

AN EARLY THEOCRITUS BOOK (P. OXY. 2064+3548): PLACING FRAGMENTS

In 1930 Hunt and Johnson published the remains of P. Oxy. 2064, a roll containing at least some of the poems attributed to Theocritus and dating from the late second century A.D. (A. S. Hunt and J. Johnson, *Two Theocritus Papyri* [London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1930], 3–19). The papyrus was important, even though very fragmentary (no column is preserved complete, and very few lines are wholly intact), since at its time of publication it was one of the three earliest witnesses to the text of Theocritus. Fragments of other early papyri of Theocritus have been published since then, but P. Oxy. 2064 has remained the most important known witness prior to the fifth century because of the spread of poems which the extant fragments show it to have contained. No other papyrus allows us to reconstruct the contents of an early Theocritus book to such an extent. In 1983 the editors of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* published a further collection of Theocritus fragments from various papyri (P. Oxy. 3545–3552), among which were more remains from P. Oxy. 2064 edited by P. J. Parsons under the number P. Oxy. 3548 (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* L [Graeco-Roman *Memoirs*, 70: London, 1983], 105–22).

Hunt and Johnson were able to reconstruct the sequence of poems in the papyrus (using the numeration of modern editions) as 1, 6, 4, 5, 7, 3, 8; the new fragments show that 8 was followed immediately by 9, 10, and that the papyrus also contained *Id.* 11 (position unknown),¹ and there are also a number of fragments from the text, and from marginal scholia, which could not be placed (P. Oxy. 3548 frs. 45–63, and frs. 64–70). Since these are essentially the only unallocated fragments from any Theocritus papyrus, and since this book is such an important witness to the early text-history of Theocritus, it seemed worthwhile to try to place as many of them as possible. The early history of the transmission of the text of Theocritus is still almost a complete mystery: the papyri order the poems in sequences which differ both from one another and from those of the medieval MSS, and it is now certain that there was more of Theocritus to be read in antiquity than has come down in the medieval MSS. Whatever information these fragments might yield will thus be important, whether it add to or only extend what is known about this book. I have searched through the text of Theocritus (and the other bucolici) as systematically as I could looking for homes for the more substantial or idiosyncratic of the P. Oxy. 3548 fragments. After I had written up a first draft of these suggestions P. J. Parsons most generously re-examined the papyrus and communicated the results by letter (dated 17.11.85): with his permission I have quoted his observations, where pertinent, below with the reference PJP2 (I have referred to his editorial comments in the original publication with the reference PJP1). One fragment, fr. 56, is now certainly squared away, another, fr. 53, almost certainly is, fr. 62 probably has a home, and several others have been found possible placings; one, fr. 52, seems to be problematical.

On the most intriguing question, what the full contents of this book were, nothing

¹ Hunt and Johnson (p. 3) had already remarked that the order of the poems in this roll, with the exception of the placing of *Id.* 5, most closely resembled that of the medieval 'family' of MSS identified by Ahrens and Wendel (and subsequently Gallavotti) as the Laurentian, as against the orders of the Ambrosian or Vatican groups. The information now provided by the P. Oxy. 3548 fragments that *Id.* 8 was followed by 9 and 10 confirms this further; this roll is still our earliest surviving witness with any extensive evidence concerning the order of the poems (along with P. Oxy. 3547, also from the second century, with *Id.* 3 and 4 in sequence), and the conventional order of modern texts, which follows the Vatican family, still has no ancient support.

too definite has been added to what was already known, but there are some signs that it may have contained more than just the ‘pastoral’ Idylls: first, in commenting on fr. 46 I suggest that *Id.* 15 may have been in the papyrus (though this fragment is so slight that the suggestion can only be tenuous) and fr. 47 may also be a candidate for that poem, then fr. 52 raises the possibility that the papyrus contained *Id.* 22 (or even a text otherwise unknown), and fr. 69 may contain a comment to *Id.* 24.

