

Earth, Zeus, and Revenge: The text and the nature of the new Euripides papyrus*

Luigi Battezzato

This paper discusses the philological reconstruction of several passages of the New Euripides papyrus. It also offers some general considerations on why and how the text was copied. The textual notes always begin with the text and translation printed in the excellent *editio princeps* (Gehad et al. (2024)). I will occasionally refer to the authors of that publication as “the editors.” I will also refer to suggestions made at the CHS conference of June 13-14, 2024.

The final section of the paper (section 12) gathers and discusses all the evidence that supports the hypothesis that the papyrus is a gnomic anthology from *Ino* and *Polyidus*. I assume that the two sections contain extracts from these two plays; that the extracts of each play do not contain a continuous scene; that sections (of a length that we are not able to determine) are missing within the extract of each play; that the forked *paragraphoi* we clearly see in col. ii indicate such omissions; that the extract were made from a complete copy, and first copied on this papyrus. Specific arguments for these hypotheses will also be made in individual sections, and summarised in the conclusions.

1. **Revenge: col. i 5-6**

οὐ] μὴν σιωπή γ' ἐν δόμοις οἰμωγμάτων·
κα]λῶς κάχ', ὡς ἔοικε, πράσσεσθαι καλόν

* I thank John Gibert and Yvona Trnka-Amrhein for inviting me to read the text in advance of their splendid edition princeps, and for many comments on my suggestions. I also thank them, and D. J. Mastronarde for comments on a preliminary version of these notes, and the participants in the seminar for their suggestions and objections. J. Diggle, P. J. Finglass, D. J. Mastronarde offered excellent suggestions and corrections on a draft of this article. I alone remain responsible for any error of fact or judgment.

Indeed there is [no] silence from laments in the house. It is fair, it seems, for a fair face to be put on evil deeds.

Gehad et al. (2024) 15 write:

We take 6 to be added to 5 by the same speaker, in explanatory asyndeton. What the speaker means by “putting a fair face on evil deeds” is that the singer of 3–4 has implicitly invoked general disapproval of bigamy as justification for what s/he did or suffered. This suggests strongly that the singer is Themisto and the speaker is Ino, continuing in a sarcastic spirit. The sarcasm of καλόν at the end of the line is neatly paired with the paradox of καλῶς κακά at the start; for similar word-play with these value-terms, see e.g. *Hipp.* 411–12, 500; *Tro.* 967–8; *Soph. Aj.* 1137. We are grateful to James Diggle for these parallels and for convincing us that κα]λῶς is more likely than κα]κῶς.

The parallels show that the paradoxical expression κάχ'... πράσσεισθαι καλόν is in keeping with the style of Euripides; so would be the paradoxical phrase κα]λῶς κάχ'... πράσσεισθαι. Here however we have two paradoxes, not one. The parallels quoted offer a single paradox (and only two contrasting terms) in each sentence: see E. *Hipp.* 411-12: ὅταν γὰρ αἰσχροῦ τοῖσιν ἐσθλοῖσιν δοκῆι, | ἢ κάρτα δόξει τοῖς κακοῖς γ' εἶναι καλά, *Tro.* 968 καλῶς κακοῦργος οὕσα, *Ajax* 1137 Πόλλ' ἂν καλῶς λάθρα σὺ κλέψειας κακά. In *Hipp.* 500 αἰσχρο', ἀλλ' ἀμείνω τῶν καλῶν τάδ' ἐστὶ σοι we have three terms, but again only a single paradox (that “shameful things” are “better than good things”). These terms are often used in moral terms: “good” and “bad” refer to moral and immoral, just and unjust actions. I have not been able to find three forms of κακός/καλός in a single sentence in tragedy (as opposed to

dozens of examples of two forms, like those above).¹ Finglass, in the CHS conference, referred to *S. El.* 989 ζῆν αἰσχρὸν αἰσχρῶς τοῖς καλῶς πεφυκόσιν “living shamefully is shameful for people who are of noble birth/nature”; this line has indeed three opposing terms, but not a single paradox (not to mention two). This parallel would strengthen the case for the supplement suggested by Gehad et al. (2024) 15, κα]κῶς; the negative terms (αἰσχρὸν αἰσχρῶς, κα]κῶς κάχ’) reinforce each other (for an extreme example, see *A. Pe.* 1041 δόσιν κακὰν κακῶν κακοῖς).² However, Finglass rightly points out that κα]κῶς does not fit the traces.³

One should also note that the translation offered by the editors “It is fair, it seems, for a fair face to be put on evil deeds” eliminates the paradox by introducing the metaphor of the face; a more literal translation would be: “it is just, it seems, that unjust deeds should be done justly” (with κα]λῶς).

The only parallel I was able to find for the double paradox is *E. IT* 559 ὡς εὖ κακὸν δίκαιον ἐξεπράξατο “how well he exacted a bad justice”.⁴ Euripides, however, in introducing here a double paradox, avoids repeating the same root, and uses terms that are not cognate (εὖ, κακόν, δίκαιον); two terms are in fact syntactically joined (“bad justice”).

E. IT 559, moreover, supports the possibility of taking πράσσεισθαι as middle, not passive, in the sense of “exacting revenge”, “exacting evils as a punishment.” As Parker (2016) on *E. IT* 559 argues,

¹ *A. Pers.* 1041 has three forms of καλός, but that is a (rare) trebly reinforced statement, not a double paradox.

² For more common patterns, where two negative terms reinforce each other, see e.g. *E. Med.* 806-7 κακὴν κακῶς | θανεῖν, 1386 κατθανῆι κακὸς κακῶς, *Andr.* 590 ὦ κάκιστε κάκ κακῶν, *Hec.* 585 λύπη τις ἄλλη διάδοχος κακῶν κακοῖς, 608 κακὸς δ' ὁ μὴ τι δρῶν κακόν, fr. 166.2 φιλεῖ γὰρ οὕτως ἐκ κακῶν εἶναι κακοῦς, 296.2 κακὸς κακῶ δὲ συντέτηκεν ἡδονῆ, 1049.4 κακὸν γὰρ ἄνδρα χρὴ κακῶς πάσχειν ἀεὶ.

³ Finglass (forthcoming).

⁴ Translation Parker (2016), with her note *ad loc.*; see also Cropp (2000) *ad loc.*

the verb takes the accusative of the punishment inflicted.⁵ This would fit better the context of the *Ino* fragment. See also Call. *Lav.Pall.* 91 *μεγάλ' ἀντ' ὀλίγων ἐπράξαο*. The phrase is also used with the double accusative of the person punished and of the punishment inflicted: E. *Pho.* 1651 *οὐκ ἔννομον γὰρ τὴν δίκην πράσσεσθέ νιν* “No: the penalty you exact from him is not lawful”.⁶ The meaning “exacting punishment” is a metaphorical extension of a financial metaphor.⁷ E. *IT* 559, quoted above, shows that Euripides too can use the middle without the accusative of the person punished.

As for supplements, one could consider alternatives. For instance

διπ]λῶς κάχ', ὡς ἔοικε, πράσσεσθαι καλόν.

It is just, it seems, that evil deeds should be committed twice.

This would refer to the double death of the children. Euripides often uses the adjective ‘double’ in similar contexts: *Med.* 1185 *διπλοῦν γὰρ αὐτῇι πῆμ' ἐπεστρατεύετο*, 1315 *διπλοῦν κακόν* (the death of the two children), *Hec.* 518 *διπλᾶ με χρήζεις δάκρυα κερδᾶναι, γύναι*, *Hel.* 143 *οὐ διπλᾶ χρήζω στένειν*.

Other alternatives are also possible (e.g. *φαύλως*, *ἀπλῶς*, *ἀικῶς*).

διπ]λῶς is slightly longer than *κα]λῶς*, and (as Finglass objected during the CHS conference), is considerably longer than *οὐ]* in the previous line. However, *οὐ]* is not the only possible supplement.

⁵ Parker notes that in *Hdt.* 6.158 the verb takes the accusative *φόνον* “to exact vengeance for murder”; this does fit the *IT* passage, nor the present *Ino* passage.

⁶ Text and translation from Kovacs (2002).

⁷ See LSJ s.v. *πράσσω* VI: “*Med.*, exact for oneself, *πράξασθαί τινα μισθόν* *Pi. O.* 10(11).30; ἀργύριον, χρήματα, *Hdt.* 2.126, *Th.* 4.65, cf. *Ar. Ra.* 561, etc.; *τὴν διπλασίαν π. τὸν ὑποφεύγοντα* *Pl. Lg.* 762b, cf. *Plb.* 5.54.11; *π. τοὺς ἐξάγοντας τριακοστὴν* *D.* 20.32; *πράσσεσθαι χρέος* *Antipho Fr.* 67; *φόρους πράσσεσθαι ἀπό, ἐκ τῶν πόλεων*, *Th.* 8.5, 37; *παρ' αὐτῶν ἂ ὄφειλον* *Lys.* 17.3, cf. *And.* 2.11: metaph. of exacting punishment, etc., *μεγάλ' ἀντ' ὀλίγων ἐπράξαο* *Call. Lav.Pall.* 91:—Pass. pf. and plpf. in med. sense, *εἰ μὲν ἐπεπράγμαν τοῦτον τὴν δίκην* if I had exacted from him the full amount, *D.* 29.2.”

One can also consider καὶ] μὴν σιωπὴ γ' ἐν δόμοις οἰμωγμάτων “and indeed there is silence from laments in the house” (καὶ] μὴν had been suggested by J. Diggle to the editors in February 2024, and occurred independently to me and to Olson at the CHS conference): in that case the line would comment on a situation like that of *E. Or.* 1281-1295, where Electra and the chorus expect to hear shouts from within, and comment on the surprising silence.

There is an additional consideration to be made: we are not sure that line 6 was part of the same context as line 5. If so, one can suppose that καλῶς is an indignant question, picking up a previous utterance, as in *E. HF* 557 αἰδώς;, *Ion* 959 πῶς;. See the excellent treatment of the topic in Diggle (1981) 50-1.

In response to “Was this not done justly?” someone could have answered:

καλῶς; κάχ', ὡς ἔοικε, πράσσεσθαι καλόν.

