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OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
PART XV
GRENFELL AND HUNT
PREFACE

Owing to the large compass of the Byzantine documents intended for this volume, it was found advisable to reserve them for a separate Part (XVI), which will probably be issued in the course of 1922; the present instalment therefore, like Parts XI and XIII, consists of literary texts alone. The more extensive of these, including 1787–90, 1792, 1798, 1800, 1805–6, 1808, 1810, belong mainly to the second large literary find of 1905–6; others proceed from the work of different seasons, and a few, of which the most important are 1786 and 1793, were acquired by purchase on the site of Oxyrhynchus by Professor Grenfell during his visit to Egypt in the winter of 1919–20.

That unfortunately remains my colleague's chief contribution to the following pages: a few of the minor texts were originally copied by him, and he was able to revise my copies of a few others; the rest of the work involved in the preparation of this book has fallen to myself—a fact which accounts for some delay in its appearance and for many defects in its execution.

I am again indebted to Mr. E. Lobel for much assistance with the new classical texts, and especially the fragments of Lesbian poetry. Valuable suggestions at an early stage were received from Professor Gilbert Murray, and Professor A. E. Housman kindly sent notes on a few passages in the poetical pieces. My thanks are also due to Professor H. Stuart Jones for a transcript in modern form of the musical notation of the early Christian hymn, No. 1786, and to some other scholars for help on special points, which is acknowledged in connexion with the texts concerned.

ARTHUR S. HUNT.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD,
DECEMBER, 1921.
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NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The general method followed in this volume is the same as in preceding
Parts. 1787–90 and 1792–4 are printed in dual form, a literal transcript being
accompanied by a reconstruction in modern style. In the remaining texts the
originals are reproduced except for separation of words, capital initials in proper
names, some expansions of abbreviations, and supplements of lacunae. Additions
or corrections by the hand of the body of the text are in small thin type, those
by a different hand in thick type. Square brackets [ ] indicate a lacuna, round
brackets ( ) the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets < > a
departure from the text of the original, braces { } a superfluous letter or letters,
double square brackets [ ] a deletion in the original. Dots within brackets
represent the approximate number of letters lost or deleted; dots outside brackets
indicate mutilated or otherwise illegible letters. Letters with dots underneath
them are to be regarded as doubtful. Heavy Arabic numerals refer to the
texts of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri in this volume and Parts I–XIV; ordinary
numerals to lines, small Roman numerals to columns. The terms recto and verso
when used of vellum fragments refer to the upper and under sides of the leaf,
where these are determinable.

P. Halle = Dikaiomata, &c., von der Graeca Halensis.
P. Oxy. = The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Parts I–XIV, by B. P. Grenfell and
A. S. Hunt.
A. S. Hunt.
I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1778. ARISTIDES, Apology.

\[12 \times 14.6\text{ cm.} \quad \text{Fourth century. Plate I (Fols. 1–2, recto).}\]

The following small but valuable fragment of the Apology of Aristides in the original Greek is contained on the upper part of a leaf from a papyrus book, adjoined by a narrow strip from the other leaf of the sheet. How the sheet was folded, i.e., what was the relative order of the two leaves, and what was the position of the sheet in the quire cannot be determined; since, however, the strip from the second leaf is inscribed with but a single word, these questions are of slight importance. The handwriting is a handsome well-formed uncial, which though somewhat smaller and more compact has a decided general resemblance to that of 847, a leaf from a vellum MS. of St. John's Gospel, and like that specimen may be assigned with probability to the fourth century. No punctuation occurs. θεός is contracted in the usual way, but ἄνθρωπος and apparently οὐρανός were written out in full (ll. 32, 37). Some inaccuracies may be detected in the text, which seems to have been of mediocre quality; cf. nn. on ll. 26 sqq. and 33.

The Apology is a recent addition to early Christian literature. The first step towards its recovery was made in 1878 with the publication of an Armenian translation of the first few chapters from two MSS. in the Lazarist monastery at Venice. This was followed eleven years later by Dr. Rendel Harris's find at Sinai of a complete version in Syriac; and shortly afterwards Dr. Armitage Robinson, who had seen Dr. Harris's work in proof, recognized that the Apology was actually already extant in Greek, having been embedded in the early mediaeval romance, the History of Barlaam and Josaphat. The outcome of these fortunate discoveries was the joint edition by the two scholars of the Apology of Aristides in Texts and Studies, I. i. (1891), containing the Syriac
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The question then presented itself, how far the Greek of Barlaam and Josaphat could be regarded as representing the ipsissima verba of Aristides. That certain modifications had been introduced by the author of the romance was evident, e.g. a passage near the end in which the Christians were defended from certain charges made against them by early enemies was naturally discarded as out of date. But there remained considerable divergences which could not be easily accounted for. The Syriac has a number of repetitions and details not found in the Greek, the difference in total length approximating to the ratio of 3 to 2. Was this the result of expansion or compression? Had the Syriac translator amplified the original or the redactor of the Greek cut it down? The latter explanation, as Dr. Armitage Robinson observed in discussing this problem (op. cit. pp. 71 sqq.), seemed a priori the more probable, but careful consideration of the opening passage in which the testimony of the Armenian fragment was also available showed that the faults were by no means all on one side. While in the Greek there could here be traced one serious modification with a consequent displacement, one considerable abbreviation, and an added phrase in a Christological passage, the Syriac was found to be often loose and inaccurate, dropping some phrases and inserting others, sometimes with a distorting effect. Dr. Robinson's general conclusion was 'that the Greek will, as a rule, give us the actual words of Aristides, except in the very few places in which modification was obviously needed. Where the Syriac presents us with matter which has no counterpart whatever in the Greek, we shall hesitate to pronounce that the Greek is defective, unless we are able to suggest a good reason for the omission, or to authenticate the Syriac from some external source.' Harnack agreed that the Greek was the truer witness, but proposed to account for the variations of the Syriac and Armenian by postulating as the basis of these a later Greek Überarbeitung, which they in turn had still further transformed (Gesch. der altchristlichen Litt. i. 1. 97)—a needlessly complicated hypothesis. Again, R. Raabe, in his commentary in Texte und Untersuchungen, ix. 1, has no high opinion of the accuracy of the Syriac translator. On the other hand, Dr. Rendel Harris in a recent essay seeks to show that Celsus, in replying to Aristides, used a text of the Apology which was in close agreement with the Syriac (Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vi, pp. 163 sqq.).

With the welcome discovery of what is undoubtedly a fragment of the original text, the problem now reaches a new phase. The relation of the Greek of the fragment (P) to that of Barlaam and Josaphat (BJ) and to the Syriac version is discussed in detail in the notes below on ll. 8 sqq. and 26 sqq. In
general it may be said that P, as might be expected, holds an intermediate position. Though open to criticism especially for its verbosity, to which much of its comparative length is due, the Syriac has at any rate some of the advantages claimed for it by Dr. Rendel Harris, in places reproducing the original more faithfully than BJ and retaining words and phrases which the Greek redactor discarded. The latter often preserves the language of Aristides with much fidelity, but he treats the original with some freedom, making such short cuts and readjustments as seemed suitable for his purpose, and not confining himself to 'necessary modifications'. On the whole then the present discovery appears to place the Syriac version, if not in the flattering position suggested by Dr. Harris, yet in a more favourable light than that accorded to it by Dr. Armitage Robinson and by Raabe (op. cit., pp. 37-8). If the prudent critic must still 'hesitate to pronounce that the Greek is defective', he should exercise a corresponding caution in condemning matter peculiar to the Syriac. With P as guide, the task of sifting the wheat from the chaff may now be undertaken with a better chance of success.

Fol. 1, recto. Plate I.

6 lines lost

7 μιαροιν

Fol. 2, recto. Plate I.

10 [πλακοφταί] φανερα
[γ]αρ εστιν ημιν στι [δου]λευει ετερω ποτε
[μεν γαρ] συξει[ποτ]ε δε
ληγει ουκουν αναγ

15 [κα]λειται υπο τινος
[. . . . . .] [. . . .] έξι
[. . . . . .] νοφρα [. . ]
[. . . . . .] λ [. . . .]
4 lines lost

[. . . . . .] εξ . . .
[. . . . . .] ντων των

Fol. 2, verso.

[ση]μειον εις σημειον [καθ] ημεραν φερομε
νον δυνοντα τε και
ανατελοντα του
30 θερμαινειν τα βλα
οτα και τα φυτα εις
tην χρονι σων αν
θρωσων επει και [ ] με
ριμουσ εξ[οντα με]
35 τα των λοιπων αοτε
ρων και ε[λαττου]α
οντα του [ουρανου]
πολυν αυξειε δε και
μειονται [και εκλειπισ
4
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7. μιαρος is apparently a misspelling for μιαρος. This word does not occur in the extant Greek, and to what context it should be referred is not clear. There are several references to pollution in ch. iv and the preceding part of ch. v in connexion with γῆ and ὕδωρ, — φυρομένη, αἵματος μολυνόμενος καὶ εἰς πάνω τῶν ἀκαθάρτων πλύσιν ἀγόμενον. The original form of one of these phrases may have included the adjective μιαρος, though there is nothing in the Syriac suggesting this. Possibly, again, the word was used later in reference to the Greek gods or their human imitators; cf. viii εἰς ζῷα μεταμορφωμένοις ἐπὶ σωσίας καὶ αἰσχρὰς πράξεις, and τοῦ μὴ δυνάσθαι ναυπορφορίσσεσθαι θεοῦ, κατά τὰς εἰσηγήσεις αὐτῶν τὰς σωσίας, ἵνα τούτους συνηγόρους ἔχοντες τὸν κακᾶν μοιχεύσωσιν, ἁρπάζωσιν, φονεύωσι καὶ τὰ πάντα ποιῶσιν. As mentioned in the introd., the relative positions of Fol. 1 and Fol. 2 are indeterminate.

8 sqq. The extant Greek of this passage is as follows: of δὲ νομίζοντες τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων πνοὴν εἶναι θεὰν πλανῶνται. φανερὸν γάρ ἐστιν ὅτι δουλεύει ἑτέρῳ, καὶ χάριν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατεσκευάσται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς μεταγωγὴν πλοίων καὶ συγκομιδὰς τῶν σιτικῶν, καὶ εἰς λοιπὰς αὐτῶν χρείας. διὸ οὐ νενόμισται τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων πνοὴν εἶναι θεάν, ἀλλ᾽ ἔργον θεοῦ.

The Syriac is: ' And again those who have thought concerning the blasts of winds that it is God, these also have erred: and this is evident to us, that these winds are subject to another, since sometimes their blast is increased and sometimes it is diminished and ceases, according to the commandment of him who subjects them. Since for the sake of man they were created by God, in order that they might fulfil the needs of trees and fruits and seeds, and that they might transport ships upon the sea; those ships which bring to men their necessary things from a place where they are found to a place where they are not found; and furnish the different parts of the world. Since then this wind is sometimes increased and sometimes diminished, there is one place in which it does good and another where it does harm, according to the nod of him who rules it; and even men are able by means of well-known instruments to catch and coerce it that it may fulfil for them the necessities which they demand of it; and over itself it has no power at all; wherefore it is not possible that winds should be called gods, but a work of God.'

In ll. 8-12 the agreement with the extant Greek is close, the only discrepancies being θ(εὸ)ν εἶναι for εἶναι θεάν, φανερά for φανερῶν, and the addition of ἡμῖν after ἐστίν. In the Syriac the simple directness of the original is obscured by unnecessary verbiage: 'concerning the blast of winds, that it...these also...and this is evident...that these winds...'. On the other hand 'to us', which the extant Greek has dropped after 'evident', is correctly retained; and the following clause 'Since sometimes their blast is increased and sometimes it is diminished and ceases' apart from the redundancy of 'their blast' and 'and ceases', corresponds faithfully to the original, whereas the extant Greek parts company, omitting the dependent clause and passing on to the next sentence. At this point, however, the Syriac too becomes faulty. After 'and ceases' it proceeds 'according to the commandment of him who subjects them' (cf. κατ᾽ ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ in the extant Greek); whereas the original has an inferential sentence, apparently 'therefore it is under some compulsion...'. Further detailed comparison is precluded by the unfortunate mutilation of the
lower part of this page; but the scanty remains appear to support the fuller version of
the Syriac as against the much shorter extant Greek, though no definite correspondence can
be made out.
9. 6(co)v: so also the Syriac, 'that it is God'. The extant Greek has θεόν both here
and elsewhere where the subject is feminine.
13. α[ύεν: the identification of the exiguous traces is confirmed by the collocation
αὔξει τε καὶ λήγει farther on in BJ. Whether that is to be regarded as a transposition
of ποτε μεν... λήγει is doubtful, for the Syriac repeats 'Since then this wind is sometimes
increased and sometimes diminished' at the corresponding point, and it is therefore quite
possible that there was a similar repetition in the original. In that case BJ omitted ποτε
μεν... λήγει here, and did not merely transfer it to a later position.
14. αναγκαῖοι: cf. the references in BJ to ἀνάγκη in connexion with other elements,
&c., e.g. in κινεῖται δὲ οὐρανὸς κατ' ἀναγκὴν, ν ὁρῶμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν (ο. τῶν ἁλῶν) κυνομένων κατ' ἀνάγκην,
and the application of the same phrase to the moon and to man. To read αναγκη
etia is less suitable, since of the doubtful letters before ταὶ the second is the taller of the
two, whereas if they are οὐ the reverse would be expected. The top of the supposed
ξ is not unlike that of ζωτες in l. 8.
16. The very scanty remains are not inconsistent with αὐξεῖ again, though the repetition
of this word seems unlikely. Of the three letters printed the e is the most probable;
the other two are very uncertain.
17. The first ν is very doubtful. The next letter is apparently ο or η, which
is followed by ν or κ.
18. The doubtful λ may be μ.
26 sqq. The opening sentence of this section may safely be restored from BJ on the
analogy of ll. 8–10 οἱ δὲ νομιζοντες τον ἅθεον θ(εοὴν εἰναι πλανωνται, BJ continues: ὁρῶμεν yap αὐτὸν κινούμενον κατὰ ἀνάγκην καὶ τρεπόμενον καὶ μεταβαίνοντα ἀπὸ σημείου eis σημεῖον, δύνοντα καὶ ἀνατέλλοντα, τοῦ θερμαίνειν τὰ φυτὰ καὶ βλαστὰ εἰς χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὧν ἐλάττονα ὄντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πολύ, καὶ ἐκλείποντα τοῦ φωτός, καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοκράτειαν ἔχοντα. διὸ οὐ νενόμισται τὸν ἥλιον εἶναι θεόν, GAN ἔργον θεοῦ.
The Syriac is: 'So too those have erred who have thought concerning the sun that he
is God. For lo! we see him, that by the necessity of another he is moved and turned
and runs his course; and he proceeds from degree to degree, rising and setting every
day, in order that he may warm the shoots of plants and shrubs and may bring forth in the
air which is mingled with him every herb which is on the earth. And in calculation the sun
has a part with the rest of the stars in his course, and although he is one in his nature he is
mixed with many parts, according to the advantage of the needs of men: and that not
according to his own will, but according to the will of Him that ruleth him. Wherefore it
is not possible that the sun should be God but a work of God.'
Here the Greek of BJ is close to that of the papyrus throughout, especially when one
or two necessary corrections have been made. θερμαίνειν of l. 2 has disappeared and is more
likely to have been simply dropped than to be represented by μεταβαίνοντα, since the Syriac
has an equivalent for this as well as for θερμαίνειν. καθ ἡμεραν, which the Syriac connects,
probably rightly, with δωντα τε καὶ ανατέλλοντα, has also been discarded. The article has
been omitted with βλαστά and χρῆσι (confirmed against the v. l. χρεια), and βλαστά and
ϕυτά are transposed; which was the correct order may be questioned, but the papyrus
seems on the whole to be supported by the Syriac. μηρισμοί (l. 33) was read by Boissonade,
with some MSS. (μηρισμοί W, divisionem Lat.; cf. Syr.). In ll. 38–40 αὐξεῖ de καί μειουται
[καὶ εκλείπει (?)] εἰς is represented by καὶ εκλείποντα τοῦ φωτός, and this or something like it
is probably to be regarded as the correct text, since the indicativeς αὔξει, &c., interrupt
the participial construction, which is carried on in ll. 40–1 by καὶ μηρισμοῖς αὐτοκρατεῖαν εχοντα;
and though waxing and waning might be interpreted as referring to varying degrees of heat they are not terms ordinarily associated with the sun. It is then likely, as Dr. Rendel Harris suggests, that αὐξανόμενη καὶ μειομένη καὶ ἐκλείψεις ἔχουσαν.

The Syriac has preserved φερομένων and καθ ἡμέραν, but in other respects does not compare favourably with BJ. 'Shoots of plants and shrubs' is a pointless change, and 'may bring forth ... earth' and 'in his course ... parts' are gratuitous amplifications. εἰτε is omitted, and the insertion of 'in calculation' is anything but a gain in clearness. 'According to the advantage of the needs of men' is displaced, and is besides a clumsy translation of εἰς τὴν χρήσιν τῶν ανθρώπων, though less verbose than 'and that not according to his own will', &c., as an equivalent of καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοκρατεῖαν εἴσοδα. The reference to eclipse has disappeared. Raabe, l.c., was rightly critical of this passage.

33. ετει is obviously an error for ετο (arising not improbably out of an intermediate misspelling ετοι), and BJ's addition of δέ may well be also right. There would be room for one letter between καὶ and the following μ, but none seems admissible and perhaps there was a flaw in the papyrus.

38-40. Cf. n. on II. 26 sqq. ἐκλείψεις is assured by the parallel there quoted from BJ and would not overload the lacuna if ἐκλείψεις or ἐκλιψὶς were written, as is quite possible.

1779. PSALM i.

II·5 X 7·7 cm. Fourth century.

A complete leaf from a papyrus codex, containing three verses of the first Psalm. The informal hand, which may be assigned to the fourth century, is rather large, and disproportionate to the size of the leaf, so that only 17 lines are got into the two pages. Stops in the high position are used, and a rough breathing occurs in l. 4. There is no stichometric division of the verses, as there was e.g. in 1226, a fragment from a still earlier book. A variant known from an eleventh-century cursive receives support; cf. 1226, &c.

Recto. Verso.

ουχ᾽ ουταῖς] οἱ ἀσεβεῖς: σεβεῖς εν
οι ασεβεῖς
ουχ᾽ ουτοὺς
ἀλλὰ ἡ ὡς χροῦς
ἐκριπτεῖ
ο ἀνέμος
ἀπὸ προσωποῦ
η ᾲς ἡ διὰ
τοῦτο οὐκ᾽ ανα

i. 4 10 [σ]ησονται α
σεβεῖς εν
κρισεὶ ουδε α
μαρτωλοὶ εν
βουλη δικαιων
ο ἄνεμος
οτι γινωσκειν
ἐκριπτεῖ
ων και οδος

4. οι χροοῦ: so the cursive 281 (Laur. v. 18, 11th cent.); ο χροοῦ other MSS.
10. ασεβεῖς: so Ν’ARa and many cursives, including 281. οι ασεβεῖς others.
A leaf from a papyrus codex, complete at the top and bottom, but torn vertically, so that about half of the lines are missing on both pages. The handwriting, a handsome specimen of the 'biblical' type, large and upright, is unlikely to be later than the fourth century. A pause is sometimes marked by an increase of the interval before the following letter, otherwise punctuation is absent. The contractions usual in theological texts occur. A pagination figure, 74, has been entered (by the original scribe, apparently) in the left-hand corner of the recto; a comparison of the capacity of this leaf with the amount of the preceding part of the Gospel shows that the number refers to the page, not to the leaf, and it will follow either that the pages were numbered alternately in the series 2, 4, 6, &c., or that they were numbered consecutively at the top left corner. Here then may well be another example of the system of alternate pagination which appeared probable in 1011; cf. Part VIII, pp. 18–19. The text, like that of 847, shows a general agreement with the Codex Vaticanus.

