

The *Epyllium Telephi* (*P. Oxy. 214*): A Reappraisal

Martina Delucchi

Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici, Napoli, Italia

Abstract This article re-examines *P. Oxy. 214*, commonly known as *Epyllium Telephi*. It is a fragmentary hexametrical text first published in 1899 that has received limited scholarly attention. The recto narrates parts of the myth of Telephus and his son, Eurypylos, while the verso describes a perilous sea journey. This study provides an updated reading of the papyrus, the first complete English translation, a reassessment of its date, and a reconsideration of its genre and narrator. A detailed commentary addresses textual and literary issues.

Keywords Epyllium Telephi. Epica adespota. Hexametrical poetry. Epic fragments. Papyrological fragments.

Summary 1 Introduction. – 2 Text and Translation. – 3 Context and Date. – 4 Contents, Characters, and Setting. – 5 Commentary.



Edizioni
Ca' Foscari



Peer review

Submitted 2025-02-04
Accepted 2025-06-06
Published 2025-12-17

Open access

© 2025 Delucchi | © 4.0



Citation Delucchi, M. (2025). "The *Epyllium Telephi* (*P. Oxy. 214*): A Reappraisal". *Lexis*, 43 (n.s.), 2, 217-238.

DOI 10.30687/Lexis/2724-1564/2025/02/003

217

1 Introduction

P. Oxy. 214, a fragment of a hexametrical text found in Oxyrhynchus, was first published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1899.¹ Four years later the papyrus was acquired by the British Museum and inventoried as *P. Lond.* 1181.² It has not received much scholarly attention, apart from a handful of articles published soon after the *editio princeps*.³ It was later included in larger collections and more recently discussed in an unpublished doctoral thesis, but there is no complete study of the text.⁴ Most scholars have based their hypotheses on the *princeps*, without examining the papyrus itself.⁵

The papyrus contains a fragment of a larger hexametrical poem of uncertain length. It is commonly referred to as an epyllion and called *Epyllium Telephi*.⁶ The text on the recto deals with the myths of Telephus and his son, Eurypylus. The events mentioned, recounted by a female narrator, are the battle of the Caicus, fought between Achaeans and Mysians; and the intervention of Eurypylus in the Trojan War and his impending duel with Neoptolemus. On the heavily damaged verso, a perilous journey by sea is described. It is difficult to say if it is a continuation of the recto or another poem altogether.

This study offers an updated reading of the poem and its first complete English translation. First, the dating of the papyrus sheet is clarified through palaeographical parallels, reconstructing its history. Second, the likely period of the poem's composition is identified, narrowing the broad range of previous estimates – the text has in fact been dated to the third century BCE, to the third CE, and to periods in between. Third, the traditional classification as an epyllion is reconsidered, providing alternatives. Fourth, the analysis also discusses the identity of the speaker and locates the speech

I am grateful to the British Library, and especially to Mr J. Kattenhorn, for granting access to the papyrus and providing high-quality photographs. I also thank Profs D. Colomo and P.J. Finglass, and Drs R. Ast, R. Bongiovanni, and E. Prodi for their helpful suggestions. I gratefully acknowledge the support of the Classical Association through the CA Graduate Bursary, and of the Fondation Hardt, which enabled two weeks of research in August 2022.

1 Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 27-9 (TM 64084).

2 Bell, Kenyon 1907, lxiii; Milne 1927, 32.

3 Platt 1899; Fraccaroli 1900; Ludwich 1900; Weil 1900; Wilamowitz 1900; Bolling 1901. Cf. also Powell, Barber 1921, 110.

4 *CA ep. adesp.* F 3 (= Powell 1925, 76-8); *GLP* F 133 (= Page 1942, 534-5); *Griech. Dichterfr.* F 18 (= Heitsch 1963, 58-60); Pellin 2007-08, 187-286.

5 Platt (1899) and Fraccaroli (1900) examined the papyrus; Bolling (1901) did not; Pellin (2007-08) saw only photographs; Wilamowitz (1900), Weil (1900), Ludwich (1900), Powell (1925), Page (1942), Barigazzi (1946), Rostagni (1956), and Heitsch (1963) do not say if they did.

6 Thus, first, Wilamowitz 1900, 35.

within the broader mythological context. Finally, a commentary addresses textual issues and the surrounding literary context.

2 Text and Translation

Recto

ἔξαπίνης ἐπέδησεν ἀνωϊστοῖσι κλάδοισι,⁷
 οὐ] κεν ἔτι ζῶοντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον [Ἀχαιοί·
 ἔ]νθα δέ κεν Μενέλαος ἐκέκλιτο, ἔγ[θ' Ἀγαμέμνων
 ὤλετο καὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοισι [Ἀχιλλῆα
 Τηλέφος ἐξενάριξε πρὶν Ἑκτοροῖς ἀντίον ἐλθεῖν. 5
 Ἄλλ' ὁπόσον μοι κάρτ[ος] ἀμνέμεν· ρ[
 χ]ραιμῆσαι δ' ἐμοί α[.....] α[. Γ.] Γ[
 ἴ]η[τ] καὶ ἀπ' Ἀργείοι<ο> λάχεν γέν[ος] Ἡρακλῆος
 Τ]ηλέφον ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμων ἀπάνειυθε ~ ~ ~
 κ]λ]ῦτέ μοι ἀθάνατοι, [Ζ]εὺς δ[ὲ] π]λέον, ὄν γενετῆρα 10
 Δαρδάνου ἡμετέροιο καὶ Ἡ[ρ]α[κ]λῆος ἀκούω,
 καὶ τούτων φράσασθε μ[αχῶ]ν λύσιν, ἵσα δὲ μύθοισι
 ε]ν]θεσίῃ Τρώεσσι καὶ Ἀ[ρ]γ[ε]ίοισι γενέσθω.
 ο]ὐδὲ <γὰρ> Ἀργείους θανέειν α[ί]τήσομαι αὐτῆ
 Ἐάνθου φοινίξαντας. [...] μετὰ χεῖμα Καΐκου 15
 Τηλέφου ἴφι τ[.....] οὐ]κέτι θωρηχθέντες.
 ...] τῆ]λε κλύε τ[.....]] και... ρον Ἀχαιῶν
]υσαι ἔχειν π[.....]]ζεσκον Ἀχαιοὶ
]εται μεσ[.....]]. χ. ογ ελλ[
]τος με[... π]ολύς· εἰ δὲ με[20
]ο σὺ μοι πάρα μη[
]]. [

6 ὄπαcon Platt | κάρτ[ος] Wil.: τ[όδ'] Fraccaroli: τ[ῶι] Ludwich: τ[ὸ] GH || 7 χραιμῆσαι δέ μοι GH Powell Page Heitsch Pellin || 8 ἴη Weil: εἰ Platt: ἦ Ludwich | λάχον Heitsch || 9 Τηλέφου Weil || 12 μ[όθω]ν Ludwich | ἵσα Weil: ἵσα Powell || 14 <γὰρ> Platt: <κεν> GH | [αἰτ]ήσομαι Fraccaroli: [ἄρ]ήσομαι Platt: [ἡγ]ήσομαι Ludwich | αὐτῆ vel -τις Fraccaroli || 15 φοινίξαντας Fraccaroli Wil. Bolling: φοινίξαντες Π || 16 τ[ό]χοι δάμην Platt: δ[α]μέντας Bolling || 17 τηλεκλειτ[] Weil || 18 fort. ῥέ]ζεσκον || 19 ἔ]ύσ[κ]ιον GH

[if Dionysus had not] suddenly enveloped [Telephus] in unexpected [vines],
 the [Achaean] would not have arrived in Ilium alive;
 then Menelaus would have fallen, then Agamemnon

7 If not otherwise specified, the supplements accepted are those of the *editio princeps*.

would have perished, even the best of the Argives, Achilles,
 Telephus would have killed before he could face Hector. 5
 How much strength (would be needed) of me to ward off [...] to help/defend my (?) [...] [...] surely obtained from Fate [...] the offspring of the Argive Heracles,
 Telephus, in the house far from wars [...].
 Grant me my wish, oh immortals and chiefly Zeus, who I hear is the father 10
 of our Dardanus and of Heracles,
 and devise a release from these battles, and likewise with words Trojans and Argives may arrive at a compromise.
 I myself, indeed, will ask that not even the Argives die, turning red [...] of the Xanthos after the stream of the Caicus, 15
 [...] by(?) the strength of Telephus, no longer holding (their?) weapons.
 [Zeus?,] hear from afar [...] of the Achaeans
 [...] have [...] the Achaeans
 [...] [...] much: if then [...] 20
 [...] you on me [...]

