

ALCAEUS FR. NI HELEN (LOBEL-PAGE), 15 F.

πόλ]λα δ' ἄρματ' ἐν κονίαισι[
ἦρι]κεν, πό[λ]λοι δ' ἐλίκωπε[ς

'And many chariots were smashed to pieces in the dust . . .' My conjecture ἦρι]κεν seems far more vibrant and vivid than Edgar Lobel's suggestion ἦρι]πεν. Adopting my supplement the Greek will mean that the chariots are not only broken but actually smashed to pieces. This Epic form fits well into a poem that already has so much Epic usage. As to the papyrus, I have had a very close look at it in photographic form, and can confirm that the traces of ink do correspond with κ having been written. Sir Denys Page also looked at the photograph on my behalf and agrees with my findings.¹

Cambridge

CHARLES E. GILLIES

¹ My best thanks are due to the late Sir Denys Page, Miss N. Dunbar of Somerville College Oxford, and Mrs C. E. Thomp-

son, for help in various ways with this fragment.

THE NEW GALLUS, 8-9

. . . atur idem tibi, non ego, Visce,
. . . pl. Kato iudice te vereor.

As far as I am aware, it has generally been taken for granted that 'Kato' in the pentameter must be vocative. The double vocative 'Visce'—'Kato' does not seem objectionable if 'non' were repeated as first word of the pentameter (e.g., as Professor Nisbet suggests, '*non* ego, Visce, / *non* quadrupla, Kato, . . .'). None the less this is unexpected, and it seems at least worth considering the possibility that 'Kato' might be nominative. The most plausible (if not the only) way of accounting for a nominative would be as subject of a relative clause. Further consequences would follow almost inevitably: the word-ending doubtfully read -plā or even -uplā must be neuter accusative plural; we will need the relative pronoun 'quae', and a transitive verb which cannot be more than monosyllabic. These considerations have led me to:

. . . atur idem tibi, non ego, Visce,
quae volt¹ dupla Kato iudice te vereor.

¹ This idea occurred to me before I had seen a photograph, or had been given precise information about spaces and traces. As to length, Mr P. J. Parsons kindly traced out for me 'quae *vult* dupla', pronouncing it half a letter too long. But 'quae *volt*' seems at least as likely (note 'quom' in line 2), and in this scribe's hand would probably save a little space, bringing the restoration within an acceptable range as far as length is concerned (Mr Parsons agrees). The crucial point is whether the trace of what, in my

restoration, would have to be the D in DUPLA is so definite as to rule out this possibility. This trace is described (Nisbet *et al.*, p. 145) as 'apparently a short oblique, descending from left to right, a little above base-level (i.e. an interpunct; or from the right side of A, K, M, R, X)', which leads Nisbet to give most consideration to 'quadrupla'. Mr W. S. Barrett suggests to me that the 'apparent short oblique' might conceivably be a cross-section from the thick base of a D.