Verso. Recto.

[kai eiπεν] αυτοις viii. 14 και μ[μαρτυρει περι
[καν εγω μ]αρτυρω
[περι εμαυ]νυν η μαρ
[τυρια μου] αληθης
[εστιν οτι ο]ιδα πο
[θεν ηλθον και που η]
[υπαγω υμεις δε]
[ουκ οιδα]τε ποθεν
[ερχομαι] η που υπα
10 [γω υμεις] κατα τη[σαρκα κρ]ινετε εγω
[ου κρινω]ονυθενα
[και εαυ κ]ρινω δε
[εγω η κρ]ισις η εμη
15 [αληθινη ε]στιν ο
[τι μονος] ουκ ει  

1780. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1780. ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL viii.

25·6 × 8 cm. Fourth century.

[Kat εἰπεν] autos Vili. 14 και μίαρτυρει περι
[καν εγω μ]αρτυρω
[περι εμαυ]νυν η μαρ
[τυρια μου] αληθης
[εστιν οτι ο]ιδα πο
[θεν ηλθον και που η]
[υπαγω υμεις δε]
[ουκ οιδα]τε ποθεν
[ερχομαι] η που υπα
10 [γω υμεις] κατα τη[σαρκα κρ]ινετε εγω
[ου κρινω]ονυθενα
[και εαυ κ]ρινω δε
[εγω η κρ]ισις η εμη
15 [αληθινη ε]στιν ο
[τι μονος] ουκ ει
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI.

[μι αλλ εγγ Και ο]
[πεμψας] με πηρ
[και εν τω] νομω

20 [δε τω νε]στερω
[γεγραπται αι στι δυ]
[ο αινον η] μαρτυρι
[a αληθησ] εστιν ε

25 [ρων περι] εμαυτου

η ορα αντου εισεν 21
ουν πα[λιν αυτοις]
εγου υπαγω και ζη

τη αμαρτια ημων
αποθαυσθε ο
που εγου [υπαγω]
νεις ου [δυνασθε

50 ελθειν ε[λεγον ουν

3-5. η ματυρια μου αληθης [εστιν: this is the order of B. αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου
W(estcott)-H(ort) and T(extus)-R(eceptus) with most MSS.
7. δε: so BD, W-H, T-R; om. N.
9. η: so BDs, W-H; και Ν, T-R.
13. It is clear that the papyrus did not read και with δε for και εαυ.
15. Considerations of space are indecisive between αληθης (BD, W-H) and αληθης (N, T-R), but in view of the general agreement of the papyrus with B, αληθης is the more probable reading.
16. There would be no room for εγος after μους (D).
21. [γεγραμμενον εστιν η]
31. ης: so BD, W-H; ο Ιης δε, T-R. SD further add και ειπεν (εις.
34. The omission of μου with Ν would make the line unduly short.
36. The line is sufficiently filled without the addition of ο ι(ηςου)δ, which is read after ελαλησεν by some of the later uncials and T-R; cf. l. 43, n.
42. ειπεν: Ν ελεγεν, which, though unlikely, can hardly be excluded; cf. l. 15, n.
43. The papyrus evidently agreed with the best MSS, in omitting ο ι(ηςου)δ which is added after αυτοις by T-R with inferior authority.
47. ο[που: the variant και οπου is possible though not probable.

1781. ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL xvi.

The following leaf from a papyrus codex evidently belonged to the same MS. from which 208 (now Brit. Mus. 782), a sheet containing portions of chaps. i and xx of St. John’s Gospel, was derived. The character of the hand (both in the main text, which is written in an upright rather heavy script of semi-literary type, and in the corrections), length of lines and columns, method of punctuation by short blank spaces, occasional use of the rough breathing, and internal textual evidence, all combine in proving an identical origin. 208 was assigned to the
period between A.D. 200 and 300 (Part II, p. 2), and there is no reason to ques-
tion that attribution, though the codex is perhaps more likely to date from the
second half of the century than the first. With regard to the corrections and
additions, which are in a small but very similar hand, the further specimens now
available rather suggest that these are due to a diorthotes rather than to the
original scribe, though they must in any case be practically contemporary.

In consideration of the interesting character of the text of 208, the recovery
of a further fragment of this ancient book, the earliest copy so far known of
the Gospel, is very fortunate. In 208 a tendency was noted to agreement with
the Codex Sinaiticus, but this is not apparent in 1781, so far as variants peculiar to
that MS. are concerned, though where Ν is supported by one or more of the other
chief uncials the papyrus is usually in harmony. Coincidences with ΝΑ are found
in ll. 47, 48, with ΝΔ in l. 12, with ΝΒΔ in ll. 13, 20, with ΝΒC in ll. 34–5. There
is one agreement with B against the other main authorities (l. 13, omission of the
article with Ἰησοῦς; cf. l. 12, n.), one with BD (l. 31) and BCD (l. 34). An
omission of ἐγώ in l. 47 is peculiar to the papyrus, and in l. 44 there was
apparently another omission which has hitherto depended on slight authority.
The tendency to brevity, especially in omitting unnecessary pronouns, con-
junctions, &c., is an outstanding feature of both 208 and 1781; cf. 208 Fol. 1
verso. 5, 10, 11, recto. 12, 22, Fol. 2 recto. 19, verso. 2, 5 sqq., l2, 14–15, 17, 1781. 6,
l2, 13, 20, 26, 38, 44, 47, 50–1, and nn.

Recto.

[ο[]ι οκ τον εμον λημψεται και αναγιν[ xvi. 14
[γελει υμιν παντα ως παντα εχει φιλορειτε με και 15
[μα εστιν δια τουτο ειπωσιν εικειν εικειν]
[εμον λαμβανει και παλιν μεικρον και οψάρεται με και 16
[εικον και ουκ εισερχεται με και]
[παλιν μεικρον και αντι της μεικρον και ουκ εισερχεται με 17
[ουν εκ των μεικρων και ουκ θεωρειτε με και]
[ποιεις αλληλος εις τον ουκ ηθελειν τι και της μεικρων και ουκ 18
[περιη της μεικρων και ουκ ηθελειν εις της μεικρων]
[αυτω ερωτην και εισερχεται και εισερχεται και εισερχεται και]
15 [περὶ τουτον ζητεῖτε μετ αλληλῶν]
[οτι ειπον μεικρον και ου θεωρεῖτε]
[με και παλιν μεικρον και ουφεσθε με]

20 [κοσμος χαρησται ουμεις λυπηθη]

Verso.
νυν μεν [λυπην εχετε παλιν δε]

30 [η καρδια [και την χαραν υμων ου]
[δεις αρει [αφ] υμων και εν εκεινη]

35 εν τω ον[ο]ματι μου αιτειτε και

40 ληψθε τη [να η χαρα υμων η]

45 [γ]αρ ο προ φιλει υμιασ οτι υμεις εμε

[πεφιληκατε και [πεπιστευκατε]
1781. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

3. εἰπὸν: to read εἰπον μετ' with Ν and others would overload the lacuna.

4. Whether διαβατει (BDI*, W-H) or λυς(μ)τεται (ΣΝΛ, T-R) was written cannot be determined.

5. On the basis of the preceding and following lines, οὐκετε (ΣΝΒΔΙΠ, W-H) suits the length of the lacuna better than οὐ (A, T-R).

6. T-R with AΠ and others adds στι εγὼ υπαγω προς τὸν πατέρα after οψεσθε με.

7. The lacuna is of the same length as that at the beginning of l. 6 and shorter by only one letter than that in l. 8. Perhaps there was some deletion, e.g. the scribe might have begun to write προς αλλήλους after οὖν, which is the order of K. There is no authority for the insertion of τινες before εκ.

9. δέωρει[τ]: oψεσθε D.

10. The reading after ωψεσθε is very uncertain; there was perhaps a correction.

11. The lacuna would not admit of εγὼ υπαγω (D, T-R). ελεγον οὖν is omitted in D*.

12. τουτο so Ν*D*; for τούτο ο λέγει (ΣΝΑΒΔΙΠ, W-H, T-R) there is clearly no room.

13. Either τι λαλει ο ο λέγει (D*) is required in the lacuna; om. B.

14. D's reading επερωτησαι περὶ τούτου is obviously excluded. A omits αυτοις.

15. Whether αδα or αλλ was written cannot be ascertained.

16. The corrector has substituted ν for οι without cancelling the original spelling, for which cf. l. 20.

31. αρει: so ΒΔ*, W-H; αρει ΝΑCD*, T-R.

33. αιρει may have been added at the end of the line as in ΝD* (T-R).

34. αυ τι is the reading of BCD, W-H; αυ Ν, α τι αυ Α, ουρα (ε)αυ some later MSS., T-R.
34-5. δωσε... εν τω ονομ. μου: so NBC*, W-H; εν τω ονομ. μου, δωσει νυν AC*D, T-R.

35. The first sentence of verse 24, έος αρτι... ονοματι μου, was originally omitted owing to homoeoteleuton. This mistake has been corrected at the foot of the page, where l. 35 has been rewritten in a smaller and probably different hand with the missing words incorporated. A symbol calling attention to the correction was presumably entered in the right-hand margin.

38. The line is sufficiently filled without αλλα (AC*D?) before ερχεται, especially as a short blank space may well have been left after νυν.

39. οτε: οτις Ν*

41. απαγγέλω : so NABC*D, W-H; αναγγελω (5, T-R.

42-3. έι, εν τω ονομ. μου Ν.

44. The lacuna here is of practically the same length as in the immediately preceding and following lines, and it seems clear that either τον π(αρτ)ομα or περι νυνις was omitted, and for the latter omission there is some authority (the cursive 36, Ital. MSS. bce, Cyril. Acta 49, Aug. De Trin.). D adds μων after πατηρα, and this may have been written, though not required.

45. Whether εμε (ABCD) or με (N) was written cannot be decided.

47. οτι: οτις εγω MSS.

θ(εο)υ: so Ν* A; τον θεου C* and others, T-R; τον πατρος BC*D, W-H.


εϊληλθα : ηλθον Ῥ.

50-1. λεηδοσυνυ, the original reading, is that of ΝBC*D*, W-H; αυτω, which has been inserted above the line, is added by AC*D, T-R.

51. εν may have been omitted, with A.

1782. DIDACHE i-iii.

Two vellum leaves, containing a few verses from the first three chapters of the Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, supposed by some to be of Egyptian origin and now making its appearance for the first time in an Egyptian manuscript. The leaves, which are a good deal worn and discoloured, are detached, but originally may well have formed a single sheet, since the two interior edges follow roughly the same contour. In that case the quire included five sheets at least, eight leaves being required for the matter intervening between Fol. 1 verso and Fol. 2 recto, and would be more likely to have consisted of the unusual number of eight sheets, for the 3½ verses lost before Fol. 1 recto would occupy only three more leaves. This latter inference would of course be invalidated if the Didache was preceded by some other treatise, but the supposition of a large total number of leaves does not well accord with their proportions, which are remarkably small—smaller even than in 840. The book to which they belonged was one of the miniature volumes which seem to have been often preferred for theological works, though not limited to that class of literature (cf. e.g. P. Rylands I. 28). It may
perhaps date from the fourth century rather than the fifth. The hand is a medium-sized informal uncial, at its best somewhat similar to that e.g. of 1818 and the Cairo Menander; on Fol. 1 recto it is markedly larger and more irregular than on the other three pages. That the writer was a person of no great culture is clear also from his spelling and division of words (e.g. επιθυμειων, υμεις). ν at the end of a line is commonly represented by a horizontal stroke above the preceding vowel, and the usual abbreviation of πνευμα occurs. There is no punctuation, but the end of a chapter is marked by a row of wedge-shaped signs followed by horizontal dashes. The apparent absence of pagination may be due to the poor state of preservation of the upper margins.

The Didache has been preserved in a single MS. (M) of the middle of the eleventh century, discovered at Constantinople by Bryennios and edited by him in 1883. It is supposed by Harnack to have taken its present shape about the middle of the second century (Lehre der zwolf Apostel, pp. 159 sqq.), but to have an older text, based ultimately on Jewish elements, behind it (cf. Gesch. d. altchristl. Litt. I. i. 86-7); and he finds indications of an earlier recension in the Κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, a treatise called by Bickell, its first editor, the 'Apostolische Kirchenordnung' and by Hilgenfeld (N. T. extra Canonem) 'Duae Viae vel Iudicium Petri', as well as in an old Latin translation of Didache i–vi (the 'Two Ways') edited in 1900 by J. Schlecht, in both of which Did, i. 3–ii. 1 is omitted, though that omission may be otherwise explained (Gebhardt, ap. Harnack, Lehre d. zwolf Apost., p. 281). But that in the fourth century at any rate the Didache stood practically as found in M was sufficiently indicated by the Apostolic Constitutions, a compilation generally supposed to have originated in Syria or Palestine between about A.D. 340 and 380, in the seventh book of which the Didache has been largely drawn upon.

In the existing paucity of evidence for the text, any addition is welcome, and a comparison of these early Oxyrhynchus fragments with M and with the corresponding passages of the Apostolic Constitutions is an interesting study. Separated as they are in date by some eight centuries, it is hardly surprising to find several variations between M and 1782, which offers one or two remarkable new readings. Of these the most striking is the insertion between the third and fourth verses of chap. i of the words ἄκουε τι σε δεῖ ποιοῦντα σῶσαι σου τό πνεύμα. πρῶτον πάντων, which form a transition to the abrupt ἀπέχου of the accepted text. Other noteworthy variants are the omission of καὶ σωματικῶν (καὶ κοσμικῶν Const. Apost.) in i. 4, and of ἀπὸ παντός in iii. 1, the insertion of πράγματος in iii. 1, and the substitution of ἐπειδὴ δοθηκεί for δοθηκεί γάρ in iii. 2. How should these novelties be appraised? The two last are not very convincing, and ἀπόσκοιν for ἀπέχου in i. 4 certainly does not inspire confidence. On the other
hand the omission of a second adjective in i. 4 renders more intelligible the strange variation there between M and Const. Apost., and ἄκουε... πάνων does not look like an interpolation. Perhaps, then, Harnack's statement (op. cit. p. 172) that there is not the slightest trace of any alteration in the Didache during the two centuries which elapsed between its composition and embodiment in the Apostolic Constitutions may now need some qualification. With regard to the relation of M to Const. Apost., though in cases of divergence the former has generally the support of 1782, there are two unexpected agreements with the latter in i. 3, τοῦτο for τὸ αὐτό and φιλεῖτε for ἀγαπάτε. Similarly, one coincidence occurs with Kav. ἐκκλησ. (Hilgenfeld’s Duæ Viae) against M and Const. Apost., ὥν δὲ ἴον δὲ ὧν, which may be correct; a reading which Hilgenfeld ventured to adopt from that source is not, however, confirmed.

In the appended collation the texts as given by Harnack, op. cit., have been utilized, together with H. Lietzmann's convenient edition of the Didache (Kleine Texte 6), in which a reprint of Schlecht's Latin version is added to the apparatus.
1782. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

2. τοῦτο: τὸ αὐτὸ M; cf. Matt. v. 47 ὅwyi καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; On the other hand Const. Apost. (vii. 1) have καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ τὸν πατὴρ ἐκείνου, and so Justin, Apol. i. 15 (with πάντως instead of ἐθνικοῦ).

4. φιλεῖτε: so Const. Apost.; ἀγαπᾶτε M, and so also Matt. v. 44, Luke vi. 27, Gospel according to the Egyptians, and Justin, Apol. i. 15.

7. ἐν καὶ ἐξετε ἐξθρον is also the order of M. ἐχθ. ὅτι ἐξετε ἐχθρον Const. Apost.

8-12 ακοῦ ἀπαντ(ε) there is nothing corresponding to these words in M or Const. Apost., which pass abruptly to ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν κτλ. For σωσαί τὸ πν(ε)ρα cf. e.g. 1 Cor. v. 5 ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου.


14. σαρκικῶν επιθυμεῖων: σαρκικῶν καὶ σωματικῶν ἐπιθ. M, σαρκ. καὶ κοσμικῶν ἐπιθ. Const. Apost. κοσμικῶν was adopted by Bryennios and preferred by Harnack (pp. 5, 172) who however hesitated to accept it in his text; cf. Titus ii. 12 ἀντιπαρελκάθαι ἀπὸ τῶν κοσμικῶν ἐπιθ. The variation in M and Const. Apost. as to the second epithet may perhaps be regarded as an argument for its omission with 1782, which has also in its favour the analogy of 1 Pet. ii. 11 ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ... ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθ.

16. ἐλεγξε: so M. The ἢ, though little of it remains, is practically certain, and ἐλειψεν, which Hilgenfeld inserted after ἐλέγξε from Kav. ἐκκλ., is therefore excluded. Const. Apost. (vii. 5), like M, make no reference to ἐλέος, but are here rather compressed.

16-17. ὁ δὲ ἐλεήσεις: so Kav. ἐκκλ.; ἐλεήσεις, which Hilgenfeld inserted from Kav. ἐκκλ., is therefore excluded. Const. Apost., Kav. ἐκκλ. ἐλεήσεις, which Hilgenfeld inserted from Kav. ἐκκλ., is therefore excluded. Const. Apost., Kav. ἐκκλ., so Kav. ἐκκλ.; ἐλεήσεις, which Hilgenfeld inserted from Kav. ἐκκλ., is therefore excluded.

23. οὗ δὲ: So Kay. eked. ἐκκλ.; ὡν M. Both M and Kav. ἐκκλ. have προσεύξῃ.

24. πραγματος: om. M, Const. Apost., Kav. ἐκκλ. πραγματος may have been inserted to obviate the ambiguity in gender of πονηρου (cf. the opposite rendering of the Latin ab homine malo), but on the other hand the homoeoteleuton would make the loss easy.


1783. HERMAS, Pastor, Mand ix.

6 x 9.3 cm. Early fourth century.

This fragment, the fourth from the Shepherd to be obtained from Oxyrhynchus (cf. 404, 1173, 1599), consists of the lower portion of a vellum leaf containing a few verses from Mand ix. Seven lines are missing at the top of the verso, and on the assumption that the upper margin was of the same depth as the lower the height of the leaf when complete may be estimated at 13 cm. The hand is a round upright uncial of medium size and rather graceful appearance, which may be referred to the earlier part of the fourth century. There is no trace of ruling. One instance occurs of a stop in l. 4. θεὸς and κύριος are contracted as usual, but not ἀνθρωπος (l. 5).
The leaf is a palimpsest, but the original text, which ran in the reverse direction, is so much obliterated that its identity has not yet been established. It was prose, written apparently in lines of much the same length as those of the Shepherd, and in a hand which looks very little earlier in date. Among the few words which have been recognized with the aid of a reagent are  ... τον περιεσχυσθεν το θεο, ου μονον τω, και πληρω.

