

# Hipponax and Ancient Greek Scholarship (P.Oxy. XVIII 2176): a commentary with marginal and interlinear notes

Anika Nicolosi  
Università di Parma  
anika.nicolosi@unipr.it

## Abstract

The works of Hipponax were carefully analysed and studied by ancient Greek scholars. The richness of the papyrological documentation reveals a high number of glosses, interlinear notes and also part of a full commentary (P.Oxy. XVIII 2176). The hypomnema was copied in a neat upright semi-angular bookhand and it is possible to date it around the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> or the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. It shows remarkable similarities with a group of fragments ascribed by scholars to the so-called Scribe A19.

## Keywords

Commentary on Papyri, Hipponax, Ancient scholarship

As we can argue by papyri, Hipponax was an author carefully studied by ancient Greek scholars. It is highlighted by a papyrus-roll that shows an extensive apparatus of annotations, P.Oxy. XVIII 2176, from Oxyrhynchus (Bahnasa), edited by Edgard Lobel in 1941 in the volume 18<sup>th</sup> of the collection.<sup>1</sup> We have scraps from a full commentary on Hipponax' texts (P.Oxy. XVIII 2176),<sup>2</sup> an *hypomnema*, in which we find a sequence of annotations (scholia), which were gathered together in a book separate from the work to which the comment refers to. We have 24 papyrus-roll fragments of different size<sup>3</sup> and all these fragments (many in groups of macro fragments) are named with the letters of the alphabet.<sup>4</sup> It is not simple to verify the arrangement of the lemmata; fr. A was probably

---

<sup>1</sup> A detailed commented edition in Nicolosi 2019.

<sup>2</sup> MP<sup>3</sup> 551; LDAB 1317. There is also a small fragment (P.Oxy. X 1233 fr. 29) dubiously published by Hunt 1914, 64 f. and 70, and then assigned to the *hypomnema* by Lobel 1941, 184 f.

<sup>3</sup> The largest fragments (frr. 1 and 8) show scraps of 2 columns (18 ll.) and the right of a column (about 24 ll.); some of these, together, are a large fragment or themselves are a large section of the commentary. See Lobel 1941, 87-96 and 184 f.; Lobel 1948, 153 f.

<sup>4</sup> The main groups are frr. A, B, C, D, E in Degani's edition (= frr. A, B, C, E, D in West's edition): fr. A (fr. 1 col. I + fr. 9 + *Add.*) = Hippon. fr. 129 a (= 118, 1-2 + 5-6 W.<sup>2</sup>); fr. B (fr. 3 + fr. 4 + fr. 5 + *Add.*) = Hippon. 129 b Dg. (= 118, 3

above fr. B,<sup>5</sup> but it is not possible specifying the distance, and fragments A, B and C seem to belong to the same *kollema* (i.e. the same sheet of papyrus in a papyrus-roll).<sup>6</sup>

No doubt we have about Hipponax' authorship of the text. The text of ll. 2 f. in fragment B (= Hippon. 129b Dg. = 118,3 W.<sup>2</sup>) *λαιμᾶι δε σοι τὸ / [χεῖ]λος ὡς [ἐρω]διοῦ*, was already known by a scholion to Nic., *Ther.* 470 (191,9-12 Crugnola), which assigns the lemma to Hipponax and provides an explanation for the verb glossing *μαμῶσσων* as «eat without measure».<sup>7</sup> Otherwise, it is not clear how many Hipponax' texts we have. The first three fragments (fr. A-B-C Dg. = W.<sup>2</sup>) seem to refer to a single poem which is an aggressive speech against a man named (or nicknamed) Sannus, described as gluttonous, hungry and very skinny (fr. 129a-e Dg. = 118,1-12 W.<sup>2</sup>).<sup>8</sup> More uncertain is the arrangement of the other fragments.<sup>9</sup> We have Sannus' composition, and then we have the *pharmakòs* text (*τρ[ιτα]ῖον ἐκ κήρυ|κος ἀσμε[ν . . . ]έ μιν*, fr. 8,4f.). About all the other texts, we can only say there are (Ionic) words that would be from Hipponax; they are ἐπὶ ἄμμον θα|[λα]σσίαν (fr. D ll. 3 f. Dg.), φλο|γώματα (fr. E l. 10 Dg.), τίνυσ[αι *vel* τίνυσ[θαι (fr. D l. 32 Dg.) and θυρέων (fr. K l. 2 Dg.). The author of the commentary quotes Hipponax, fr. 17 (= fr. N Dg, *om.* W.<sup>2</sup>) καὶ Ἴππων[ (καὶ Ἴππων[αξ *iam* Masson 1962), and the names of ancient authorities are also mentioned. Among others we can remember Polemon of Ilius (fr. 1 col. 1 l. 6) and Aristophanes of Byzantium (to him, according to Eustathius, we can refer the exegesis of fr. A ll. 2 f., about *σαννῶς*, and he is probably quoted in fr. 8, 21), Hermippus of Smyrna (fr. 11 f.) and, perhaps, Palamedes of Elea (fr. 4, 5).<sup>10</sup>