Justly? It is just, it seems, to commit unjust deeds

This would sit well with the resigned tone implied by ὡς ἔοικε: see e.g. *Hec.* 766 ἀνόνητά γ', ὡς ἔοικε, τόνδ' ὄν εἰσορᾶις, *HF* 502 θανεῖν γάρ, ὡς ἔοικ', ἀναγκαίως ἔχει, 1357 νῦν δ', ὡς ἔοικε, τῆι τύχη δουλευτέον. For a gnome accompanied by ὡς ἔοικε see *Pho.* 406 ἡ πατρίς, ὡς ἔοικε, φίλτατον βροτοῖς.

Irrespectively of the adverb that one supplies at the beginning of line 6, it seems likely that κάχ' refers to the death of Themisto's two children.

We should now discuss the identity of the speaker and the sequence of thought. Gehad et al. (2024) 15 see a reference to lines 3-4, on bigamy:

What the speaker means by “putting a fair face on evil deeds” is that the singer of 3-4 has implicitly invoked general disapproval of bigamy as justification for what s/he did or suffered. This suggests strongly that the singer is Themisto and the speaker is Ino,

continuing in a sarcastic spirit. The sarcasm of καλόν at the end of the line is neatly paired with the paradox of καλῶς κακά at the start.

But line 5 refers to lamentations, and lamentations are uttered for the dead (e.g. *A. Ag.* 1346, 1366) or for imminent death (*A. Th.* 8, *Ag.* 1384, *E. Ba.* 1112). The only deaths in the play are those of the children (whether or not the murder has been actually committed yet, which we do not know for sure). Lamentations in line 5 are unlikely to refer to bigamy, and line is unlikely to refer to the question of bigamy. It is much simpler to suppose that “evils” in line 6 (whether or not it followed immediately after line 5 in the original text) refer to the killing of the children as well. If that is so, in this line Themisto immorally and shockingly rejoices in the expectation of the death of Ino’s children (or Ino offers an indignant comment on Themisto’s immoral action).

Lines 7-9 are a comment, possibly by the chorus, uttered when Themisto, later on, realises that she has caused the death of her own children (note line 10: discovery of the truth; 11-12: comment on Themisto’s ill will). See below for a possible reconstruction of the content of lines 13-15.

2. Witnesses: col. i. 9-10

]μάρτυσιν γὰρ τάφανῃ λαμπρύνεται. 10

Yes, for what was unclear shines brilliantly [among?] witnesses. (10)

Gehad et al. (2024) 16 suggest supplementing “σὺν] or, less likely, ἐν]”, and quote *E. El.* 966 and 1039–40 for the meaning of the verb λαμπρύνεται (see below).

“Proofs”, μαρτύρια, are metaphorically said to “shine” in *A. Eum.* 797 ἀλλ' ἐκ Διὸς γὰρ λαμπρὰ μαρτύρια παρῆν. A similar metaphor applies to events that are revealed in *S. Trach.* 1174 ταῦτ' οὖν ἐπειδὴ λαμπρὰ συμβαίνει, τέκνον. This helps to explain the meaning of λαμπρύνεται.

What is the best supplement for this line? The preposition ἐν, in connection with middle and passive forms of λαμπρύνω, indicates either the object on which the subject of the verb “becomes manifest”, or, more commonly, the instrument by which one “distinguishes oneself”.⁸ The instrumental meaning is not appropriate in the present fragment: witness can make what is hidden “shine” at a trial, but the context here is completely different. The expected meaning is that the hidden truth “shines” to the witnesses.

The closest parallel, noted in the *editio princeps*, is E. *El.* 1039 ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ ψόγος λαμπρύνεται. LSJ s.v. λαμπρύνω A I analyses the verb in E. *El.* 1039 as passive “to become manifest or notorious”.⁹ E. *El.* 1039 is not completely similar to the present passage. A stronger support comes from Pl. *Smp.* 175e ἡ δὲ σὴ [in reference to σοφία] λαμπρά τε καὶ πολλὴν ἐπίδοσιν ἔχουσα, ἢ γε παρὰ σοῦ νέου ὄντος οὕτω σφόδρα ἐξέλαμψεν καὶ ἐκφανῆς ἐγένετο πρώην ἐν μάρτυσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων πλέον ἢ τρισμυρίοις “your wisdom is brilliant ... and shone and became manifest yesterday in front of more than 30.000 Hellenic witnesses”.

The phrase σὺν μάρτυσιν “in front of witnesses”, suggested in the *editio princeps*, is certainly possible: see e.g. E. *HF* 1076 σὺν μάρτυσιν θεοῖς δεῖ μ' ἀπαλλάξαι σέθεν.

There is yet another possibility: one can read the simple dative μάρτυσιν, and have it preceded by the article τοῖς (or by some other monosyllable, such as σχέξ, probably too long). The simple dative with λαμπρύνω/λαμπρύνομαι generally indicates what makes one “distinguished” (*El.* 966 καὶ μὴν ὄχοις γε καὶ στολῆι λαμπρύνεται, *Hdt.* 1.41.3 ἀπολαμπρυνέαι τοῖσι ἔργοισι, 6.70.3 ἄλλα τε Λακεδαιμονίοισι συχνὰ ἔργοισί τε καὶ γνώμησι ἀπολαμπρυνθεῖς, *Th.* 6.16). In the *Ino* fragment, the

⁸ See LSJ s.v. λαμπρύνω A II: “distinguish oneself in or by . . . ὅσα . . . χορηγίας ἢ ἄλλω τῷ -ύνομαι *Th.* 6.16; μειρακίων - νομένων ἐν ἄρμασιν *Ar. Eq.* 556; λ. ἐν οἷς οὐ δεῖ *Arist. EN* 1122a33.” These forms are analysed as middle by LSJ.

⁹ Similarly Cropp (1998) “and then the censure of it reflects on us” and Cropp (2013) “and then the censure of it makes us notorious”).

dative should be interpreted as similar to the dative following φαίνω: *Il.* 1.198 οἷω φαινομένη, *Od.* 12.334 εἴ τις μοι ὁδὸν φήνειε, LSJ s.v. φαίνω A b, B a, and *passim*. We have several similar sentences where φαίνω is used in reference to revealing something that is hidden: *E. Hipp.* 594 τὰ κρυπτά γὰρ πέφηνε, *S. OR* 1228-30 οἶμαι γὰρ οὔτ' ἂν Ἰστρον οὔτε Φᾶσιν ἂν | νίψαι καθαρμοῶ τήνδε τὴν στέγην, ὅσα | 1229 κεύθει, τὰ δ' αὐτίκ' εἰς τὸ φῶς φανεῖ κακὰ. The theme of τὰ φανῆ, “obscure truths”, that come to light is found in other passages of Euripides: *E. fr.* 574 τεκμαιρόμεσθα τοῖς παροῦσι τὰ φανῆ, *fr.* 811 τὰ φανῆ τεκμηρίοισιν εἰκότως ἀλίσκεται, *Hipp.* 346 οὐ μάντις εἰμὶ τὰ φανῆ γνῶναι σαφῶς. For the position of γὰρ see *E. fr.* 287.1 τοῖς πράγμασιν γὰρ οὐχὶ θυμοῦσθαι χρεῶν, 1018 ὁ νοῦς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἔστιν ἐν ἐκάστῳ θεός. For the asyndeton after σχές see *Hipp.* 1353 σχές, ἀπειρηκὸς σῶμ' ἀναπαύσω, *Hec.* 963 σχές τυγχάνω γὰρ ἐν μέσοις Θρηίκης ὄροις.

The length of the supplement remains uncertain. The supplement at the beginning of line 12 is relatively certain (βου]λεύεται), and suggests that three letters are lost. The supplement τοῖς includes a narrow letter (iota); the space occupied by βου in col. ii 20 (βούλεται) is equivalent to that occupied by τοῖς (in βροτοῖς) at the end of col. ii 32.

One additional point: there must have been a discontinuity between lines 7-9 and line 10. Lines 7-9 are in a lyric metre (presumably by the chorus). Line 10 begins with a sentence introduced by γὰρ. No iambic trimeter delivered by a character after a lyric section in the extant plays of Euripides begins with a sentence introduced by γὰρ.¹⁰ In most cases, the first line is in asyndeton; in other cases, it begins with forward-looking sequences such as καὶ... μὴν. In general, characters ignore what is said in the previous choral section. I was able to find only one instance of γὰρ in an iambic trimeter

¹⁰ *E. HF* 137 ἀλλ' εἰσορῶ γὰρ τόνδε is uttered by the chorus, and in any case presents ἀλλ' (cf. *HF* 442, ἀλλ' εἰσορῶ γὰρ τούσδε, uttered by the chorus, in anapaests, after the first stasimon). *E. Tro.* 259 οὐ γὰρ μέγ' αὐτῆι βασιλικῶν λέκτρων τυχεῖν; is in a lyric dialogue between two characters, and again presents a different combination of particles.

in the mouth of a character after a lyric choral utterance in an epirrhematic dialogue: E. *IT* 646.¹¹ Line 10 however is a comment on the action (or inaction) that takes place offstage (see e.g. E. *Hipp.* 776-89, *El.* 746-60); it is the sort of comment that characters make after a choral song, introducing the action of the episode, with no reference to the sung section. In any case, the content of line 10 (what is secret is revealed) contradicts the content of lines 7-9 (the divinity acts secretly); it does not “explain” the previous lines (which would be the normal function of γάρ). Line 10 might have come not too far away from lines 7-9, but I find it unlikely that it came immediately after them.

3. The tomb: col. i 13-15

The editors print and translate as follows

]..ς γὰρ ὅστις ζῶν ἔδοξ' εἶναι κακός

]ουτον εἶναι μηδ' ἔς ημε.....ειν

]ον καθ' αὐτοῦ τύμβον αἰσ.....δόμοις.

