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A Note on the Reading ‘Hesiod’ (ZPE 203 (2017) 1–23)

Since our reading of the name ‘Hesiod’ in this papyrus (P.Gen. 161) has – among other things – been ‘strongly contested’ by the author of the previous paper (S. Costanza), and the point seems to be important, we allow ourselves a short note of further justification. The evidence for the reading is as follows. There is punctuation (a kolon, or raised dot) in the middle of fr. 5, line 5, followed by words which seem to be quoted from an epic source, as Hurst recognized before us. Before the punctuation, as Costanza concedes, one reads clearly δοϲ. Before that, separated by traces of three letters, stands what can only be eta. One tries the supplement ησιοδοϲ as a suitable author of epic works, and the middle traces fall into place. This has been checked in the original and on a high resolution picture.

Accordingly the reading Ἡϲιοδοϲ is not merely possible, it is highly probable. Costanza does offer an alternative: to read ὦϲ, way, which he takes in its technical sense in extispicy as referring to a line on the liver. It is very hard to see how this word in this context could introduce a quotation from epic.

We do not wish to engage in prolonged polemics with the author, but let this note stand as one for many.
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