The papyrus-roll is a carefull copy. The script is a practised and well-executed bookhand, with marginal and interlinear notes, and the level of erudition is high. The commentary itself is a sequence of learned annotations and sometimes they are included to the ancient lexica. The

W.<sup>2</sup>); fr. C (fr. 1 col. II) = Hippon. 129 c-d-e Dg. (= 118,7-12 W.<sup>2</sup>); fr. D (fr. 2+ fr. 8 + P.Oxy. X 1233 fr. 29 + *Add.*) = Hippon. 130 Dg. (= 118 E W.<sup>2</sup>); fr. E (fr. 6) = Hippon. 131 Dg. (= 118 D W.<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>5</sup> See Lobel 1941, 184.

<sup>6</sup> See Slings 1987, 88.

<sup>7</sup> We read: *γράφεται καὶ λαιμῶσσων, ἀντὶ τοῦ πεινῶν, ὡς Ἴππωνᾶξ: λαιμᾶι δε σοι τὸ [χεῖ]λος ὡς [ἐρω]διοῦ*. Nicander has also *λαιμῶσσοντα* (*v.l.* *λαιμάσσοντα*), *Alex.* 352 (cf. *Ar. Eccl.* 1179 *λαιμάττουσι*), and Herond. 6, 97 has *λαιμᾶι τ[ις]* (cf. 4, 46 *λαιμάστρον*). For the meaning, we can see Hesych. λ 137 *s.v.*, were *λαιμᾶι* is explained with *εἰς βρῶσιν ὄρμηται*, and λ 140 L. *s.v.*, were *λαιμᾶν* with *ἐσθίειν ἀμέτρως* (cf. λ 136 *s.v.* *λαιμά: λαμυρά*, 138 *s.v.* *λαιμάζουσιν: ἐσθίουσιν ἀμέτρως*, 142 L. *s.v.* *λαίμαργος: φάγος, ἄπληστος ἐπὶ τὸ φαγεῖν, καὶ μανῶδης*). See also Cyrill. *λαι* 35 Dr. *λαιμᾶι: μαίνεται, συντόνως ἐπιθυμῆι*.

<sup>8</sup> I agree with the layout suggested by Degani 1991<sup>2</sup> ad fr. 129, which preserves the order of the citations in the commentary – the sequence at vv. 1-4 (= fr. A ll. 1f. and 11-14), b (= fr. B), c-d-e (= fr. C ll. 2-4, 11 and 15) – and does not imply a gap between the first four verses, that are likely the opening words of the poem.

<sup>9</sup> Slings 1987, 91 thinks that it is not likely that the treatment of the *pharmakòs* (fr. D Dg. = E W.<sup>2</sup>) might be connected with Sannus, and it is probable that these verses belonging to another epodic poem, because the previous one, would be concluded with the gluttony of Sannus. West 1989<sup>2</sup> ad l. thinks that in this fragment (fr. E = D Dg.) should be about other two verses and prints all other fragments of bigger size (fr. D-E-F-G-H-J) under the same number (fr. 118). Degani 1991<sup>2</sup> suggests at least three compositions: fr. 129 (= fr. A, B, C); fr. 130 (= fr. D); fr. 131 (= fr. E-V). See also Lobel 1941, 95 f.; see Adrados 1990<sup>3</sup>, 63; Medeiros 1961, 171-179 ad fr. 113; Masson 1949, 311 f., 318 f.