This fragment is approximately contemporary with 1172 and 1599, and shows a text of a somewhat similar type. It is not free from errors (e.g. ll. 5, 6), but in several places it is superior to the Codex Athous, here the only continuous Greek authority, and supports corrections which editors have adopted from other sources. For the passage covered by 1783, the testimony of the Athous (ca) and the Latin and Aethiopic versions is supplemented by a fragment printed from an early MS. by J. E. Grabe, Spicil. ss. Patrum, i, p. 303 (ed. 2), and extracts found in Ps.-Athanasius and Antiochus. In the collation below the transcript of the Codex Athous given by K. Lake in Facs. of the Athos fragments of the Shepherd of Hermas has been utilized, besides the editions of Gebhardt-Harnack and Hilgenfeld.

Recto.

πολυσπλαγχνιαν αυτου οτι Mand. 15 αναστρεφησε εση εαν αδιστα ix. 4
ου μη σε [εγκαταλειψει αιλλα το ix. 2
αιτιμα της ψυχης σου πληρο
φορησει ουκ εστιν ο θεος οι οι
5 ανθρωποι μνησικακουντες
αλλ αυτος αμνησικακητος εστιν
20 ουν ουσι εισων οι Διψυχοι και

1. την] πολυσπλαγχνιαν : so recent edd. with Grabe's fragment; την πολλην ευσπλαγχνιαν ca, Ant.(iochus), Athan.(asius) Cod. Guelf. (την πολυσπλαγχνιαν Cod. Pariss.).
4. εστιν α θεος : έστη γαιρ ca, omitting α θεος, which Hilgenfeld and Gebhardt-Harnack add from Grabe's fragment, Ant., Athan., both Latin versions, and the Aethiopic.
5. οι μνησικακουντες, with ca and Grabe's fragment; the omission of οι (due no doubt to the termination of ανθρωπος) is found also in Ant. and Athan. Grabe's fragment adds (εις) διάλογοι αλληλους απετελειν μνησικακος.
6. αμνησικακητος : αμνησικακος ca, &c. αμνησικακητος occurs elsewhere only in Polyb. xl.
12. 5 in a passive sense.
15. αναστρεφητος : so ca, Hilgenfeld, Gebhardt-Harnack; αναστρεφητος Athan. Cod. Pariss.
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16. ἐορθός: so edd, with Athan. Cod. Paris., the Palatine Latin, and Aethiopic; om. ca.
17. οὐ: so edd, with Athan. Cod. Paris., the Palatine Latin, and Aethiopic; om. ca.
18. οὐ μὴ λαθεῖς: so edd, with Athan. Cod. Paris., the Palatine Latin, and Aethiopic; om. ca.

1784. CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED.

6.5 X 19.8 cm. Fifth century.

This copy of the so-called Constantinopolitan Creed, which as being an enlargement of the Nicene Creed has commonly passed under the latter name, is still older than that of the Nicene Creed published in P. Rylands I. 6. It is written in an upright semicursive hand which may be referred to the second half of the fifth century. In l. 3 v of του is written as a semicircle above the o and a common abbreviation of καὶ is used in l. 6. θεός, κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, and Χριστός are contracted, but not πατήρ, νόος, or ἀνθρωπός. ο and ω, as often happens in documents of this period (cf. e. g. 1130, which is approximately contemporary), are repeatedly interchanged.

The origins of this Creed are obscure. According to Nicephorus (Hist. Eccles. xii. 13) it was framed by Gregory of Nyssa, but the Acts of the Council of 381, to which it is attributed, are not extant, and its first authoritative appearance is in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), by which 'the Creed of the 150 holy Fathers assembled at Constantinople' was reaffirmed. That the present copy was made not very long after that event would be a natural supposition. Apart from misspellings it agrees so far as it goes with the ordinary text; unfortunately it breaks off before the eighth article, in which the 'Filioque' was inserted at an uncertain date, is reached, though that addition is not likely to have been incorporated here.

3. μονογενὴς: this form of the acc. is a vulgarism common from the Roman period.
4. ἐθ(εο)ν: the ν has been written over an original s, which being in darker ink looks at first sight like the later letter, but that this appearance is deceptive is shown by ἀληθήνον.
1785. Homilies?

Frs. 2 + 3  6-6 x 13:8 cm.  Fifth century.

A fragmentary papyrus leaf, apparently from a collection of discourses which at present remain anonymous. The style of Frs. 2–4 recto, concerning con-
cupiscence, of which a series of Biblical instances is cited, recalls that of 1603,
now identified as (Pseudo-)Chrysostom In decollationem Precursoris (λόγυ. 90), but
efforts to trace 1785 among the works of that voluminous author have so far not
been successful. Other fragments of homilies cast in a somewhat similar mould
are 1601–2. That the several fragments, of which a few are too insignificant
to be worth printing, are all from the same leaf is likely though not certain.
Frs. 1–5 recto and Fr. 1 verso. 1–6 are written in fairly regular slightly sloping
uncials of medium size; at Fr. 1 verso. 7 the hand changes, and from this point
onwards approximates to cursive. Apparently ll. 5–6 are remains of a heading,
and ll. 7 sqq., where the second hand begins, are a fresh discourse, which
is of a hortatory description and relates to reverence and godly fear. A fifth-
century date seems to be indicated, more especially by the second hand. The
ink throughout is of the brown colour characteristic of the Byzantine period.
A mark like an enlarged comma is employed with some freedom to divide
words, and two or three instances of the rough breathing occur on the recto,
where also a high stop is once found (Fr. 1 recto. 7).

Fr. 1 recto.

\[ \text{θανατος και } \]
\[ \text{Ἰαντων απο δικαιων } \]
\[ \text{δικαίων εντολων ϑυ αι } \]
\[ \text{κατεφρονησαῖν } \]
\[ \text{ὃς καὶ α.ὶς καὶ ψνχησί } \]
\[ \text{Ιο οἹς οφθίμων? } \]
1785. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

Frs. 2–4 recto.

[16 letters ενεκεν συνοψισμον ου]

κ]ατεψευσεν οι πρεσβυτεροι] κατα Σουσαν []
[ν]ας ενεκεν συνουσιασμον η υψη] του αρ[χι[μ]
[μ]αγειρου κατεψευδομαρτυρησε] του Ιω

5 [σ]ηφ ενεκεν συνουσιασμον [απωλευτων πολ]

[λοι] απο της φυλης Βενιαμεω [οι] δε εσωθη]
[σα]ν ενεκεν συνουσιασμον οι Σοομειαι

ερ]εκεν συνουσιασμον δι απο του Κα

[. . . . . . . . . . . . ]μ[. . ] ενεκεν συνουσιασμον οι εν τη]

10 [. . . ενεκεν συνουσιασμον, η γυνη [το]υ]

[. . . . . . . . . . . . ]σ[. . ] ε-ονουσιαζει αυτης [?] ανηρ]

[. . . . . . . . . . . . ]ν υπο του ιδιου [. . . . ] οη[. . .]

15 [ ] 27 " ] [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]

Fr. 4

Fr. 5.

β]ασιλ[
[ον]
[ιρη]

Fr. 1 verso.

[ ] [ ]

]οσιν εκ εναντι
]α ειπεν ο θεο και δια []
[του του[. . . . . . . . . . . .]] []

5 κατα τουδε νουν λογος, λογος

C 2
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

2nd hand  

Frs. 2–4 verso.

Fr. 1 recto. That this fragment is to be placed above Fr. 2 is shown by the change of hand on the verso.

7. The first letter must be a, δ, or λ, and if, as seems probable, the vestiges above the line represent a rough breathing, δοῦ or δῶ is indicated, the word following perhaps being σοῦ; otherwise δοῦ or δῶ could well be read.

8. θ(εός) is doubtful, the cross-bar of θ being rather indistinct, and the form of the sign of abbreviation unusual. Possibly the oblique stroke might be taken as meant for a mark of division between |v and xa, but it is rather farther away from the v than would be expected, and with the stop above the line would also be superfluous; cf. however Frs. 2–4 verso. 7, where a somewhat similar stroke occurs apparently as a mark of punctuation.

Frs. 2–4 recto. The position of Fr. 2, giving the ends of ll. 1–3 is certain, but that of Fr. 4, which contains the ends of ll. 12–15, with a vestige supposed to belong to the a of ανηρ in l. 11, is less clear.

2. Either ξαραφεύεται or ξαραφεύει δομαρτυρησαι (cf. l. 4) is probable and the former must be preferred if οἱ πρεσβυτέροι is right. Σωσάννα is the spelling of BAQ; Σωσάννα B rescr.

3. αρ[χιμαγειρο]: so the LXX in Gen. xxxix. 1.
5-6. The incident referred to is related in Judges xix-xx. At the end of l. 5 απωλέσαντο πολλοί is very conjectural, especially as there is barely room for [λοί] before απο in l. 6.

7. απο Σοδομειταί (Gen. xix) and the following nominatives lack a verb, e.g. διεφθαρσαν, and the angular symbol preceding απο may be interpreted as referring to this loss, which was perhaps supplied in the margin.

8. Dr. Bartlet suggests that Κα... may be Καπερναούμ, referring to Matt. xi. 23, but this can only be restored on the assumption of a misspelling.

11. The explanation of the dash between the ε and ξ of εξουσίαζεν is not evident. There is a hole in the papyrus immediately below it. ν of αὐτοῦ may be Λ, e.g. αλ[λα ο].

Fr. 5. 3. A combination with Frs. 2-4. 1. 2 [κ]ατεψευδάρα [δομαρτυρήσαν] [σα]ν is possible, though unconvincing.

Fr. 1 verso. 4. The latter part of this line has apparently been washed out.

6. Whether part of an oblique stroke immediately after the lacuna belongs to a letter, e.g. υ, or some other sign is doubtful.

Frs. 2-4 verso. 1-2. The margin being lost both here and in ll. 7-9, the point at which the lines began, though fixed with probability, is not quite certain.

7. ο of τον has been corrected, perhaps from η.

8. φρονηῄματ᾽ .. .: or possibly φρονιμίωδης, a form found in some MSS. of Philostratus 705, which would suit the space rather better than φρονήμα.

10-13. The explanation of the dash between the ε and ξ of εξουσίαζεν is not evident. There is a hole in the papyrus immediately below it. ν of αὐτοῦ may be Λ, e.g. αλ[λα ο].

1786. CHRISTIAN HYMN WITH MUSICAL NOTATION.

29-6 x 5 cm. Late third century. Plate I.

This interesting fragment of what is by far the most ancient piece of Church music extant, and may be placed among the earliest written relics of Christianity, is contained on the verso of a strip from an account of corn, mentioning several Oxyrhynchite villages and dating apparently from the first half of the third century, though later than the Constitutio Antoniniana, since some of the persons named are Aurelii. The text on the verso is written in long lines parallel with the fibres in a clear upright hand which approximates to the literary type but includes some cursive forms, e.g. the ε of [π]ατερα in l. 4. Above each line of text the corresponding vocal notes have been added in a more cursive lettering, whether by the same hand or another is not easy to determine. The character of both scripts appears to point to a date in the latter part of the third century rather than the early decades of the fourth. This hymn was accordingly written before either P. Amh. 2 or Berl. Klassikertexte VI. vi. 8, which are both assigned.
to the fourth century. Unfortunately only its conclusion is preserved, and that very imperfectly, four lines out of the five being disfigured by large initial lacunae. Nevertheless the general purport of what remains is fairly clear. Creation at large is called upon to join in a chorus of praise to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the concluding passage is the usual ascription of power and glory to the 'only giver of all good gifts'. The original extent of the hymn cannot be gauged from the recto, for though the strip evidently came from the latter part of the column of accounts, the breadth of this is unknown, and a second column, or more, may of course have followed.

The early date indicated by the character of the handwriting is reflected in the metre, which is purely quantitative and uninfluenced by accent. Owing to the mutilation of the fragment the metrical scheme cannot be closely followed, but the rhythm was apparently anapaestic and may be analysed as a series of dimeters, either catalectic, catalectic, or brachycatalectic. A short syllable is allowed to replace a long at the end of a colon, and the first syllable of ἀμήν is lengthened metri gratia. It is noticeable that the metre of both P. Amh. 2 and Berl. Klass. VI. vi. 8 is analogous, and the anapaestic measure thus seems to have been a favourite one with early Christian hymnologists in Egypt. Perhaps, as in the Berlin hymn, pairs of cola formed a system.

The musical notation is generally similar to that found in the rather earlier papyrus published by Schubart in Sitzungsber. preuss. Akad. 1918, pp. 763 sqq., the text of which has been revised and discussed by Th. Reinach in Revue Archéologique, 1919, pp. 11–27, and has been arranged in modern style by Prof. A. Thierfelder. The notes which can be recognized with certainty are eight, ρ φ σ ο ζ ι ζ ε. These all occur in the Diatonic Hypolydian key of Alypius, to which Reinach assigns also the Paean of the Berlin papyrus; that, however, is more probably to be regarded as in the Iastian key. As for the mode, there can be little doubt that it is the Hypophrygian or Iastian, as in the Epitaph of Seikilos and the Hymn to Nemesis of Mesomedes; cf. Gevaert, La mélopée antique, pp. 48 sqq. With regard to the character of the syllables and the corresponding notes, Reinach has observed that in the Berlin Paean a barytone syllable is always sung on a lower note than the succeeding accented final syllable, and that a circumflexed syllable has two notes at least. Neither of these observations holds in the case of 1786, and the former indeed can hardly be maintained of the Paean either. On the other hand, two notes are assigned to a short syllable in one instance at least (l. 4).

In addition to the notes five signs are used, all of which are found also in the Berlin papyrus. (1) A horizontal stroke is placed above notes attached to

1 Paean and Tekmessa (Leipzig), reviewed with severity by Schröder, Berl. Phil. Woch. xl. 354.
syllables which are long or scanned as such (for a possible exception see l. 2, n.).

(2) A curved stroke or hyphen, as in modern notation, is written below notes that are to be regarded as legato. (3) A symbol like a half-circle, written in the same line with the musical notes, is to be explained with Reinach as a form of \( \lambda \), a sign given by Bellermann’s Anonymus 102 and signifying a \( \chiρόνος \, κενὸς \) or rest. According to the same ancient authority the duration of the pause was increased by the addition of various marks of length, and in 1786, i.e. a double \( \chiρόνος \), is regularly used, whereas in the Berlin text the bare symbol only occurs. There are three instances of it (ll. 2, 3, 4) corresponding with the metrical divisions; a fourth which is expected at the end of l. 4 possibly stood at the beginning of l. 5. The purpose of (4) the colon (:), which is sometimes placed in front of a note or group of notes, is not very clear. Reinach (p. 14) says that this is peculiar to the instrumental portions of the Berlin papyrus, and regards it as a diastolé or sign of division between two cola. But the same sign is to be recognized more than once among the vocal notes of the Paean also, and in 1786 it has evidently nothing to do with the separation of cola. According to Thierfelder, l.c., it means two beats; at any rate, it probably affects the time in some way. (5) A single dot is frequently placed above the notes, and according to the anonymous authority cited above this means arsis: \( \cdot \, \muὲν \, ὃν \, \θέσις \, σημαίνεται, \, ὅταν \, ἁπλῶς \, τὸ \, σημεῖον \, ἀστίκτον \, · ... \, \cdot \, \, ἡ \, ἄρσις, \, ὅταν \, ἑστιγμένον \) (3, 85). Some critics have considered that in that passage the terms \( \θέσις \) and \( \, ἄρσις \) have become transposed, others, e.g. Blass, Bacchylides, p. 1 (so too Reinach, p. 6, n.), maintain its correctness. As Professor Stuart Jones observes, the fact that here, as in the Berlin papyrus, the symbol for the \( \chiρόνος \, κενὸς \) is dotted, looks like a confirmation of the latter view. Apart from this however, if the metre of 1786 is rightly regarded as anaepastic, the use of the dots seems for the most part to favour the hypothesis that they denote thesis, and they were so interpreted, plausibly enough, by Wessely in the Orestes fragment at Vienna (Mittheil. Pap. Erz. Rainer, v. 65 sqq.). The dot associated with the \( \chiρόνος \, κενὸς \) might possibly then be accounted for by catalexis. Unfortunately the Berlin papyrus throws little light on the problem, a consistent interpretation of the dots there having yet to be found. Schröder, Berl. Phil. Woch. xL 352, thinks that in the second of the fragments arsis is plainly meant. Both he and Thierfelder, who takes them to denote ictus, profess to distinguish two kinds of dot, a heavy and a light, but the distinction is probably imaginary.

A transcription in modern notation has been kindly supplied by Professor H. Stuart Jones.
ομον πασαι τε θεων λογιμοι
φασφορα λ[επ]ε
πασαι τε θεου λογιμοι πασαι υμνουν
των δε ημων
μονοι παντων αγαθων αμην αμην
σωτηρια μουν αμην αμην
1. Only slight vestiges of the musical notation are visible above this line.

2. προτατμο: the word is somewhat unexpected and the mark of length on the second syllable is a difficulty, but this may possibly be connected with the fact that the η has been corrected from ν. The occurrence of η for ει is common. To suppose that ηω = έω and that ταν = τήν or -τὴν is much more difficult.

3. Perhaps και ποταμων (sc. πηγαί, or something similar), with a preceding mention of the sea, but the uncertainties are too many for a convincing restoration. λε (or χε?) is followed by a vertical stroke suggesting γ or τ, and the doubtful r may be φ or ψ. ροθων is over an expunction.

4. A dot is probably to be restored above the notes on πνευ, the papyrus having been rubbed here. The dots on the notes from χ᾽ νυον to πνευμα are carried on in regular succession to those of the preceding words, as if there were no pause at νληρα. Another dot is most probably lost above the second syllable of the first άμην. A dot above the a of κατάρος (a little below the ν of ταυ in l. 3) is ignored in the transcription, since it is more to the right of the note η than usual and would also interrupt the sequence. The note η above a of δυναμεις is very uncertain. Δυναμεις is used of heavenly bodies (e.g. Matt. xxiv. 29 ai δ. τῶν οὐρανῶν: cf. also n. on l. 5) and sometimes of angels, but may here be quite general.

5. In the line of notes the second group : ο is very doubtfully deciphered; the upper dot of the supposed colon must be supposed to have disappeared, and the lower one is rather large. The vestiges might be regarded as a single letter, but they then suggest nothing but a rather unsatisfactory α, which does not occur elsewhere in the piece and would be extraneous to the mode. A dot may be lost above the mark of length and others above φοικ and the ι over the second syllable of δι[ο]ρ[ι]; the surface is a good deal rubbed hereabouts.