Fr. 45

] . [
] μα [
] ε λ υ [

PJP1 suggested that this could be *Id.* 5.6–8:

ἐκτάσω κύριγγα; τί δ' οὐκέτι σὺν Κορύδωνι
ἄρκει τοι καλά, μαλ' αὐτὸν ποππύσδεν ἔχοντι;
τάν μοι ἔδωκε Λύκων, ὠλεύθερε. τὴν δὲ τὸ ποῖον . . .

The attraction of this identification is that *Id.* 5 is known to have been in this book-roll (contained in columns 6–10), even though no part of that section survives, but two other possibilities should at least be mentioned:

- (i) 21.34–6 ἄλλως καὶ σχολά' ἐστι· τί γὰρ ποιεῖν ἂν ἔχοι τις
κείμενος ἐν φύλλοις ποτὶ κύματι μηδὲ καθεύδων; 35
ἀλλ' ὄνος ἐν ῥάμνῳ τό τ' εἰ λύχινον ἐν πυρτανείῳ . . .
- (ii) 25.183–5 οὐ μὲν γάρ κε τοσόνδε κατ' Ἀπίδα κνώδαλον εὖροις
ἱμείρων ἰδέειν, ἐπεὶ οὐ, μάλα τηλίκᾳ βόσκει,
ἀλλ' ἄρκτους τε σύας τ' εἰ λύκων τ' ὀλοφώμιον ἔθνος . . . 185

Neither of these Idylls has yet been attested in any papyrus text (a fact which must give more weight to *Id.* 5 as a candidate here), but their inclusion in a second-century collection of Theocritean poems is not *a priori* unlikely. [PJP2 remarks that ‘the trace in the first line is a rising oblique, like the left side of alpha or lambda. But even that doesn’t reduce the possibilities.’]

Fr. 46

] . [
] . δ [
] τ [] . [
] . η κ ω . . [
]
] ζ
] ≡

If the surviving text, which is a scholion, applied to the poem of which the coronis marked the end, it could perhaps have referred to the penultimate line of *Id.* 15, v. 148, where the last word *ποτένθηις* is given in MSS ANU as *ποθ' ἤκοις*. (The notes in this roll often give simple glossographical equivalents and paraphrases.) [PJP2 notes that normally the last line of the text proper would be marked with an underline paragraphos parallel to the third or fourth bar in the coronis, so that the penultimate verse line would be slightly below the scholion of this fragment – ‘but of course marginalia aren’t always exactly ranged with their text.’]

Fr. 47

$$\begin{array}{c}]\kappa\lambda\epsilon[\\]\alpha\lambda\lambda' [\\]\tau\epsilon\epsilon[\\]\dots[\end{array}$$

We should start by assuming that the suprascript theta in v. 3 was a correction of a mistake, even though the original tau was not deleted (the same mode of correction is found at, for example, 7.86 and 109). However, I have been able to find no passage in the extant corpus which corresponds especially closely to this fragment: the sequence -αλλ- and -θεε- in successive lines seems rare, and in the only superficially plausible passage, *Id.* 8.70-2 (which is already attested in the papyrus for the middle parts of vv. 71ff.: fr. 42 + 42A-B [see *Ox. Pap.*, L, p. 118]) fr. 47 would have to fit fr. 42 + 42A-B papyrologically, and PJP2 notes 'that would give one letter too many, i.e. ανεβάαλλ, ανεβάλλλ or the like'.

Thus another possibility should at least be considered. At the end of *Id.* 24 the Antinoopolis Papyrus contains traces of thirty-two more lines than are attested in any of the later MSS, along with a scholion to the penultimate line, v. 171, which runs: *εγω ο φθαρτος ποιητ(ης) | κελευω τω Ηρακλει . . | θ . ως εναλλασσομενος | κ(αι) εκ διαδοχ(ης) νικησας | δικαιως ποιησ() | κ(αι) τον ποιητ(ην) | παντ(ας) νικησ(αι)*. The combination of the name Heracles and the verb *εναλλασσομενος* in proximity should at any rate be noted.²