For ... who(ever) had (or “has”) a reputation for being evil while alive ... to be ... and not to ... at his own tomb, a source of shame (?) for the house. (15)

The text is very fragmentary and suggestions for this passage are likely to remain tentative. The editors suggest reading εἰ]κῆς γάρ at the beginning of line 13, and τοι]οῦτον at the beginning of line 14. The following note will discuss some alternative possibilities. The precise meaning of κακός in line 13 will also be discussed at the end; for the moment, it will be simply transliterated as *kakos*.

¹¹ See *Or.* 167 for a completely lyric dialogue and *Hel.* 112 for a dialogue between two characters.

At the beginning of line 13, I see traces of a triangular letter, such as delta or lambda, followed by the remains of alpha or omicron, and then the sigma read by the editors. For the sequence alpha sigma in line 13



compare the same sequence in i 6 (πρασσεσθαι)



Line 13 could be a complete sentence, such as [τά]λας γὰρ ὅστις ζῶν ἔδοξ' εἶναι κακός. This would however make the syntax of line 14 difficult or even impossible to reconstruct. I suggest reading [αύ]δᾶ<ι>ς γὰρ ὅστις ζῶν ἔδοξ' εἶναι κακός in line 13.

In line 14 υτον is preceded by a dot in mid-position:



The editors read ου. Omicron is possible but so is alpha: compare παυε in i 32



The traces are very faint; if the scribe wrote alpha, the ligature between alpha and hypsilon has disappeared.

Given the mention of a tomb in line 15, one can think that line 14 mentions other ritual acts connected with burial:

[αύ]δᾱ<ι>ς γὰρ ὅστις ζῶν ἔδοξ' εἶναι κακός

[ἄκλ]αυτον εἶναι;

you say/order that the person who had a reputation for being *kakos* while not alive is not mourned?¹²

For similar phrases see e.g. E. *Hec.* 30 ἄκλαυτος ἄταφος, *Pho.* 1634 ἐᾶν δ' ἄκλαυτον, ἄταφον, οἰωνοῖς βοράν, fr. 787.2 ἄλουτος ἐν φάραγξι σήπεται νέκυς, *Od.* 4.493-4 οὐδέ σέ φημι | δὴν ἄκλαυτον ἔσεσθαι, ἐπεὶ κ' ἐὺ πάντα πύθηαι, *Il.* 22.386 ἄκλαυτος ἄθαπτος. Of course it is also possible to read

[αύ]δᾱ<ι>ς γὰρ ὅστις ζῶν ἔδοξ' εἶναι κακός

τοι]οὔτον εἶναι;

you say that the person who had a reputation for being *kakos* while not alive is *kakos*?

The second part of the sequence, starting in line 14, probably requires an imperative (note the negation μηδ'). One can accept the suggestion by the editors αἰσχύνῃν δόμοις in line 15 and supply ἔ[α λ]α[β]εῖν or ἔ[α λ]α[χ]εῖν in line 14. One possibility is:

¹² If we print τοἰ]οὔτον in line 14 we would then have a sentence such as “you claim that the person who had a reputation for being evil while alive is so”.

μηδὲ σῆμ' ἔ[α λ]α[β]εῖν

[αὐτ]ὸν καθ' αὐτοῦ τύμβον, αἰσχύνῃν δόμοις.

Do not even let him get a sign next to his own tomb, (which would be) a disgrace to the household

An alternative would be σῆμ' ἔ[δε]ι. For σῆμ' see LSJ s.v. A 3 “sign by which a grave is known, mound, cairn, barrow”. The “sign” (σῆμα) would be different from the simple tumb (τύμβος) of line 15 (LSJ s.v. τύμβος A 2). One must however admit that often σῆμα and τύμβος designate the mound. This is a weakness of this proposed reconstruction.¹³

The precise reconstruction will remain uncertain. One can however make hypotheses on who the *kakos* person is. The editors suggest that one should “identify a dead person of whom it might be said that he had a reputation for being evil while alive” (Gehad et al. (2024) 17). However, *κακός* also means “ill-born”. Note that the extract that immediately follows (16-18) is about nobility: τί γὰρ αἰσχύνῃς | πλέον ἀνθρώποις ἐ[κύρησε μέρ]ος | τοῖς γενναίοισι πάρ[οιθεν (supplements by J. Diggle) “for what greater share of disgrace has befallen noble people before now?”. Nobility was a prominent theme in the play; it is mentioned in four of 25 extant fragments (frr. 404, 405, 413, 414).¹⁴

¹³ J. Diggle offered a different reconstruction of these lines at the CHS conference.

¹⁴ E. fr. 404 τό τ' εὐγενὲς | πολλὴν δίδωσιν ἐλπίδ' ὡς ἄρξουσι γῆς “Their high birth gives great hope that they will rule the land”; fr. 405 τὴν εὐγένειαν, κἄν ἄμορφος ἢ γάμος, | τιμῶσι πολλοὶ προσλαβεῖν τέκνων χάριν, | τό τ' ἀξίωμα μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ χρήματα “Many men value acquiring a wife of high birth, even if she is not handsome, for the children’s sake, and reputation more than money”; fr. 413 ἐπίσταμαι δὲ πάνθ' ὅσ' εὐγενῆ χρεῶν, | σιγᾶν θ' ὅπου δεῖ καὶ λέγειν ἴν' ἀσφαλές, | ὄρᾶν θ' ἃ δεῖ με κοῦχ ὄρᾶν ἃ μὴ πρέπει. | < > | γαστρὸς κρατεῖν δέ· καὶ γὰρ ἐν κακοῖσιν ὦν | ἐλευθέροισιν ἐμπεπαίδευμαι τρόποις, “know all that one well-born should, to keep silent where necessary and to speak where safe, and to see what is necessary and not to see what is unfitting . . . and to control appetite; for though I am in the midst of troubles, I have been schooled in freeborn ways”; fr. 414 φειδώμεθ' ἀνδρῶν εὐγενῶν, φειδώμεθα, | κακοὺς δ' ἀποπτύωμεν, ὥσπερ ἄξιοι “Let us spare well-born men, yes, spare them—but spurn bad ones as they deserve” (text and translation Collard and Cropp (2008a))

One can suppose that Themisto accused Ino's children of being "ignoble" (perhaps because she considered the marriage not a valid one?). Line 13 of the papyrus fragment could be a reference to Ino's children. A speaker is addressing Themisto: she thought that the child, when he was alive, had the reputation of being "not noble"? Well, she should have him buried without a sign by his grave. This could be ironical: the dead child is in fact Themisto's. If that is so, the singular is generalizing. One must stress that this is only one of many possible reconstructions of the context.

4. Justice and injustice: col. i 19

In col. i 19-20, someone says (19-20)

φεῦ] φεῦ τὸ νικᾶν τ᾿ἀνδ[ιχ'] ὡς καλὸν γέρας
τὰ μ]ὴ δίκαια δ' ὡς ἀπανταχοῦ κακόν·

Well! How fine a prize it is to prevail in a just cause, and how everywhere evil to do so in an unjust one.

Gehad et al. (2024) 18 suggest that this passage too is spoken by Ino. This statement is the opposite of that of line 6. Note the presence of φεῦ] φεῦ. In Euripides' usage, this interjection, when followed by a general statement, may indicate that the speaker realises that the general truth that follows sadly

applies to his/her situation.¹⁵ In other cases, it indicates astonishment or admiration.¹⁶ The speaker of lines 19-20 thinks that some actions committed in the play were unjust. The speaker can be the chorus (as in *Hipp.* 431-2, *Hec.* 1238-9, *Suppl.* 463-4), Ino or Themisto (for characters uttering such *gnomai* see *Alc.* 727, *Med.* 330, *Andr.* 184-5).¹⁷ If it is Ino, she repents her “unjust victory”, when she caused the death of Themisto’s children: she must interpret the death of her own child as a divine punishment for what she did to Themisto. Alternatively, the lines could have been spoken by Themisto when she realised what she caused the death of her own children. She had considered that a “victory”, but now realised that it was “a complete disaster” to (try to) win an unjust victory. That is however less likely, and probably less in character.

5. A new supplement: col. i 30

The editors read and translate:

καὶ] μὴν ὄτ' ἐλθεῖν ὄφελ[ε]ς φάος

¹⁵ See e.g. *E. Alc.* 727 φεῦ φεῦ τὸ γῆρας ὡς ἀναιδείας πλέων (spoken by Admetus), *Med.* 330 φεῦ φεῦ, βροτοῖς ἔρωτες ὡς κακὸν μέγα (spoken by Medea), *Andr.* 184-5: φεῦ φεῦ (extra metrum, unlike the present passage) | κακὸν γε θνητοῖς τὸ νέον ἔν τε τῶι νέωι | τὸ μὴ δίκαιον ὅστις ἀνθρώπων ἔχει (spoken by Andromache), *Suppl.* 463-4 φεῦ φεῦ κακοῖσιν ὡς ὅταν δαίμων διδῶι | καλῶς, ὑβρίζουσ' ὡς αἰεὶ πράζοντες εὔ (spoken by the chorus). For a single φεῦ see *Hipp.* 925 φεῦ, χρῆν βροτοῖσι τῶν φίλων τεκμήριον etc. (spoken by Theseus), *Hec.* 864 φεῦ (extra metrum) | οὐκ ἔστι θνητῶν ὅστις ἔστ' ἐλεύθερος (spoken by Hecuba), 956 φεῦ (extra metrum) | οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν πιστόν, οὔτ' εὐδοξία (spoken by Polymestor), *El.* 367 φεῦ (extra metrum) | οὐκ ἔστ' ἀκριβὲς οὐδὲν εἰς εὐανδρίαν (spoken by Orestes), *Ion* 1312 φεῦ (extra metrum) | δεινὸν γε θνητοῖς τοὺς νόμους ὡς οὐ καλῶς (spoken by Ion), *Or.* 1155 φεῦ (extra metrum) | οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κρεῖσσον ἢ φίλος σαφής, (spoken by Orestes).