With regard to the text of l. 5, the scanty vestiges well suit μωρω, but δ[οι][φ] is highly doubtful, though some such word is demanded by the sense. In the preceding lacuna the musical notes indicate a loss of seven syllables, of which the last three were an anapaest. One more syllable at least, however, seems necessary for the metre, and it is perhaps just possible that a note is missing between : ι and : τ, where there is a rather broad space and the surface is not well preserved. Something like τιν καὶ αἰῶνας (or δύον καὶ αἰῶνας) διδομειν is wanted; cf. e.g. the eleventh prayer in the Greek morning service (Εὐχολόγιον τοῦ μέγα) ὅτι σε αἰνοῦι πάντας αἱ Δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀνασέσωμεν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἅγιῳ Πνεύματι νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. ἀμήν. The double ἀμήν at the end of the line appears to be extra metrum.
II. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1787. Sappho, Book iv.

Fr. 1 15.9 x 9.4 cm. Third century. Plate II
(Frs. 1 + 2, 9).

The authorship of the following fragments, being (with P. S. I. 123) the sixth distinct papyrus of Sappho so far obtained from Oxyrhynchus, is established by one certain and two other probable coincidences with lines previously extant; some isolated words attributed by Grammarians to Sappho also occur. To which of the available books among the nine of her lyrics they belonged is uncertain, but they may be assigned with some probability to the fourth. The metre is apparently the same throughout, a two-line strophe consisting of a repetition of the verse $\frac{1}{2}-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\nu$, which Hephaestion 64 describes as an Ionic a maiore tetrameter acatalectic, adding that it was called Αἰολικόν from its frequent use by Sappho, from whom he cites Frs. 76-7 as examples. Similar two-line strophes are described by Hephaest. 111, 116-17, according to whom Sappho's second and third books consisted entirely of such systems, Book ii containing poems in the Σαπφικὸν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκασύλλαβον (\(\frac{1}{2}-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\nu\): cf. Hephaest. 42), Book iii of the ἑκκαιδεκασύλλαβον (\(\frac{1}{2}-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\nu\): Hephaest. 60). Since the fifth book was of a different character, consisting partly, at any rate, if the Berlin fragments belonged to it, of poems in strophes of three lines, it seems that the only book to which the two-line strophes of 1787, which are entirely analogous to those of Books ii and iii, can be logically referred is Book iv. Perhaps this further resembled the two preceding books in the homogeneity of its contents; that supposition is not excluded by the fact that Hephaestion does not refer to Book iv in connexion with two-line strophes, and on the other hand accords both with his statement about the Aeolic tetrameter that Sappho πολλῷ αὐτῷ ἐχρῆσατο and with the not inconsiderable remains of the present papyrus. But it is of course quite possible that poems in similar metres (cf. e.g. Sapph. 60, 62) were also included.

Like most of the papyri from this find, 1787 has suffered severely, having been torn into quite small pieces, which have not fitted together very well. The difficulty of the task of reconstruction, in which Mr. Lobel has rendered valuable assistance, is much increased by the fact that the remains of this roll were found
together with a quantity of other lyric fragments in an identical hand. There is
a number of smaller pieces which cannot be assigned to one MS. or the other
with any approach to security, and in these circumstances it seemed advisable to
print here only such fragments as were shown by dialect or some other special
indication to belong to the Sappho. A revised text of P. Halle 2, the source of
which now becomes evident, is included for the sake of convenient reference.
That fragment was no doubt abstracted and sold by a dishonest workman;
script, metre, and date of acquisition all point to this conclusion.

The hand is a rapidly formed uncial of medium size and with a decided
slope; that of 1788 is in many respects very similar. Stops in the high
position occur, and accents, breathings, and marks of elision, quantity, and diaeresis
have been freely added, as usual in papyri of lyric poets. Acute accents are
sometimes so horizontal as to be barely distinguishable from marks of length.
Two rarer symbols are a mark similar in form and position to a comma, to divide
words (Fr. 8. 2), and the converse of this, a curved ligature below the line, which
connects the parts of a compound word in Fr. 9. 4. Paragraphi are employed to
mark off strophic couplets (cf. 1233. 1. ii) and a coronis to indicate the conclusion
of a poem. The few interlineations occurring seem all to proceed from the
original scribe, who may also be credited with at any rate many of the
diacritical signs.

Remains of eight poems at least can be distinguished, and the number
represented is no doubt considerably larger than this. It is noticeable that three
out of the four poems of which the initial letter has survived begin with E, but
the fact that in Fr. 3. ii E is succeeded by O, while not definitely excluding
an alphabetical arrangement, is certainly not in favour of it. Of the individual
pieces there is not much to be said, since their severe mutilation, except in one
or two cases, prevents the line of thought from being followed with precision, and
restoration cannot be attempted with any real chance of success. Fr. 1 gives the
ends of lines of a poem of some length in which Sappho dwells on the advance
of age and the inevitable approach of death, passing on to a declaration, in two
verses cited by Athenaeus, that to be desirable life must for her have the accom-
paniments of delicacy (ἁβροσύνη), splendour (τὸ λαμπρόν), and beauty (τὸ καλόν).
The second column of Fr. 3 included two complete poems, of six and five
couplets respectively, in the former of which several persons, perhaps the poet's
companions, were addressed, the other being an invocation, tantalizingly mutilated,
to sleep. In Fr. 4 Sappho herself is addressed by name, as in Sapph. 1 and 59
and Berl. Klassikertexte, V. xiii. 2. Fr. 6 is notable for a political reference, rare
in Sappho as common in Alcaeus. Apparently some one is reproached for
having chosen ‘friendship with the daughters of the house of Penthilus’, with
which the sweet song, the melody of birds, and the dewy leaves, spoken of in the following lines, are contrasted. The offender had perhaps been a member of the poet's circle, and is warned that she would no longer be welcome (l. 2, n.). Fr. 6
mentions Andromeda, a rival who is alluded to in several already extant fragments. In the small Frs. 33 and 34 further coincidences with previously known verses are probably to be recognized.

Fr. 2 (a).

\[\text{Δεσσα} [\text{πέρι} [\text{εικε} [\text{αλλα} . . . . . . αὐταν \]

\[\text{ια τι λ. . . . ]εισα } \]

\[\text{ένα ταν [ . . . ]αν ύμο . \]

\[\text{υι θ'αι στ[ι][μα[σι] πρόκυψιν } \]

\[\text{πων κάλα δωρα παίδες } \]

\[\text{δ' ϕιλ', άοιδον λιγύραν χελύνναν } \]

\[\text{πάμνας χροα γήρας ήδη } \]

\[\text{λεδκαί τ' εγένοντο τρίχες έκ μελαίναν } \]

\[\text{νυ γόνα δ' [ού φέροισι } \]

\[\text{ησθ' ίαν νεβώισιν } \]

\[\text{δ'λλα τ' κεν ποείν ; } \]

\[\text{ού δύνατον γένεσθαι } \]

\[\text{βροδόταιν α'ων } \]

\[\text{κατα γ'ας φέροισα } \]

\[\text{ου ύμως έμαρψε[ν } \]

\[\text{άταν άκοιτιν } \]

\[\text{φθ[ι]μεναν νομίσδει } \]

\[\text{αις όπάσδου } \]

\[\text{[έγω δε' φιλημ' αβροσύναν . . . . . ] τούτο και μοι } \]

\[\text{το λαμπρον ύρως δέλιο και το κάλλον λέ[λογχε} \]

\[\text{επιν[ } \]

\[\text{23 letters } \]

\[\text{φίλει . [ } \]

\[\text{και ν[} \]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS. PAPYRI.

Col. i.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Fr. 3.} & \quad \text{Col. ii.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Fr. 4.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[\ldots\ldots]} & \quad \text{[\ldots\ldots]} \\
\text{σίτῳ} & \quad \text{σωμακ} \\
\text{[\ldots\ldots]} & \quad \text{[\ldots\ldots]} \\
\text{ρομέ} & \quad \text{[\ldots\ldots]} \\
\text{[\ldots\ldots]} & \quad \text{[\ldots\ldots]} \\
\text{δελαστ} & \quad \text{[\ldots\ldots]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Fr. 5.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[\ldots\ldots]} & \quad \text{[\ldots\ldots]} \\
\end{align*}
\]
1787. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Col. i.

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

Fr. 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Επτάξατε [ ]</th>
<th>δάφνας ὄτα [ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Col. ii.

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

Fr. 4.

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

Fr. 5.

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |

| [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] |
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 6.

τομὴ ημείας

τελαὶ . . . . ηὰς ἑγωνυκεάσω

[πυρωτός . . ἕλεονυθῆληγίς

[δακός . . . ]γροπελαμοὶ

5 [μελ. . . . ]γυλύκερον . [αμελλιχοφόροι

βελιγυμαίζαν[η[δρος[.]εσσα[...

Fr. 8.

[αθανά[ερας[τὸν [εδοισί[θ[θειειε[αι[αγινη[θακ[...

ouμανεφιλη[νυν[ἐννεκα[

tονἀιτιονουτ[ουδενπόλιε[ [. . . .

Fr. 7.

[γάρμπ[απτασ[μωσθ[ισανθεοισιν[

[δρομεδαρ[. . . [

5 [τα . . . κα[ρὸπος[]

[ηροφοκατιο[τυνδίαθ[19 [χαρίεντ'α[. [ηκέτισυ[

. . . . . . . α[. . . . α[...

Fr. 9. Plate II.

[οδέρκεντωμοσ[[νέτυτανπαίδαθ[β[.][ανκάυχερρίθ[. [ει[. . . . ]παρε[...
5 Ἡπέφοι, οὐ διὰ
Κύπρος β[α]σίλικα,
καὶ τοῖς μέγα δῖ
[ὁ]σοι διὰ Φαέθων
πάντας κλέος [5]
10 καὶ σοί ἔνν Ἀχέρ[οντος
ρ[...]]ν[π]

Fr. 6.
] σὸν Μίκα
ιελα[...]. ἀλλὰ σοὶ ἐγὼ'ν εἶσον
[ν] μιλότ[ατ] ἕλεος Πενθιλ[άν
]τα κα[κό]ρροπ' ἀμο[σ
5 ] μέλ[ος] το γλύκερον .[
]α μελιχόφωνος
ἀπε[δει]λν Λύκερροι δ' ἄπ[δοι
] δροο[δ]εσσα[ι]

Fr. 7.
? καὶ γὰρ ὃς απ' τῶν [5
] ὄμος δ'[.
] ἵσαν θεόισιν
] ἀσαν ἀλτρα[.
] τὰ... κα
] τρόπον δι[.
] ορρον οὐ κατίοσ[χ
] Τυνδαρίδαι[;
] χαρίεντ' α...[
] ο[η][κέτι συν[
] . α[...];]

Fr. 8.
] ἄθανατ[τ
]ἐρα σε[;
]λον
]έδουσιν [5
]αθεῖσεν[;
]αγίνη[;
]μακ[;

Fr. 9.
]οδέρκεν ἐπώμοσσ[ι
]ν ἂτι: τὰν παῖδα δὲ [5
]άβρ[ό]ταν καὶ χεριβ[;
]ε[...]. .] παρε[;
Fr. 10.

34

Fr. 11.

Fr. 12.

Fr. 13.

Fr. 14.

Fr. 15.

Fr. 16.

Fr. 17.
Fr. 10.

\[ \eta \eta \ ουθε[ \]
\[ \eta \ η \ μερ[ \]
\[ \eta \ η \ δαμα[ \]
\[ 5 \ \ άνθος\[ \]
\[ \ ιμερον \]
\[ \ ιητερπ[ \]
\[ \ \]

Fr. 11.

\[ \ ιβμ\[ \]
\[ \ \]
\[ \ ια \]
\[ \ α\[ \]
\[ \ δ\[ \]
\[ \ άλλοι \]
\[ \ α\[ \]
\[ \ ένα \ θαάσο\[ \]
\[ \ άλλε\[ \]
\[ \ έρρυα\[ \]
\[ \]

Fr. 12.

\[ \ ομπι \]
\[ \ ηέσειβ \]
\[ \ η λελά\[ \]
\[ \ έ \ θέλα[ \]
\[ \ \]

Fr. 13.

\[ \ αμαλ\[ \]
\[ \ να\[ \]
\[ \ νδ' \ ειμ' \ ε[ \]
\[ \ ορομέν[ \]
\[ 5 \ \]
\[ \ άμικ' \ \]
\[ \ \]
\[ \ \]

Fr. 14.

\[ \ αμμ\[ \]
\[ \ ι θαά[ \]
\[ \ ποιο\[ \]
\[ \ εσ \ δ' \ αμαι[ \]
\[ \ άνθρωπ[ \]
\[ \ \]
\[ \ \]

Fr. 15.

\[ \ ομπι \]
\[ \ πάντα[ \]
\[ \ \]
\[ \ \]

Fr. 17.

\[ \ \]
\[ \ \]
\[ \ \]

Fr. 16.

\[ \ ν \ αίσχρ[ \]
\[ \ \]

Fr. 18.

\[ \ \]
\[ \ \]

D 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 18.</th>
<th>Fr. 19.</th>
<th>Fr. 20.</th>
<th>Fr. 21.</th>
<th>Fr. 22.</th>
<th>Fr. 23.</th>
<th>Fr. 24.</th>
<th>Fr. 25.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὐδὲ[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>αὶ[</td>
<td>αὶ[</td>
<td>πι[</td>
<td>κατ[</td>
<td>τα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταῦτα[</td>
<td>θύρα[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>εἷ[</td>
<td>σεδ[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαίσμῳ[</td>
<td>οἰχάλετ[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλὴρῳ[</td>
<td>δεκ[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αμφ[</td>
<td>οποπάλην[</td>
<td>σθεο[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔρωσ[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 26.</th>
<th>Fr. 27.</th>
<th>Fr. 28.</th>
<th>Fr. 29.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τα[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>αμο[</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σετα[</td>
<td>μητ[</td>
<td>αμμα[</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μμαυ[</td>
<td>διασάα[</td>
<td>ντε[</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ετεχα[.]ρο[</td>
<td>σο-αλ[</td>
<td>λη[</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>νιάν[</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διδύοισ[</td>
<td>φρα[</td>
<td>τε[</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεναμ[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>μάστε[</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐλονα[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰδ[</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI**
1787. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 18. Fr. 19. Fr. 20.

Col. i. Col. ii.

\(\ldots\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\)

\[\ldots\phi\] \[\ldots\]

\[\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\] \[\ldots\theta\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\]

\[\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\mum][\] \[\ldots\chi\alpha\le\nu\pi\]

\[\pi\lambda\eta\omicron\nu\] \[\ldots\delta\epsilon\kappa\eta\]

\(5\) \(\ldots\alpha\mu\phi\)

\(\ldots\sigma\theta\eta\omicron\omega\nu\)

Fr. 21. Fr. 22. Fr. 23. Fr. 24. Fr. 25.

\(\alpha\omicron\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\)

\[\alpha\omicron\] \[\ldots\]

\[\pi\] \[\ldots\]

\[\dot{\epsilon} \gamma\] \[\ldots\]

\[\phi\] \[\ldots\]

\[\dot{\epsilon} \alpha\] \(5\) \(\tau\)

Fr. 26. Fr. 27. Fr. 28. Fr. 29.

\(\ldots\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\)

\[\ldots\] \[\ldots\] \[\ldots\] \[\ldots\]

\[\alpha\omicron\] \[\ldots\] \[\lambda\] \[\ldots\]

\[\sigma\eta\tau\alpha\] \[\ldots\] \[\dot{\nu}\eta\] \[\ldots\]

\[\mu\mu\alpha\nu\] \[\ldots\] \[\dot{\nu}\eta\dot{i}\delta\iota\alpha\omega\alpha\] \[\ldots\]

\[\dot{\epsilon}\] \[\chi\alpha\iota\epsilon\rho\omicron\] \[\ldots\] \[\dot{\epsilon}\] \[\chi\alpha\iota\epsilon\rho\omicron\] \[\ldots\]

\(5\) \[\ldots\] \[\phi\rho\alpha\] \[\ldots\] \[\tau\epsilon\] \[\ldots\]

\[\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\] \[\ldots\] \[\mu\nu\omega\] \[\ldots\]

\[\iota\sigma\sigma\nu\gamma\omicron\] \[\ldots\] \[\mu\omega\] \[\ldots\]

\[\iota\alpha\omicron\alpha\] \[\ldots\] \[\ldots\] \[\ldots\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Text</th>
<th>Transcribed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 30.</td>
<td>Fr. 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰεριμνα[</td>
<td>Ἰσθην[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. ko[</td>
<td>.. κι[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. ai[</td>
<td>.. κι[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 32.</td>
<td>Fr. 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. [</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 34.</td>
<td>Fr. 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ[</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μηθεν[</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νυνδʼαι[</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μηβολλε[</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. [</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 37.</td>
<td>Fr. 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. [</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. [</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. [</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 40.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. [</td>
<td>.. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 30</td>
<td>Fr. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ]εριμνα[</td>
<td>σθην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]γην</td>
<td>] . σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . κο[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]αι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>] ἀπόθεσθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]χιστα λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[οὐ δὲ στεφάνοις, ὁ Δίκα, περθέσ[θ' ἐράταις φόβαισιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [δρπακας ἀνήτω (?) συναέρραιται [ἀπάλαιοι χέρσιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 34</th>
<th>Fr. 35</th>
<th>Fr. 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τ' ε[</td>
<td></td>
<td>] aίτ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μηδεν[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>]λ' αδθι με[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νυν δ' α[</td>
<td>] άδ[</td>
<td>] νύμθθ' ο[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μη βόλλε[ο</td>
<td>] ν</td>
<td>] δητρ' επιτ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>] εν [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 37</th>
<th>Fr. 38</th>
<th>Fr. 39</th>
<th>Fr. 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]ων κ[</td>
<td>] πε[πάμενα[</td>
<td>] οι πλυ[</td>
<td>] . ι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>)τον ὀνεο[</td>
<td>] τ' ὠστ' ὁ πέλη[ος ?</td>
<td>]τετοκω[</td>
<td>] ἀνο[λθον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δφροσετιχά</td>
<td>Ολκανε [</td>
<td>Μπ'ά[</td>
<td>Ακολήν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 41.</td>
<td>Fr. 42.</td>
<td>Fr. 43.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιαν[</td>
<td>Κλα[</td>
<td>δω [</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αεκτ[</td>
<td>Ψό [</td>
<td>τόλμ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Να[</td>
<td>Εσ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δοσ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Μυ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 44 = P. Halle 2 (Dikaiomata, pp. 182 sqq.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ορχοσα</th>
<th>Δελ'ωνταπίσαν[</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Εσοννημα [</td>
<td>Ετωνκαλημ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 Πεδαθυμοναίψα[ | Σατυχηνθηληση[
| Πεμομαχοχσθα[ | Αδαναιπιθεισα[ |
| Συνθευγαρισθα | Ετειταίλλε |
| Ελασ[ | |

Fr. 45.

| Με[ | Χαπ[ |

Frs. 1+2. 8. The end of this line is difficult. Either ὄν or ἂν may be read, and the letter following ὄν has a rounded base which, if the line is to scan, seems consistent only
Fr. 41.  

Fr. 42.  

Fr. 43.  

Fr. 44 = P. Halle 2.  

Fr. 45.  