Verso⁸

.....] βιότουσαν [.] δε. νεγ ὄραις
] ν πόντον χθόνα τ' ἠδὲ νόησε
] φς α. μα πολυπλάγκτοιο θαλάσσης
] τ. θετο νηί θαλάσση
] [.] θαι καὶ προσὶν ἑτοίμη 5
] ἐπὶ χθονὸς εἰθύσαιμι
] α[.....] ν ες τινα χῶρον
] [.....] [.....] τος ἠχὴν
] [.] [.] ν [.] [.] νος. α πόντου
 [.] ἰνο..... οἱ. ὦ. τος. [.] Ὠκεανοῖο 10
 νήπιος ο[.] ἔλα. ἐ[.] [.] [κατ[.] θε[.] ὄν ὀδεύει
 δούρασι π[ων]τοπό[ρ]οι[ς] τ[.....] ἐ[.] ὄς [ο]ντιβανῶσι.
 πῆ νυν. τ..... [.....] ενο. ἐλοι. ε θάλασσα[ν
 ἔμπεδος [.....] ν. [.] [.....] α[.] ἐ[.] ἔλικτός
 ἰχθύβοτο[ς] κτα. [.] [.] [.....] ῥέεθρου 15
 προσὶν. [.] [.....] ἀμείνων
 τίς μεδε[.....] [.....] θάλασσαν

8 Several letters that Grenfell and Hunt read are today illegible (esp. lines 10 and 12). I decided to preserve those letters, as the ink plausibly faded with time.

ναίειν. τρον[...].. [...].. [.....]ον ἀνθρωπο[
 . [...]τι[.].. [.....]εστιν [.....]ηδεγ ἀρ[ή]γε[ι
 ..].. [.....]β. εἰθ... [.....]εἰθεδ[20
]σα. [.]τα[
]υθ[.]φ[.].. [

1 βιότου τ' ἀν[α]δέ[δρομεν Platt || **2** ἦδὲ νόησε Platt: ηδ' ενοησε GH || **3** φς ἀλλα vel
 ἀλαια GH:]ως οἶδμα Powell || **6** ἰθύσαιμι Heitsch || **7** ἔς Powell || **9** διὰ π. Pellin || **11**
 δ[ε] τ' ἐλάξει[] vel δ[ε] π[ι] ἐλαγ[ο]ς, κ[α]τ[ὰ] θε[ῖ]νον Platt: πελάσας γαίηι Powell: κατ'
 ἄθελκτον Heitsch || **12** ποντοπόροις πεπ(ε)ικμένος οὔτιδανοῖς Platt: πεποιθὼς
 Powell || **13** μ[α]λλον ἔλοιτο Platt: πλεῖν μ. ἔ. Powell || **14** ἄσ[τυφ]έλικτος Ludwich
 || **18** fort. ἀνθρωπο[ί]σιν

[...] they spent their lives [...] in seasons
 [...] sea and land, and saw
 [...] of the agitated sea
 [...] with a ship, at sea
 [...] and ready to run (?) 5
 [...] towards the land I would throw myself
 [...] towards a certain place
 [...] noise
 [...] of sea
 [...] of Oceanus 10
 silly that [...] travelled
 on the wooden planks that sail the sea [...] worthless
 in some place now [...] sea
 solid [...] twisted,
 that nourishes the fish [...] of the flow, 15
 with feet [...]
 who [...] sea
 to live [...] the man(?)
 [...] is(?) [...] does nothing (?)
 [...] 20

3 Context and Date

The papyrus is 11 cm in height; its width varies between 7 and 13.4 cm. On the recto, 21 verses are readable and traces of a twenty-second line are discernible; on the verso there are 22 verses, but the papyrus leaves are heavily damaged, “rubbed and difficult to decipher”.⁹ The upper and right margin on the recto (upper and left

⁹ Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 27.

on the verso) are partially visible; a modern annotation is noticeable in the top left on the recto.

P. Oxy. 214 comes from a papyrus codex. It shows no binding marks, maintains a consistent column width, and lacks rupture lines. Most scholars date the sheet to the third century CE, though none provide clear justification.¹⁰ Pellin, by contrast, dates it to the fourth century CE, stating that the Greek uncial – this is what Grenfell and Hunt call this papyrus script – is not attested before 300 CE.¹¹ However, Grenfell and Hunt employ the term ‘uncial’ broadly to refer to any majuscule script.¹² Greek majuscule is indeed perfected in the fourth century CE,¹³ when it is mainly used in religious manuscripts (cf. e.g. London, BL, Add. 43725; Vat. Gr. 1209). For this reason, it is known as biblical majuscule or, alternatively, as uncial. This kind of script, though, is already attested in papyri from the Hellenistic period on, since it is the natural transposition of the one used in inscriptions.¹⁴ Our majuscule is visibly not as refined or rigorous as that of the codices mentioned above. Rather, it is a specimen of a common sloping majuscule, rigid and angular, related to the severe style that emerges in the second century CE.¹⁵ Broad letters like mu, nu, tau, and omega contrast in size with most of the narrow ones (in particular with omicron and epsilon) and the script features a pronounced rightward slant. Comparable examples include *PSI* 10.1170 (second century), *PSI* 11.1203 (late second century), *PSI* 10.1169 (third century), and *P. Lond. Lit.* 5+182 (third century).¹⁶

Grenfell and Hunt compare *P. Oxy. 214* to “a number of cursive documents with which this fragment was found” and write that the “handwriting is very similar to that of ccxxxiii, which is of the same

10 Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 28; Ludwich 1900, 356; Bolling (1901, 63) quotes Grenfell, Hunt but does not discuss the date; Bell, Kenyon 1907, lxiii; Milne 1927, 32; Powell 1925, 78; Page 1942, 133; Turner 1977, 92, 116.

11 Pellin cites “Turner (1977) 97” for the dating of the papyrus between the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the fourth century CE (2007-08, 192). However, the book that Pellin refers to as “Turner (1977)” does not appear in her bibliography. In 1977 Turner published *The Typology of the Early Codex*, which also appears in this papyrus’ bibliography on the Mertens-Pack³ online catalogue; but nothing is written about this papyrus at page 97. The papyrus does appear, catalogued as number 308, at pages 92 and 116, both times dated to the third century CE. There is no mention of a different, later date.

12 West (1973, 25) opposes “Greek uncials (from 300 B.C.)” and “Greek minuscule (from the ninth century, at first concurrent with capitals)”.

13 It is the so-called Latin uncial which develops in the fourth century, cf. *BNP* s.v. “Uncials”.

14 Cf. Wilson 2008, 103-4; Cavallo 1967, 64-5.

15 Cf. Schubart 1925, 11-12; Cavallo 2011, 132-3.

16 *PSI* 10.1170 = TM 97892; *PSI* 11.1203 = TM 5953; *PSI* 10.1169 = TM 60797; *P. Lond. Lit.* 5+182 = TM 110341. For other parallels cf. Del Corso 2006.

period".¹⁷ *P. Oxy.* 233 is a fragment of a papyrus roll containing Demosthenes' *Against Timocrates*.¹⁸ This papyrus is closely associated with *P. Oxy.* 232 (= *P. Lond. Lit.* 128), a fragment of the same oration, which on the verso preserves parts of a letter dated to the end of the second century CE or the beginning of the third.¹⁹ This means that the recto of *P. Oxy.* 232 should be dated to the beginning of the third century at the latest. Therefore, since the script of *P. Oxy.* 232 is very close, "almost identical",²⁰ to *P. Oxy.* 233, and *P. Oxy.* 233 is "very similar" to *P. Oxy.* 214, it is likely that they all belong to the early third century at the latest.

The date and, consequently, the authorship of the text is more controversial. As mentioned, the content of *P. Oxy.* 214 is generally called an *epyllion*, a denomination first bestowed by Wilamowitz.²¹ Several scholars attribute this text to a Hellenistic poet, mentioning the style²² or similarities to other works.²³ Others attribute it to the second-third century CE because of vague linguistic evidence.²⁴ Let us discuss this.