Fr. 49

$$\begin{array}{c}].\nu[\\]\chi\sigma[\end{array}$$

Several of the poems already known to have been contained in the papyrus offer possibilities (with the necessary upright in v. 1 before the ν): 4. 19-20, 7.138-9 (the first few syllables of these lines are preserved in fr. 24 + 25 + 26: see *Ox. Pap.* L, p. 112), 8.13-14 (the first few letters only are already preserved, and fr. 49 would fit in closely: see *Ox. Pap.* L, p. 116), 10.10-11.³

Fr. 50

$$\begin{array}{c}].\dots[\\]\kappa\epsilon.[\\].\nu[\end{array}$$

In v. 2 the third letter must be one which has an 'upright, hooked leftwards at foot', and in v. 3 the first letter shows remains of an 'oblique, back of alpha etc.' (PJP1). The two apparent possibilities from those poems already known to have been in the papyrus, 7.114-15 (some of the first few letters and the last letter of these lines are already preserved: see *Ox. Pap.* L, p. 110) and 11.42-3 (vv. 14-20 of this poem have

² I had also considered several other remote possibilities: 22.215, 24.111, 25.110 or Moschus 3.47. But PJP2 remarks that none of these will fit the traces. Perhaps 15.123-5 should be considered: *ὦ ἔβενος, ὦ χρυσός, ὦ ἔγκ λευκῶ ἐλέφαντος | αἰετοὶ οἰνοχόον Κρονίδαι Διὶ παῖδα φέροντες. | πορφύρεοι δὲ τάπητες ἄνω μαλακώτεροι ὕπνων*.

³ In *Id.* 2, the only poem from 1-11 of modern editions not yet attested in the papyrus, vv. 35-6 are a possibility. PJP2 notes: '8.13-14 is certainly satisfactory from the point of view of spacing, but I can't say the fibre correspondences much recommend it.'

now been identified in fr. 44 of *P. Oxy.* 3548), both have to be excluded since PJP2 reports that ‘in 2 the final trace is a short upright, with the surface apparently undamaged above and to the left. So neither \neg for 7.114 [sc. οὐ₁κέτ₁ι] nor \backslash for 11.42 [sc. ἀφί₁κεν₁ι co] seems likely.’⁴

The only other possibilities which I can find which do seem to fit the constraints of the traces of the missing letters in both lines are from the non-Theocritean corpus:

- (i) Moschus 1.21–2 τοὶ μικροὶ κάλαμοι τοῖς πολλάκι καὶ τιτρώς₁κει₁
πάντα μὲν ἄγρια ταῦτα· πολὺ πλεόν ἂ δαῖς₁αὐ₁τῷ
- (ii) Bion 1.47–8 ἄχρ₁ις ἀποψύχ₁η₁ς ἐς ἐμὸν στόμα, ₁κει₁ς ἐμὸν ἦπαρ
πνεῦμα τεὸν ρεύσ₁η₁, τὸ δέ σε₁ν γ₁λυ₁κὺ φίλτρον ἀμέλ₁ξω.

Fr. 51

]μ₁η[
]δε[
]τ[
]μ₁η[

The only close possibility which I can find from one of the Idylls known to have been in the papyrus is *Id.* 5.49–52 (the last four lines in column 7, from which no remains have been identified so far); however this would entail v. 4 of the fragment being]ν₁η[and not]μ₁η[, and PJP2 reports ‘one sees, surely, mu, not nu’. Furthermore PJP2 also reports: ‘about the reading of 2 I’m not clear. I now seem to see a low trace at the end, like the tail of rho, hypsilon, phi or the like, together with what may be another trace joining the cross-bar of the epsilon.’⁵

Fr. 52

]. πεπε. [
]. λοχου. [
].

