Continuité et ruptures des pratiques scribes en Égypte pharaonique, gréco-romaine et byzantine = Actes du colloque international (Liège, 2-4 juin 2016)*. Liège, 145-66. *Papyrologica Leodiensia* 9.
- Fowler, R. (2013). *Early Greek Mythography*, vol. 2. Oxford.
- Fraenkel, E. (1950). *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Gentili, B.; Lomiento, L. (2008). *Metrics and Rhythmics: History of Poetic Forms in Ancient Greece*. Pisa.
- Hadjimichael, T. (2014). "Bacchylides fr. 60 M. and the *Kassandra*". *BASP*, 51, 77-100.
- Henrichs, A. (2000). "Drama and *drômena*: Bloodshed, Violence, and Sacrificial Metaphor in Euripides". *HSCP*, 100, 173-88.
- Hollingshead, M.B. (1985). "Against Iphigeneia's *adyton* in Three Mainland Temples". *AJA*, 89, 419-40.
- Hornblower, S. (2015). *Lykophron: Alexandra*. Oxford.
- Johnson, W.H. (2004). *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto.
- Kanavou, N. (2015). *The Names of Homeric Heroes. Problems and Interpretations*. Berlin; New York.
- Körte, A. (1939). "Referate. Literalische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen". *APF*, 13, 95.
- Kousolini, V. (2016). "Panhellenic and Epichoric Elements in Corinna's Catalogues". *GRBS*, 56, 82-110.
- Kyriakou, P. (2006). *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*. Boston.
- Lardinois, A. (2009). "The New Sappho Poem (P.Köln 21351 and 21376): Key to the Old Fragments". Greene, E.; Skinner, M.B. (eds), *The New Sappho on Old Age: Textual and Philosophical Issues*. Washington, D.C., 41-57. Hellenic Studies Series 38.
- Larson, J.L. (1995). *Greek Heroine Cults*. Madison.
- Lesky, A. (1939). s.v. "Orestes". *RE*, XVIII(1), 971-2.
- Lobel, E. (1956). "Nos 2370-74. Boeotian verse". *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XXIII. London, 60-87.
- McPhee, B.D. (2018). "Mythological Innovation in Corinna's Asopides Poem (fr. 654. ii-iv PMG)". *GRBS*, 58, 198-222.
- Morelli, D.; Pintaudi, R. (a cura di) (1983). *Cinquant'anni di papirologia in Italia. Carteggi Breccia-Comparetti-Norsa-Vitelli*. 2 vols. Naples.

- Neri, C. (2020). "Iati in Saffo". *Eikasmos*, 31, 15-28.
- Norsa, M.; Vitelli, G. (1932). "PSI 1174". *Papiri greci e latini. Volume decimo, fascicolo 2: n° 1163-1181*. Firenze, 140-1.
- Page, D.L. (1942). *Greek Literary Papyri*, vol. 1. London; New York.
- Page, D.L. (1953). *Corinna*. London.
- Page, D.L. (1968). *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford.
- Palumbo Stracca, B. (1993). "Corinna e il suo pubblico". Pretagostini, R. (a cura di), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica*. Roma, 403-12.
- Papathomopulos, M. (1968). *Antoninus Liberalis. Les Métamorphoses*. Paris.
- Pease, A.S. (1942). "Some Aspects of Invisibility". *HSCP*, 53, 1-36.
- Prodi, E.E. (2016). "Titles and Markers of Poem-End in the Papyri of Greek Choral Lyric". Derda, T.; Łajtar, A.; Urbanik, J. (eds), *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology* (Warsaw, 29 July-3 August 2013). Warsaw, 1137-84.
- Prodi, E.E. (2020). "Poem-titles in Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides". Currie, B.; Rutherford, I. (eds), *The Reception of Greek Lyric Poetry in the Ancient World: Transmission, Canonization, and Paratext*. Leiden; Boston, 461-515.
- Roberts, C. (1956). *Greek Literary Hands. 350 B.C.- A.D. 400*. Oxford.
- Rodríguez Piedrabuena, S. (2015). "Boeotica incerti auctoris?". Macía Villalobos, C. et al. (eds), *Europa Renascens. La cultura clásica en Andalucía y su proyección europea*. Zaragoza, 469-81.
- Rutherford, I.C. (1997). "Odes and Ends: Closure in Greek Lyric". Fowler, D.; Roberts, D.; Dunn, F. (eds), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton, 43-61.
- Schachter, A. (1972). "Some Underlying Cults Patterns in Boeotia". Fossey, J.M.; Schachter, A. (eds), *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities*. Montreal, 17-30. Teiresias Supplement 1.
- Schachter, A. (1981-94). *CoB: The Cults of Boiotia*, 3 vols. London.
- Schachter, A. (1990). "Ovid and Boiotia". Schachter, A. (ed.), *Essays in the Topography, History and Culture of Boiotia*. Montreal, 103-9. Teiresias Supplement 3.
- Schachter, A. (2016). *Boiotia in Antiquity: Selected Papers*. Cambridge.
- Scappaticcio, M.C. (2009). "La diastole, i grammatici latini e due esempi virgiliani". *RhM*, 152, 369-84.
- Stockert, W. (1992). *Euripides: Iphigenie in Aulis*. 2 Bde. Wien.
- Thomas, O. (2020). *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes*. Cambridge.
- Torres i Ribé, R.; Capellà i Soler, M.; Pòrtulas, J. (2005). *Corinna de Tanagra. Testimonis i fragments*. Barcelona.
- Tsagalís, C. (2017). *Early Greek Epic Fragments*. Vol. 1, *Antiquarian and Genealogical Epic*. Berlin; Boston.
- Ucciardello, G. (2020). "More Simonides among the *fragmenta lyrica adespota*? A Survey of the Fragments and a Case Study: P. Strass. inv. 1406-9". Agócs, P.; Prauscello, L. (eds), *Simonides Lyricus: Essays on the 'Other' Classical Choral Lyric Poet*. Cambridge, 27-58. CCJ Suppl. 42.
- Vergados, A. (2012). "Corinna's Poetic Mountains: PMG 654 col. i 1-34 and Hesiodic Reception". *CP*, 107, 101-18.
- Vessella, C. (2012). "Lettori di Corinna in Egitto". Schubert, P. (ed.), *Actes du 26e Congrès international de papyrology* (Genève, 16-21 août 2010). Geneva, 809-16.

- Vessella, C. (2016). "Boeotian Accentuation in the Ancient Editions of Boeotian Poetry". *Mnemosyne*, 69, 742-59.
- von Kamptz, H. (1982). *Homerische Personennamen: sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*. Göttingen.
- Vottéro, G. (2012). "Remarques sur les graphies et la langue des papyrus de Corinne". Brixhe, C.; Vottéro, G. (éds), *Folia Graeca in honorem Edouard Will. Linguistica*. Paris, 97-159.
- Wackernagel, J. (1916). *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen.
- West, M.L. (1970). "Corinna". *CQ*, 20, 277-87.
- West, M.L. (1990). "Dating Corinna". *CQ*, 40, 553-7.
- Williger, E. (1928). *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Komposita der griechischen Dichter des 5. Jahrhunderts*. Köln.