<sup>10</sup> According to Montanari 2002, 81-85, I think that the abbreviated word *παλ* is an adjective as *παλαιός* (e.g. *παλαιᾶ γραφή* *vel* οἱ *παλαιοί*) or an adverb as *πάλαι* *vel* *παλαιῶς* (*scil.* *γράφεται*) or *πάλιν* (p. 84). It's worth noting that it is not a literary abbreviation but a documentary abbreviation.

reference is often Hesychius, as in fr. A ll. 5 f. for *σαννάδας* (see σ 171 H. *σαννάδας· τὰς ἀγρίας αἰγίας*) and *σαννιοπλήκτους* (see σ 173 H. s.v. *σαννιόπληκτος· αἰδοιόπληκτος*), or in fr. E ll. 10 f. for *φλογώματα* (see φ 635 H.-C. s.v. *φλογώματα· τῶν ἄρτων τὰ ἐπικεκαυμένα*). The critical explanations (exegeseis) are of different kind. Some are lexical-semantic, for example about *σαννάδας*, wild goats but also fools (fr. A), or about *φλογώματα*, bread's blister made by a burn (fr. E); one is mythological, about *ἐρωδιός*, where the bird recalls the omen sent by Athena to Odysseus and Diomed before their sortie, the so called *νυκτηγρεσία*, *Iliad* X 270 ff. (fr. B); one is historical, about the treatment of the *pharmakòs* (fr. D); one is a metaphrasis to briefly explicating the content, about what kind of exercises and music the poet recommends to Sannus (fr. C).

The original copyist's work is good. It includes *iota* adscripts<sup>11</sup> and some lectional signs.<sup>12</sup> We find itacism: we have *καμει-* *pro* *καμι-* and *ἐξειπ-* *pro* *ἐξιπ-* (fr. 6, 4 f.) and, for the same reason, we must read *ἀπόδ<ε>ξιπ* (fr. 1 col. II l. 7). Lemmata are marked by a paragraphos underneath the line in which they begin (fr. 1 col. II [= C] ll. 2, 11 and fr. 16 [= M] col. II l. 2), a space (vacuum) of about one character (fr. 1 col. II [= C] l. 11, and fr. D l. 4),<sup>13</sup> and by a paragraphos and dipole (obelismene). It is not clear if there is also ekthesis because the beginning of the text is often damaged;<sup>14</sup> there is only one case in which *alpha* (fr. 1 col. II [= C] l. 15) protrudes to the left although it has the same shape in another fragment (fr. 16 [= M] col. II l. 3). A vertical ancora is placed in the left margin, perhaps keying the note and its relevant place in the main text (fr. 4, 7); at the end of the line, filler-signs are used in many fragments.<sup>15</sup>

A corrector, perhaps the same copyist or a second hand, added annotations, written in more cursive script (see Lobel 1941): there are marginal notes, written in the right and in the lower margin, and interlinear notes. We find common abbreviations<sup>16</sup> and signs of prosody.<sup>17</sup> There are also textual variants or corrections; for example, *απ* is rectified with *απτ*, a horizontal stroke on *pi* and two *tau* overwritten (fr. 6, 12 f. *ἀπτα|ράγους*), and *eta* is rectified with *iota* (fr. 14, 1). Moreover (fr. 1 col. II), *ποιεῖν* is rightly rectified with *πιεῖν* at line 13, but the same emendation is wrongly added in line 14, probably for the similarity between *φάρμακον πιεῖν* and *φάρμακον ποιεῖν* (*ποιεῖν* was rightly added by Latte).<sup>18</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Fr. 1 col. I l. 9; 5, 2; 8, 20; it isn't in fr. 1 col. I l. 3.

<sup>12</sup> Accents (fr. 1 col. I l. 1; col. II l. 17; 6, 6 f. and 10; 12, 2; 19); breathings (fr. 6, 7) and signs of prosody (*longa*, fr. 1 col. I l. 1; 6, 6; *brevis*, fr. 24 col. II ll. 5 f., a marginal note in the lower margin).

<sup>13</sup> In fr. 1 col. I [= A] l. 11 there isn't any gap between two texts, not clear is fr. 4, 6 (= B l. 11) and nothing we can say about fr. 5, 2 (= B l. 2).

<sup>14</sup> Fr. 1 col. I [= A] l. 1 and fr. 1 col. II [= C] l. 3; fr. 1 col. II [= C] l. 2 and fr. 16 [= M] col. II l. 1.

<sup>15</sup> Fr. 1 col. I (ll. 5, 7, 9-11, 16-18); fr. 6 (ll. 5 f.); fr. 8 (ll. 7 f., 13, 21); fr. 24 col. I (l. 3).