¹⁶ For φεῦ φεῦ ‘ah!’, expressing admiration (not sadness) see *E. Hipp.* 431-2 φεῦ φεῦ, τὸ σῶφρον ὡς ἀπανταχοῦ καλὸν | καὶ δόξαν ἐσθλὴν ἐν βροτοῖς καρπίζεται. Battezzato (2018) on *Hec.* 1238, referring to LSJ s.v. ii and *Hclld.* 552. See also Biraud (2010) 109-11, Nordgren (2015) 238-40. These (and those listed in the previous note) are the only instances of φεῦ or φεῦ followed by a gnome in the complete plays of Euripides (it is difficult or impossible to establish the tone and the speakers of gnomic passages preserved in fragments).

¹⁷ See the previous notes for the texts.

]ηρος ἦκεις καὶ θεοῖς στυ[γο]ύμενος

Indeed when you ought ... to have come into the light, (30)

you have come, ... and hateful to the gods (31)

They comment (Gehad et al. (2024) 19 that the line is two syllables short, and we are not sure whether the very faint traces of ink visible to the right of φάος supplied them, or James Diggle's elegant <μήποτ'> (after ἐλθεῖν) is to be preferred. Either way, ἦκεις in the next line (see n.) recommends the division ὄφελ[ε]ς rather than ὄφελ' [έ]ς, which means that φάος must be terminal accusative (as at *Alc.* 456–7 δυνάϊμαν δέ σε πέμψαι | φάος ἐξ Ἀίδα (lyr.)), even though use of the preposition is far more common in this phrase.”

The supplement <μήποτ'> is indeed elegant, but preceding and following lines clearly preserve traces of ink in the spaces corresponding to the right of φάος. It is much simpler to suppose that the end of the line has been effaced. The terminal accusative is rare, and unparalleled in trimeters; it is strange in such a common phrase. One could supply a third-person subject,

καὶ] μὴν ὅτ' ἐλθεῖν ὄφελ'[έ]ς φάος [πάθος]

“but when what happened ought to have come into the light”.

This is one of several possible supplements; Finglass, in a forthcoming paper, offers a different and very promising line of approach.¹⁸

¹⁸ See Finglass (forthcoming).

6. Traces: col. i 34

In col. i 34 the editors print

]...μεν νηπίου δ' αρ.μάτας

In fact at the beginning of the line one can read more traces:]..οιμεν is fairly sure. For the iota before my, one can compare the iota in άνθρωποις in col i. 17 and the one in ΠΟΛΥΙΔΟΥ in col. i 38.

7. Other possible supplements: col. i 35-37

The editors read and translate

]τί μοχθεῖτ' οὐδὲν εἰδότες πέρ[α

]...ς ὑμῶν ὄλβιος γενήσεται

]...ς εσται δυστυχής ὅταν τύχη(ι)

... why do you toil, although you know nothing further, (35) [neither which one?] of you will be fortunate, [nor whether someone?] will be unfortunate when it may happen?

They report possible supplements (Gehad et al. (2024) 19): “At left, a vocative or adverb, e.g. μῶρο]ι (Cropp), μάτη]ν (Diggle). At right, either οὐδὲν εἰδότες πέρ[α “not at all knowing further ...” (cf. *IT* 91) or οὐδὲν εἰδότες πέρ[ας “not at all knowing the endpoint” (Diggle, comparing e.g. *Alc.* 890). It is unclear whether the direct question is complete with this line or continues through the next two (see next n.)”

One could suggest βροτο]ί or θνητο]ί at the beginning.

Note that this is probably echoed by Athenaeus fr. 225 in Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983), an epigram on Epicurus:

ἄνθρωποι, μοχθεῖτε τὰ χείρονα, καὶ διὰ κέρδος
ἄπληστοι νεικέων ἄρχετε καὶ πολέμων·
τᾶς φύσιος δ' ὁ πλοῦτος ὄρον τινὰ βαιὸν ἐπίσχει,
αἱ δὲ κεναὶ κρίσεις τὰν ἀπέραντον ὁδόν.

Athenaeus' ἄνθρωποι (225.1) supports my proposed supplement βροτοί/θνητοί (i 35), just as μοχθεῖτε (225.1) echoes μοχθεῖτ' (i. 35), κέρδος and πλοῦτος (225.1 and 3) echo ὄλβιος (i 36), ἄπληστοι and ὄρον (225.2 and 3) echo πέρ[α or πέρ[ας (i. 35). This parallel makes it more likely that the sentence continued in line 36.

8. The tomb, again: col. i 39

i.39]ος ὁ τύμβος· ἡ χάρις δ' ἀνωφελής

The tomb is [magnificent?], but its splendor is useless

Gehad et al. (2024) 23 *ad loc.* write: “ὄλβιος is not attested as a descriptor of a tomb in classical Greek [...] Another possibility is τίμι]ος (Diggle), as tombs can receive honor (e.g. *Alc.* 997–8).”

An additional possibility is ἄξιος “worthy” (of the status of the deceased).¹⁹ One can read ἄξι]ος ὁ τύμβος· ἡ χάρις δ' ἀνωφελής: “the tomb is worthy, but the favour is useless”.²⁰ The roots of ἄξιος, τύμβος and χάρις are found in succession in *E. Hec.* 319-20: τύμβον δὲ βουλοίμην ἂν ἀξιούμενον | τὸν ἐμὸν ὄρᾶσθαι· διὰ μακροῦ γὰρ ἡ χάρις “but I would like to see my tomb honoured: that is gratitude

¹⁹ See LSJ s.v. ἄξιος I 3 “abs., *worthy, goodly*, ἄξια δῶρα *Il.* 9.261; ἄ. ὤνος a *goodly price*, *Od.* 15.429; ὅθεν κέ τοι ἄξιον ἄλφοι it would bring thee a *good price*, 20.383; φέροντες ὅ τι ἕκαστος ἄξιον εἶχε *X. Cyr.* 3.3.2.”

²⁰ For this meaning of χάρις see the contribution by James Diggle in the volume from the CHS conference.

that endures” (tr. Kovacs (1995)). (or “but I would like to see my tomb considered worthy of honour, because this is a favour that lasts a long time”).

9. Earth and nature: col. ii 26-28

The preliminary draft edition of col ii 26-28 read ΕΚΤΗΣ and placed a full stop at the end of line 26. The infinitives βιῶναι καὶ θανεῖν in line 26 lacked a subject. I proposed to read ἐκ γῆς in line 25 and to remove the full stop at the end of line 26. The editors accepted this suggestion. Gehad et al. (2024) thus print and translate:

εὖ δ' ἴσθ', ὅσ' ἐκ γῆς ἐξακοντίζει φύσις
δεῖ καὶ βιῶναι καὶ θανεῖν· τὰ πάντα γὰρ
χρόνω(ι) τε φύει καὶ μεθίσταται πάλιν.

Know well: whatever nature shoots up from the earth must live and die, for in time all things grow and change back

Polyidus is arguing that Minos should accept death as part of the natural cycle. The idea is found in e.g. A. Cho. 127-8 καὶ γαῖαν αὐτήν, ἣ τὰ πάντα τίκτεται | θρέψασά τ' αὔθις τῶνδε κῦμα λαμβάνει. For μεθίσταται ‘to die’ see LSJ s.v. Β I 3 “μ. βίου die, Id. Alc. 21 (also μ. alone, J. AJ 17.4.2, Plu. 2.1104c; ἐκὼν μ. commit suicide, Vett. Val.94.9.” Here πάλιν, in the absence of βίου, suggests the meaning “to die”. The presence of βιῶναι καὶ θανεῖν in the previous line also helps the comprehension.

Gehad et al. (2024) 22, in their apparatus to line 28 write “φύει, with ται added above ει (i.e. φύεται) καθ' ε [.]ω i.e. καθ' ἔ[ξ]ω added above μεθι (see comm.)”. The (Gehad et al. (2024) 27) point out that there are “a few poetic examples of intransitive φύειν (LSJ s.v. A.II, to which add Alc. fr. 10.5), including Glaukos’ famous likeness at Hom. Il. 6.146–9, likely to lie somewhere in the background of the present passage.” In their commentary (Gehad et al. (2024) 27) they note that “The

first variant, φύεται for φύει, may involve uncertainty about the quantity of the stem vowel, the correct voice of the verb, or both. In the present tense, the quantity of the upsilon (always before a vowel) fluctuates (LSJ is misleading); here it must be short in φύεται, long in φύει”. This would lead to reading χρόνω(ι) τε φύεται καὶ μεθίσταται πάλιν, with resolution of the third element. This solution is certainly possible.

In several tragic cases the hypsilon is short (A. *Th.* 535 ὥρας φυούσης, ταρφὺς ἀντέλλουσα θρίξ, 622 γέροντα τὸν νοῦν, σάρκα δ' ἠβῶσαν φύει, E. fr. 377.2 παῖδας φυτεύειν· ὃς γὰρ ἄν χρηστὸς φύῃ), following the epic and elegiac practice (e.g. *Il.* 6.148 τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἕαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη, Thgn.1164 ἐν μέσσωι στηθέων ἐν συνετοῖς φύεται). The only certain instances of present/imperfect of φύω with a long hypsilon in tragedy are the middle form in Sophocles fr. 88.4 ἔπειτα δ' οὐδεὶς ἐχθρὸς οὔτε φύεται, and the active transitive form in *TrGF Adespoton* 454.2 Ἄβαντα φύει διάδοχον τυραννίδος. Forms with a long vowel are securely attested in archaic and classical lyric (e.g. Thgn. 537 οὔτε γὰρ ἐκ σκίλλης ῥόδα φύεται οὔθ' ὑάκινθος). The reading φύει in col. ii 28, if correct, would be another instance of a long hypsilon, comparable to *TrGF Adespoton* 454.2.

If the reading φύει in line 28 is correct, it may help interpreting another tragic passage. Lloyd-Jones (1996) prints and translates S. fr. 910 Radt as follows:

χῶρος γὰρ αὐτός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπου φρενῶν
ὅπου τὸ τερπνὸν καὶ τὸ πημαῖνον φέρει·
δακρυρροεῖ γοῦν καὶ τὰ χαρτὰ τυγχάνων

Delightful things and painful things occupy the same place in a man's mind, for he weeps even when something pleasant happens to him.

1 αὐτός Bamberger: οὗτός codd.

2 τερπνὸν] τέρπον Cobet φέρει Ll.-J.: φύει codd.