First, not all verses are well-preserved enough for metrical analysis: a complete one is possible for thirteen lines (r 1-5, 8-15),²⁵ a partial one for others.

- i. The author favours the trochaic caesura after the first short of the third *metron*. He uses it eleven times out of 14 (78.6%), either alone (r 1, 2, 4-6, 11, 13, 15)²⁶ or in combination (r 3 and 12 with bucolic diaeresis; 8 with a masculine caesura in the fourth *metron*). The others are three masculine caesurae

¹⁷ Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 28.

¹⁸ Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 133-4. *P. Oxy.* 233 = *P. Univ. Pennsylv. Mus. Inv.* E2757 = TM 59635.

¹⁹ Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 132-3. *P. Oxy.* 232 = *P. Lond. Lit.* 128 = TM 59591. Del Corso 2006, 97.

²⁰ Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 133.

²¹ Wilamowitz 1900, 35.

²² Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 28; Weil 1900, 98; Ludwich 1900, 356, 357 (considering it a student's work); Barigazzi 1946, 16.

²³ Wilamowitz 1900, 35; Powell attributes it to Philitas, just because he wrote a *Telephus* (1925, 78; cf. Spanoudakis 2002, 26, 309-12); Rostagni (1956, 55) evokes the lost *Eurypyleia* of Homer of Byzantium.

²⁴ Bolling (1901, 68) believes it to be closer to Quintus Smyrnaeus than to Apollonius Rhodius and is inclined to date it shortly before the papyrus sheet; Page (1942, 535-6) attributes it to the school of Quintus Smyrnaeus; Powell, Barber 1921: "it may even be not earlier than the date of the Papyrus itself".

²⁵ The type of cesura in line 16 cannot be determined due to the missing third foot, but the metrical scheme is clear.

²⁶ Lines 6 and 15 are damaged, but a trochaic caesura is likely.

- in the third *metron* (*r* 9 and 14 in combination with another masculine in the fourth *metron*; 10 with a bucolic dieresis).
- ii. The contraction of the *bicipitia* involves three times the first foot (*r* 7, 12, 15), seven times each the second and fourth foot,²⁷ twice the third foot (*r* 10; *v* 2), four times the fifth foot (*r* 8, 16; *v* 6, 18). The high percentage of spondees in the fourth foot is surprising, as it appears to be in line with Tryphiodorus, Nonnus, and generally later works.²⁸
 - iii. All the most common bridges are respected (Hermann, Naeke, both Meyer, Giseke-Meyer, and Tiedke-Meyer). Hilberg's is broken at 6, but this occurs with a monosyllabic word.
 - iv. In 34 lines (*r* 1-5, 8-18; *v* 1-8, 10-19) out of 44, it is possible to identify a fifth foot to establish whether the hexameter is spondaic. Four hexameters out of 33 are spondaic (*r* 8, 16; *v* 6, 18). If the papyrus preserves two different poems it means that on the recto 12.5% of the hexameters are spondaic, on the verso 11.1%. If the papyrus preserves one poem, 11.8% of the hexameters are spondaic.
 - v. Hiatus recurs once at the bucolic dieresis (*r* 3: ἐκέκλιτο, ἔνθ' Ἀγαμέμνων).
 - vi. There are nine correptions *in hiatus* (*r* 7: χραισιμῆσαι δ'εμοῖ αἰ; 8: καὶ ἄπ'; 10: μοῖ ἄθάνατοι; 11: Δαρδάνου ἡμετέροιο καὶ Ἡ<[ρ]α>κλήῃος; 13: καὶ Ἀ[ρ]γείοις; 14: αἰ[τ]ήσομαι αὐτῆ; 16: Τηλέφου ἴρι; 18:]υσσῆ ἔχειν).

Points (i), (ii), (iii), and (vi) are inconclusive. Even considering the limited number of verses, this data is generally consistent with the any kind of post-Homeric hexameter up to the third century: predilection for the feminine caesura, often in combination;²⁹ distribution of the spondees (more numerous in the second foot, less in the first and third, in this order); violation of the aforementioned metrical laws; correption of αἰ, οἰ and οὐ of a genitive singular.³⁰ Conversely, points (iv) and (v) may give some hints. The percentage of spondaic hexameters (iv) stands out. In Homer, a spondee occurs in the fifth foot in 2% of cases,³¹ Callimachus 7%,³² Aratus and Euphorion 17%,³³

27 Second foot: *r* 2, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15; fourth foot: *r* 1, 4, 11, 13, 14; *v* 3, 4.

28 Silva Sánchez 1999, 121-2.

29 Especially Oppian and Quintus Smyrnaeus: cf. Köchly 1850, xlix; Whitby 1994, 108, 114; Agosti 2004, 64-8.

30 Clapp 1906, 241-2, 251. Cf. also Köchly 1850, xxxiv; Zimmermann 1908, 4; Keydell 1911; Vian 1959, 212.

31 West 1982, 37; Martinelli 1997, 67.

32 West 1982, 154; Martinelli 1997, 68-9.

33 West 1982, 154.

Quintus Smyrnaeus 6.7%,³⁴ Oppian 7.9%, ps.-Oppian 11%,³⁵ Colluthus 4.56%,³⁶ while Nonnus avoids it completely.³⁷ Ps.-Oppian emerges as the closest parallel. The hiatus at the bucolic dieresis (v) is rare in Hellenistic poetry;³⁸ conversely, it is tolerated, when not common, in some Imperial authors: ps.-Oppian frequently employs it³⁹ and Quintus allows it.⁴⁰

Since metrical evidence alone cannot securely date the fragment, let us consider diction instead. The most revealing term is *ιχθύβοτος* (v 15), found only once each in Oppian (*H.* 2.1) and Nonnus (*P.* 21.80). In the same case and metrical position, *γενετ ή ρ* (r 10) appears exclusively in Oppian.⁴¹ Almost unknown before Hellenistic times – and even then, only attested in a disputed papyrus attributable perhaps to Cleon's lost *Argonautica*⁴² – it gains popularity later on. In its accusative form alone, it is found fourteen times in the *Oracula Sibyllina*, once in ps.-Oppian (*C.* 3.339), once in Triphiodorus (294), thirty-seven times in Nonnus, and is fairly popular in inscriptions. Considering other cases, the number grows considerably. Finally, the lemma *ἀνώϊστος*, despite being quite common, is declined in the rare dative plural form *ἀνώϊστοισι* (r 1) featured only in Oppian (*H.* 3.43) and Moschus (*E.* 75).⁴³ Similarly, *ποντοπόρος* (v 12), is found in the same case and position only in ps.-Oppian (*C.* 1.120).

Cross-referencing all the information, the fragment is probably to date between Oppian and Quintus, the *terminus ante quem* is determined by the date of the papyrus sheet: the beginning of the third century.⁴⁴ The lexicon points towards the Imperial Age; the presence of Homerisms – such as the genitive in -οιο, the rare, Homeric *πολυπλάγκτοιο* (from *πολύπλαγκτος*),⁴⁵ even the clear allusion to Homeric passages –, ⁴⁶ the predilection for the trochaic caesura in the

³⁴ Vian 1959, 246.

³⁵ On ps.-Oppian cf. Mersinias 1998, 118; on both Oppians cf. Silva Sánchez 1999.

³⁶ Nardelli 1982, 324

³⁷ West 1982, 178; Martinelli 1997, 73.

³⁸ West 1973, 156.

³⁹ Silva Sánchez 1999, 205-6.

⁴⁰ Vian 1959, 216, 219-20.

⁴¹ Opp. *H.* 5.84. In the same case but in a different metrical position: *H.* 4.154. Cf. also [Opp.] *C.* 3.339.

⁴² *P. Oxy.* 4712 fr. 1.14, cf. De Stefani 2006; Magnelli 2006. It appears also in [Arist.] *De Mundo* 397a.4, referring to the creator of the universe; this religious use is close to that of *γενέτωρ* (cf. Chantraine 1946, 247-8; 1999, 223).

⁴³ It is quite rare in general (*TLG*: 42 occurrences).

⁴⁴ Cf. Wifstrand 1933, 78; Agosti, Gonnelli 1995, 293; James 2014, xxiii.