<sup>16</sup> For example, *kappa* with accent for *καί* (fr. 3 ad l. 3; 8, 26; 24 col. I l. 10); the ending *-αι* reduced to sinusoid in fr. 24 col. II l. 14; smaller letter overwritten (fr. 5 ad l. 2, 6 ad l. 12; 8, 29; 17,4); *kappa* overwritten to *βι* in *-αμβικ* (fr. 23,8 and 24 col. I l. 9); *phi* with a stroke overwritten for *φ(ησί) vel φ(ασί)* (fr. 8, 27).

<sup>17</sup> We find *brevis* at fr. 24 col. II ll. 5 f.

<sup>18</sup> Latte 1948, 40 f. (1968, 471).

The annotations are short scholia, and they are often lexical and exegetical notes. We have etymological explanations, as the one above *λαιμᾶι* to explain the grimace on Sannus' face caused by his stretch out the lip to look for food (*δη(λοῖ) νόμφην τού(του)* ad fr. 5, 2),<sup>19</sup> or another one that adds the explanation of *φλυκταίνειν*, as a synonym of *φλογώματα* – we can read *τὰ κεκαυσμένα τ(ῶν) ἄρτων*, «bread's blister made by a burn (?)» ad fr. 6,12;<sup>20</sup> metaphrases (ad fr. 1 col. II l. 15) to explain what kind of *melos* (*τὸ Κωδάλου μέλος*) will be performed by the *aulòs* player Cicon, it is the «Codalus' type of melody» (*τὸν Κωδάλου [νόμον, suppl. Latte 1948, 39]*); an ethnographic excursus about Aegina and its inhabitants (fr. 8); finally, grammatical and metric explanations (fr. 23 and 24) written in the lower margin.<sup>21</sup> The annotations are both marginal and interlinear notes.

To this description we can add something about the handwriting and give some new suggestions. The papyrus-roll is a carefull copy, and the hand is an elegant and well-executed upright bookhand, varying in size.<sup>22</sup> The original hand seems to have added a few variants and lectional signs; other additions, notes and marginalia more cursively written, appear to have been made subsequently, some perhaps by the same handwriting (smaller and with less fugitive ink), some by a different pen. I think that it should be possible to date the bookhand in the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> or the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D.<sup>23</sup> There are some archaic signs as triangular *phi*, and more recently as rounded *my*. We can also note the shape of *ypsilon* and *epsilon*, and *alpha*, that has sometimes a rounded, sometimes an angular loop. The hand may be compared with P.Oxy. XXIII 2359 (Stesichoros?), of the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> century or the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century: an elegant upright uncial.<sup>24</sup> Lobel 1941, 89 assigns our hand to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D., and compares it with P.Oxy. X 1233 (Alcaeus) and P.Oxy. VIII 1082 (Cercidas). Between the two hands there are similarities,<sup>25</sup> but they are more regular than ours (we can see *alpha* and *phi*) and now, thanks to Johnson's study (2004, 61 and 64), we can assign them to two scribes, Scribe A32 and Scribe A4.

<sup>19</sup> We can compare Hesych. ν 717 L. s.v. which glossing *νόμφη* with *τὸ μεταξύ τοῦ γενείου καὶ τοῦ κάτω χεῖλους ἐν μέσῳ κοῖλον* (so *νόμφη* signifies «the hollow between the under-lip and chin»), cf. Ruf. *Onom.* 42. It is wrong translating «bride» as McNamee 2007, 265 does. The usual compendium for *δηλοῖ* is *δηλ*, for this reason, Slings 1987, 78 suggests *λέγει τὴν δὴ νόμφην τὸ ἦ*. But we have small *eta* overwritten (*apex*) and the same compendium, *δη(λοῖ)*, quite unusual, could also be used in fr. D, l. 29.

<sup>20</sup> We have a very close correspondence with Hesych. φ 635 H.-C. s.v. *φλογώματα τῶν ἄρτων τὰ ἐπικεκαυμένα*; see Nicolosi 2012, 49 f. Maas 1942, 133 suggests *τὰ κεκλασμένα τ(ῶν) ἄρτων* (*coll. Phot. κ 406 Th. s.v. κατεαγότα: κεκλασμένα* and *Suda κ 902 A. s.v. κατεάγη*).

<sup>21</sup> Fr. 24: l. 3 *τρόποι* could be understood as «figures of speech» or «characters»; l. 5 *τ(ῶν) ἀρτίων* could be a technical word to indicate metra in iambic trimeters (cf. Hephaest. 5,1, p. 15, 20 Consbr.); l. 6 *τάξιν* vel *παράταξιν* could indicate the arrangement of the elements. See McNamee 2007, 267.

<sup>22</sup> I think that it should be an exemple of the so-called «intermediate-style», see Menci 1984, 53-55.