3 χαρτὰ Conington: καὶ τὰ codd.

In fact Lloyd-Jones does not really translate his conjecture φέρει, which does not sit well with ὄπου. If we read ὄπου we should translate χῶρος γὰρ αὐτός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπου φρενῶν | ὄπου τὸ τερπνὸν καὶ τὸ πημαῖνον φέρει as “The place where (someone? God?) produces delightful and painful thoughts is the same in a man’s mind.” With φέρει, one would need to introduce the further change ὅσπερ instead of ὄπου: χῶρος γὰρ αὐτός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπου φρενῶν | ὅσπερ τὸ τερπνὸν καὶ τὸ πημαῖνον φέρει “The place that in fact (ὅσπερ) produces delightful and painful thoughts is the same in a man’s mind.” Radt (1999) lists other conjectures, and considers φύει corrupt. The new Euripides fragment offers a parallel for intransitive φύει. If one reads φύει in line 2, the text χῶρος γὰρ αὐτός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπου φρενῶν | ὄπου τὸ τερπνὸν καὶ τὸ πημαῖνον φύει can be translated as: “The place where delightful and painful thoughts grow is the same in a man’s mind” (i.e., more idiomatically, “there is a single place in a man’s mind where delightful and painful thoughts grow”).

Let us go back to the Philadelphia papyrus, and to the variants for line 28. In the photo, I can only discern a smudge of ink where ται is read above φύει. The editors had access to the original, and I will take their reading for correct. If we are to interpret the variant as implying φύεται, as suggested in the *editio princeps*, we need to interpret ται as replacing the iota of φύει (not simply as an addition). One would need to eliminate the iota of φύει.

Alternatively, one can suppose that ται is a phonetic error for τε, and that it points to reading χρόνω(ι) φύει τε καὶ μεθίσταται πάλιν. One would need to eliminate the τε present after χρόνω(ι). If so, φύει would have a short first syllable, as often; χρόνω(ι) would also be more naturally placed in reference to both verbs.

As for the second group of letters written above line 28, the editors read it as καθ' ε [.]ω, which they interpret as καθ' ἔ[ξ]ω (*sic*). They suggest that ἔ[ξ]ω might refer to a what is written on the other side of the papyrus, but admit that it is not easy to connect it to any specific point in that text (Gehad et al. (2024) 27); B. McGing, at the CHS conference, could not find any element of the text on the recto which could be connected with the Euripides passage. Moreover, the theta in καθ' is unexplained; it cannot derive from κατά, since ἔ[ξ]ω has a smooth breathing.

It is difficult to read these letters, since part of the papyrus reporting the previous line (letters εἰ of θανεῖν) is dislodged and covers the crucial space between the third letter and the final omega. Moreover, the superscript writing is less regular and predictable in spacing. Perhaps only five, not six letters, were written. I would read the first letter as chi or kappa, the second letter as alpha or epsilon, the third as iota (or, less likely, rho), then a one-letter lacuna, and finally omega. I suggest that we should read καῖ[ρ]ῶ(ι) (less likely χρο[ν]ῶ(ι)). In combination with τε, this would give another variant, i.e. the addition of καιρῶι in mid-line in stead of χρόνωι at line beginning:

τὰ πάντα γὰρ

φύει τε καὶ καιρῶι μεθίσταται πάλιν (or, less likely, φύει τε καὶ χρόνωι μεθίσταται πάλιν)

... for all things grow and change back at the appropriate moment

The resulting line is not metrically acceptable in Euripides, because it lacks the required caesura after element 5 or 7.²¹ It is also possible that καιρῶι was simply misplaced and was originally meant as a variant for χρόνω(ι) at line beginning. However, this hypothesis explains the second group of letters written above the line as a variant, which is consistent with what happens with ται earlier in the line (whatever the interpretation of ται) and of α i 4 (see also below, on ii 29).

²¹ See Diggle (1994) 82-4, 473-4 n. 151, 475-6 n. 158, with further references.

10. Old and young: col. ii 29-30

The editors read and translate:

ἐξῆς δ' ἕκαστος γί(γ)νεται νέος τ' ἀνήρ

γ[έ]ρωγ τε καὶ ζῶν οὐ δις ἀλλ' ἅπαξ μόνον. 30

Each man becomes young and old in turn, living not twice, but just once.

The text is problematic

1. It is not true that each man becomes young and old in turn. In fact, the play is about the death of a son who dies very young, and a father who cannot accept the son's death.
2. The sequence γί(γ)νεται νέος τ' ἀνήρ | γ[έ]ρωγ τε καὶ ζῶν is problematic:
 - a. it places on the same level two nouns (a young man and an old man) and a participle. It does not make sense to coordinate νέος and γ[έ]ρωγ with ζῶν.
 - b. the text gives the sequence ἕκαστος γί(γ)νεται ζῶν, a very strange periphrastic construction
 - c. the editors omit καὶ in their translation. The presence of τε makes impossible to analyse καὶ as “also, especially.”

The Greek naturally translates as “each person becomes a young man and an old one and living not twice.” One would have and expected the verb “to live” to be coordinated with γί(γ)νεται. Reading ζῆι gives perfect syntax (“... and old in turn, and lives not twice...”) but impossible metre (hiatus ζῆι οὐ). In alternative, we would need to get rid of the final καί (as in the translation).

3. ἐξῆς does not mean ‘in turn’ but ‘in the prescribed order’. But the point here in the play is not that one should be born old and become young again (Plato, *Politicus* 268d-274e), or that one should become young again after reaching old age (as in E. *HF* 637-670), but that one should not return to life again after death.
4. The space at the beginning of line 29 is too small: if we read ἐξῆς, the letter xi corresponds to two or three letters in the lines above and below (28 ΧΡΟΝΩ [the space corresponds to part of Ν as well], 30 ΓΕΡΩΝ).

These problems do not admit of a simple solution. Either Euripides stretched his use of language here, or we must accept the possibility of a corruption. Corruptions do occur in the Philadelphia Euripides papyrus: the papyrus omits a line from the original text in col. i 20, and two syllables in col. ii 1.

Problems 3 and 4 can be solved by offering longer supplements. See e.g.

ἐ[κ τ]ῆς δ' ἕκαστος γί(γ)νεται νέος τ' ἀνὴρ

or

ἐ[κ γ]ῆς δ' ἕκαστος γί(γ)νεται νέος τ' ἀνὴρ

in both case in reference to the “earth” of line 26. The second suggestion occurred independently to Rebecca Lämmle. Lämmle, in the CHS conference, rightly compares E. fr. 839. The idea would be very philosophical and abstract. The text would be translated as: “Each man is born from the earth, young and old”. This is still not very satisfactory. Something like θ[ά]λ' λ' εἰ δὲ καὶ παῖς γί(γ)νεται νέος τ' ἀνὴρ “(the offspring) flourishes and becomes a boy and young man” would offer much better sense. The traces might be compatible with θ[ά]λ' λ' εἰ. However, the letters ΚΑΣΤΟΣ are clearly read in the papyrus; καὶ παῖς is a conjecture.

As for line 30, different solutions can be advanced. In the published image one can read traces above N in line 30 (unless the signs are simply shadows where the papyrus is broken). If so, one could read: γ[.]ωγ `ς´ τε καὶ ζῶν οὐ δις ἀλλ’ ἅπαξ μόνον. I would interpret the second line as γ[ε]γῶγ with sigma above, indicating correction: this would lead to γεγῶς τε καὶ ζῶν οὐ δις ἀλλ’ ἅπαξ μόνον “born and living not twice, but only once”. The signs above the line are however very uncertain; it is not possible to be certain unless one sees the original. Moreover, one could consider whether the initial letter could be read as part of theta, reading θ[α]γῶγ τε καὶ ζῶν οὐ δις ἀλλ’ ἅπαξ μόνον (with hysteron proteron). This seems unlikely from a palaeographic point of view: gamma is much more probable.

The simplest alternative is to imagine that a line was lost:

γί(γ)νεται νέος τ’ ἀνήρ

γ[έ]ρωγ τε < - x - ∪ - x - ∪ - >

γεγῶς τε> καὶ ζῶν οὐ δις ἀλλ’ ἅπαξ μόνον. (or <... | θανῶν τε> καὶ ζῶν...)

becomes a young man and an old one <and arrives at the end of his life, having been born and living> not twice but only once (or: “dying and living not twice...”)

The similarity of line beginnings easily explains the omission.

11. Divine laws: col. ii 43-50

The editors read and translate

—

ἄ μὴ γὰρ ἔστιν ὅστις ὄντα βούλεται

θεῖναι κακίων πῶς ἂν οὐ γένοιτ’ ἀνήρ;

—

οὐ δῆτ' ἄπαις εἶ, ζῆν ὃς οὐ φή(ι)ς, ὡς ἐγώ 45
(ἐκ τῆς τεκούσης δ' ἦλθε τὸ ψεῦδος τόδε)
ὃς τοὺς τεθέντας ἀνατρέπεις πάλιν νόμους
καὶ ξυνταράσσεις θέσμι' ἀμαθίας ὑπο.
εἰ γὰρ τυραννὶς ἢ πολύχρυσοι δόμοι
δυνάσει τὸν ἐκλιπόντα φέγγος ἡλίου 50

How would that man not become (or “be”) worse, who wants to make things be that are not? No indeed: You are childless, you who deny, as I do, that he lives (45) – this falsehood came from his mother – you who are foolishly trying to overturn the established laws and throw the rules into confusion. For if, through their power, tyranny and gilded palaces [sc. “are able to resurrect”] the one who has left the light of the sun, (50)

As announced in Gehad et al. (2024) 34, I offer a different reconstruction of line 45. As the editors note, the text of line 45, as reconstructed above, violates Porson’s law.²² The law requires that the final cretic ὡς ἐγώ be preceded by a light, not a long syllable. In the text printed above we have the long syllable φή(ι)ς. Moreover, the editors also note a syntactic difficulty: “the translation [...] ‘you who deny ... that he lives’ would normally require that the accusative subject αὐτόν be expressed. As it stands, the Greek ought to mean ‘you who deny that you live.’”²³ But how can a speaking character in a play deny that (s)he lives? Another difficulty is in line 46: “what falsehood came from the boy’s

²² On Porson’s law, see Devine and Stephens (1984), Battezzato (2009).