Σαπφοὺς  
μείλων ὀ?  

with σ or θ. The division Ἰάνυσον σ is thus suggested, but neither σε nor σο[ι] is satisfactory, though perhaps there has been some alteration.
9. στ[ὐ]μα[τι] or στ[ύ]μα[σι] appears inevitable; the latter suits the size of the lacuna the better of the two. πρόκοψις as a synonym of προκοπὴ has not occurred previously. Cf. Alc. 35. 2.

11. χελύνναν is gen. plur.; cf. 1231. 14. 8, n. For χελύννα cf. Orion 28. 15 (Sapph. 169) ὠς παρὰ Σαπφοὶ χελύννα χελύνη, where χελύννα should now be restored. The doubled ν is perhaps to be recognized also in Babrius 115. 4.

12. The words χρόα γῆρας ἤδη occurred at the end of a Sapphic line in 1231. 10. 6; cf. l. 17, where there is a similar doublet of 1231. 1. i. 33, and Fr. 7. 3. Either Sappho was rather forgetful, or she did not mind repeating herself.


17. Cf. note on l. 12 above. With regard to the accent of γίνεσθαυ, the remark of Wilamowitz, Sappho and Simonides, p. 99, is mistaken, the original edition of 7. 6 being correct, and the appearance in the facsimile of an accent on the second syllable being due, as stated by Mr. Lobel, who has recollated the original, to a displaced fibre. There is therefore no conflict with 1238. 8. 4 λάθεϊ σθαι, and the note on 1231. 1. i. 33-4 is to be amended accordingly.

18–19. The idea here may well be that old age follows youth as inevitably as night the dawn (ἢ νὺξ κατὰ ναῦς φέροις: the participial clause might be applied to νῦς as symbolizing death). a of φεροισα was probably the final letter of the line, but the surface of the papyrus is damaged.

21. Perhaps ἐρίταταν, or a superlative, e. g. κεδνοτάταταν. But the reference remains in doubt.

24–5. These two verses are quoted by Athen. xv. 687 Α (= Sapph. 79) καίτοι Σαπφώ, γενὴ μὲν πρὸς άλήθειν φόντα καὶ φαύνη, ὡς άληθεὶς τὸ καλὸν τὴν ἀδρότητος ἀδελφὴν λέγοντα δέ τις φίλημα ἀδροσῶν καὶ μοι τὸ λάμπρον ἔρως (v. l. εἰς) ἄδροι καὶ τὸ κάλλων λέοχυς, φανερὸν ποιώνα πάνω ἄδρον Κορῆ ὡς τὸν ζῴον ἐπιθυμία τὸ λαμπρόν καὶ τὸ κάλλων εἴχαν (ἢ εἴληχα) αὐτῇ. ταῦτα δ᾽ ἐστὶν οἰκεῖα τῆς ἀρετῆς. Various attempts at restoration have been made, but, as is now seen, Blass alone was right in marking a lacuna after ἀδροσῶν and in taking τὸ λάμπρον . . . λέοχυς as a complete verse, in which the only alteration needed is ἔρως δέλει (so Blass: cf. Fr. 11. 4 ἐβλεποντος δ᾽ ἐρωτεθεν (ἢ) ἔρως τὸ ἄδρον. In the preceding verse there are five syllables to be supplied after ἀδροσῶν, of which the two last are τοῦτο. How the lacuna remaining, a dactyl of about 6 letters, should be filled is not obvious. If τοῦτο = τὸ ἀδρόν, this was perhaps preceded by an adverb qualifying φίλημα, e. g. ἐξομηλικά, ἄδρον ἄλλ' ἐτι, or a predicate of τοῦτο, as ἄδρον γε. The papyrus may of course have agreed with Athen. in the spelling φίλημα, but καλὴμ is written in Fr. 44. 4.

That the small fragment containing the beginnings of ll. 25–9 is rightly placed can hardly be doubted. The fact that l. 28 is the last of a column helps to confirm the coincidence of the letters τολα[ in l. 25.

Fr. 2(a). This fragment has been included on account of its similarity on both sides to the upper part of Fr. 1; but that it belongs here is not certain.

Fr. 3. ii. 4. ἄδρον: or Δάρενα?

6. A dot in front of the line seems meaningless and may be accidental.

11. It does not seem possible to read ταῦνα, as demanded by the metre. For the spelling with ε, which seems to be the regular form in the papyri when the first syllable is short, cf. 1231. 14. 4, 1233. 2. ii. 5, &c.

13. For the small marginal cross cf. Fr. 35. ii. 6 and 841. introd.

NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1787.

16. e. g. ἑκταχήθη βλεφάρωσι λάθαν or ἓλθε σφι' ἀμμή κατά δὴ καλύψῃ.
18. τὸ κάθως ἔχην: the tmesis is indicated in the papyrus by the accentuation.
20. νι' or χι' may be read in place of λι'.
21. οὐ is more suitable than ἔν or αὐ. The accent on γάρ points to κ᾽ ἔοι, not κέον.

Fr. 4. 2. Possibly Ἀνδρομέδα, whose name recurs again in Fr. 7. 5; as Lobel observes, Aristid. ii. 508 οἶμαι δὲ σὲ καὶ Σαπφοῖς ἀκούσας... λεγοῦσας, ὥς αὖθιν αἰ εἰ μοῦνα τῷ ὀς ἄλλων τῇ καὶ ἔρροσην ἐποίησαν, καὶ ὥς ὑπὸ ἀποθανοῦσης ἑτοι λήθη might perhaps be brought into connexion with ll. 5 sqq.

4. The vestiges of the fourth letter are consistent with ζ, ζ, or τ, but no satisfactory restoration suggests itself.

6. Below the remains of the initial κ there is a spot of ink which might well be the extremity of a paragraphus, but this would be out of place unless indeed these lines were in a different metre. A paragraphus may have disappeared below l. 7, as there is little left of the κ at the beginning of the line.

9. The supposed acute accent on the first θ is particularly badly formed, the right-hand extremity being turned downwards; but it is difficult to see what else can be meant.

10. For the doubled ν of ἔν cf. e. g. 1233. 2. ii. 8, 1280. 1. 10. μελάθροισιν, δομοῖσιν; or Some synonym may be supplied.

Fr. 5. 3. ὀλοφίώιος, which must be scanned as a quadrisyllable, is suggested as accounting more naturally for the correction of the accent than e. g. any part of ὀλοφυδνός.

7. ε. [...] perhaps ε᾽.

Fr. 6. 1. Μίκα seems best taken as a proper name, especially as σμίκρος or μίκρος is well attested for the Lesbian poets (Sapph. 34, 1233. 24. 2, 1234. 6. 8). Μίκα is given by the Ravennas in Aristoph. Thesm. 760, and Μίκα is not infrequent. It is tempting to regard Μίκα as the name of the person addressed, but the accent is against this, since Μίκα would be expected on the analogy of Sapph. 1. 1 Ἀφρόδιτα, 78. 1 Δίκα (cf. Choerob. In Heph. c. 14). To disregard the accent in a passage so defective is unjustifiable, and Μίκα may be the name of a third party: ‘Mica wishes to bring you here, but I will not receive you’. σὲ can hardly be Sappho herself, with a different second person in the next line.

2. εγνύκ is analogous to e. g. 1231. 1. 1. 23 εμνάσθ᾽ αἶλλα ἡλια'[λια], 1234. 1. 11 πῶσλον. The practice of making the written text represent the number of spoken syllables may be mistaken, but it is not ‘modern’ (Wilamowitz, Sappho und Simonides, p. 82).

3. The mark of length on the a indicates that Πενθιλήαν is fem. gen. plur., in agreement with some such word as παιδών; cf. Frs. 1+2. 11 n., and for the adj. Πενθιλήας, 1234. 6. 10.

4. καὶ κατήρον' seems probable, though the letters aκo must have been rather spread out to fill the lacuna. λ or χ might be read in place of a.

6. Cf. Aristaenetus i. 10 (Sapph. 129) αἱ μουσικώτεραι τῶν παρθένων καὶ μελίχφωνοι (L. μελλίχ.) τοῦτο δὲ Σαπφοῦς τὸ ἡδίστον φθέγμα. The form μελίφωνος ascribed to Sappho in the similar passage Philostr. lm. ii. 1 should now disappear until otherwise attested.


Fr. 7. 3. Cf. Sapph. 2. 4 ἵσος θέασαι.

4. ἀλίτρη: a very small speck on the edge of the papyrus after the second a, if it is ink, may be a medial stop, or, possibly, a vestige of e. g. a final ν. The fem. ἀλίτρη occurs in Semonides 7. 7, and cf. Fr. 32. 2 below.

5. For Ἀνδρομέδαν cf. Sapph. 41. 58.
6. There are perhaps only two letters, e.g. μα or να, between ια and κα.
8. Not μαρολ.
12. Probably μυ or μα. The overwritten letters enclosed between dots are variants added by the original hand.

Fr. 8. 3. The supposed mark of length may be an acute accent.

Fr. 9. This fragment is composed of two pieces, the combination of which seems certain, although l. 1 is difficult and l. 3 must be emended in order to scan. The points of junction are, l. 1 ειπ, l. 2 πα, l. 3 καν.
1. ἀδέκεν is puzzling. Ñ is more probable than y, which is the only alternative and also difficult to interpret. If eiω is right, the ω was rather smaller than usual, but eiω is not more attractive.
3. ἐθεργεταί: or ἐμφατομενοι.

Fr. 10. 5. The high stop is not certain, being on the edge of the papyrus; it might be the vestige of a letter.

Fr. 11. 4. ἐφορτε: cf. Frs. 1+2. 24-5, n., and Himerius i. 4 είς νυμφεῖαν ἄγετ (sc. Σαμφάδ) καὶ Ἀφροδίτην (cf. l. 3) ἔφη ἀματι καὶ ἐφ᾽ ἅρματι Χαρίτων καὶ χορὸν Ἐρώτων συμπαίστορα. ἐραυταί or ἐφορτε are other possibilities.

Fr. 12. 6. The remains of the first letter suit ζ better than anything else, but ςδ would be expected, and η or ει is perhaps admissible. In the following word it is not clear whether the vestige above α represents a mark of short or of long quantity.

Fr. 13. 4. The first letter may be ρ or ο instead of ρ.
8. The letter before the lacuna was apparently either ε or σ, not α.
10. δή: δῆ seems to be excluded.

Fr. 14. 4. If κλέωδει is one word, the fragment must be from near the ends of lines; but the division κλέω δοι (δ᾽ ον ?) is possible.
5. e.g. λ, ψ.

Fr. 15. 1. α, ρ, v may be read in place of τ.
3. ἐκπορος for ἐκπορος had already occurred in 424. 9. The interlinear insertion may be by the original scribe.

Fr. 18. 2. λ before the lacuna is only one of several possibilities, e.g. δ, ν.
4. An acute has been substituted for a circumflex accent; cf. e.g. Frs. 5. 3, 19. 3.

Fr. 19. 2. The mark like a sign of elision is possibly a diastolé, which is sometimes (e.g. 1789), though not elsewhere in 1787, placed above the line.
4. Though the papyrus is partially preserved after κυ, all trace of writing has disappeared.

Fr. 21. The width of the space above l. 1 suggests that this fragment, like 22 and 23, came from the top of a column, but is hardly sufficient to prove it.

Fr. 23. 4. The right-hand tip of the paragraphus is expected to be visible below this line, but the paragraphi are sometimes rather short.

Fr. 26. 3. α or ρ can be read in place of ν; ν also is very uncertain.
5. For the alteration of accent cf. e.g. Fr. 18. 4. The second acute could be read as a circumflex.

7. The supposed mark of length is placed low and may be the tip of the cross-bar of a τ.

Fr. 27. 3. There is a short blank space after a, which perhaps ended the line.

6. The accent is very doubtful.

Fr. 29. 4. Ἡμω is a gen. plur.; cf. Frs. 1 + 2. 11, n.

Fr. 32. 1. The letters of this line are distinctly smaller than those of ll. 2–3.

Frs. 33–43. This group of fragments is distinguished by being more discoloured and rubbed than the rest. Frs. 41–3 have been included on account of their resemblance to the larger pieces.

Fr. 33. 4–5. The identification of these two verses with Sapph. 78. 1–2, though probable, is in consequence of the damaged condition of l. 5 hardly certain; however, the remains suit ἡς[ quite well, and the preceding acute accent is just in the right place if ἐρμαω was written.

Fr. 34. 1. καὶ τ᾽: or καὶτι(ο). 5, if rightly read, probably = Sapph. 76, from Hephaest. 64, Εὐμορφοτέρα Μναιδίκα τᾶς ἀπαλάς Ρομίννως. Unfortunately the letters are broken, the first and fifth especially being doubtful; the latter might well be ε, o in this hand being generally, though not always, smaller. Since the margin is lost it remains possible that, as maintained by Bergk, the line was the first of a poem (it is perhaps worth noting that the initial letter is again E; cf. int., p. 27) There is also a possibility, so far as the papyrus is concerned, that P. Halle 2. 1, which may = Sapph. 77, immediately succeeded.

Fr. 36. 4. It is not clear whether the accent on δηφὲ is circumflex or acute, but the former is in accordance with 1231. 15. 3.

5. For ἠδέ cf. 1288. 4. 2; this in conjunction with the accented ε makes τ(ε) likely.

6. καὶ[ : or καὶ[.

Fr. 38. 2. πέλη[ is possibly for πέλειος, 'dark'; cf. πέλεια.

Fr. 39. 1. A very small vestige after ν is consistent with ν.

Fr. 40. 1. The doubtful ε was perhaps the final letter of the line.

2. A compound is indicated by the grave accent, and ἄνολβον by the metre.

4. αὐταν or ταυταν.

Fr. 41. 5. There is no trace of ink below this line, which was perhaps the last of a column.

Fr. 44 = P. Halle 2. The revised text printed is based on the facsimile (Tafel 8) accompanying the original edition, but photographs are apt to be deceptive, and a satisfactory revision can only be made by means of the actual papyrus. The reprint in Diehl, Supplementum lyricum, p. 43, adds nothing material. That the interlinear signs are, of course, the ordinary accents, marks of quantity, &c., and have nothing to do with musical notation has been pointed out by Hunt, Year's Work, 1913, p. 78, and Wessely, Wochenschr. f. klass. Phil. 30. 669.

1. This line, which is the first of a column, may possibly, as the edd. say, = Sapph. 77, but apart from the doubt as to the reading there, τίχωσα is hardly enough for an identifica-
tion; cf. n. on Frs. 1+2, 12 above. Moreover, ll. 2-6 rather suggest an invocation to a deity.

2. Ἰθέλὠώνἀπάισᾶν, Ἰθέλων τὰ παισᾶν edd.; but the facsimile shows clearly an acute accent on ε and suggests an elision mark after λ. δῆλον thus seems assured, and όντι can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as ὀντί, the retracted accent replacing the circumflex, as elsewhere in papyri (cf. e.g. 223. int.). Hence the last word will be either ἀπαίσαν or ἀπαίσαν, according as the accent or the mark of quantity on the final α is accepted; ἀπαίσαν acc. fem. would conflict with other evidence.

3. Ἰεσον edd. If, however, the facsimile may be trusted, a vestige of the letter preceding ε is visible, indicating δ or λ. For τέλεσον cf. Sapph. r. 26-7 οὔσα δὲ μου τελέσσαμι θύμος ἑαυτῶν τέλεσων. 7. 3-4. Alc. 77 Ζείκ τελέση νόμα.

6. ὅσα: cf. e.g. Sapph. r. 26 quoted in the preceding note; ονα edd.

7. ἰπτέσσα edd., who note that δ is possible.

8. πίθεισα: cf. 1238. 2, ii. 20 πίθεις. ἀπίθεισα edd.

9. τά. Ἀδ. edd., but ἃ obviously cannot be correct, and the facsimile shows that the circumflex over ε, and hardly justifies πεῴ, the letters being too small and crowded. Apparently γαρ σώθα is quite possible, as well as ἤ in front of ον. ἰλλ. Ἀλ. edd., but ἃ obviously cannot be correct, and the facsimile shows that the circumflex over ε, and hardly justifies πεoubted, the letters being too small and crowded. Apparently γαρ σώθα is quite possible, as well as ἤ in front of ον. ἰλλ. Ἀλ. edd., but ἃ obviously cannot be correct, and the facsimile shows that the circumflex over ε, and hardly justifies πεوء, the letters being too small and crowded. Apparently γαρ σώθα is quite possible, as well as ἤ in front of ον. ἰλλ. Ἀλ. edd., but ἃ obviously cannot be correct, and the facsimile shows that the circumflex over ε, and hardly justifies πεوء, the letters being too small and crowded. Apparently γαρ σώθα is quite possible, as well as ἤ in front of ον. ἰλλ. Ἀλ. edd., but ἃ obviously cannot be correct, and the facsimile shows that the circumflex over ε, and hardly justifies πεوء, the letters being too small and crowded. Apparently γαρ σώθα is quite possible, as well as ἤ in front of ον. ἰλλ. Ἀλ. edd., but ἃ obvious
are guaranteed by the dialect have as a rule been printed. The non-Aeolic pieces probably come from the same roll as 1604, and are reserved for a future volume; they are much broken and of no great extent.

No coincidence has been discovered in 1788 with the extant remains either of Sappho or Alcaeus, and other clear proofs of authorship are absent. The metrical evidence, however, favours Alcaeus, and style, so far as an opinion can be formed from fragments so badly mutilated, points also in his direction. The best piece is Fr. 15, containing in the second column the first five stanzas of an Alcaic poem which are sufficiently well preserved to be more or less intelligible and include a few complete or easily completed lines. This poem, addressed to a person whose name does not occur, is apparently of a hortatory character, and contains an elaborate metaphor from a vine which promised a bountiful crop but might yet yield sour grapes. An appeal in the last stanza to past example is rather in the manner of Alcaeus; cf. 1234. 2. ii. 12, 1789. I. ii. 7–8. Frs. 1 and 3 are in Asclepiads, a metre evidently used by Alcaeus with some frequency. Fr. 1 gives a description of a natural scene (cf. Alc. 84, 1233. 3. 8 sqq.)—a pleasant picture of cool water running down from the hills to the vineyards and of green reeds rustling in the breezes of spring. Fr. 2 may for the most part be in the same metre, but 1. 10 ends like a hexameter (cf. e.g. Alc. 45–6), and the beginning of a new poem is perhaps to be marked at that point; the metre of Fr. 2. 10 sqq. may well recur in Fr. 7. Fr. 4, a long strip containing parts of as many as 40 consecutive lines, is in places rubbed and difficult to decipher. The metre of much of this was apparently again Asclepiad, but the lower portion shows rhythms of a different character. Asclepiads are also likely in Frs. 11 and 14 and possible in some others. Fr. 12. ii, from the end of a poem, seems to have consisted of 4-line stanzas which were neither Alcaic nor Sapphic.
Fr. 1.

[... ]léγάνθεουσας[  
[. ] . ἤθεσα'απυλίμνασσολ[  
[. ] . ἀνεκκορφάνοντοποδένε[  
[. ] . ἰάκανψύχρωμαδόμπελ[  
5 [... ] . ἰακαλαμοσχλῶρ[  
[. ] . ἰάδεσηρυμον,ον[  
[. ] . ἰαλεφάνηςκαδδ[  
[ . 18 letters ] ]

Fr. 2.