This fragment is something of a puzzle. So far as I can see, the sequence λοχου occurs only at *Id.* 22.155, where, however, the preceding line has nothing resembling the πεπε offered by the papyrus:

οὐχ₁ οὐ₁τ₁ω, φίλοι ἄνδρες, ἀριστήεσσιν ἔοικε
μνηστεύειν ₁ἀλόχους₁ αἷς νυμφίοι ἤδη ἐτοῖμοι. 155

The sigma of ἀλόχους fits the traces described by PJP1 well (‘foot of upright, perhaps hooked to right (as in sigma^a etc.)’), but v. 154 cannot be reconciled with the first line; the manuscript tradition has no variants, and editors have had no difficulties with v. 154 to date. This Idyll offers a text which resembles the first line of the papyrus only at v. 124:

πλήξεν ὑπὸ σκαιὸν κρόταφον ₁καὶ ἐπέμ₁πεσεν ὤμωι.

Only by assuming that in the papyrus text 31 lines had been omitted (i.e. a column in this papyrus’ exemplar, or that of an earlier antecedent) can we envisage the

⁴ 11.54–5 can also be excluded because of the tau after κε. And in any case the spacing seems wrong: οὐ₁κ ἔτ₁κεν in v. 54 would probably not have been directly over ὡς κατέ₁δ₁ν in v. 55.

⁵ From the poems not yet attested in this papyrus, or indeed in any papyrus to date, a possibility is *Id.* 23.44–7: κῆν ἀπίης, τότε μοι τρίς ἐπά₁ν₁ςον· “ὦ φίλε, κείσαι.” | ἦν δὲ θέλη₁ς, καὶ τοῦτο· “καλὸς ₁δ₁ε μοι ὤλεθ^a” ἑταῖρος.” | γράψον καὶ τότε γράμμα τὸ σοῖς ₁τ₁οίχοι χαράσσω· | “τοῦτον ἔρω₁ς ἔκτεινεν· ὁδοιπόρε, ₁μ₁η₁λ παροδεύ₁ςη₁ς... Here the mu in μοι of v. 45 following the δέ, however, would not give the tail of which PJP2 reports traces in line 2 of the papyrus.

juxtaposition of vv. 124 and 155; but this is hardly a satisfactory solution, since there are no textual similarities between vv. 124–5 and vv. 154–5 to suggest how this might have occurred ‘mechanically’, and v. 124 does not in any case offer an exact match with the traces of the first two letters in the papyrus line (PJP2 notes: ‘22.124 doesn’t seem to suit line 1;].ι could be read for].π, but not].αι’).

The alternative of supposing that the papyrus had a different verse (or verses) before 155 seems no less unsatisfactory: only after v. 170 have some editors, from Wilamowitz on, posited a lacuna in the directly transmitted text of this Idyll.

The fact that no trace of *Id.* 22 has yet been discovered in this papyrus makes me reluctant to press any interpretation of fr. 52 which involves an unusual reading. Perhaps one, or both, of these lines comes from comment rather than text.⁶

Fr. 53

].α[
].π[
 παρα[
]δεδ[

This fragment can be placed with some confidence alongside fr. 43(a) (*Ox. Pap. L*, p. 119) as part of *Id.* 9.17–19:

φαίνονται, πολλὰς μὲν οἷς, πολλὰς δὲ χιμαῖρας,
ὦν μοι πῦρος κεφαλᾷ καὶ πρὸς ποτὶ κῶεα κείται.
ἐν πυρὶ δὲ δρυῖναι χόρια ζεῖ, ἐν πυρὶ δ’ αὔαι...

Fr. 43(a) has parts of vv. 18–19:

]ος κεφ[
]ρύνω^t χόρια ζεῖ[

Above v. 19 in fr. 43(a) are the remains of a so far unintelligible suprascript comment: .λητηρηω.τ[] etc. Over the second eta is a suprascript letter which PJP1 interpreted as γ, to give ἤγουν, but with the note that the supposed gamma might be a tau. Now fr. 53 has the beginning of a suprascript comment over v. 19, παρα[, which could be fitted to that of fr. 43(a) to read παρατηρητη(αι)... This term appears in a suprascript comment in this same papyrus at *Id.* 4.63, where the scholiast appears to have written παρατετήρηται ὄτ[ι, using the same suspension for the verb.⁷ The coincidence of the supralinear note(s) seems to make the match of fr. 53 to fr. 43(a) extremely likely.⁸ (PJP2: ‘There isn’t an exact physical join, but clearly you are right. I still can’t read the rest of the marginal note.’)