²³ Gehad et al. (2024) 29, *ad loc.*

mother Pasiphae must be a matter for conjecture.”²⁴ There is a further objection: why is being ‘childless’ (45) linked to the fact that the character addressed by the speaker subverts divine laws (47-8)? An alternative possibility is to read

οὐ δῆτ’ ἄπαις εἶ. Ζηνὸς οὐ φήσω σ’ ἐγώ 45
(ἐκ τῆς τεκούσης δ’ ἦλθε τὸ ψεῦδος τόδε)
ὃς τοὺς τεθέντας ἀνατρέπεις πάλιν νόμου
καὶ ξυνταράσσεις θέσμι’ ἀμαθίας ὕπο.

Not at all: you are childless. I deny that you are the son of Zeus (this falsehood came from your mother), you who are foolishly trying to overturn the established laws and throw the rules into confusion.

This proposal solves several problems:

- a. Metre: we now have a single word in positions 9-10 (φήσω σ’ ἐγώ). There is no word end after position nine. Porson’s law is not violated.
- b. Syntax: we do not need to supply αὐτόν with ζῆν. By reading Ζηνός the problems disappear.
- c. Meaning: it is now clear what the mother’s lie is. The mother is Pasiphae; the speaker accuses her of having lied. The implication is that Minos is not really the son of Zeus. Parallels from Euripides will be listed below
- d. Meaning: the link between being childless and the idea of overthrowing divine laws is now clear. The speaker claims that Minos’ request that the seer revive Glaucus goes against natural laws.

²⁴ Gehad et al. (2024) 29, *ad loc.*

The rearrangement suggested above requires no change to the papyrus text. It also clearly indicates that the sentence is addressed to Minos. Minos is never explicitly mentioned in the papyrus, nor are there other expressions that are unequivocally linked to Minos (even if the plot of the play requires Minos to be one of the characters involved in the dialogue). Moreover, this is the only line which proves that Minos was onstage. The speaker is presumably Polyidus, as in several preceding lines.

The resulting text conforms stylistically to Euripides' usage. For the future φήσω see e.g. *E. Alc.* 238-9 οὔποτε φήσω γάμον εὐφραίνειν | πλέον ἢ λυπεῖν. This passage, along with *Alc.* 626-8 κὰν Ἄιδου δόμοις | εὖ σοι γένοιτο. φημί τοιούτους γάμους | λύειν βροτοῖσιν, offers a parallel for the asyndeton associated with the change of topic and the presence of φήσω/φημί. For the gen. "son of" with a verb of saying, and the omission of the verb of "being", see e.g. *E. Hel.* 284 τῷ τοῦ Διὸς δὲ λεγομένῳ Διοσκόρῳ ("the Dioscuroi, said (to be children) of Zeus"), *Pi. P.* 3.67 τινὰ Λατοΐδα κεκλημένον ἢ πατέρος ("someone called (the son) of Lato's son [Apollo] or of (his) father [Zeus]"), *Theoc.* 24.104 Ἄργεῖου κεκλημένος Ἀμφιτρύωνος (Heracles, "called (son) of the Argive Amphytrouon"), *KG I* 374-5.

In Homer, Zeus himself claims to be the father of Minos (*Il.* 14.322 ἢ τέκε μοι Μίνων). The statement is often repeated in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 13.449-50, *Od.* 11.568) and later authors, including Euripides (fr. 472).

Polyidus finds it outrageous that Minos, the son of Zeus, could ask him to subvert the laws of nature (46-50), and implies that such an obviously immoral request cannot really come from a son of Zeus. He suggests that Europe had Minos from a mortal, and covered her sexual misconduct by claiming that she had a son from Zeus. In Euripides' *Bacchae*, Cadmus accepts the idea that Semele lied about having had intercourse with Zeus (*E. Ba.* 333-6): κεί μὴ γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς οὗτος, ὡς σὺ φήεις, | παρὰ σοὶ λεγέσθω καὶ καταψεύδου καλῶς | ὡς ἔστι Σεμέλης, ἵνα δοκῆι θεὸν τεκεῖν | ἡμῖν τε τιμῆ

παντὶ τῷ γένει προσῆι. In the present passage, however, the statement is obviously provocative and exaggerated. Polyidus paradoxically denies a well-known fact.²⁵

According to Polyidus, the immoral actions of Minos belie his genealogy, just as, according to Andromache, Helen's actions prove that she is not the daughter of Zeus, but of an avenging Demon, of Envy, Murder and Death, and all other evils nurtured by Earth (E. *Tro.* 767-70):

ὦ Τυνδάρειον ἔρνος, οὔποτ' εἶ Διός,
πολλῶν δὲ πατέρων φημί σ' ἐκπεφυκέναι,
Ἄλαστορος μὲν πρῶτον, εἶτα δὲ Φθόνου
Φόνου τε Θανάτου θ' ὅσα τε γῆ τρέφει κακά.

Similarly, Iphigenia claims that Achilles is Hades, not the son of Peleus (E. *IT* 369-71):

Ἄιδης Ἀχιλλεὺς ἦν ἄρ', οὐχ ὁ Πηλέως,
ὄν μοι προτείνας πόσιν ἐν ἀρμάτων ὄχοις
ἐς αἵματηρὸν γάμον ἐπόρθμευσας δόλῳ)²⁶

The same Iphigenia, a few lines later, claims that Artemis cannot be the daughter of Leto, if she requires human sacrifices (E. *IT* 385-6):

οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως ἔτεκεν ἂν ἡ Διὸς δάμαρ
Λητῶ τοσαύτην ἀμαθίαν.

²⁵ For the rhetoric, compare also E. *HF* 1340-6 and the passages discussed by Stinton (1976) = Stinton (1990) 236-64.

²⁶ Note the relative clause ὄν..., as in the papyrus, line 46 ὅς ...

These statements are variations on the famous *Iliad* passage where Patroclus accuses Achilles of being the son of rocks and the sea, not of Peleus and Thetis (*Il.* 16.33-5):

νηλεές, οὐκ ἄρα σοί γε πατήρ ἦν ἰππότα Πηλεός,
οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ· γλαυκὴ δέ σε τίκτε θάλασσα
πέτραι τ' ἠλίβατοι, ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνής.

John Gibert suggested, as an alternative possibility, reading οὐ δῆτα παῖς εἶ Ζηνός, οὐ φήσω σ' ἐγώ. This is a very intelligent and interesting proposal, which I however consider less likely. It is linguistically possible, but stylistically less satisfactory. First of all, the instances οὐ δῆτ(α) are never accompanied by a finite verb in Euripides; the verb is always to be supplied from the context. In Euripides, οὐ δῆτ(α) is generally a complete sentence in itself (17 instances),²⁷ and when other words accompany the phrase, they are adjectives, pronouns or adverbial clauses.²⁸ Secondly, it is difficult to see what the preceding question could be. Minos is unlikely to have asked Polyidus whether he was really the son of Zeus.

Gibert's main argument in favour of his suggestion is that the change of topic from ἄπαις εἶ Ζηνός οὐ φήσω σ' ἐγώ is abrupt and difficult. In fact, ἄπαις εἶ in line 45 introduces the topic that will be developed in lines 49-50 εἰ γὰρ τυραννὶς ἢ πολύχρυσοι δόμοι | δυνάσει τὸν ἐκλιπόντα φέγγος ἠλίου, namely the possibility that rich and powerful people could purchase a second life for their children (or for themselves, or for other family members, lovers, etc.). Polyidus first states that Minos has lost his child, then scolds him for his desire to overthrow the law of nature, and then goes

²⁷ *Cycl.* 198, 704, *Alc.* 61, 555, *Med.* 1378, *Hclid.* 61, 507, *Hipp.* 334, 1062, 1398, 1449, *Andr.* 88, 442, 367, 756, *Hel.* 1228, *Pho.* 1661.

²⁸ *Alc.* 389 οὐ δῆθ' ἐκοῦσά γ', *Med.* 1048 οὐ δῆτ' ἔγωγε, *Hipp.* 324 οὐ δῆθ' ἐκοῦσά γ', *Andr.* 408 οὐ δῆτα τοῦμοῦ γ' οὔνεκ' ἀθλίου βίου.

back to the topic of giving life again to dead people. If we eliminate ἄπαις εἶ from line 45, we lack the content that explains lines 47-8.

This brings us to the question of coherence in the passage. As mentioned, οὐ δῆτ(α) (ii 45) is generally an answer to a command or a question. The phrase οὐ δῆτ(α) at 45 either expresses denial (Denniston (1954) 275: “giving the lie to a positive statement”: e.g. E. *Hclid.* 61), or refusal (Denniston (1954) 275: “refusing to obey a command”: e.g. E. *Med.* 1378, *Hipp.* 334,) or offers a “negative answer to a question which either definitely expects a positive answer, or recognizes with reluctance or surprise that a negative answer may be given” ((Denniston (1954) 275; e.g. S. *El.* 403).

The lines that precede οὐ δῆτ(α) (ii 45) in the papyrus, however, do not provide an appropriate context. This is the text of lines 43-4, as translated in the *editio princeps*:

ἄ μὴ γὰρ ἔστιν ὅστις ὄντα βούλεται
θεῖναι, κακίων πῶς ἂν οὐ γένοιτ' ἀνήρ;

How would that man not become (or “be”) worse, who wants to make things be that are not?

The question is easily interpreted as a criticism of Minos, “who wants to make things be that are not”, i.e. to revive his dead son. The question requires a positive answer. However, we find a negative answer at 45. Moreover, the character that delivers lines 47-50 (which condemn Minos’ request to resuscitate Glaucus) certainly agrees with a negative assessment of Minos; it would have been illogical for him/her to answer the question of lines 43-4 with the emphatic “no” we find in line 45. Both lines 43-4 and 45-50 were probably spoken by Polyidus. It is conceivable, but less likely, that 43-

4 were spoken by the chorus; such direct criticism of rules can be found in the mouths of seers,²⁹ but is not common in the mouth of a chorus leader.³⁰

Line 45 must then have been preceded by a different question or request in the original complete text of the play.