[. ]μωνις[  
[. ] . ἰτατε[  
[. ] . πνείπη[  
5 . ἰαναιδεκ[  
[. ]σ[  
τωγα]]ρ[ . οτρόμμε[  
[. ] . ἵπτογενημομελαιμ[  
10 ]μπριακαντα αὐτησαποτου. [  
[ . ] . ἰλίτως[  
[. ] . ὀλβονδρ[  
. 10 ][. ] . τ[  
. ][. ] . π[  
. ][. ] . κα[  

Fr. 3.

[. ]χευ[  
. ] . ευετω ταυτατ[  
. ] . ἅνεσαμοτ[  
5 . ἰεται[  
. ] . ἱνακέας[  
. ] . ἱσσ[  

Fr. 4.

. ] . ετυ[  
. ] . τασερη[  
. ] . ἰμερτονορη[
Fr. 1.

[. . ? π]λεξάνθιδος ἱππ[π]
[ὀρ]νίθεσιν ἀπὸ λίμνας πολ[π]
[ά]κραν ἐκ κορύφαν ὑπὸ ὁμόθεν ἐ[π]
[γ]λαύκαν ψῦχρον ὕδωρ ἀμπελ[α]

5 [. . . . . .]αν κάλαμος χλῶρ[ο]
[. . . . . .]η]άδεις ἥμισυ δὴν [π]
[. . . . . .]η]η]εφάννυ καθ[α]
[. . . . . .] 18 letters [π]

Fr. 2.

]μ]π[σι[
]τ[ε] πὲ τὸ τε [. [π]
]τι[π]νε[ή][π]
5 [. . . . . .]α]ν[
]τις ὁ με[τ]. . . [λα[π]
]τὸ γάς (?) ἀρτρώμμε[π]

ν[. . . . . .]ο[ν] τὸ γένηθν μέλαις ἐμ[εναί][π]
10 [. . . . . .]μ[ῦ[ρια] πάντα αὐτῆ ἀπὸ τοῦ[π]

Fr. 3.

]χ[ε[ι[π]

5 [. . . . . .]ε[λευθέρα[π]
]μ[εν[π]
]

Fr. 4.

]. [. ἐ[τι[π]
]τ[ασ ἐπ[η[π]
]ἐμερτον ὅρ[η[π]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

5 |υφοδυτίης[ |

10 |σάγαθος-τα[ |

15 |μιοραί[ |

20 |ν. ασδ'ουγαρέγω[ |

25 |παλισκυμ'αλ[ |

30 |άντω[ |
κ]ούφω δ᾽ ὑπίησ[ιν

5  ]δα[...]ες π[αί]δας ἀπ[]
   ]...[ αὐς κολοκύνταις ὑπα[]
   [στασ[...].]ο[...[ α[...] α[...] απαλ[]
   ...[ α'[...].]δ᾽ ὑπ[]
   [αναφα...[ ]

10  ]...[ αγαθος[...[ τα[...]
   [θάμα πω[...].[ ]
   ]...[ εν με[...].]η...[ ]
   ]α[ ]
   [λιον α[...] ]

15  ]...[ ν[...] κερ[...][ ]
   γάρ [ρ[...].]αισ[...][ ]
   ]...[ ε[...] ες τ᾽ δ[...][ ]
   ]...[ τε[...].]χ...[ ]
   ]...[ νάα πο[...] ]

20  ]...[ ν[...] ασθ᾽ ου γάρ ἐγω[ ]
   ἐ[...]πόνησας κατὰ[ ]
   ]...[ ε[...] καὶ πόλλα χαρισ[ ]
   ]θοίς, τοίς δ᾽ ὑπίσω[ ]
   ]ται: π[...]σύνα δ᾽ ὅκ[...][ ]

25  ]...[ πολίας κύμ᾽ ἀλ[...]ς[...][ ]
   ]...[ ε[...] τούτο νούκ ὀίδειν, ἐνοιπ[ ]
   ]αισιν ὁμίλλει τὰ δεῖν θ[ ]
   ]...[ αὕτῳ[...].]ο[...] χρήματος[ ]
   ]κ[...]...[...] ὀλομέν[ ]

30  ]...[ των τευ. ηδε[ ]
   ]κάκων ἐσχατ[ ]
   ]...[ ψύχαν ἄκατ[ ]
   ]...[ ν᾽ ἐ δ᾽ ὀδ[...] ἐσο[...][ ]
   ]...[ δ᾽ ἄλλος[...].]ε[...][ ]

35  ]εραι, γα[ ]
   ]ψυχρ[...]ν[ ]
   ]μμεν[...].[ ]
   ]...[ α[...].]τ[...]ο[...] ω[...][ ]
   ]θαδ[...]το δοκ[...][ ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 6.</th>
<th>Fr. 7.</th>
<th>Fr. 8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἰατονή</td>
<td>ἀέρρανῆ</td>
<td>ἐλκεά</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 9.</th>
<th>Fr. 10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἰγαμῖ</td>
<td>ἔοντί</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 11.</th>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἰόμεν Ἱμενοῖ</td>
<td>ΡΛ, ὩΣ</td>
<td>αὐτόν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τοῦτο' ἔγω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 13.</th>
<th>Fr. 14.</th>
<th>Fr. 15. Col. i. Plate II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[λοισ]</td>
<td>[σοσεται]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[μιονα]</td>
<td>[τατος]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[νονα]</td>
<td>[. πάθην]</td>
<td>[.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ἐπου]</td>
<td>[αισομεν]</td>
<td>[.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[πόλλακ]</td>
<td>[10 πόλλυμ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 15. Col. i. Plate II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. ε']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[εσενουσιαζοντεσσοι]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[γουν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ηπηγ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[νιαι]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 15. Col. i. Plate II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. πατιτουτουτουχει]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. αντιτουτουτουτικει]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[σαι]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fr. 13.

1788. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 14.

1788. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 15. Col. i.

...
Fr. 15  Col. ii.  Plate II.

\[\lambda[\sigma^\prime \eta[\deltaμά[\acute{α}σίμ][\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\alphaθέ[\tauαναι][\δμα[\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\nu][\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\kappaα][\tauίστ'\απο[\text{\textsuperscript{10}}\text{έπτη[\παρέσκεθ'δ[\δάμον'\ανάτιο[\text{\textsuperscript{15}}\text{δενοντοσούδεπ[\tauασσάςεγ[\μφ[\μ[\τ[\είπη[\τασσανκάκων[\δύντω[\άτιδύναικατεχ[\σομε[\ιρ[..\περβέββ[\iotaχρο[\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\iotaκαρποσοσο[\σησσων\αριπε[\κάλωγα[\τοκλάμμαθ'\ελπόθα[\παλαθ[\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\text{\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\.\]}

Fr. 1. 1. The length of the initial lacuna in this and the following lines is determined by l. 4, where [γλ]αί[ is evidently to be restored. Neither πλεξ[nor λεξ[ occurs elsewhere.
2. The first σ, though rubbed, is practically certain.
3. [ἀρ]ω is perhaps not too much for the lacuna, ρ being a narrow letter.
4. [φλ]ακὸν is gen. plur. fem., as shown by the mark of length on αν; /.../αι in l. 5 was
another word of the same kind. The language here is close to that of Sapph. 4 ὁμφι δὲ (ὑδωρ) ψῦχρο κελάδει (cf. l. 6) δὲ ὀδὸν καί λάον, but the present passage can hardly have been the source of that fragment.

6.

6. The vestige of the letter after ὠψ suggests e.g. λ, χ.

7. τῆσπερίον: it is unlucky that the initial letter is missing, as in 1231. 1. i. 27 τῆλεκ (?), 1233. 4. 10 τῆλεκ. τῆλεκ rests on the evidence of grammarians.

Fr. 2. 7. Not  ἄκηλλος ἀνίππων (cf. 1233. 1. ii. 8).

8. The correction of γαρ to γας may be by the original hand. How the letters should be interpreted is open to doubt, but γας is in keeping with ἀροτρωμι, and Ἰτῶγας is unknown.

9. καὶ γενηον is not very satisfactory, but an alternative that will suit the context is not easy to find.

10. A new poem with a change of metre apparently begins here.

Fr. 3. This fragment is very similar in appearance to Fr. 2, and at first sight a combination of l. 6 with Fr. 2 l. 9 is attractive, but this would create difficulties both in the scansion of l. 8 (if γας is right) and in the marginal note in l. 10, where γυναῖκας (ς) is a more probable reading than σαῦακος (λκθ'). The two fragments may, however, well have belonged to the same column.

Fr. 4. 3. e.g. ᾧσθυμ', ᾧσθυμ.

6. The second ω of κολοκυνταις has apparently been converted from v.

7. The supposed interlinear δ might possibly be a rather large circumflex, but the preceding vestige would remain unaccounted for.

8. To the right of the cancelled δ on the edge of a hole in the papyrus is a spot of ink which may be a vestige of an interlinear letter, or of an apostrophe.

17. A vestige above ω is doubtfully interpreted as a circumflex.

19. ᾧ: ᾧ is rather suggested by the remains, but seems excluded by the metre.

22. Three consecutive long syllables are plainly shown here by the papyrus, as apparently also in ll. 30 and 32-3; cf. the next note.

25-8. The letters πολ, ὅστο, αυσα and part of α, αυ at the beginnings of these lines are on a small fragment which fits here so well that the combination is almost assured. A sequence of four long syllables results in l. 26, but in view of ll. 22, 30, and 32-3 that cannot be regarded as a fatal objection.

26. The stop (?) after αυσα is well below the line.

27. παθε: παθε is hardly possible.

28. A mark on the edge of a hole above the doubtful ο is unexplained; possibly it was a grave accent, or there may have been some correction.

38. Some vestiges above the line point to a correction.

Fr. 5. The appearance of this fragment suggests that it is from the bottom of the column from which Fr. 4 belonged.

4. ιψ is followed by four centimetres of papyrus on which nothing is visible, but owing to the rubbed condition of the fragment it is not clear that the line ended here.

6. Cf. Fr. 4. 22, n.; but μησηψυρμ hardly fills the lacuna.

Fr. 6. 3. The accent on α is doubtful; it might be e.g. a mark of length.

4. ιψ: or ινα.

Fr. 7. 4. κατάγρει recurs at the end of a line in 1288. 11. 9; cf. Sapph. 43.
8. v is a correction from τ. If v is right, σα is presumably the possessive pronoun.

Fr. 9. That this fragment is Aeolic is shown by the accent in l. 2.

Fr. 11. This fragment, at the right-hand side of which there is a junction between the selides, may come from Fr. 15. i, but does not join on immediately, at any rate.

Fr. 12. ii. 3. There is no paragraphus below this line.
11. The supposed coronis is uncertain, being represented only by part of a thin vertical stroke immediately in front of l. 10.

Fr. 13 is included here on account of its similarity to Fr. 14, which is apparently Aeolic.

Fr. 15. i. 4. Ἰερεαν: or perhaps Ἰερεζιαν.
5. Didymus is known to have written a book περὶ λυρικῶν ποιητῶν, but this seems to have been of a historicico-literary nature rather than a critical ὑπόμνημα of the kind indicated by the present passage. It is, however, likely enough that his voluminous commentaries included a treatise on the Lesbian poets, as well as on Pindar and Bacchylides.
11. παρέσκεθ᾽ here provides a parallel for Powell's admissible suggestion περσκέθοισα in 1231. 1. i. 18.
13. τζ: or τζ [ ].
14. ετι: or ετι[ ]
16. The accent on α might be taken for a mark of short quantity. λ[ is possible in place of γ[.
18. For the (Doric) form ἦς for ἕν cf. 1360. 1. 9, where ἦς is better taken as 3rd person, and 1231. 55. 4, where ἦς is probably to be recognized; ἕν, which is read in Sapph. 106, may now well be emended. The following word as originally written was apparently συναπεραι[ ]-ἀγη- is possible), which was amended in some way, perhaps by the substitution of α[ε][ε] or α[ε][γ] for α[ε], but there has been no deletion.
19. For the doubled μ in κάλομα cf. e.g. Sapph. 1. 16 κάλημα, 14. 1 and the Halle fragment πόμα, 1231. 13. 4 ἔτο[ ]κόμα. κάλον γη[ ] is evidently parenthetical. πάλαιον which was first written = πάλαιον (adv.), πάλαιος being the Aeolic form according to Eust. 28. 33. Whether the correction is due to the original hand or to a diortholes is not evident.
21. Vestiges above the line suggest ν rather than τ, and e.g. δ[ ]π[ ] well suits the conditions; but τ is possible, if some interlinear addition is supposed. What has been taken for a high stop in front of τοντας may be part of the preceding letter.
22. The letter after τυ has been corrected, but what was intended is hardly determinable as the line stands. Apparently o was first written, and through this there is a vertical stroke ( ?), with a vestige of ink close by on the edge of a hole in front of o. Perhaps ἦν was altered to ἦνος. Further on, if τ and ε are rightly read, the intervening letter, which had a vertical stroke, was presumably γ or τ.
23. For the interpretation of this line much depends on the identity of the letter printed as η before δρ. The first stroke of the η has the form of a narrow oval, and it is therefore questionable whether θε should be read instead of η. But the oval is considerably narrower, and the cross-stroke longer, than in a normal θ, and ηθ is, moreover, intractable metrically. Perhaps then the scribe began to write ε and converted this to γ. If η is right, -ημι μη would be suitable enough. The first visible letter must be either β, ι, ρ, or φ, and next to this the slight remains suit the upper part of a β better than anything else. [τα]ιβημι
would sufficiently satisfy the conditions, if that word were likely. For ὅλῳ, [ .. ]σιν, ὅλῳ[α]σιν naturally suggests itself but is difficult in the context. Possibly ὅλῳ[α]σιν or ὅλῳ[α]σιν may be restored on the analogy of 1234. 2. i. 9 τρόπῳ, ii. 7 ὁντρόπῳ. The high stop after this word seems superfluous in any case.

25. ἐπονήμΙενοι: cf. 1789. 1. i. 5 (v.l. ἐπονάμ., probably correct) and Alc. 46 ἐπόνασιν ἐμοὶ γένεται, which has been gratuitously altered to ἐπ᾿ ὀσαν. There is more to be said for the correction ἐμοὶ γένεται.

26. ἕ: or γ or σ.

27. e. g. καρτεί, καρτεί.

28. [διπλ]ασίαν is perhaps not too much for the lacuna when allowance is made for the slope of the column.

1789. ALCAEUS.

Fr. 1 11.7 × 15.2 cm. First century. Plate III (Frs. 1–3, Col. i).

The authorship of these fragments, consisting of parts of two columns and a number of disconnected pieces, would have been sufficiently clear even without the occurrence in them of Alcaeus 19, part of an Alcaic stanza cited by Heraclides Ponticus, whereby their source is definitely proved. This coincidence is found in Fr. 1. i. 15–18, and it becomes plain that the lines quoted by Heraclides were the beginning of a poem, of which we now recover the continuation in the following column, where Alcaeus’ favourite metaphor of a storm-tossed ship is carried on for a further two lines. Since the height of the column is unknown, the extent of the lacuna between Col. i. 19 and Col. ii. 1 cannot be determined, but it may be only one line and is hardly likely to have exceeded five lines, which would give three stanzas for the development of the metaphor. Six more stanzas at least followed, of which however only one and a half are sufficiently well preserved to be intelligible and capable of restoration. In these the poet passes from allegory to precept, and urges his fellow-citizens to courage and endurance and to emulation of their ancestors. The subject of the preceding poem, the conclusion of which survives in a mutilated form in the upper portion of Col. i, is obscure. It presumably belonged, like the other, to the class of Στασιωτικά; there are references to marriage (ll. 7, 14), but whether these have anything to do with the marriage of Pittacus, to which allusion is made in 1234. 2. i. 6, remains doubtful. As the text stands its chief point of interest lies in the metrical scheme, which seems clearly to be a stanza of four lines, the first three being lesser Asclepiads and the fourth a Glyconic. This stanza was used repeatedly by Horace (i. 6, 15, 24, 33, ii. 12, iii. 10, 16, iv. 5, 12) who has commonly been credited with its invention, but his debt now becomes evident. That the similar stanza with a Pherecratic for the third verse (e.g. Horace i. 5,
14, &c.) was borrowed from Alcaeus had already been suspected on the ground of Alc. 43; another (previously unknown) form of Asclepiad stanza is exemplified in 1284. 2. i. From the remaining fragments not much can be extracted. In Fr. 6, which is in Alcaics, a mention of the Pelasgi is noticeable, and there seem to be other historical references. The character of Fr. 12, in the same metre, is indicated by the occurrence of the word μονάρχια as well as by a reference to Myrsilus in a marginal note. Alcaics are perhaps also to be recognized in Frs. 24 and 25. Fr. 13 may be in the Sapphic stanza, and Fr. 29 possibly in Asclepiads.

The round upright script of this text is rather smaller and less ornate, but otherwise very similar to that of 1361 (Bacchylides, Scolia, Part XI, Plate 3), the characteristic letters ε, θ, and ξ being formed in just the same way with a dot in the centre disconnected from the other strokes. Of ζ, which in the Bacchylides has a vertical bar joining the horizontal strokes in the centre, there is here no example, but a similar archaic formation is presumable. 1361 was referred to the first century, a date which finds some confirmatory evidence in the cursive annotations of the present papyrus, which are not likely to be far removed in time from the main text. Apparently two secondary hands are to be distinguished, and the interlinear alternative readings, which are not infrequent, may be due sometimes to one and sometimes the other. Stops in two positions are used (a double dot, of uncertain meaning, is found in Fr. 1. i. 11), and marks of elision and quantity are fairly plentiful. The diastolé employed to divide words, more usually (cf. e.g. 1787–8) inserted at the base of the letters, is in this text placed like the sign of elision (e.g. Fr. 1. i. 6, 17), which it also resembles in shape. A ligature below the line occurs once (Fr. 17). These additions seem to be largely secondary; the paragraphi, however, are most probably original.
Fr. 1. Col. i. Plate III.
[ .......... ]
[ .......... ]  ραίσεχνη  12 letters  ὡν
[ .......... ]εὐπροσκακός
[ .......... ]νοὴς,  ὄς,  ὄς,  ὄς

Fr. 1. Col. ii.

φαρδομεθ' ὀσκιστῷ
ἐσθ' ἐχυρωλίμεναδρον

καίμητακνοσομοῦν

λαχη' προδηλογαρμεῖ

μυαθητετῶπαροιδαῖρ

ννντισάνηποδκιμοσγεῖ

Fr. 2. Col. i.
[ .......... ]σιληυσεχην
[ .......... ]καὶβδλασ[πα]  αμη  αι
[ .......... ]μενη[πε]  μουτοσα
[ .......... ]νοιτ’ ὑποταλ  με  ὑ
[ .......... ]ηγάμωη[  ] Fr. 3. Col. i.

Fr. 3. Col. ii.

[ .......... ]παρεξείδο[  ]ολυν
[ .......... ]εικε' να[  ]
[ .......... ]όμεθε[  ]

Fr. 4. Col. i.

[ .......... ]
Fr. 1. Col. i.

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

5 [.....]eneuton µηδ’ ἐπονήμε[ν]οι

[Themenedon δέικεν. Ταμευντον Ταμεύτωσαν.