⁶ It is worth noting that I have been unable to find any instance of the sequence πεπε in the text of the Idylls. If the first pi is sound (cf. PJP2 reported above), this could indicate that line 1 at least is comment. *Epigram* 21 is an epitaph for Archilochus; the poet’s name appears in the accusative, not the genitive, in the text, but the λοχου of fr. 52 could perhaps be part of a heading or marginal note to the poem.

⁷ I.e. with tau suprascript to eta. The fragment was not included in the plates published by Hunt and Johnson, but see Kathleen McNamee, *Abbreviations in Greek Literary Papyri and Ostraca* (*Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists*, Supplement 3: 1981), 79.

⁸ I have noticed one other possible fit among the Idylls already attested in the papyrus, at *Id.* 8.2–4: μῆλα νέμων, ὡς φαίνεται, κατ’ ὥρεα μακρὰ Μενάλκας. ἄμφω τῶγ’ ἤστην, πλοροτρίχω, ἄμφω ἀνάβω, ἄμφω κυρίδεν’ δεδαημένω, ἄμφω αἰείδεν. φαντί corresponds well to the traces in line 1 of the fragment (before the α is a ‘medium-long descender’), but the supralinear comment would be problematical: the first few letters and some middle letters of *Id.* 8.2–4 are preserved in fr. 28 E etc. (*Ox. Pap. L*, p. 115), and there is no trace of any supralinear comments to the lines there – παρα[in fr. 53 would therefore have to be part of a short, probably single-word, gloss, presumably to δεδαημένω, and it is difficult to see what this might be. (For another possible example of a semi-legible tau resembling semi-legible phi see below on fr. 56 line 3.)

Fr. 56

].μ.[
]τῆ[[ε]].[
],[[αι]]φ[
]αν.[
].έμ[
].ομ[
].[

On the traces PJP1 notes: '2].[: upright, blob at its middle (kappa?). 3].[: triangular top as of delta or the like. 5].[: high oblique, top right of hypsilon or chi?'.
 This comes from *Id.* 3.35–41:

τά,ν με, και ἃ Μέρμωνος ἔριθακίς ἃ μελανόχρως
 αἰ,τῆ· κ,αἰ δωσῶ οἱ, ἐπεὶ τῷ μοι ἐνδιαθρύπτῃ.
 ἄλ,λετ,αι ὀφθαλμός μεν ὁ δεξιός· ἀρά γ' ἰδησῶ
 αὐτ,άν; ἀ,ι,εῦμαι ποτὶ τὰν πίτυν ὧδ' ἀποκλινθεῖς,
 καί, κέ μ, ἴσως ποτίδοι ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄδαμαντῖνα ἔστιν.
 Ἰπ,πομ,ένῃς, ὅκα δὴ τὰν παρθένον ἤθελε γάμαι,
 μᾶλ' ,ε,ν χερσὶν ἐλὼν δρόμον ἀννεῖν· ἃ δ' Ἀταλάντα...

40

The traces fit: 2].[is indeed a kappa; 3].[is lambda, not delta; 5].[is the high oblique of a kappa, not upsilon. In line 3 the letter with an upright which was read as phi is tau unless the scribe wrote phi by mistake, his eye jumping ahead four letters to the phi of ὀφθαλμός (this scribe made several such errors). The accents in lines 2, 4 and 5 all accord. The spelling of αἰτῆ in line 2 matches the treatment of third singular endings of epsilon contract verbs elsewhere in the papyrus (at 7.74 the scribe corrected to ἀμφεπονῆτο); in line 3 the original αι for ε is a mistake made throughout this papyrus.