It is easy to suppose that ii 45 was an answer to a request by Minos such as “you must resurrect my son; I, a king, and the son of Zeus, cannot be and will not remain childless.” Hyginus reports exactly such a request in his account of the myth of Minos and Polyidus, an account which is generally considered to be a summary of our play (a hypothesis confirmed by the rest of the Philadelphia papyrus).³¹ In Hyginus *Fab.* 136.5 Minos orders Polyidus *corpore invento nunc spiritum restitue* “you have found the body: now restore his life’s breath” (tr. Collard and Cropp (2008b)).

A forked *paragraphos* separates lines 44 from line 45. This sign must have had some specific meaning (see below, section 12). The break in content and linguistic continuity between 44 and 45 strengthens the case that a forked *paragraphos* indicates the end of an extract.³²

Let us return to the meaning of lines 43-4. What is the meaning of “worse”? As mentioned above, the emphasis is on “wanting” something that cannot be achieved, and only Minos wants something of the sort. The editors suggest “Perhaps the meaning is simply “very bad”, or perhaps the thought is that a man who wants to resurrect the dead will be emboldened to go on to do even worse things.” (Gehad et al. (2024) 29 *ad loc.*). One could consider “worse” as referring (or at least alluding) to

²⁹ See e.g. Tiresias in Sophocles’ *Oedipus the King*; see Battezzato (2020).

³⁰ But see e.g. A. *Ag.* 1612-71, with Fraenkel (1950) and Medda (2017) *ad loc.*, and E. *Hel.* 1627-41, with Kannicht (1969) and Allan (2008) *ad loc.*

³¹ See e.g. Kannicht (2004) 624, Collard and Cropp (2008b) 89-90, 223-233.

³² As argued also by e.g. Meccariello in the conference at the CHS, June 13-14, 2024, with different explanations and suggestions.

nobility in the moral and also social meaning: “how would that man not be less noble...”. Polyidus is accusing Minos of acting like a man from a lower class since he, like men of low birth, wants to change reality. If so, lines 43-4 introduce the theme of the nobility of Minos which is developed in lines 45-6. The same theme appears in another fragment from the same play (fr. 644):

ὅταν κακός τις ἐν πόλει πράσση καλῶς,
νοσεῖν τίθησι τὰς ἀμεινόνων φρένας,
παράδειγμ' ἐχόντων τὴν κακῶν ἐξουσίαν.

When a bad man does well in a city, he corrupts the minds of his betters, who have as their example the power given to bad men.³³

Fr. 644 probably alludes to Minos, a “bad” man who has power in the city. It might even have been from the same context as lines 43-50. The theme, however, could have been developed over different scenes.³⁴

³³ Here and below, previously known fragments of Euripides are quoted from the edition and translation of Collard and Cropp (2008a) and Collard and Cropp (2008b), unless otherwise specified.

³⁴ A similar argument could be made about a fragment in col. i. A strong thematic connection links col. i 3-4 (παλαιοὶ νόμοι βροτῶν | διδυμόλεκτρον οὐ σέβουσιν ἡδονάν), from *Ino*, with another fragment of *Ino* (fr. 402), also on the laws about marriage and bigamy (νόμοι γυναικῶν οὐ καλῶς κεῖνται πέρι· | χρῆν γὰρ τὸν εὐτυχοῦνθ' ὅπως πλείστας ἔχειν | {γυναῖκας, εἴπερ <ή> τροφή δόμοις παρῆν}, | ὡς τὴν κακὴν μὲν ἐξέβαλλε δωμάτων, | 5 τὴν δ' οὔσαν ἐσθλὴν ἡδέως ἐσώζετο. | νῦν δ' εἰς μίαν βλέπουσι, κίνδυνον μέγαν | ῥίπτοντες· οὐ γὰρ τῶν τρόπων πειρώμενοι | νύμφας ἐς οἶκους ἐρματίζονται βροτοί “Laws are not well made concerning wives: the prosperous man should be having as many as possible {if his house could maintain them}, so he could throw the bad one out of his home and be pleased at keeping the one who actually is good. Now, however, they look to one wife, and risk much on the throw; for people take wives into their houses like ballast, with no experience of their ways”). We do not know whether fr. 402 was from the same scene as col. i 3-4 (and omitted in the selection made in the Philadelphia papyrus), or from a different part of the play (or whether it was anthologised in the lost column written before our col. i).

12. Selection and order

As often mentioned above, I consider the text to be an anthology of gnomic passages from *Ino* and *Polyidus*. In this section, I will argue that the Philadelphia papyrus was copied directly from a complete text of these two plays. Someone marked passages to be copied in the complete text, and the copyist who wrote the Philadelphia papyrus copied also several notations that are typical of complete plays (and unusual in anthologies). If this is so, it would prove that copies of the entire plays were available in Philadelphia (or elsewhere in Egypt) at the time when the play was written.

Several features of the papyrus suggest that it is an anthology. The main ones are:

1. Most passages in the papyrus are gnomic (only col. i 1-2 and 5 are not, but they can be usefully quoted in different rhetorical contexts). Several lines were already known from the gnomologic tradition. An oblique stroke marks lines ii 19-20, 23-25 and 37-38, which are (part of) passages anthologised in the gnomologic tradition (see below).³⁵
2. We find several sudden changes of topic (e.g. col. i 10-15; col. ii 23-26; note also the sequences of asyndeta in col. ii 10-12). For instance, at ii 25, end of sentence coincides with the end of a fragment transmitted in the gnomologic tradition (fr. 641) and we find a change of topic in the next line. Note that the forked *paragraphoi* transmitted after lines 8, 10, 12, 14, 20, 21, 22, 33, 40, 42, 44 in col. ii always coincide with a change of topic. Moreover, col. i 10 cannot come immediately after the preceding lines 7-9 (see above, section 3). This situation is best explained by the hypothesis that we have a series of different extracts, separated by lines that are now missing. The forked *paragraphoi* indicate the end of a quotation.

³⁵ See below, note 38.

3. The metrical sequence of col. i 1-19 is unparalleled in a continuous section of a Greek tragedy. We have six trimeters (1-6), three lyric lines without responsion (7-9), six trimeters (10-15), three anapaestic lines (16-18), and a sequence of several trimeters. As the editors note, “We have not found a parallel for such a short system of recitative anapaests within a play” (Gehad et al. (2024) 17. This seems a strong argument against the hypothesis that we have two continuous extracts from a text. It is much simpler to suppose that we have a series of extracts from different sections of the same play.

On the other hand, we have several signs that suggest that our papyrus was copied from a complete text:

1. The scribe noted orthographic (col. i 4) and textual variant readings (col. ii 30).³⁶ In col. i 4 ΗΔΟΝΑΝ the scribe wrote Α over the first eta to indicate the reading ἄδονάν. The reading ἄδονάν serves no purpose in an anthology: the reading ἡδονάν is more easily understandable, as it is close to the common form ἡδονήν. The scribe must have derived the variant from the model he was copying. The same applies to the other variants. Variant readings are found in complete texts of classical authors who were edited and studied by Hellenistic scholars (e.g. tragedy, Pindar).³⁷
2. Accents (e.g. the accent on εῖ in col. ii 16), breathings and occasionally a sign indicating vowel length (over the iota of κακίων in col. ii l. 44): see Gehad et al. (2024) 2-3.

³⁶ See above, section 10, for a discussion of these variants.

³⁷ McNamee (2007) 37-48 (who also lists papyri that attribute variant readings to specific scholars, a feature that is of course absent from the Philadelphia Euripides papyrus). On interlinear notes see esp. McNamee (2007) 16 and n. 35. For a survey of the papyri of Euripides, see Carrara (2009); for notations and variants in the Euripides papyri, see Bastianini et al. (2023). For an example of a correction in an edition of Euripides, see Kannicht (2004) 766 on E. fr. 754b, line 6. For glossae (not variants) in an anthology of Euripides, see Funghi and Martinelli (2017) 116-8 (lines 7bis and 9bis in P.Berol. inv. 21144 [third century AD])

Meccariello, at the CHS conference, convincingly suggested that the interlinear signs at ii.26, ii.30, and ii.50, and possibly i.26 may be acute accents. The accents are used to help distinguish similar words: in ii 26 the accent on omicron in the sequence $\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\kappa$ helps readers understand that they should interpret it as $\acute{\omicron}\sigma' \acute{\epsilon}\kappa$, and not as $\delta\zeta \acute{\epsilon}\kappa$. The same probably applies to the makron on the iota of $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$: it is possible that this is simply an erudite remark on the original length of the vowel³⁸ but it could also be a way to signal that one should read the sequence as $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ and not as $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa' \acute{\iota}\omega\nu$. These are typical features of ancient editions which received philological attention. Personal texts of course also annotate accents and breathings, often heavily, to help learners understand the text.³⁹

3. Lyric and anapaestic sections (respectively col. i 7-9 and 16-18) are written colometrically and with *eisthesis*, as in tragic papyri (and medieval manuscripts).⁴⁰ Anthologies simply write lyric passages as prose, not only in the Hellenistic era,⁴¹ but down to the time of Stobaeus;⁴² anthologies even write iambic trimeters as prose.⁴³ Eisthesis is a clear sign that

³⁸ Gehad et al. (2024) 29 write “There is a macron above the iota of $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$. All is in order with the quantity; the point may be to signal awareness that prosody later changed and/or that comedy was freer than tragedy” and refer to Diggle (1981) 29-30.

³⁹ McNamee (2007) 25-6.

⁴⁰ On colometry in papyri derived from Alexandrian editions, see esp. Prauscello (2006) 7-183. On *eisthesis* in papyri of Greek tragedy see Savignago (2008).

⁴¹ See e.g. Pordomingo (2013) 20-1; most of the anthologies listed by Pordomingo were probably based on editions which lacked colometry in the lyric sections.

⁴² See e.g. E. fr. 61b in Kannicht (2004).