⁴⁵ In that form only in *Il.* 2.308, before late antiquity.

⁴⁶ Cf. commentary on 3-5, 15-16.

third metron, the hiatus at the bucolic caesura, and the recurrence of spondaic hexameters are all characteristics that approximate our poet – in varying degrees – to either the two Oppians or Quintus.⁴⁷

P. Oxy. 214 is not unlike several *adespota* dated around the same period, such as *P. Oxy.* 4847 (second century, hexameters on a Trojan subject), 4848 (second-third century), 4849, and 4850.⁴⁸ *P. Oxy.* 4849 is particularly interesting as it is dated to the late second-early third century CE, like ours, it is a sheet of a codex, like ours, is akin to Quintus, like ours, and deals with something similar to our text, namely Neoptolemus' deeds. *P. Oxy.* 4850, dated to the third century is equally relevant, as it is the fragment of a codex and contains lines that might be spoken by a woman who is addressing Zeus (20), and Achilles seems to be mentioned (4).⁴⁹

Another way to interpret this fragment is as an ethopoeia – a rhetorical exercise.⁵⁰ The influence of rhetoric is recognisable in several Imperial authors already discussed – ps.-Oppian, Quintus, Nonnus.⁵¹ The oldest example of an ethopoeia found on papyrus might be the hexametrical text preserved in *P. Oxy.* 4939,⁵² dated to the first half of the second century CE. This text appears to be a monologue in which someone mourns the death of a cherished young woman.⁵³ From at least the third century CE, such hexametrical compositions on a given subject became widespread for training rhetors in imagining specific scenarios, often mythical. Homeric themes were particularly favoured, as in *PSI* 6.722 (third century) where Priam debates with himself about the ransom of Hector, *P. Oxy.* 1821 (third century) about Odysseus' return, *P. Ant.* 1.17 (third century), where someone complains about Ajax's death,⁵⁴ or *P. Oxy.* 3002 (fourth century) where Athena talks to Achilles after his quarrel with Agamemnon. It is also possible that fragment belonged to an anthology of ethopoeias, like *TCD Pap. Inv.* D 6 (fifth-sixth century),

47 On Quintus Smyrnaeus (esp. language) cf. Bär 2009, 43-52.

48 *P. Oxy.* 4847 = TM 113262; *P. Oxy.* 4848 = TM 113263; *P. Oxy.* 4849 = TM 113264; *P. Oxy.* 4850 = TM 113265.

49 Cf. *P. Oxy.* 5104 = TM 140273 (second-third century) mythological hexameters on Aphrodite. *Contra* Perale (2021, 34), who suggests a connection with the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice.

50 On ethopoeias cf. Miguélez-Cavero 2008, 316-27; on history of ethopoeia cf. Heusch 2005; on relationship between ethopoeia and Imperial poetry cf. Agosti 2005; on catalogue of ethopoeia cf. Amato, Ventrella 2005, 213-31.

51 Whitby 1994, 112, 114; Agosti 2005, 45-52.

52 *P. Oxy.* 4939 = TM 117819.

53 The earliest evidence for ethopoeia is *IG* XIV 2012 = *IGUR* 1336 Moretti, dated 94 CE (cf. Fernandez Delgado, Ureña Bracero 1993). Cf. also *P. Lond. Lit* 51 = TM 63520 (second century).

54 For later ethopoeia cf. Miguélez-Cavero 2008, 46-7, 49-50, 54, 58.

P. Heid. inv. 1271 (sixth century), and, perhaps, *P. Ryl.* 3.487 (end of third century).⁵⁵

4 Contents, Characters, and Setting

The hexametrical composition on *P. Oxy.* 214 centres, as mentioned, on the myths of Telephus and his son Eurypylus. On the recto, a woman is giving a direct speech (ἀυτή, 14), though it is unclear whether the text captures it entirely, if it was part of a larger composition with narration or dialogue, or if it was simply a short exchange between two figures. Lines 1-5 recount the battle of the Caicus. The narrator states that, without Dionysus's intervention, Telephus would have killed all the Greeks - even those fated to survive. Lines 6-9 refer to the lineage of Heracles and Telephus. They might connect to the preceding, lost section, highlighting the bond between Telephus and his father, possibly through Auge, Telephus' mother. At the same time, they may serve as a lead-in to line 10, where a woman is praying Zeus and the other gods to help end the war between Greeks and Trojans. On the verso, as well, the speaker is again a female character (ἑτοίμη, 5) - the same woman, if this is the same poem - who describes a dangerous sea journey.

It is generally believed that the woman is Astyoche - sister of Priam, wife of Telephus, and mother of Eurypylus.⁵⁶ This is plausible. She names herself a descendant of Dardanus, prays for peace between Greeks and Trojans, and twice compares the Trojan War to that between Greeks and Mysians. But when and where does she speak? The fragment offers two clues. At lines 4-5 Astyoche says that Dionysus intervened to prevent Telephus from killing Achilles before he could face Hector (πρὶν Ἐκτορ[ο]ς ἀντίον ἔλθεῖν); and at 12-13 she prays for peace between Achaeans and Trojans.⁵⁷ Therefore, the action must take place either (i) after the battle of the Caicus and before the start of the Trojan War, positing that Astyoche knew that the Achaeans would go and attack Troy, or (ii) during the Trojan War, when Eurypylus joins the fight.⁵⁸

55 *PSI* 6.722 = TM 64028; *P. Oxy.* 1821 = TM 64167; *P. Ant.* 1.17 = TM 64141; *P. Oxy.* 3002 = TM 60991; *TCD Pap. Inv.* D 6 = TM 64912; *P. Heid. inv.* 1271 = TM 64961; *P. Ryl.* 3.487 = TM 64318.

56 Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 27; Platt 1899, 439; Weil 1900, 96; Fraccaroli 1900, 91; Bolling 1901, 64; Powell 1925, 78; Page 1942, 534-5; Heitsch 1963, 59. Only Ludwich (1900, 357) disagrees, though on the basis on his own supplements.

57 Cf. Weil 1900, 97; Page 1942, 535; Rostagni 1956, 54-5.

58 Robert sets the story after the Trojan War (*ap.* Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 28); Fraccaroli (1900, 91) during a second meeting between Greeks and Mysians. Both hypotheses do not stand.

Point (i) implies that Astyoche is lamenting Telephus' wounding, which just occurred, and the future war looming.⁵⁹ This interpretation is based on two elements: the ending of 5 (πρὶν Ἴκτορ[ος ἀντίον ἔλθειν) and the expression ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμων ἀπάνευθε at 9. Platt believes that when writing πρὶν Ἴκτορ[ος ἀντίον ἔλθειν the poet is not implying that Hector's death has already happened, just that it might be an option. Bolling agrees, adding that the construction πρὶν + infinitive does not warrant a conclusion of the action expressed by the verb.⁶⁰ This may be true for some cases, but it is also not cogent: cf. e.g. *Il.* 7.480-1 (οὐδέ τις ἔτλη | πρὶν πιεῖν, πρὶν λείψαι ὑπερμενεΐ Κρονίωνι). Then, Platt interprets line 9 as referring to Astyoche hoping to live in peace with Telephus.

Traditionally, though, Astyoche's involvement in the Trojan War is closely tied to that of her son. It has been so since *Od.* 11.521, where Eurypylus' demise is attributed to "the gifts of a woman" (γυναιῶν εἴνεκα δῶρων) – a reference to Astyoche accepting Priam's bribe to send him to war. This theme is likewise central to Sophocles' lost *Eurypylus*, which depicted a penitent Astyoche regretting her weakness – a play that still circulated in the second century.⁶¹ Another similarity is to be found in how both the *Epyllium Telephi* and the tragedy invite comparison between the duos Achilles-Neoptolemus and Telephus-Eurypylus.⁶² Overall, Astyoche's prayer is more meaningful in a narrative where her son is involved in the action (ii).