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

10 [.....]εκα πόλλας παρ. ἀμη. α[, ταμε]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

Fr. 2.

15 [Τὸ δήθ]τε κῦμα τῷ π[ρ]οτε[ρω νέμω]

[στείχει] παρέξει δ’ ᾧ μοι πόνον π[όλιν]

[άντιλην, ἐπ]ει κε ναίος ἐμβα

[.....]

[.....]

[.....]

[.....]

Fr. 3 Col. i

Fr. 1. Col. ii.

φαράκωμεθ’ ὡς ἀκιστία —

εἰς δ’ ἐχυρὸν λίμενα δρόμῳμεν.

καὶ μὴ τιν’ ὅκνος μόλιθ[ακος ἀμμέον?

λάβῃ, πρόδηλον γὰρ μέγ[α συμφέρον?

5 μνάσθητε τῷ πάροιθα µ[ῶμο?

νῦν τις ἀνηρ δόκιμος γενέσθω.
καὶμηκαταισχυνωμεν[ ἑσλοιστόκηασγᾶσὔπακ[ [.τανδ[
10 τανπο[ έοντε[ Fr. 4. τώνσφ[ Fr. 5. εσικε[ ]
ται[ ]οτε[ ]
15 αλλ [ ]ιον[ ]
[ ]
Fr. 3. Col. ii. π[ Fr. 6.]
μ[ ]
20 γ[ ]ωφ[ ]ιδρεία [ ]
[ ]απάν[ ]]
καιμάλ[ ]\]
10 νάνταιδροσπολ[ ]πελάσγωναμ[ ]
[ ]ποκέξεπει[ ]
[ ]μαχιλαφύρα[ ]
κ[ ]κόρσακσ [ ]
[ ]ηαισι[ ]εποτ [ ]
[ ]ιοισφάλ[ ]μάδε [ ]
[ ]]
[ ]μνεξει [ ]
[ ]ονυμον. [εκ]
[ ]άψετ [ ]
[ ]]
[ ]όρον [ ]
[ ]]
[ ]
καὶ μὴ κατασχένωμεν [ἀνανδρίᾳ?
ἐσολε τόκης γὰς ὑπα κειμένοις,
[οῖ?] τάνδα?

10 τὰν πόλιν
ἐοντεὶς Fr. 4. Fr. 5.
tὸν σφ[...]
eἰσικε[...]
tαῖς οτε[...]
15 ἀλλ[...]
[. . . ] . [...]

Fr. 3. Col. ii. π[...]
μ[...]

20 γε[...]
[...]
[. . . ] . . . . . . . . .

5 νὰντ' ἄιδρος πόλις[...]
[...]
[. . . ] . . . . . . . . .

10 ηασίν[...]
[. . . ] . . . . . . . . .
μάδε [. . .]
[. . . ] . . . . . . . . .

F
Fr. 9.  
[,] νθετω[  
[,] τινησεμεντεν[  
[,] ορεσσεμεντα[  
[,] οσουθε[  

Fr. 10.  
[,] ρματ[  
[,] δηνω[  
[,] μη[  
[,] σκάκοι[  

Fr. 11.  

Fr. 12.  

Fr. 13.  

Fr. 14.  

Fr. 15.  
[,] oσουθεί[  
[,] νυμμα[  
[,] ορντβαθ[  
[,] άφη[  
[,] ανατ[  
[,] ανασ [  

Fr. 16.  

Fr. 17.  

Fr. 18.  

Fr. 19.  
[,] ρθεφω[  
[,] αντ[  
[,]πναπροφ[  

Fr. 20.  

Fr. 21.  

Fr. 22.  
[,] ληστ[  
[,] κρακαμ[  
[,] παρμέν[  
[,] μνυαται[  
[,] αισισ[  
[,] αισισ[  

Fr. 23.  
[,] δικωσ[  
[,] δικωσ[  
[,] τοταθη[  
[,] τοταθη[  
[,] τοταθη[  

1789. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

Fr. 9.  


Fr. 10.  


Fr. 11.  


Fr. 12.  


Fr. 13.  


Fr. 14.  


Fr. 15.  


Fr. 16.  


Fr. 17.  


Fr. 18.  


Fr. 19.  


Fr. 20.  


Fr. 21.  


Fr. 22.  


Fr. 23.  


F 2
Fr. 1. i. 1 sqq. The length of the initial lacunae is estimated from ll. 15-17; in one or two lines the resulting number of letters is rather scanty, e.g. l. 10, but could be slightly increased if one or two narrow letters such as α, ι, λ, ρ be supposed to have occurred.

1. The two first and two last letters, of which only the bases remain, were round.

2. εἴχυραις, e.g., would be consistent with the very slight vestiges preceding π. In the note opposite this line the horizontal dash possibly distinguishes a syllable separately mentioned. The note may have been continued in a second line.

3. ]πε: or perhaps νεπ.  

4. The letter after θ may be either α or λ, the papyrus being damaged where the cross-bar of the a would be. The following vertical stroke is so close to θ that the choice seems limited to ι or π. A small slightly curved stroke starting from near the base of this letter on the right-hand side is not easily accounted for and was possibly unintentional. [θαρος could be read but is unconvincing in so doubtful a context, especially as a broader letter than θ would be expected. After θ, ι or π is perhaps most likely.

5. μενοτω, σθενέτω, στενέτω? For ἐπονήμεινἾοι cf. 1788. 15. ii. 25, 0.: 'let them not return evil for good'; the diasolé was wrongly placed. The interlinear variant ἐπονάσιν in Alc. 46.

6. ν after the lacuna is due to the hand which wrote ζαμεύοντον in the margin; the µ following also shows signs of alteration. To judge from ll. 15-17, something rather shorter than ζαμεύοντον originally stood in the text.

7. ξυστοφορήμεῖῖνος: the verb was apparently not previously attested.

8. γλαυξεας: if the first letter is γ, which looks probable, the second must be either α or λ, and υε are consistent with the very scanty vestiges in the third and fourth place. The question of the reading here is complicated by the marginal annotation, which is no doubt a variant, the letters ταν and ων corresponding with the text; but there seems to have been a considerable divergence otherwise, since γα[ cannot be read.

9. ηὲ κ ”μὲν: the adscript corresponds with the text; but there seems to have been a considerable divergence otherwise, since γα[ cannot be read.

11-13. Fr. 2, which was found with Fr. 1, has been assigned to the ends of these lines with considerable hesitation. Its external appearance is favourable to the combination, and the resulting reading in ll. 12-13 αὶ γάρ ἐμοι τοῦτα ... γενότ' ὀπτοτα runs well, but the ends of ll. 11 and 13, especially the former, are difficult. In l. 11 a letter is desirable, though perhaps not absolutely essential, between σ and π, after which either α or λ can be read. Earlier in the line the small colon before πάλλασσι is possibly a stop, such double dots being sometimes used for punctuation, even in company with single dots (cf. e.g. 1809-10); or it may be connected with the marginal adscript. In Fr. 2 the letter before ομ is represented by a mere speck, which is capable of many interpretations; that before the final a was γ, ι, ρ, or σ. In the marginal note opposite it is not clear whether the mark above the last letter denotes an abbreviation. In l. 13 on the edge of the papyrus above the left-hand upright of μ there is a small semicircular mark which might be e.g. the remains of a dot enclosing an over-written letter. In l. 12 α blockDim may be suggested (cf. 1787. 36. 2),
ii. 1. Perhaps ὀκιστία τοίχου, as Murray suggests, but the object may have stood in the preceding line and this one have ended with e.g. τάος (Lobel).

2. ές: cf. l. 13, 1294. Fr. i. 10 (Part XI, p. 56), and Sapph. i. 19, where the MSS. give ες. ές is normal for Aeolic, though ές is hardly to be avoided in 1232. Fr. 2. 3.

3. For μόλθακος, which seems to be novel, cf. 1233. i. 2, 10 ὀσαρων, &c.; the superscribed variant would eliminate the Aspasim, as in l. 5 below and Fr. 22. 2. δοκεσ μόλθακος is comparable to e. g. χλωρὸν δέος. As an alternative to ἀμμέων or ὑμέων a participle like εἰσβάλων or ἐμπέσων may be suggested.

4. The v. l. λαβη seems preferable to λαχη. συμφέρον is highly conjectural; the clause may alternatively be regarded as giving the reason for the warning, e. g. μέγαν χεῖρι ρήν, as Lobel suggests.

5. πάρωθα is analogous to e. g. ὑπίσθα. At the end of the verse μ[νι] may seem to suit the contrast between τῶ πάρωθα and the emphatic νῦν at the beginning of the next line better than e. g. μ[νι] or μ[νι] ὑμεων; the v. l. τῶν is however perhaps rather in favour of one of the latter words.

8. έσλοις τόκηας: cf. 1234. 2. ii. 12 έσλων έστιν έκ τοκῆαν.

13. έσικε: or έσικετ᾽ ἡ Cf. n. on l. 2. But ες may be the termination of a divided word.

23. The position of the visible remains suits a stichometrical figure (a ? b?) rather than an initial letter, for though the scribe has, as usual, a tendency to edge towards the left as he proceeds with the column, the movement is elsewhere only gradual; moreover, the horizontal stroke projects considerably too far for his usual paragraphus. On the other hand the supposed figure is closer to the column than would be expected.

Frs. 4–5. These two small fragments were found, like Fr. 2, with the bulk of Fr. 1.
somewhat apart from the rest, but it does not of course necessarily follow that they belong to that column.

Fr. 6. 2. Either λ᾿ (diastolē) or λ (elision) can be read. At the end of the line α was perhaps followed by a round letter (σ?) the ink of which has run slightly.

5. ἀδρος occurs in Ion 34, and cf. Etym. Magn. ἀδροσόμη, Pindar, Νεμ. 1. 63 ἀδροδικας.

7. The occurrence of the Doric πορα here is strange, πορα, as in the v.l., being well attested for Aeolic.

9. The remains of this line are difficult. According to the Etym. Magn. ᾿ιρα was another form of Κίρα, the Phocian coastal town, and a geographical name is not out of keeping with the rest of this fragment, especially if γαφαρα in 1. 8 be taken to imply νῆες. But the following letters are awkward. There are slight vestiges round a small hole in the papyrus above the α, so that a letter may have been added, but the traces suggest nothing suitable.

Fr. 7. This fragment and the next both show a junction between two sēlides and almost certainly belong to the same column, Fr. 7 being from the top of it; but there seems to be a lacuna between them. There is a similar junction in Fr. 11, but that that fragment came from the same column as Frs. 7 and 8 is doubtful.

1. ἐπίϊταδέως, like τᾶν δα- in Fr. 3, is a ν. as is indicated by the enclosing dots.

5. ἀπολελειμμένον is a gloss probably referring to the last word of the verse, the termination of which corresponds. The question arises whether μένον in the second line of the scholium is part of the word ἀπολελειμμένον or of a second explanatory participle; it is much more cursively written, and on the whole is best regarded as distinct and the writer as the author of the more cursive annotations in Fr. 1. i.

Fr. 8. 2. ε is followed by a vertical stroke consistent with e. g. μ, ν, π, ρ.

4. ἁνέχατι, συνέχατι?

5. e.g. ἄπολελειμμένον, ἐπώνυμον. The corrector wished to double the ν.

6. The variant here seems to be by the original hand.

8. Some vestiges opposite this line are very doubtfully deciphered.

Fr. 9. 1. ω is preceded and followed by the bases of vertical strokes which can be variously read.

3. γὺρ ἔσσετ᾿ : or παρέσσετ᾿? A small curved mark above the τ appears to be part of a sign of elision.

Fr. 12. 4. ε is very doubtful: ο or ω is equally possible.

6. ο : or ο.

7. τπο : or τπο ὁ . As the last letter μ, ν, or π is probable.

8. This was no doubt the last verse of the column.

10—11. The ink here is much effaced.

Fr. 13. This fragment may well be from the top of a column.

3. Perhaps ἐλεύθερος, with θελευθερος in the previous line; but ἔλευθερος is possible.

Fr. 17. The ligature below the line shows that the letters belong to a compound word.

Fr. 19. That this fragment belongs to 1789 is not certain.

Fr. 22. 2. For the v.l. removing the Aeolic form cf. Fr. 1. ii. 3, n. The last letter may be γ instead of π.
1789. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS.

Fr. 23. 3. If the dot was a high stop, this line was separated from the preceding one by an unusually broad space.

Fr. 25. 6. The mark after ν may signify either elision or division of words.

Fr. 26. 2. The supposed stop is uncertain and is perhaps the vestige of another letter (σ?).

Fr. 28. This fragment from the bottom of a column does not come from Fr. 1. ii, and the appearance of Fr. 32 is also different.

Fr. 29. 4. Possibly δερ[οι or -ον, as in Aesch. Eum. 565. ι may be read instead of τ, but not or another vowel, apparently. ας cannot be Acc. Plur. Fem. unless the accent was mistaken.

7. μανιώδη is a gloss on μαινόμειον.

Fr. 31. 2. The interlinear ε is part of a variant.

Fr. 32. 3. ὅ τείλαις?

Fr. 33. 2. The dot after μη (?) is raised a little above the line, and might possibly belong to an interlinear v. 1., instead of being a stop.

Fr. 40. This fragment is probably from the bottom of a column, but is apparently not to be connected with Fr. 12, in spite of the similarly placed scholia.

2. The significance, if any, of the dot on the left of the accent is not evident. A corresponding dot on the right cancelling the accent should be visible if written. The occurrence of the accent is rather against the supposition that the ε was to be deleted.

Fr. 41. 1. Ζ is an interlinear v. 1.

5. The variant δῆυ implies davre in the text.

1790. IBYCUS.

Height 20 cm. First century B.C. Plate III (Fr. 2 + 3, Col. ii).

Remains of three consecutive columns from the end of a roll containing lyric poetry in Doric dialect, with a few smaller pieces from a preceding column or columns. The good-sized and ornate but rather crabbed uncials are of a decidedly early type, and seem to belong to the middle or latter half of the first century B.C. Stops in two positions (high and middle), marks of diaeresis and quantity, breathings and accents have been inserted not infrequently, and many of these have the appearance of being subsequent additions, due perhaps to the writer of the cursive note at the foot of the third column, whose hand suggests the first century A.D.

The short third column, besides having a blank space below it, is succeeded by a complete width of 13 centimetres of papyrus, but unfortunately this contains no title and the identification of the poet is left to conjecture. Internal evidence, however, so narrows the choice that only one name seems
practically possible, that of Ibycus of Rhegium. In the penultimate line the author addresses Polycrates, to whom he ascribes imperishable fame. This can hardly be other than the well-known tyrant of Samos, who became a patron of the arts, and to whose court went Anacreon and, according to the common acceptation of a rather confused note in Suidas, also Ibycus. Anacreon is excluded at once by the dialect, which however is entirely suitable to Ibycus. A further argument in favour of the identification is provided by the metre, in which among some less expected features the dactylic sequences frequent in the extant fragments of both Ibycus and Stesichorus are prominent.

The previously known fragments of the poet, apart from isolated words and references, number a bare thirty, and the longest of them consists of but eleven lines, so that a consecutive piece of about four times that length, assuming that it is his, must be reckoned a very substantial gain. It relates to the story of Troy, to which several of the extant fragments also refer (Ibyc. 9, 11-13, 34-8, Bergk). After speaking of the destruction brought down on the city of Priam by the beauty of Helen the poet disclaims any intention of celebrating the various actors in that great drama, a theme better suited to the art of the Muses than to mere human skill. By this negative method he contrives to glance at the chief figures and several incidents of the story. The style is simple and flowing, and there are repeated Homeric reminiscences in the phraseology. While the general effect is pleasing enough, what remains of this poem can hardly be said to justify the somewhat arrogant claim of the closing passage, in which the author implies that his poetic fame will rival that of his patron in other fields. But the recovery of a considerable specimen of his heroic manner, of which the present may presumably be taken as a sufficiently representative sample, is none the less welcome.

Metrically the piece is of much interest. Though, as in 1861, the copyist contrary to the usual practice has not indicated the main divisions by paragraphi, the strophic responson is evident. A short strophe and antistrophe of four lines is followed by an epode of five lines, the scheme being as follows:—

Strophe.

\[ \begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\text{Strophe}. & \text{Epode}. \\
\hline
\text{I}_{1} & \text{II} \\
\hline
\text{I}_{1} & \text{II} & \text{III} & \text{IV} \\
\hline
\text{V} & \text{VI} & \text{VII} & \text{VIII} \\
\hline
\text{IX} & \text{X} & \text{XI} & \text{XII} \\
\hline
\end{array} \]

1 Suidas, s.v. Ἴβυκος, says... οἰκεῖ τῷ Ῥηγίῳ ἐνθένδε εἰς Σάμον ἦλθεν, ὅτε αὐτῆς ἦρχε Πολυκράτης, ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ. χρόνος δὲ οὗτος ὅτι Κριόνου, 'Ολυμπίας εὐ. Maas (Pauly-Wissowa, Realencycl.) regards this visit to Polycrates as uncertain, on account of the confused dating—an inadequate reason, since the main fact would no doubt be attested by the poems themselves while the dates would be added by the commentators. ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ is a riddle. Schneidewin's suggested solution ὁ τοῦ τυραννικοῦ or τῶν τυράννων πρῶτος, is unconvincing.
It was maintained by Schneidewin (Ibicy Reliqu. p. 78) that Ibycus like Stesichorus used lengthy strophes similar in compass to those of Pindar. We now see that this is not true of all his poems at any rate, if indeed of any; and the more cautious judgement of Maas (Pauly-Wissowa, Realencycl.) is well justified. Of the individual verses employed several have parallels in the existing fragments, scanty as they are. The dactylic dimeter of the strophe occurs repeatedly; see Ibuc. 1. 5-6, 5. 1-2, 16. 4, and cf. Stesichorus 2. For Strophe 1. 3, cf. Ibuc. 1. 8, 9. 2, for Epode 1-2, Ibuc. 15, 18, 27, Stesich. 10, 48, and for Ep. 3, Ibuc. 26. 1, Stesich. 48.

A purer dialect is shown by these fragments than by the extant remains of Ibycus and Stesichorus, where the mixture of forms is partly no doubt due to copyists. ξειναπάτας (1. 10) and Πολυκράτης (l. 47, Pol. Pap.) are metrical Ionisms which appear also in Pindar. ἐσθλός is apparently written, and ἐλευσαν (l. 18) is noteworthy. Whether ἐγήνωτο in l. 41 is more than a vagary of the papyrus is not clear. No example occurs of the σχῆμα Ἰβύκειον. In its accentuation the papyrus follows the Doric system (e.g. l. 2 ηνάρον, 18 πολυγόμφοι, 23 μόισαι, 24 εμβάιεν, 47 εξεῖς) found also in 8, the Paris Alcman, and the Berlin fragments of Corinna (Berl. Klassikertexte, V. xiv). The additional accents supplied in the reconstructed text follow the same system so far as possible, but the present state of our knowledge does not enable this to be carried out with much confidence.
ΤΗΣ ΟΞΥΡΥΧΝΥΧΟΥΣ ΠΑΠΥΡΙ

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. i.