<sup>23</sup> Second century according to Lobel 1941, 89, comparing P.Oxy. X 1233 and VIII 1082. The handwriting may be similar to Scribe A19 (see Porro 2011, 184-185 ad P.Oxy. XXII 2318), but I think he isn't the same copyist.

<sup>24</sup> Lobel 1956, 11 compares the hand with that of P.Oxy. VIII 1082 and dates it in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. There is a lectional signs which appear to be in a blacker ink; they may be due to the same hand that added the variant at fr. 1 col I 6 in the right margin: *μόλ*, i.e. *ιας δὲ μόλ* (highlighted with an antisigma on the left, and a dipole below) instead of *ιασδ'έμολ* col. II the alignment is notably irregular. There is also a critical sign (X) in the left margin of the column col. II 3.

<sup>25</sup> See Hunt 1914, 51 (P.Oxy. X 1233) and Hunt 1911, 20 f. (P.Oxy. VIII 1082).

We can try a different comparison that can also confirm the new dating hypothesis. The hand shows remarkable similarities with a group of fragments (two of which are commentaries) ascribed by scholars, not without some doubts,<sup>26</sup> to the so-called Scribe A19 (see Johnson 2004, 23 f.). They are P.Oxy. XXII 2318 (Iambic trimeters in the Ionic dialects, Archilochus?);<sup>27</sup> P.Oxy. XXII 2327 and XXV 2430 (two papyri of Simonides);<sup>28</sup> P.Oxy. XXIV 2389 and XLV 3210 (commentary on Alcman);<sup>29</sup> P.Oxy. XXIV 2397 (commentary on *Iliad* XVII);<sup>30</sup> finally, P.Oxy. XXXIV 2694 (Apollonius Rhodius, II 917-53, IV 317-22, 416-61, 468-512),<sup>31</sup> but that the same scribe wrote this papyrus is disputed. They are all written in an elegant upright uncial of a not uncommon type. All of these have correction in the text, variants, lectional signs, marginal and/or interlinear notes that have been added by the same hand or by a second hand (see, for example, XXII 2318 and 2327, XXV 2430, XXIV 2389, and, perhaps, XXXIV 2694).<sup>32</sup>

Lobel 1954 b, 67 (ad P.Oxy. XXII 2327) suggests that many of these fragments should «have been picked out of a large collection written by one copyist»,<sup>33</sup> and then (1959, 45 ad P.Oxy. XXV 2430) he adds that the fragments assembled under this hand are «a selection from a larger number, which more many remain unrecognized». <sup>34</sup> It's worth noting that already Lobel compares our hand with some of these papyri: with P.Oxy. XXII 2318 (Archilochus?), and with P.Oxy. XXIV 2389 (Commentary on Alcman). In particular, when he published this second one (P.Oxy. XXIV 2389), in 1957, he assigned all the papyri of this group to the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century. He confirmed his new opinion when he published Simonides (P.Oxy. XXV 2430); he explained that «the dating

<sup>26</sup> See Haslam 2011, 17 and Porro 2011, 184-185.

<sup>27</sup> Lobel 1954 a, 42 (P.Oxy. XXII 2318) says: «The hand, a pretty upright uncial varying in size, may be assigned to the second century. The scribe, like those of 1082 and 2176, employs both an angular and a round-looped  $\alpha$ . The majority of the accents and other lectional signs are, as far as I can tell, by the same hand as the text, but I think one or two may be due to a different pen». Porro 2011, 184 assigns it to end of the 1<sup>st</sup> century or the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> A.D.

<sup>28</sup> See Lobel 1954 b, 67 (P.Oxy. XXII 2327) and 1959, 45 f. (P.Oxy. XXV 2430).

<sup>29</sup> Lobel 1957 a, 28 f. (P.Oxy. XXIV 2389) says: «I believe the same copyist, whose hand I should compare to those of 1233 and 2176 and now assign to the second half of the first century, was further responsible for the following manuscripts: 2318 [...]; 2327 [...]; 2397»; Römer 2013 a, 11 assigns the papyrus to the 1<sup>st</sup> century A.D.; Haslam 1977, 6 and Römer 2013 b, 47 (P.Oxy. XLV 3210) assigns the hand to the 1<sup>st</sup> century A.D.