As the events realistically occur during the Trojan War and involve Eurypylus, Astyoche's speech could be set either in Troy – if she followed her son there – or in Mysia, if she stayed behind. The latter seems more likely, as it was unusual for a mother to accompany her son to war. Instead, a mother bidding farewell and awaiting her son's return is a well-established motif. Penelope offers the clearest parallel as both she and Astyoche are mothers of underage sons acting as regents until they come of age. Indeed, Penelope stays in Ithaca when Telemachus leaves. To provide another term of comparison, in Aeschylus' *Persians*, Atossa receives news of Xerxes' defeat in Susa. Unfortunately, the fragments of Sophocles' *Eurypylus* do not clarify the setting, depriving us of what might have been the most cogent analogy.⁶³

59 Bolling 1901, 65-6; Platt 1899, 440.

60 Bolling 1901, 66.

61 *TrGF* 4 F 211. On Astyoche in Sophocles' *Eurypylus* cf. Finglass 2019, 48-53; Ozbek 2019, 54-9; Cowan 2020.

62 *TrGF* 4 F 206, 210-12.

63 For some reason, *Eurypylus* is generally believed to be set in Troy, but there is no actual evidence; cf. e.g. Wilamowitz 1900, 34; Brizi 1927, 5-6; Carden 1974, 2; Lloyd-Jones 1996, 85; Ozbek 2006, 31.

5 Commentary

The fragment on the recto can be divided into two sections. Lines 1-5 recount of the battle at the river Caicus, referencing the Teuthranian expedition, when the Greeks mistakenly attacked Telephus and his men, thinking them Trojans. Lines 6-16 contain Astyoche's prayer to the gods, requesting the cessation of the Trojan War. This second section is divided into three shorter parts (lines 10-13, 14-16, 17 to where the papyrus break), punctuated by verbs of request: κλύω (10, 17) and αἰτέω (14).

1 ἔξαπίνης ἐπέδησεν ἀνωϊστοῖσι κλάδοισι ([if Dionysus had not] suddenly enveloped [Telephus] in unexpected [vines]). This is part of a protasis, whose respective two apodoses are in lines 2 and 3. The necessary missing nexus – εἰ μή, εἰ μή ἄρα, to match οὐ κεν (2) and ἔνθα δέ κεν (3)⁶⁴ – must have been in the previous line.⁶⁵ Barigazzi proposed the metrically sound [εἰ μή νιν προσιόντα πόδας Σφάλτης Διόνυσοι],⁶⁶ cleverly employing the epithet Σφάλτης which appears only in Lyc. Al. 207 (cf. also SEG 19 399.a6, ca. 150-115 BCE: Σφαλεώτας). The adverb ἔξαπίνης appears at the beginning of hexameters both in Homeric poetry and in later epics.⁶⁷ The supplement at the end of the verse is accepted by everyone. Weil,⁶⁸ followed by Powell⁶⁹ and Barigazzi,⁷⁰ adds an ephelecytic nu. Ephelecytic nu is sometimes used before consonants, particularly in poetry, to create a richer sound at the end of a line.⁷¹ Its use is a matter of choice from Hellenistic times on.⁷² Here, it seems unnecessary: κλάδοισι closes the protasis of the hypothetical construction, and the apodosis starts at the beginning of the following line. Therefore, the hypothetical construction itself and the separation of the verses already ensure a solid division between protasis and apodosis, making the ephelecytic nu redundant.

2 οὐ κεν ἔτι ζώοντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον [Ἀχαιοί· (the [Achaean] would not have arrived in Ilium alive). The verse is probably adapted from *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 141 (πόσσοι ἄμ' Ἀτρεΐδην ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον Ἀχαιοί;).

64 Pellin 2010, 520.

65 Cf. Fraccaroli 1900, 89: "Cioè all'incirca: εἰ μή Διόνυσος Τηλεφον; Heitsch 1963, 59: "intellige: εἰ μη Διονυσος Τηλεφον επεδησεν, ου κεν κτλ" (sic).

66 Barigazzi 1946, 16.

67 *Od.* 10.557, 24.160; *Nonn. Dion.* 7.147, P. 9.42, 9.65, 11.104; *Colluth.* 220, 255.

68 Weil 1900, 97.

69 Powell 1925, 76.

70 Barigazzi 1946, 16.

71 Cf. Curtius 1868, 24.

72 Bolling 1945.

In its latest form, the *Contest* is a Hadrianic work and thus slightly antecedent to our fragment.⁷³ Cf. also *Od.* 4.487 ἢ πάντες cὺν νηυσὶν ἀπήμονες ἦλλον Ἀχαιοί.

3-5 ἔνθα δέ κεν Μενέλαος ἐκέκλιτο, ἔν[θ]’ Ἀγαμέμνων | ὄλετο καὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοις [Ἀχιλῆα | Τήλεφος ἐξενάριξε πρὶν Ἴεκτορο[ς ἀντίον ἔλθειν. (then Menelaus would have fallen, then Agamemnon would have perished, even the best of the Argives, Achilles, Telephus would have killed before he could face Hector). The author employs a well-balanced climax: first, he names Menelaus, the scorned husband of Helen, the man who wanted the war in the first place, then his brother Agamemnon, the general who leads the army, and finally Achilles, the best of the Achaeans. The list recalls Nestor numbering the heroes killed during the Trojan War (*Od.* 3.109-10). The third conditional is broken by enjambment, skilfully interrupting the rhythm created by the anaphoric ἔνθα.⁷⁴ The temporal aspect of ἔνθα, ‘then’, should be preferred here, as the entire sentence is giving temporal coordinates: if Dionysus had not intervened (*scil.* in that specific moment), then the Greeks would have not reached Troy (*scil.* after the battle of the Caicus), many heroes would have died and among them Achilles, before (πρὶν) he could face Hector. Page and Pellin translate ἔνθα as a locative.⁷⁵ However, if used in that sense, ἔνθα would mean ‘there’ (rightly Page), not ‘here’, *pace* Pellin, who argues that ἔνθα refers to Mysia (*scil.* the place in which Menelaus and Agamemnon would have died had Dionysus not intervened), thus setting the poem in Mysia. The hiatus ἐκέκλιτο, ἔνθ’ Ἀγαμέμνων is not particularly bothersome: it is broken both by punctuation and the bucolic dieresis. The ending of 5 is a supplement made by Grenfell and Hunt, based no doubt on *Il.* 7.160, the sole other instance.

6-9 Ἄλλ’ ὅποσον μοι κάρτ[ος] ἀμυνέμεν. ρ[| χραισμησαι δ’ ἐμοί α[.....]α. [.] [| †η† καὶ ἀπ’ Ἀργείοι<ο> λάχεν γέν[ος] Ἡρακλῆος | Τήλεφος ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμων ἀπάνε[υθε ~ - ρ (How much strength (would be needed) of me to ward off [...] to help/defend my (?) [...] surely obtained from Fate [...] the offspring of the Argive Heracles, Telephus, in the house far from wars [...]). Astyoche seeks to prevent something from happening. Her attempt probably concerns the prayer that starts at 10. Lines 8-9 could refer to Telephus’ decision not to help either the

73 Bassino 2018, 115. Cf. also Koniaris 1971; Mandilaras 1992.

74 Ἀγαμέμνων is supplemented by Grenfell and Hunt and it is extremely common at the end of the verse in the Homeric poems (*Lfgre* s.v. “Ἀγαμέμνων”), both with and without enjambement. For examples in Homer cf. Parry 1929; Kirk 1966; Bakker 1990; 1997; 2005; Higbie 1990; Clark 1994; Blackenborg 2014; in Quintus of Smyrna cf. Visser 1987, 287.