Fr. 56 can therefore be fitted immediately to the left of fr. 29, already located to these lines of the *Idyll* (*Two Theocritus Papyri*, p. 12; *Ox. Pap.* L, p. 114). In v. 40 fr. 56 is recorded as having].ομ[, while fr. 29 has]μενῃς...; in theory the scribe could have mis-spelt the name, with two mus (immediately after two pis: this scribe makes quite a few mistakes of this kind), but in fact the mu of Hippomenes is split physically between the two fragments and has been read for each. (PJP2: 'There is a physical join in 40, where, as you suggest, half of the single mu is on one fragment, half on the other. In 3 = 37 tau is in fact a better reading than phi!')

Fr. 57

]ε[
]ς[
].αν.[

PJP1 notes 'line ends, unless 2 belongs to a comment'; to which PJP2 adds 'There is ink after [αν] (like the LH half of omicron) – though I suppose it could belong to a marginale which has got too close.' From the *Idylls* already known to have been in the papyrus one passage with similar line endings is *Id.* 9.2–4:

ὠιδᾶς ἄρχεο, Δάφνι, ἐφεψάσθω δὲ Μενάλκας,
 μόσχως βουκὶν ὑφέντες, ἐπὶ στεῖραισι δὲ ταύρω,ς
 χοὶ μὲν ἀμᾶι βόσκοιντο καὶ ἐν φύλλοις πλανῶντο

(If this is correct fr. 57 would follow on immediately, or very closely, after fr. 43 which contains the last two lines of *Id.* 8 [see *Ox. Pap.* L, p. 119], the earliest part of *Id.* 9 so far attested in the papyrus being vv. 17ff. in fr. 53 + fr. 43(a) [see above].)

If the trace of ink in line 3 of the papyrus after *αν* is part of a marginale, two possibilities from the poems already attested for the papyrus are 3.2–4⁹ and 5.18–20 (11.74–6 seems possible but less likely because of the probable alignment of the lines over one another). If the letter following *αν* is something other than an omega, then from the poems already known to have been in the papyrus 10.12–14 should be considered.

Fr. 59

] . δ[
] . πο[
] αν[
] [

PJP1 notes ‘1] . : perhaps high oblique (right-hand tip of hypsilon or the like?); but perhaps a smaller trace, then a high point’. If *υδ* is to be read in line 1, one possibility from the poems known to have been in the papyrus is 5.137–40 (though with the location of the acute accent in line 4 of the fragment for v. 140 not clear):

οὐδ’ ἔποπας κύκνοι· τ₁ὺ δ₁’, ὦ τάλαν, ἐςσὶ φιλεχθής.
 παύσασθαι κέλομαι τὸν πολυμένα· τιν δέ, Κομᾶτα,
 δωρεῖται Μόρσων τ₁αν₁ ἀμνίδα· καὶ τὸ δὲ θύσας
 ταῖς Νύμφαις Μόρσωνι καλὸν κρέας αὐτίκα πέμφων

140

(A few syllables from the earlier parts of these lines are preserved in fr. 7(a) of the papyrus: see *Two Theocritus Papyri*, p. 7.)

Other possible candidates, though not with an hypsilon before the delta in line 1 of the fragment, are 5.25–8 (with an acute accent perfectly placed in v. 28), 5.45–8, and 7.98–101 (fr. 59 would then be nearly contiguous in the papyrus to fr. 19C, which has a few syllables from the second half of each of these lines: see *Ox. Pap.* L, p. 110).¹⁰

Fr. 61

] . . . [
] . ωεν[
] . [

A negative report; since PJP1 remarks that line 3 could show line-end I had considered the possibility that the fragment comes from *Id.* 13.11–13, but PJP2 comments: ‘The traces don’t suit omega of *αωσ* or rho of *ρωιεν*. There is spare ink below the final nu of line 2, which could be part of a cancellation stroke...’