<sup>30</sup> Lobel 1957 b, 91 (P.Oxy. XXIV 2397) says: «My chief reason for including it is the convenience of displaying the writing in company with 2389. Second half of the first century». It's worth noting that also *Odysssey* is mentioned (ὀδου-, fr. 2 col. I 3) and we can note that in P.Oxy. 2174, written by a similar hand, we have a strange scrap, perhaps not from the same roll, in which we read ΟΔΥΣΣ-.

<sup>31</sup> Kingston 1968, 49 (P.Oxy. XXXIV 2694) assigns the hand to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. and says: «the script is an upright angular capital of small size with an appearance of regularity and elegance, which may be attributed to the second century»; then, he explains that «the text is written on the recto, perhaps in a hand different from that used for the marginal notes and for what seem to be an extract from a commentary on the verso». The hand is an elegant upright bookhand around the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> century or the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. for Haslam 2011, 17 f.

<sup>32</sup> It is difficult to distinguish. Annotations are all at least by the same hand, perhaps different from that of the scribe; sometimes accents have been added in a different ink, by a second pen or by the scribe in a second pass.

<sup>33</sup> He explains that, though they appear to be the work of a single copyist, there are wide variations, sometimes more easily perceived than defined, in the general appearance of the script and measurable differences in the size of the letters and the spacing of the lines.

<sup>34</sup> Lobel 1957 a, 29 says: «a few very much tattered and rubbed prose fragments, perhaps also a commentary, in variant A; and a good number of fragments of lyrical pieces in variant A but of various sizes [...] the smaller larger than the Alcman commentary, some capable of being confused with the elegiac poem, 2327 and 2318».

he had elsewhere suggested may require modification in that the latter part of the 1<sup>st</sup> century would not to be ruled out» (1959, 45). The same period, second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century, he suggested (Lobel 1957 a, 28 f.) for the commentary on *Iliad* (P.Oxy. XXIV 2397), and it was confirmed by Haslam (1977, 6) for the new scraps from the commentary on Alcman (P.Oxy. XLV 3210).

We can note similarities:<sup>35</sup> letters (the shape of *psilon*, P.Oxy. XXII 2318 and 2327, XXV 2430); the shape of *phi*, P.Oxy. XXII 2318 and 2327, XXV 2430, XXIV 2397; the double *alpha*, P.Oxy. XXII 2318); aids to the reader (accents, breathings, marks of elision, signs of prosody), perhaps due to a second pen (P.Oxy. XXII 2318 and 2327, XXV 2430, XXXIV 2694?); correction and variants (P.Oxy. XXII 2327 fr. 5 f.; XXIV 2389, XLV 3210, XXV 2430); abbreviation (*phi* with stroke for φησί, P.Oxy. XXIV 2389 fr. 35 and XXV 2430).

The group shares several features that are common in many others literary papyri. I point out only few things. There are comparable signs: a vertical anchora is added in the left margin of P.Oxy. XXV 2430 (fr. 78 col. II), see also P.Oxy. XXXIV 2694 C, c l. 18; the commentary on *Iliad*, P.Oxy. XXIV 2397 (fr. 3b col. I l. 18) has the same filler-sign (7) that we find in many fragments of our commentary. For the punctuation employed, the poetic texts are all punctuated by slight spaces of half to two-thirds of a character in width; the prose commentaries, as for our hypomnema, by spaces that are sometimes as wide as a full character space.<sup>36</sup> It's worth noting that in the commentary on Alcman (P.Oxy. XXIV 2389) lemmata division is marked by ekthesis.<sup>37</sup> As usual, strophic (for poetry) or lemmata (for commentary) division are marked by paragraphoi, while a new poem is distinguished by a coronis.<sup>38</sup> We could compare the paragraphos with dipole of our hypomnema with the sign we have in fr. 4, 6 of the Commentary on Alcman (P.Oxy. XXIV 2389), a forked paragraphos with coronis.

The commentary on Alcman (P.Oxy. XXIV 2389), like our text, mentions the ancient poet and quotes many authorities, among others the name of Aristarchus (fr. 6 col. I, l. 7).<sup>39</sup> The same text (fr. 35 g) has a note with an ethnographical and/or geographical excursus, something like that about

<sup>35</sup> It is noteworthy that in P.Oxy. XXII 2327, on the right margin, there are two letters overwritten each other (*alpha* and *my*) as in P.Oxy. XVIII 2174.

<sup>36</sup> Sometimes there are dots accompanying the space (XXII 2318 and 2327, XXV 2430), but there are none in the two commentaries. The situation certainly has the appearance of a scribe routinely using space to punctuate the text, and later readers adding dots to clarify.