75 Page 1942, 537; Pellin 2007-08, 199.

Greeks or the Trojans.⁷⁶ Eurypylus, who is about to face Neoptolemus, reversed it. This interpretation agrees well with the following prayer in which a repentant Astyoche asks the gods to stop a war in which her son is involved. The reading κάρτ[ος] is Wilamowitz's. Although only the vertical line of the rho is visible, the reading is probably correct: the stroke is slanted (cf. e.g. other rhos at 4 and 7) and there is enough space for the round portion of the letter – space that would be excessive for an iota alone. Moreover, given the module of omicron and sigma in this hand, it is entirely plausible that both would fit within the lacuna. Adopting Wilamowitz's restoration also solves the issue of a prepositive καί immediately before the expected central caesura. After ἀμυνέμεν the traces of two letters are visible. The first is not identifiable; the second seems to be rho.⁷⁷ The last two feet of the hexameter are missing; the easiest option is to imagine a trisyllable followed by a disyllable or vice versa. Preserving the traditional reading χραϊεμῆσαι δέ μοι at 7 violates Giseke's Law. This is easily avoidable by simply reading χραϊεμῆσαι δ' ἔμοι – instead.⁷⁸ I place *crucēs* around the eta that opens 8. Three interpretations have been proposed, none solid enough: Platt (and also Bolling, before proposing a different rendition of 8) takes it to mean εἰ, Wilamowitz, Ludwig, and Fraccaroli⁷⁹ interpret it as a feminine relative pronoun, and Weil understands it in an exegetic sense.⁸⁰

No reconstruction of 6-9 entirely convinces. Right before Astyoche's prayer for Zeus and the other gods to stop the war, we should expect something related to her regret towards the decision to accept the bribe – maybe 7 was a cry for help to fix her mistake? – possibly followed by a praise of Telephus' decision not to get involved in the war (9?). Key to the understanding of these lines is probably the meaning of the eta at the beginning of 8, but without 7 this seems virtually impossible. Interpreting eta as a feminine relative pronoun means that either Astyoche is talking about another woman (perhaps Auge, like in Fraccaroli's reconstruction),⁸¹ or herself in the third

76 Cf. Sch. D II. 1.59 van Thiel; Hyg. *Fab.* 101.1-5; Dictys *Eph.* 2.10.

77 Others see an epsilon before the break, but the traces do not seem to fit (Grenfell, Hunt 1899, 28; cf. also Platt 1899, 440; Fraccaroli 1900, 90).

78 For the norms regarding metrical words cf. Cantilena 1995, 20-8; Magnelli 1995, 140-1. Cf. also Giseke 1864, 128-9; Maas 1962, 63 § 94; Oswald 2014, 422. Violations of Giseke's Law in Hellenistic poetry: Magnelli 1995, 142-56, 162-4; in Nonnus only twice (cf. Magnelli 2021, 295). For stressed pronouns in Wackernagel's position cf. e.g. *Od.* 9.550.

79 Followed by Heitsch.

80 Pellin chooses the same adverb as Weil but uses it to confirm an assertion, translating it as "certo" ("in truth").

81 Fraccaroli 1900, 90.

person, which seems unlikely,⁸² or that there is a mistake in the last two lines.⁸³ It may be correct to hypothesize that eta refers to Auge, and that the story of Telephus' birth was briefly alluded to, as in QS 6.134-7. A reminder of Telephus' lineage placed before the prayer to Zeus could help Astyoche with her supplication. Since Heracles is mentioned at 5, a connection with the Arcadian lineage of Telephus, and by extension of Eurypylus, could be helpful as well; after all, Arcas was a son of Zeus too.

10-13 κλῦτέ μοι ἄθάνατοι, [Ζ]εὺς δ[ὲ] π[λ]έον, ὄν γενετῆρα | Δαρδάνου ἤμετέροιο καὶ Ἡ[ρ]α[κ]λῆος ἀκούω, | καὶ τούτων φράσσειαθε μ[α]χῶν λύειν, ἴσα δὲ μύθοις | εἰς ὑθεσίη Τρώεσσι καὶ Ἀ[ρ]γείοις γενέσθω. (Grant me my wish, oh immortals and chiefly Zeus, who I hear is the father of our Dardanus and of Heracles, and devise a release from these battles, and likewise with words Trojans and Argives may arrive at a compromise). The speaker begins a prayer of indeterminate length which respects the canonical form of prayer.⁸⁴

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. κλῦθι. | a. κλῦτε. |
| b. Invocation of a god by name or distinctive epithet. | b. ἄθάνατοι; Ζεὺς. |
| c. Mention of past service to the god, or by the god. | c. ὄν γενετῆρα Δαρδάνου ... καὶ Ἡρακλῆος. |
| d. Request. | d. καὶ τούτων φράσσειαθε μαχῶν λύειν, ἴσα δὲ μύθοις εἰς ὑθεσίη Τρώεσσι καὶ Ἀργείοις γενέσθω. |

The second person plural of κλύω used by a mortal to address gods is rare in hexametrical poetry – both Homeric and late – as it is always used by a god talking to gods or by a mortal talking to mortals and never as a prayer; furthermore, the perfect is generally favoured. Exceptions can be found in *Hym. Orph.* 59.1 (To the Fates); 60.1 (To the Graces); 69.1 (To the Furies); 70.1 (To the Eumenides); and in Aesch. *Ch.* 399, 802. In the entire epic production, there are only four

82 Wilamowitz (1900, 34) identifies the speaker of the fragment with an undetermined Mysian woman, and implies that she is talking about Astyoche; Ludwich (1900, 357) does not believe that the speaker is Astyoche.

83 Thus Weil, who emends Τηλέφον to Τηλέφου and interprets 8-9 as a rhetorical question to which the reader should expect a negative answer: ἦ καὶ ἂπ' Ἀργεῖοι<ο> λάχεν γέν[ο]ς Ἡρακλῆος | Τηλέφου ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμοιο ἀπάνευθε [καθῆσθαι, "Portait-il [Eurypylus] donc dans ses veines le sang d'Hercule pour se tenir dans le palais de Téléphe loin des batailles?" (1900, 97).

84 Scholarship on this topic is rich. For an overview cf. e.g. Furley 2007. I employ here Morrison's convenient scheme (1991, 147-8).

occurrences of women addressing gods directly in prayer: *Il.* 6.305-10 (Theano and the Trojan women), *Od.* 4.759-67, 20.61-90 (Penelope), and 20.112-19 (unnamed woman). The use of nominative for Ζεύς, when we would expect a vocative, should be understood as a case of nominative *pro* vocative (cf. *Soph. Aj.* 695).⁸⁵

14-16 οἴδὲ <γὰρ> Ἀργείους θανέειν ἀ[ιτ]ήχομαι αὐτή | Ξάνθου φοινίξαντας . [. . .] μετὰ χεῦμα Καΐκου | Τηλέφου ἴφι τ.[. οὐ]κέτι θωρηχθέντες (I myself, indeed, will ask that not even the Argives die, turning red [...] of the Xanthos after the stream of the Caicus, [...] by(?) the strength of Telephus no longer holding (their?) weapons). In the second part of the prayer, Astyoche adds that she also prays for the Argives, wishing for the slaughter of the battle of the Caicus not to repeat itself. Numerous are the references to the duel between Achilles and the Scamander from *Il.* 21 (cf. esp. 326: πορφύρεον κῦμα).⁸⁶ Cf. also: Arch. F 17a.8-10 Swift: ἐϋρρείτης δὲ Κ[αΐκος] | π[ι]πτόντων νεκύων στείνετο καὶ [πεδίων | Μύσιον; *TRF* 633: *flucti cruoris volverentur Mysii*;⁸⁷ *On. Met.* 12.111-12: *vel cum purpureus populari caede Caicus | fluxit*; QS 9.178-9: περὶ Ξάνθοιο ῥέεθρα | αἵματι φοινίχθησαν, ἐνεστείνοντο δὲ νεκροί; Philostr. *API* 16.110.2-3: Τήλεφος αἰμάξας φρικτὸν Ἄρη Δαναῶν, | Μυσοῦν ὅτε πλήθοντα φόνω ἐκέρασσε Κάυκον.⁸⁸ At 14, the lacuna in ἀ[ιτ]ήχομαι allows for two letters. The traces of alpha before the rupture rule out Platt's ἀρήχομαι, as one letter in the lacuna is not enough,⁸⁹ and Ludwich's ἠγήχομαι, which does not fit the context. At 15, the papyrus reads φοινίξαντες. To agree with Ἀργείους (acc.) it should be emended to φοινίξαντας, and this seems to be the best choice;⁹⁰ however, this form is unattested, and emending close to a lacuna violates the *lex Youtie*. Alternatively, a different syntactic structure for 15-16 might be proposed: Ξάνθοῦ φοινίξαντες [...] μετὰ χεῦμα Καΐκου | Τηλέφου ἴφι τό[σοι δάμεν οὐ]κέτι θωρηχθέντες⁹¹ though this is syntactically strained. In the lacuna at 15 we likely expect a reference to water.⁹² At 16, the papyrus has εἴφι for ἴφι, either an error of itacism or a hypercorrection.