Fr. 62

] μ[
] ε^κ [τ]ομ[

Id. 7.82–3 reads:

οὐνεκα οἱ γλυκὺν Μ₁οῖσα κατὰ στόματος χέει νέκταρ.
 ὦ μακαριστ₁έ Κομ₁ᾶτα, τύ θην τάδε τερπνὰ πεπόνθεις...

⁹ Note that traces of the column immediately adjacent to the opening lines of *Id.* 3, but with a comment spilling over from the end of *Id.* 7 (which preceded *Id.* 3), have now been identified in fr. 28C (*Ox. Pap.* L, p. 113).

¹⁰ *Id.* 11.50–3 also have δ, πο and αν on successive lines, but there is no hypsilon before the delta and the alignment of the lines looks wrong.

Parts of these lines are already preserved in frr. 17, 18 etc. (*Ox. Pap.* L, p. 109), but in the first half of vv. 82–3 [υκυ μοις α κ] and [τε κοματα τ] are missing, and fr. 62 would fit well.

The identification of fr. 62 here seems confirmed by PJP2, who comments: ‘Your placing seems all the more plausible, because with a now informed eye I think I could now see a low trace before mu in line 1, suitable for the foot of hypsilon, and a hairline horizontal at the beginning of 2, suitable for the top of tau.’

Fr. 69 (scholia)

] [
]ργος ολι . [
]πων και [
]απεδω . [

This note might refer to *Id.* 24.130–1:

οὐ ποκα κλᾶρον ἅπαντα καὶ οἰνόπεδον μέγα Τυδεύς
ναῖε παρ’ Ἀδρήστοιο λαβὼν ἱππῆλατον Ἄργος . . .

Line 2 of the fragment would have the name Argos, line 3 an explanation of its epithet, line 4 a part of the verb ἀποδίδωμι (e.g.]ἀπέδωκ[ε) in the course of the explanation how Adrastus was a benefactor to Tydeus (ἀποδίδωμι is often used in later Greek of bestowing or awarding).¹¹ No trace of *Id.* 24 has otherwise been found in this papyrus to date.

University of California, Berkeley

A. W. BULLOCH

¹¹ I do not understand line 2 ολι if the gap after the iota is correctly read. It should perhaps be noted that *Id.* 25.230 ends with the phrase *σαρκὸς ὀλιθεν*.

BOOK VI OF ENNIUS' *ANNALS*

The contents of the sixth book of Ennius' *Annals* have recently become a matter of dispute. Ever since Columna's edition (1585) it had been assumed that the book was entirely given over to the story of the war against king Pyrrhus (followed perhaps by mention of some events of the next few years; so my commentary, Oxford, 1985, p. 329). That view was based on the anecdote told by Quintilian 6.3.6, that Cicero, asked to say something *de Sexto Annali*, a witness in a law case, replied: ‘*Quis potis ingentis oras euoluere belli*’. It seems as good as certain that this was the first line of Book VI¹, and *belli* was taken by all as referring to the Pyrrhus war. According to Dr T. Cornell, however,² ‘unrolling the mighty scroll of war’ means that the poet is now going to describe warfare on the grand scale, thus setting the sequence of the third Samnite War, the Pyrrhus War, and (the first and) the second Punic War against the minor wars described in the first five books.³ I doubt if Ennius would have felt that

¹ It is not the first line in Virgil's imitation, *Aen.* 9.528, but is adapted in the beginning of Lucretius' Book V, and Cicero is most likely to have quoted a line which, as the first of Book VI, would most easily come to him and be recognized by his audience.

² *JRS* 76 (1986), 248ff.

³ It is true that in 7.29.1 Livy writes: *maiora iam hinc bella* (note the plural!)...*dicentur. namque eo anno* (343 B.C.) *contra Samnites. . . mota arma; Samnitium bellum ancipiti Marte gestum Pyrrhus hostis, Pyrrhum Poeni secuti*. This, however, refers to the first Samnite war, and Dr Cornell is not inclined to include that war in Book VI, which would mean that even the Latin war, with the execution of the younger Manlius (340 B.C.; my V i), would have to be accommodated there.