<sup>37</sup> Fr. 35 d, 24 f. καμ legit Lobel (κάμα Römer), possis καλλ, cf. Alcman fr. 98. See XXXIV 2694 fr. C, c l. 18 (Apollonius Rhodius).

<sup>38</sup> See P.Oxy. XXV 2430 (Simonides), the coronides may be compared with P.Oxy. XXIV 2389 fr. 4.

<sup>39</sup> A reference to Aristophanes of Byzantium may be read in P.Oxy. XXXIV 2694 A4 (Apollonius Rhodius), but it would be very much out of the ordinary to find such a reference in annotation on Apollonius' epic; see Haslam 2011, 19.

Aegina and its inhabitants in our text.<sup>40</sup> Finally, the alignment of all texts is notably irregular, and the columns are slightly inclined, in accordance with Maas' Law.<sup>41</sup>

Although there would remain doubts about one copyist or more, I think that also our commentary should be included in the list of the texts dubiously ascribed to the Scribe A19 and we can assign all of them to the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century or the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. Moreover, we can observe that we have a very good collection of ancient Greek poetry, with copies carefully studied, with learned annotations and a high level of erudition.<sup>42</sup> We have a collection of fragments among which we have: prose texts, that are hypomnemata (Alcman, Hipponax and, perhaps the verso of the papyrus of Apollonius Rhodius) and scholia (on *Iliad*); and a good number of fragments of lyrical pieces (Simonides, Archilochus? and Apollonius Rhodius, and also may be add the Stesichorus of P.Oxy. XXIII 2359). Probably all of them may be due to a well-structured scriptorium (active over a period of fifty years), and it would be tempting to think they could be very close descendants from the Alexandrian scholarship.

## Bibliography

Adrados, F. R. 1990<sup>3</sup> (II 2010<sup>4</sup>), *Líricos Griegos. Elegiacos y yambógrafos arcaicos*, I-II, Madrid (1981<sup>2</sup>; Barcelona 1956-1959<sup>1</sup>).

Degani, H. 1991<sup>2</sup>, *Hipponax. Testimonia et Fragmenta*, Stuttgartiae et Lipsiae (1983<sup>1</sup>).

Haslam, M. 1977, "3210. Commentary on Alcman? (Addendum to XXV 2389)", in Bowman, A. K. / Haslam, M. W. / Stephens, S. A. / West, M. L. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XLV, London, 6-12 (Plate II).

Haslam, M. W. 2011, "4. P.Oxy. XXXIV 2694", in Bastianini, G. / Haslam, M. / Maehler, H. / Montanari, F. / Römer, C. (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta (CLGP)*, I: *Commentaria et lexica in auctores*, 1: *Aeschines-Bacchylides*, 3: *Apollonius Rhodius-Aristides*, Berlin / Boston, 17-26.

Hunt, A. S. 1911, "1082. Cercidas, *Meliambi*", in Hunt, A. S. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, VIII, London, 20-59 (Plate II).

– 1914, "1233. Alcaeus", in Grenfell, B. P. / Hunt, A. S. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, X, London, 50-70 (Plate III).

Johnson, W. A. 2004, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto / Buffalo / London.

---

<sup>40</sup> We can compare also P.Oxy. XXXIV 2694 B (Apollonius Rhodius, with notes in the lower margin).

<sup>41</sup> P.Oxy. XXII 2327, XXIV 2389, XLV 3210 (?), XXIV 2397 (and XXIII 2359) show a slight tilt right to the column.

<sup>42</sup> They may be also due to a scholar, or a group of scholars, «who did his own research, consulting a variety of sources and entering data from them»; for example, «notes may have been entered not from a commentary as such but from a mythographical and/or geographical work of some kind (or more than one)», as Haslam 2011, 18 suggested.

Kingston, P. 1968, “2694. Argon. ii 917-53, iv 317-22, 416-61, 468-512”, in Ingrams, L. / Kingston, P. / Parsons, P. / Rea, J. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XXXIV, London, 49-58.

Latte, K. 1948, “De nonnullis papyris Oxyrrhynchiis. I. De Hipponactis Epodo”, *Philologus* 97, 37-47 [repr. Id. 1968, *Kleine Schriften zu Religion, Recht, Literatur und Sprache der Griechen und Römer*, München, 468-477].

Lobel, E. 1941, “2176. Commentary on Hipponax”, in Lobel, E. / Roberts, C. H. / Wegener E. P. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XVIII, London, 87-96 and 184-185.