⁸⁵ Cf. Bucci 2019, 63 and generally for a survey on the matter.

⁸⁶ For a line-by-line comparison cf. Tsagalis 2014, 381.

⁸⁷ Cf. *TrRF* 4.387 for a different reading.

⁸⁸ In prose: Philostr. *Her.* 23.24. Cf. also Pind. *I.* 8.108-10.

⁸⁹ Platt 1899, 440, followed by Bolling 1901, 64, 67; Powell 1925, 78; Heitsch 1963, 59; Pellin 2007-08, 256.

⁹⁰ Fraccaroli 1900, 90; Wilamowitz 1900, 34; Bolling 1901, 67. Platt 1899, 440; Powell 1925, 77; Heitsch 1963, 59; Pellin 2007-08, 258 maintain φοινίξαντες.

⁹¹ Partially from Platt 1899, 440.

⁹² Cf. Wilamowitz 1900, 34: ὕδωρ.

Reconstruction of 17-22 is virtually impossible. Platt supplements Ζεῦ at the beginning of 17.⁹³ This is probably right: Ζεῦ is a common vocative *incipit* and would agree with the repeated κλύω shortly after. The lacuna before]ζεσκον Ἀχαιοί (18) is plausibly to supplement with the clausula ῥέ]ζεσκον Ἀχαιοί, cf. *Il.* 8.250; *Od.* 22.46. Weil's emendation]τηεκλειτ[for]τηλεκλυετ[feels unnecessary and τηλεκλειτός, other than being quite a rare adjective, is never associated with Zeus, nor with other deities.

The verso is equally difficult to interpret. Apart from the frequent repetition of the noun θάλασσα, which suggests the account of a journey by sea, little can be said. At 4, the papyrus has θαλάσση for θαλάσση, which is frequent in papyri. However, the double dative is odd, and it is tempting to suspect a mistake for θαλάσσης (cf. the clausula νηὶ θαλάσσης in Nonn. *Dion.* 40.509).⁹⁴ At 18 ἀνθρωποίσι(ν) is plausible at the end of the verse, with many parallels. As regards contents, someone is talking about a journey made or that is going to be made by sea. If Astyoche is still the speaker, she may be telling the story of Auge's journey to Mysia,⁹⁵ perhaps recalling an origin story, like in ps.-Moschus' *Megara*, where Alcmene remembers the birth of Heracles. Alternatively, she might be recounting Telephus' journey towards Greece, after receiving his wound (cf. Eur. *Tel. P. Lips. Inv.* 1304.12-19; *TRF* 629-30 = *TrRF* 4.379). Then again, she might be wondering about the perilous journey she would undertake in case the Trojans lose the war, like Andromache in *Il.* 6. This option is suggested by the first person εἰθύκαμι at 6, accompanied by the complement ἐπὶ χθονός and would agree well with the tradition according to which Astyoche is one of the captive women who set fire to the Trojan ships.⁹⁶

93 Platt 1899, 440.

94 Pace Platt 1899, 440; Pellin 2007-08, 271-2.

95 Cf. Strab. 13.1.69.

96 On the episode cf. Fowler 2013, 567-8, esp. footnote 150.

Bibliography

- Agosti, G. (2004). "Alcuni problemi relativi alla cesura principale nell'esametro greco tardoantico". Spaltenstein, F.; Bianchi, O. (éds), *Autour de la césure. Actes du colloque Damon des 3 et 4 novembre 2000*. Bern: Peter Lang, 61-80.
- Agosti, G. (2005). "L'etopea nella poesia greca tardoantica". Amato, E.; Schamp, J. (éds), *Ēthopoia. La représentation de caractères entre fiction scolaire et réalité vivante à l'époque impériale et tardive*. Salerno: Helios Editrice, 34-53.
- Agosti, G.; Gonnelli, F. (1995). "Materiali per la storia dell'esametro nei poeti cristiani greci". Fantuzzi, M.; Pretagostini, R. (a cura di), *Struttura e storia dell'Esametro greco*. Roma: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, 289-434.
- Amato, E.; Ventrella, G. (2005). "L'éthopée dans la pratique scolaire et littéraire. Répertoire complet". Amato, E.; Schamp, J. (éds), *Ēthopoia. La représentation de caractères entre fiction scolaire et réalité vivante à l'époque impériale et tardive*. Salerno: Helios Editrice, 213-31.
- Bakker, E.J. (1990). "Homeric Discourse and Enjambment: A Cognitive Approach". *TAPA*, 120, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/283975>.
- Bakker, E.J. (1997). "The Study of Homeric Discourse". Morris, I.; Powell, B. (eds), *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden: Brill, 284-304. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004217607_013.
- Bakker, E.J. (2005). *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies. Hellenic Studies Series 12. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hu1.ebook:CHS_BakkerE_Pointing_at_the_Past.2005.
- Bär, S. (2009). *Quintus Smyrnaeus "Posthomeric"*. Vol. 1, *Die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie. Mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1-219*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Hypomnemata 183. <https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666252938>.
- Barigazzi, A. (1946). "De papyro graeca Vindobonensi 29801". *Athenaeum*, 24, 7-27.
- Bassino, P. (2018). *The "Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi": A Commentary*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter. Texte und Kommentare 59. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110584776>.
- Bell, H.I.; Kenyon, F.G. (1907). *Greek Papyri in the British Museum: Catalogue with Texts*, vol. 3. London: British Museum.
- Benaissa, A. (2018). *Dionysius: The Epic Fragments. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316831786>.
- Blackenborg, R. (2014). *Rhythm without Beat: Prosodically Motivated Grammarisation in Homer*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hu1.ebook:CHS_BlankenborgR.Rhythm_without_Beat.2014.
- Bolling, G.M. (1901). "An Epic Fragment from Oxyrhynchus". *AJP*, 22, 63-9. <https://doi.org/10.2307/288688>.
- Bolling, G.M. (1945). "Movable Nu at the End of Homeric Verses". *CP*, 40, 181-4. <https://doi.org/10.1086/362890>.
- Brizi, G. (1927). "L'Euripilo di Sofocle". *Aegyptus*, 8, 3-39.
- Bucci, G. (2019). *Il fenomeno del nominativo pro vocativo in greco, latino, ittita e rumeno* [tesi di dottorato]. Roma: Sapienza Università di Roma.
- Cantilena, M. (1995). "Il ponte di Nicanore". Fantuzzi, M.; Pretagostini, R. (a cura di), *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*. Roma: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, 9-67.