⁴³ See e.g. PSI 1476 (second century AD) in the edition by Bastianini (2017).

the scribe is reproducing an accurate edition of the complete play, ultimately derived from an Alexandrian edition.

4. Normal (not forked) *paragraphoi* indicate change of speaker, as in ancient dramatic papyri (and medieval manuscripts). See esp. col. ii 7, 16, 17, and Gehad et al. (2024) 3 (“We are confident that the παράγραφος here indicates speaker change”).⁴⁴ Changes of speakers are rare in anthologies.⁴⁵
5. A special mark (a diagonal line) highlights the only three gnomonic passages of column ii that are part of the gnomologic tradition (ii 19-20 = E. fr. 425; ii 23-25 = fr. 641; ii 37-40 = fr. 979). The practice of marking gnomonic passages is attested in the medieval manuscript tradition; such marks were probably present in texts of the Imperial age, as the Philadelphia papyrus confirms (see the paper given by D.J. Mastronarde at the CHS conference: passages marked as *gnomikon* or *oraion*).⁴⁶ Since the left margin of column i has not been preserved, we do not know whether similar marks were used for the sections of col. i that survive in the gnomologic tradition.

⁴⁴ Meccariello, at the CHS conference, also concurred in this convincing opinion.

⁴⁵ As shown by Mastronarde, at the CHS conference, in a survey of medieval gnomologia.

⁴⁶ See also McNamee (2007) 20 and 23 (and 23 n. 38), and the passages listed in the index on p. 562 on ὠραῖος. Note the similar stroke in P.Berol. inv. 9773, col. 2, lines 2 and 5: see Schubart and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1907) 129, McNamee (1992) 17-8 (in general), Piccione (2017) 78. Gehad et al. (2024) 3: “The diagonal line as such is unusual. [...] in our papyrus it corresponds to the three book fragments that we have identified in the column. In the first two instances (ii.19–20 and ii.23–25) the line corresponds to the first line of the book fragment, while in the third (ii.37–40) it begins at the bottom of the fragment’s first line and seems to correspond more to its second line. This could either be carelessness or an indication that the version in which the scribe knew the quotation was shorter.” The sign was probably slightly misplaced in the third instance.

In conclusion: we find several features that are typical of complete texts, and unusual in anthologies. We even find signs that indicate gnomic passages that made it into the gnomologic tradition. This text can thus be explained as an extract copied by a professional scribe from a complete text. The person who ordered this copy from a scribe marked passages to be copied in the original text of both plays; the scribe copied what he saw, including features such as colometry, *eisthesis*, variant readings, and marginal marks (*paragraphoi*, the diagonal line marking gnomic passages). The scribe used the forked *paragraphos* to indicate the end of an extract. The passages from *Polyidus* seem to come from a scene that included a large number of gnomic statements; the passages from *Ino* are shorter, and they may come from more distant sections, perhaps simply because the gnomic passages were found in scattered passages. It is possible that the person who ordered the copy was especially interested in the content of the scene between Minos and Polyidus from *Polyidus*.

The editors state that the papyrus “was discovered in one of the several pit graves of the third century CE [...] The papyri were found in a clump in the northeast corner of the tomb (figure 2); the fill above contained fragments of painted plaster that likely came from the destruction of the nearby painted structure.” As Basem Gehad explained at the CHS conference, the papyrus was found close to the first burial (i.e., the burial of a child), but not on the body. It was found together with other texts, including a list of seed loans for temple trees. The papyri might have been part of the material that simply happened to be in the area, and were used to fill the burial. However, one can also consider the symbolic significance of seeds for plants in a temple: they suggest the possibility of birth and rebirth. Birth and rebirth is also the theme of the *Polyidus* scene that was extracted.

Moreover, one should note that the Euripides papyrus was cut at right-hand side, to the right of col. ii. The last sentence of col. ii is thus made incomplete. The left margin of the papyrus is irregular, as if it had been torn. Someone might have selected specifically these two columns, first tearing the papyrus (left margin), and then (after seeing the imperfect result on the left-hand side) cutting it.

That would mean that someone selected only some passages from *Polyidus* as significant. These passages deal with death; they can be seen as a series of consolatory *topoi*: everything that lives must die; this is simply the law of nature; wealth does not make a difference.

Was it simply chance? Or did someone intend these words to accompany the dead child – and to indicate the feeling of her parents? We will never know for sure. This is of course not the first nor the last instance where someone is buried with a text that has a religious or personal meaning; the Derveni papyrus is another case in point.⁴⁷ As with the Derveni papyrus, we “gained fragments of a papyrus whose decipherment and interpretation will continue to fill generations of scholars not only with frustration but also with joy”.⁴⁸ But we can, in any case, read the consolation provided by *Polyidus* to Minos. He, unlike the author of the Derveni papyrus, does not offer hopes about life after death. In Euripides’ play, *Polyidus* was (ironically) able to resurrect Glaucus, just after saying that no one can live twice. But someone, perhaps not ironically, cut off that part of the papyrus. They were sceptical of the resurrection.

Bibliography

Allan, W. (2008) *Euripides: Helen*, Cambridge.

Bastianini, G. (2017) 'GNOM 54' in CPF (ed.), *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF). Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina. Parte II 3 Gnomica*, Florence, 376--88.

Bastianini, G., Colomo, D., Maltomini, F., Montana, F., Montanari, F., Perrone, S., Römer, C., Stroppa, M. (eds.) (2023) *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta (CLGP). Pars I, Vol. 2. Fasc. 5.1 Euripides*, Berlin.

Battezzato, L. (2009) 'Porson e il testo dell'*Ecuba* di Euripide', *Lexis* 27, 155-79.

⁴⁷ See Most (1997) 134-5.

⁴⁸ See Most (1997) 135.

- Battezzato, L. (2018) *Euripides: Hecuba*, Cambridge.
- Battezzato, L. (2020) 'Oedipus and Tiresias: Im/politeness Theory and the Interpretation of Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus' in G. Martin, F. Iurescia, S. Hof, G. Sorrentino (eds.), *Pragmatic Approaches to Drama*, Leiden, 187-212.
- Biraud, M. (2010) *Les interjections du théâtre grec antique : étude sémantique et pragmatique*, Louvain-la-Neuve ; Walpole, MA.
- Carrara, P. (2009) *Il testo di Euripide nell'antichità: ricerche sulla tradizione testuale euripidea antica (sec. IV a.C.-sec. VIII d.C.)*, Firenze.
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. (2008a) *Euripides: Fragments. Aegeus-Meleager*, Cambridge, Mass.; London.
- Collard, C., Cropp, M. (2008b) *Euripides: Fragments. Oedipus-Chrysis. Other fragments*, Cambridge, Mass.; London.
- Cropp, M. (1998) *Euripides: Electra*, Warminster.
- Cropp, M. (2000) *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*, Warminster.
- Cropp, M. (2013) *Euripides: Electra*, Second edn., Oxford.
- Denniston, J. D. (1954) *The Greek particles*, 2d edn., Oxford.
- Devine, A. M., Stephens, L. D. (1984) *Language and metre: resolution, Porson's bridge, and their prosodic basis*, no. 12, Chico, Calif.
- Diggle, J. (1981) *Studies on the text of Euripides*, Oxford.
- Diggle, J. (1994) *Euripidea: collected essays*, Oxford.
- Finglass, P. J. (forthcoming) 'Another new papyrus of Euripides' Ino'.
- Fraenkel, E. (1950) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon: edited with a commentary by Eduard Fraenkel*, Oxford.
- Funghi, M. S., Martinelli, M. C. (2017) 'GNOM 10-11' in CPF (ed.), *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF). Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina. Parte II 3 Gnomica*, Florence, 115-9.

- Gehad, B., Gibert, J., Trnka-Amrhein, Y. K. (2024) 'P. Phil. Nec. 23 ↑: New Excerpts from Euripides' Ino and Polyidos', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 228, 1-40.
- Kannicht, R. (1969) *Euripides, Helena*, Heidelberg.
- Kannicht, R. (2004) *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta Vol. 5: Euripides*, Göttingen.
- Kovacs, D. (1995) *Euripides: Children of Heracles; Hippolytus; Andromache; Hecuba*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kovacs, D. (2002) *Euripides: Helen; Phoenician women; Orestes*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1996) *Sophocles: fragments*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lloyd-Jones, H., Parsons, P. (1983), 'Supplementum Hellenisticum', *Texte und Kommentare ; 11* (Texte und Kommentare ;, 11; Berolini: de Gruyter), xxxi,863p.
- McNamee, K. (1992) *Sigla and select marginalia in Greek literary papyri*, Bruxelles.
- McNamee, K. (2007) *Annotations in Greek and Latin texts from Egypt*, New Haven, Conn.
- Medda, E. (2017) *Eschilo: Agamennone*, Roma.
- Most, G. W. (1997) 'The fire next time: cosmology, allegoresis, and salvation in the Derveni Papyrus', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117, 117-35.
- Nordgren, L. (2015) *Greek interjections: syntax, semantics and pragmatics*, Berlin.
- Parker, L. P. E. (2016) *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*, Oxford.
- Piccione, R. M. (2017) 'GNOM 4' in CPF (ed.), *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF). Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina. Parte II 3 Gnomica*, Florence, 77-86.
- Pordomingo, F. (2013) *Antologías de época helenística en papiro*, Firenze.
- Prauscello, L. (2006) *Singing Alexandria: music between practice and textual transmission*, 274, Leiden.
- Radt, S. L. (1999) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (TrGF) vol. 4: Sophocles*, Ed. corr. et augm. edn., Göttingen.
- Savignago, L. (2008) *Eisthesis: il sistema dei margini nei papiri dei poeti tragici*, Alessandria.

Schubart, W., Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. v. (1907) *Berliner Klassikertexte V 2. Lyrische und dramatische Fragmente*, eds W. Schubart, U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Berlin.

Stinton, T. C. W. (1976) 'Si credere dignum est': some expressions of disbelief in Euripides and others', *Proceedings of the Cambridge philological Society* 22, 60-89.

Stinton, T. C. W. (1990) *Collected papers on Greek tragedy*, Oxford.