– 1948, “Additions and corrections to pieces published in previous volumes”, in Lobel, E. / Wegener, E. P. / Roberts, C. H. / Bell, H. I. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XIX, London, 147-154.

– 1954a, “2318. Anonymous, Iambic Trimeters (?), in the Ionic Dialect”, in Lobel, E. / Roberts, C. H. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XXII, London, 42-48 (Plate VI).

– 1954b, “2327. Early Elegiacs”, in Lobel, E. / Roberts, C. H. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XXII, London, 67-76 (Plates IX-X).

– 1956, “2359. Stesichorus, Σουθηρα?”, in Lobel, E. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XXIII, London, 11-14 (Plate IV).

– 1957a, “2389. Commentary on Alcman”, in Lobel, E. / Roberts, C. H. / Turner, E. G. / Barns, J. W. B. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XXIV, London, 28-48 (Plates IV-VI).

– 1957b, “2397. Commentary on *Iliad* xvii”, in Lobel, E. / Roberts, C. H. / Turner, E. G. / Barns, J. W. B. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XXIV, London, 91-97 (Plate XII).

– 1959, “2430. Choral Lyric in the Doric Dialect (? Simonides)”, in Lobel, E. / Turner, E. G. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XXV, London, 45-87 (Plates V-IX).

Maas, P. 1942, “Commentarii in Hipponactem P.Oxy. 2176 fragm. 6”, *CQ* 36, 133.

Masson, O. 1949, “Sur un papyrus contenant des fragments d’Hipponax (P.Oxy. XVIII. 2176)”, *REG* 62, 300-319.

– 1962, *Les fragments du poète Hipponax*, Paris.

McNamee, K. 2007, *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt*, New Haven (Conn.).

Medeiros, W. de Sousa 1961, *Hipónax de Éfeso, I Fragmentos dos Iambos*, Coimbra.

Menci, G. 1984, “Per l’identificazione di un nuovo stile di scrittura libraria greca”, in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, I, Napoli, 51-56.

Montanari, F. 2002, “Filologia ed erudizione antica”, in *Da Αἴών a Eikasmós. Atti della giornata di studio sulla figura e sull’opera di Enzo Degani, Bologna - 19 aprile 2001*, Bologna, 73-88.

Nicolosi, A. 2012, “P.Oxy. XVIII 2176 fr. 6,12 (= Hippon. fr. 131 E Dg.; 118 D W.<sup>2</sup>)”, *ZPE* 180, 49-50.

– 2019, “2. P.Oxy. XVIII 2176”, in Bastianini, G. / Colomo, D. / Haslam, M. / Maehler, H. / Montana, F. / Montanari, F. / Römer, C. (eds.), *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta (CLGP)*, I: *Commentaria et lexica in auctores*, 2: *Callimachus-Hipponax*, fasc. 6: *Galenus-Hipponax*, Berlin / Boston, 242-280.



Porro, A. 2011, “6(?). P.Oxy. XXII 2318”, in Bastianini, G. / Haslam, M. / Maehler, H. / Montanari, F. / Römer, C. (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta (CLGP)*, I: *Commentaria et lexica in auctores*, 1: *Aeschines-Bacchylides*, fasc. 3: *Apollonius Rhodius-Aristides*, Berlin / Boston, 184-187.

Römer, C. 2013 a, “1a. P.Oxy. XXIV 2389”, in Bastianini, G. / Haslam, M. / Maehler, H. / Montanari, F. / Römer, C. (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta (CLGP)*, I: *Commentaria et lexica in auctores*, 1: *Aeschines-Bacchylides*, fasc. 2: *Alcman-Antipho*, 2.1: *Alcman*, Berlin / Boston, 11-46.

– 2013b, “1b. P.Oxy. XLV 3210”, in Bastianini, G. / Haslam, M. / Maehler, H. / Montanari, F. / Römer, C. (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta (CLGP)*, I: *Commentaria et lexica in auctores*, 1: *Aeschines-Bacchylides*, fasc. 2: *Alcman-Antipho*, 2.1: *Alcman*, Berlin / Boston, 47-53.

Slings, S. R. 1987, “D. Anonymus. Commentary on Poem(s) of Hipponax”, in Bremer, J. M. / van Erp Taalman Kip, A. M. / Slings, S. R. (eds.), *Some Recently Found Greek Poems*, Leiden / New York / København / Köln, 70-94.

West, M. L. 1989<sup>2</sup>, *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, I, Oxonii (1971<sup>1</sup>).