- Carden, R. (1974). *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles: An Edition with Prolegomena and Commentary*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter. Texte und Kommentare 7. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110845884>.
- Cavallo, G. (1967). *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica*. 2 voll. Firenze: Le Monnier. Studi e testi di papirologia 2.
- Cavallo, G. (2011). "Greek and Latin Writing in the Papyri". Bagnall, R.-S. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 102-9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199843695.013.0005>.
- Chantraine, P. (1946). "Les noms du mari e de la femme, du père et de la mère en grec". *REG*, 59-60, 219-50. <https://doi.org/10.3406/reg.1946.3090>.
- Chantraine, P. (1999). *Dictionnaire Étimologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Clapp, E.B. (1906). "On Correption in Hiatus". *CP*, 1, 239-52.
- Clark, M. (1994). "Enjambment and Binding in Homeric Hexameter". *Phoenix*, 48, 95-114. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1088310>.
- Cowan, R. (2020). "When Mothers Turn Bad: The Perversion of the Maternal Ideal in Sophocles' *Eurypylus*". Finglass, P.J.; Coe, L. (eds), *Female Characters in Fragmentary Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 139-61. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108861199.012>.
- Curtius, G. (1868). *Grammatica della lingua greca. Versione italiana riveduta sull'ottava edizione originale da Giuseppe Müller. Fonologia, morfologia, formazione delle parole*. Torino; Firenze: Loescher.
- Del Corso, L. (2006). "Lo 'stile severo' nei P. Oxy. Una lista". *Aegyptus*, 86, 81-106.
- De Stefani, C. (2006). "Conjectures on P. Oxy. 4712, fr. 1". *ZPE*, 158, 8.
- Fernandez Delgado, J.A.; Ureña Bracero, J. (1993). *Un testimonio de la educación literaria griega en época romana. IG XIV 2012=Kaibel, EG 618*. Badajoz: Universidad de Extremadura.
- Finglass, P.J. (2019). *Sophocles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Greece & Rome New Surveys in Classics 44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426921000215>.
- Fowler, R.L. (2013). *Early Greek Mythography. Vol. 2, Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780198147411.book.1>.
- Fracaroli, G. (1900). "Briciole dai papiri di Ossirinco". *RIFC*, 28, 87-92.
- Furley, W.D. (2007). "Prayers and Hymns". Ogden, D. (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Religion*. Malden; Oxford: Blackwell, 117-31.
- Giseke, B. (1864). *Homerische Forschungen*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Grenfell, B.P.; Hunt, A.S. (1899). *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 2. London: London Egypt Exploration Society.
- Heitsch, E. (1963). *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Heusch, C. (2005). "Die Ethopoiie in der griechischen und lateinischen Antike. Von der rhetorischen Progymnasma-Theorie zur literarischen Form". Amato, E.; Schamp, J. (eds.), *Éthopoiia. La représentation de caractères entre fiction scolaire et réalité vivante à l'époque impériale et tardive*. Salerno: Helios Editrice, 11-31.
- Higbie, C. (1990). *Measure and Music: Enjambment and Sentence Structure in the "Iliad"*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198143871.001.0001>.
- James, A. (2014). *Quintus of Smyrna: The Trojan Epic. "Posthomeric"*. Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Keydell, R. (1911). *Quaestiones Metricae de Epicis Graecis Recentioribus*. Berlin: diss. inaug. University of Berlin.
- Kirk, G.S. (1966). "Studies in Some Technical Aspects of Homeric Style". *YCS*, 20, 75-152.
- Köchly, A.H. (1850). *Kointou ta meth' Homēron. Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomerorum libri XIV*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Koniaris, G.L. (1971). "Michigan Papyrus 2754 and the *Certamen*". *HSCPh*, 75, 107-29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/311220>.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1996). *Sophocles: Fragments*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Loeb Classical Library 483. https://doi.org/10.4159/dlcl.sophocles-fragments-known_plays.1996.
- Ludwich, A. (1900). Review of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 2, by Grenfell, B.P.; Hunt, A.S. *BPhW*, 12, 353-60.
- Maas, P. (1962). *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Magnelli, E. (1995). "Le norme del secondo piede dell'esametro nei poeti ellenistici e il comportamento della 'parola metrica'". *MD*, 35, 135-64. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40236070>.
- Magnelli, E. (2006). "On the New Fragments of Greek Poetry from Oxyrhynchus". *ZPE*, 158, 9-12.
- Magnelli, E. (2021). Review of *Dionysius: The Epic Fragments. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, by Benaissa, A. *Prometheus*, 47, 294-7.
- Mandilaras, B. (1992). "A New Papyrus Fragment of the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*". Capasso, M. (a cura di), *Papiri Letterari Greci e Latini*. Lecce: Congedo, 55-62.
- Martinelli, M.C. (1997). *Gli Strumenti del Poeta. Elementi di Metrica Greca*. Bologna: Cappelli.
- Mersinias, S. (1998). "The Metre in the *Cynegetica* of Ps.-Oppian". *Dodone(philol)*, 27, 115-61.
- Miguélez-Cavero, L. (2008). *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200-600 AD*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter. *Sozomena* 2. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110210415>.
- Milne, H.J.M. (1927). *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum*. London: The Trustees of the British Museum.
- Morrison, J.V. (1991). "The Function and Context of Homeric Prayers: A Narrative Perspective". *Hermes*, 119, 145-57.
- Nardelli, M.L. (1982). "L'esametro di Colluto". *JÖByz*, 32, 323-33.
- Oswald, S. (2014). "Metrical Laws". Giannakis, G.K. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, vol. 2. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 419-23. https://doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000232.
- Ozbek, L. (2006). "L'*Euripilo* di Sofocle. I modelli intertestuali del fr. 210 R (P. Oxy. 1175, fr. 5) e un'ipotesi di datazione dell'opera". *ZPE*, 158, 29-42.
- Ozbek, L. (2019). "Shattered Mothers (and Relatives): Representing Maternal Grief and Responsibility in Greek Tragic Fragments". *SCO*, 65, 53-70. <https://doi.org/10.12871/97888333919914>.
- Page, D.L. (1942). *Greek Literary Papyri*, vol. 3. London: Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Parry, M. (1929). "The Distinctive Character of Enjambment in Homeric Verse". *TAPA*, 60, 200-20. <https://doi.org/10.2307/282817>.
- Pellin, A. (2007-08). *Quattro poemi ellenistici su papiro. Fr. ep. adesp. 2, 3, 4 Powell e SH fr. 939* [tesi di dottorato]. Venezia: Ca' Foscari Università di Venezia.

- Pellin, A. (2010). "Il mito di Telefo nell'epos ellenistico. L'*Epyllium Telephi*, fr. ep. adesp. 3 Powell". Cingano, E. (a cura di), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali. Generi poetici e storiografia*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso. *Hellenica* 34, 520-40.
- Peralé, M. (2021). "Critical Notes on Hexameter Adespota". *AFP*, 67, 5-42. <https://doi.org/10.1515/apf-2021-0002>.
- Platt, A. (1899). "On the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Vol. II on the New Epic Fragment, etc". *CR*, 13, 439-40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0009840x00079191>.
- Powell, J.U. (1925). *Collectanea Alexandrina. Reliquiae minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae 323-146 A.C. Epicorum, Elegiacorum, Lyricorum, Ethicorum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Powell, J.U.; Barber, E.A. (1921). *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature: Recent Discoveries in Greek Poetry and Prose of the Fourth and Following Centuries, B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Renehan, R. (1971). "The Michigan Alcidas-Papyrus: A Problem in Methodology". *HSCPh*, 75, 85-105. <https://doi.org/10.2307/311219>.
- Rostagni, A. (1956). "L'*Euripilo* di Sofocle e un frammento epico adespota". Rostagni, A. (a cura di), *Scritti Minori*. Vol. 2.1, *Hellenica Hellenistica*. Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus, 51-5.
- Schubart, W. (1925). *Griechische Palaeographie*. München: Beck.
- Silva Sánchez, T. (1999). *El Hexámetro de Opiano de Anazarbo y Opiano de Apamea* [PhD dissertation]. Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz.
- Spanoudakis, K. (2002). *Philitas of Cos*. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill. *Mnemosyne Suppl.* 229.
- Tsagalis, C. (2014). "γυναιῶν εἴνεκα δῶρων: Interformularity and Intertraditionality in Theban and Homeric Epic". Tsagalis, C. (ed.), *Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic*. Berlin; Munich; Boston: De Gruyter. *Trends in Classics* 6.2, 357-98. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tc-29>.
- Turner, E.G. (1977). *The Typology of the Early Codex*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. <https://doi.org/10.9783/9781512807868>.
- Vian, F. (1959). *Recherches sur les "Posthomérica" de Quintus de Smyrne*. Paris: Klincksieck. *Études et Commentaires* 30.
- Visser, E. (1987). *Homerische Versifikationstechnik. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. *Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XV: Klassische Sprachen und Literaturen* 34.
- Weil, H. (1900). "Nouveaux fragments de Ménandre et d'autres classiques grecs". *JS*, 95-106.
- West, M.L. (1973). *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*. Stuttgart: Teubner. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-12401-6>.
- West, M.L. (1982). *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whitby, M. (1994). "From Moschus to Nonnus: The Evolution of the Nonnian Style". Hopkinson, N. (ed.), *Studies on the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *PCPhS Suppl.* 17, 99-155.
- Wilson, N. (2008). "Greek Palaeography". Cormack, R.; Haldon, J.F.; Jeffreys, E. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 102-15. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199252466.013.0011>.
- Wifstrand, A. (1933). *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos. Metrisch-stilistische Untersuchungen zur späteren griechischen Epik und zu verwandten Gedichtgattungen*. Lund: Håkan Ohlsson.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. (1900). Review of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 2, by Grenfell, B.P.; Hunt, A.S. *GGA*, 162, 29-58.
- Zimmermann, A. (1908). *Neue kritische Beiträge zu den "Posthomérica" des Quintus Smyrnaeus*. Leipzig: Teubner.