αιδαρδαιαμεαιμομοιεμε
τυπερικελεσσιβιουνιάροι
οθενορρυμενοι
νοσμεγαλοσιβουλαις
νθάσελενασπεριέδει
μιμπολυμονοεχε[.στεο]
λεμοτηκατάκρη[.σντα[ ]
γαμονυδαν[.σαλαπειριο[ .σα
ποδειραν[.σκοποράδα.

ινδεμιοντειείνωνατανθ[ .ν
επιθυμονοτετανυ[ .νρ[ ]
νθηνηκασανδραν
αμοιοτεπαίδασαλλων[ μασθυπιπολολωοι[ .μ .]

αρανόγονομον-ουθεπ[ μωναρτην
πραβανόνιστετεκύλα[ μαλήγμοφοιελένσωμα[ μακακονηρωωεσσθ[ ]

Frs. 2 + 3. Col. i.

[.ρχεπλειοθ[.σαβας[.σαγοσανδρωι
ar踔σεσ[.ασπ[.σα]
καταμε[.σισαλσοφι[.έναι
eνάκου[.σμβάινλομ[ ]

θνατοσθρκ[.πανη
δεπο[.σακασταιποι
ναν[.σαλασαπαυμπος
αγιονδ[.συναπαργεσ[ σηλθ[.μν]

[.ποτροφο[.σεφοτεο
[.λακασπ[.σαχαιων
1790. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. i.
1 [οὶ κ]αὶ Δαρδανίδα Πριάμου μέ- 
2 [γ' ἀστὶν περικλέες ὅλβιον ἡνάρον 
3 [Ἀργ]οθεν ὄρυμένοι
4 [Ζη]νὸς μεγάλου μουλαίς
5 [ξα]νθᾶς Ἑλένας περὶ εἴθε
6 [δὴ]μιν πολυμυον ἐχ[ο]ντες
7 [πό]λεμον κατὰ δακρυο[ν]εντα, 
8 [Πέρ]γαμων δ᾽ ἄνβιθα ταλαπείριον δ᾽ ἡτα
9 [χρυσοθείραν δὶ]ὰ Κυπρίδα.
10 [νῦ]ν δὲ μοι ὀστε ξειναπάταν Π[άριν]ν
11 ἐπιθύμον οὔστε τανί[σφ]υνον
12 [μ]υνὴν Κασσανδρᾶν
13 [Πρ]έμοι τε παῖδας ἀλλοις
14 [Τρο]ίων θ᾽ ὑψιπύλοι ἅλωσιν, δὲ ἐν" οὐκ ἀνώνυμον οὐδ᾽ ἐπίανέρχομαι ?
15 [ἡρ]ώων ἀρετὰν ὑπεράφανον οὕστε κοίλαι
16 [πολυγόμφοι ἐλεύσαϊν
17 Τροία κακὸν ἥρωας ἐσθόλους" 
18 τῶν μὲν κρείων Ἀγαμέμ[μ]νον

Frs. 2–3. Col. i.
4 [ἡ]ρεθε Πλεισθίενῆδα βασιλ[εὺ]ς ἄγος ἀνδρῶν ἐσθόλου πάις ἀν[θρό]ς
1 καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄν χωσαι θεοφι[σμ]έναι
2 εἰ "Ελικονίδ[η]ς ἐμβαιεν ἐλόγῳ φ[]
25 3 θανατὸς δ᾽ οὗ κε[ν] ἀνύρ
4 διερίς τὰ ἐκαστα εἶποι
5 ναὶν, ὡς Μενέλαιος ἀπ᾽ Αἰ[λίδος
2 Αγα[ῖο]ν δὶ[ὰ] πόρτον ἀν᾽ Ἀργεὺς
3 ἠλθε [Δαρδανίαν]
30 4 [.dup]τρόφοι, ὡς δὲ φῶτες
1 [χ]αλκάσπιδες, οἳος Ἀχαι[ɔ]ν.
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Frs. 2 + 3. Col. ii. Plate III.

υλλισεγήματοσωτηντοτο[.]ράτρωιτον

ὡσειχρυσοσοῦραι

χάλκουτρισάπεφθαὶ[.]δὴ

τρωεσθ[.]ναύιτ'ερο[.]σαιν

μορφαιμάλεισκονομοιον-

toiσμενέδακαλλεσαιειν-

καισυπολύκρατεσκλεοσαφτινεξεῖσ

ὤσκατ[.]οιδάνκαιεμονκλεοσιν

μαχασεμποτετεκρουνθήσαντον[.]ν]

τουκ'ανθαποσονομετατον[.]σοχα

τουτηνγενεσιντευ...ἀαγαπεπλί.....πονα...

Fr. 4.

Col. i. Col. ii. Fr. 5. Fr. 6.

] σο[ δασε[ ]σι[ ]
] [.]ε[ [.ἐνθ' ]
] [.]χω[ [. ]
] νυσσον[ ἀδιὼ[ [.δ[ ]
] 5 αστιδα[ 5 αιτελ[ ]
] τωδαίχ[ πο[ [.νη[ ]

78
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2 [τ]ῶν μὲν πρ[φ]ερέστατος α[ι]χυμᾶ
3 [βαίν]ε[ι] πόδας ὁ[κ]ὸς Ἀχιλλεὺς
4 [καὶ μέγ]ιγας Τ[ελαμ]ώνιος ἄλκιμος Αἴας
35 [.....] απ[.....]άργυρος.
1 [ 15 letters ]ος ἀπ' Ἀργεος  ἀπρ.
2 [ 15 " ]ς ἐς Ἰλιον
3 [ " " ]
4 [ 15 " ] [.].
40 [ 14 " ] ἀ χρυσεόστροφος ἀ ντισρ.

Frs. 2 + 3. Col. ii.
2 'Τλλις ἐγήνατο, τῷ δ' [ἄρ]ε Τρωίλουν
3 ὥσει χρυσὸν ὤρει-
4 χάλκῳ τρίς ἀπέφθο[ν] ἥδη
1 Τρώες Α[λα]νοι τ' ἐρά[ε]σαν  ἐπ.
45 2 μορφάν μάλ' εἰσκον ὄμοιον.
3 τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰεν
4 καὶ σὺ, Πο[υ]λύκρατες, κλέος ἀφθίτον 
5 ὡς κατ' [ἄρ]οιδαν καὶ ἐμὼν κλέος.

[Κ]αλλιμαχος ἐν τῷ περὶ Τεῦκρου φησί· πα[.....]ν
50 [.....]ν τού καταλαβ[ε]ἵππους οὔ 
[.....]ν τού τῆν γίνεσιν 
[.....] τοῦ Λαομ[δ]οντος 
[τενσε]ν ε [.....] ε [.....] ἐστρά-

Fr. 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
<th>Fr. 5.</th>
<th>Fr. 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>σο[</td>
<td>δασε[</td>
<td>[σι[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>α[</td>
<td>[θ</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>ε [</td>
<td>[χινα [ [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>νυσσο[</td>
<td>αιθ' οι[</td>
<td>]δ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>τοι δ' αυ χα[</td>
<td>πα[</td>
<td>]ν[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
... who destroyed the famed great and wealthy town of Priam son of Dardanus, setting out from Argos by decree of mighty Zeus and ensuing an oft-sung strife for fair-haired Helen's form, in tear-stained war; and vengeance overtook miserable Pergamon because of golden-tressed Cypris. But it is not now my desire to sing of cheating Paris or slender-ankled Cassandra and the rest of the children of Priam or the capture of lofty-gated Troy, which is no unfamed theme; nor do I tell again of the supreme prowess of the heroes whom the hollow well-nailed ships brought, a freight of noble heroes fatal to Troy; whose captain was lord Agamemnon of the race of Pleisthenes, king and leader of men, the son of noble Atreus. Such things might the Muses of Helicon, versed in wisdom, well essay, but a living mortal man could not tell all the tale of the ships, how that Menelaus went from
Aulis over the Aegean sea from Argos to Dardania rich in horses, and with him the men of brazen shields, sons of the Achaeans. Foremost of them in battle came swift-footed Achilles, and great Aias doughty son of Telamon... and he whom gold-girt Hyllis bare, to whom Trojans and Danai likened Troilus in loveliness of form, even as thrice-refined gold to copper. Beauty imperishable is theirs; and thou too, Polycrates, shall have undying glory, such as is my glory in song.'

1. [αὶ καὶ] (Murray) is a likely restoration. For Πριάμου μεγαὶ ἀστυν cf. e.g. Homer B 332 ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμου. Other Homeric phrases are 1. 7 [πῶ]μον δακρύον; 14 [Τρο]ϊας ὑπευφίλου (Π 698), 20 κρειών Ἀγαμέμνων (Λ 130 &c.), 21 ἄγος ἀνδρῶν (Δ 519 G
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5. The diaeresis on εὐδα is evidently mistaken; cf. ll. 18, 31, 44.
8. The letters |ra, l. 10 το, and the vestige at the end of l. 1 4 are in Fr. 2. i, which is
separated from Fr. i by a short lacuna.
10. The term ἔξωπαρτης is applied to Paris in Eurip. Troad. 866.
11-12. ταν[σφρ][φ]οι: so e. g. Bacchyl. iii. 60, v. 69. Cassandra occurs also in Ibyc. 9.
14-15. δι᾽ γε seems to be the easiest connecting link between these two lines, and the
vestige, though very small and ambiguous, is consistent with γ. [οὐ γάρ in l. 15 is excluded
by the difficulty of completing the preceding verse; the plural ἀλώσις is not at all probable,
especially with ἄνωνυμον following. At the end of l. 15 γ is an alternative to π; a new verb
seems wanted here in any case.
18. πολύγομφος is an epithet of ἀρης in Hesiod, Op. 658. For ἐλεύσαΙν cf. ἐπελεύθω in
Cretan inscriptions, e. g. Collitz-Bechtel, Dialektinschr. 4998. I. 9-10 ai δὲ . . . μη ἐπελεύσει
to τετνακός.
19. ξηδαίως, which was suggested by Lobel, and makes an effective contrast to [Τροα
κκόρας, is a doubtful but quite possible reading, the papyrus at the top of the or being defective
so that there is an appearance of two strokes. The form ἡρθήδα is indicated also in l. 22
and recurs in Ibyc. 19. ἀγανδν is read by Ludwirch and others in Homer ζ 303.
21. Πλεισθε̊νιδας: cf. Stesichorus 42 βασιλεύς Πλεισθε̊νιδας. It would follow from the
present passage, if Murray's πατρόγας in l. 22 is right, that Ibycus regarded Agamemnon the
son of Atreus (cf. e. g. Eurip. Ἄρης 390-2) and Pleisthenes as a more remote ancestor
(grandfather?). According to Apollodorus ii. 2. 2 Pleisthenes was the father of
Agamemnon, and it would be possible to make our poet an exponent of that view by
reading ἐξ γένους, which is palaeographically admissible, in place of ἐξ πατρόγας. That,
however, would be questionable on metrical grounds, since the corresponding syllable, as
Housman observes, is short wherever preserved (Il. 9, 35, 45). The statement of Tzetzes in
II. p. 68 that the sons of Pleisthenes, who died young, were brought up by Atreus represents
an endeavour to harmonize the conflicting genealogies.
24. The end of this verse seems to be corrupt, since two short syllables are necessary
for the metre, and a heteroclitic form longa is incredible. ι or π can be read in place of γ, but
these do not help. Murray proposes to emend to πόδα, but the pleonasm is not
attractive in a metaphorical passage. ἐμβαίνειν is commonly used with the dative or
a preposition, but Euripides has ἐμβαίνουσα κέλευθον in Suppl. 989.
25. οὔ κεὴν is more euphonious than οὐκ ἄν, with ἀνήρ following.
26. For διερός after διορός . . . ἀνήρ cf. e. g. Homer ζ 201 ἀνήρ διερό βροτός: the vestige
of the o is slight but suitable. Unless there was a flaw in the papyrus, something else besides
dieros must have been originally written, but sense and metre are complete as the verse stands.
καὶ ἡμὸς γὰρ ἐνὶ βασιλῆσιν was suggested by Lobel, and makes an effective contrast to [Τροά
κκόρας.
27. A slight vestige after ναῶν suits a round letter and is inconsistent with a, so that als
is excluded.
29. If ἤλθε is right, [Ἀρδανία]ν (Murray) is the natural restoration, but the accent on
ἥλθε must be corrected (cf. Apollon. De Syrnt. iii. 7. 33 (p. 213 Bekker) and
Corinna i. 18 (Berg, Klassikkertexte, V. ii, p. 20) ἐμπελεμνοῦν, and e. g. ἤλθοιν ἐς Τροαν might be
read; the plural, however, is less natural.
30. [ιπποτρόφον] (cf. the Homeric Ἰλιον εὔπωλον &c.) suits the space better than
[iπποτρώφιμον.]
31. [χαλκάσῃ] or [χαλκάσῃ] is unconvincing, though palaeographically possible; [Ιχ] seems
objectionable on account of the hiatus, unless this could be excused by the original digamma; cf. l. 5.

36. Perhaps Τυδεός υἱος, as Lobel suggests. There should be a mention hereabout of Teucer, to whom the note at the foot of the column refers. Line 35 would be the natural place for him, but ἀπέγνωσε is a difficulty.

40–1. The reference in this passage mentioning some hero conspicuous for beauty but nevertheless surpassed by Troilus as much as copper by gold, remains obscure. Hyllis is unknown, except as a name of the nymph Ἀργεία according to Steph. Byz. s. v. Ἡλλεία. Nireus, whose parentage is stated by Homer B 672, can hardly be meant, nor is e.g. Eurypylus (cf. λ 522) suitable. In l. 40 χρυσός was originally written, and was amended by the insertion, possibly by the first hand, of an ε over the line; a cursive a seems to have been subsequently added rather above the level of the ε by some one who took χρυσέος τροφός as separate words,—which is indeed possible, though less likely. A of τροφή was converted from, probably, a partially formed α. In l. 41 the spelling of the papyrus in εήματο has been retained, though whether this is a genuine form is open to doubt.

42. ὀρείχαλκος was mentioned by Stesichorus according to Schol. Apoll. Rhod. iv. 973 ὁρ. εἶδος χαλκοῦ... μνημονεύει καὶ Στησίχορος καὶ Βακχυλίδης. Ibycus and Stesichorus were sometimes confused by grammarians (cf. Schneiderwin, Ibyc. Reliqu. p. 41 sqq.), but it would be rash to assume that the present passage is the one which the scholiast had in mind.

44. Cf. Theognis 449 ἀπεφθόν χρυσόν.

46–8. In this passage much depends on the punctuation. A logical sentence would result from the removal of the stop after αἰέν, with πεδά as the preposition (the accent in the papyrus need not imply equivalence to μέτεστι, but may be accounted for by the anastrophe, in spite of the intervening μέν). On this view the καλλος of Polycrates would be the quality which the poet desired to commemorate, and his identity with the tyrant would become questionable. On the whole, however, it seems preferable to follow the clear punctuation of the original, which gives a satisfactory sense and accords better with the attribution, on other grounds plausible, to Ibycus. τῶι μιν... αἰέν is then poetic language for 'they will always be remembered for their beauty'.

Ποζυλύκρατες is necessary if the metre is to correspond; cf. Pindar, Nem. vi. 70 Πουλυτιμίδαν.

49 sqq. This note relating apparently to Teucer and the horses of Laomedon presumably was intended to explain something in ll. 35–40, but at present remains itself obscure, though restoration should not be difficult if the right clue were found. In l. 49 [Καλλίμαχος appears the most likely name, and the Περὶ Τεύκρου may have been included among his ὑπομνήματα but is not otherwise known. The dash between two dots at the end of this line seems too large and too far from the rest of the note to be intended as an abbreviation of ἐστί, and is therefore regarded as a symbol corresponding to another in the margin of the line to which the note was attached. What has been taken for a dash after φησι may possibly be the top of an ε.

50. καταλαβεῖν is very uncertain, especially as other abbreviations do not occur in this note, but is not unsuited to the remains, and an infinitive is apparently wanted. Perhaps χάριν preceded τοῦ.

51. Τεῦκρος in some form seems inevitable, but the termination is very doubtful.

52. Possibly ἀλλὰ, but a longer word would account better for the vestiges.

Fr. 4. ii. 6. αὐχαί is possible.
8. εἴ: or εἰ.

Fr. 5. This fragment and Fr. 7 differ rather from the rest in appearance, Fr. 5 being dirty and rubbed, and Fr. 7 very dark-coloured. That Fr. 5 contains the beginnings of
lines is not certain, since the margin is lost, but if a letter had preceded φ in l. 7 some portion of it should be visible. In l. 2, if ε was the second letter in the line, the first was a narrow one.

4-5. ðθ . . . are apparently correspond, whether αi or αι is written. ωμ[ can be read in l. 4.

Fr. 7. 2. κπ | , διτν | ?

Fr. 8. 3. The supposed grave accent is possibly the second half of a circumflex.

1791. PINDAR, Paean.

This small but interesting fragment gives the context of two well-known lines cited from Pindar by Pausanias (Fr. 53 Schröder), the text of which is now finally established. The passage refers to the second and third temples at Delphi, and the Delphian story (Pausan. x. 5. 9) that the former of these temples was sent to the Hyperboreans is reflected in ll. 1-2, while the latter is described at greater length in ll. 3-9. Built by Hephaestus, 'of bronze stood the walls and even so of bronze the pillars, and six golden Charmers sang above the gable'. Its destruction by a thunderbolt was related in the broken lines 10-12. A strophic division is marked at this point and the subject apparently changes, but the lower part of the papyrus is much damaged and only isolated words are recognizable. No responson can be traced between ll. 1-12 and 13-20, and one or other of these sections presumably belonged to the epode. The metrical scheme, so far as it can be followed, is fairly simple; in ll. 1-12 short lines seem to preponderate, and several glyconic verses are included. That Fr. 53 came from the Paean is stated by Galen, who also quotes it.

The text, which is from the top of a column, is in small upright uncials of somewhat informal type to which approximations are found among the better-written Oxyrhynchite contracts of the late first and early second centuries; cf. e.g. 270 (Part II, Plate 8), which, however, is probably rather later than 1791. No stops, accents, or other signs occur except the paragraphus below line 12. Decipherment is difficult in places owing to the loss of the upper fibres of the papyrus. A junction between two selides runs down the middle of the fragment.

ναον τον μεν Τπερβορ[εοις ? κεραυνῳ χθονα νο[]
λυ . . . σε . . μενησεμ[[ εκρ[ψ . . [.]αντο[]
ω μοισαι τον δε παντεχ[νοις γλυκειαι διος αγλ[α
Αφαιστου παλαμαις και Αθηνας ? οτι ξινο . φ . νυν[ ]
τις ὁ ρυθμος εφαινετο . 15 ατευθεν τε... αν
χαλκεοι μεν τοιχοι χαλκ[ει]α δε
ουτω κινες εστασ[αν]
χρυσει δ ες υπερ αετον
αιδιον Κηληδοι[ες]
10 αλλα μν ηρον ετη []

1-2. Cf. Pausan. x. 5. 9 διευρεμα δε λέγουσιν οi δελφοι γενόσθαι ὑπὸ μελισσῶν τῶν ναῶν, ἀπὸ
tοῦ τε κηροῦ τῶν μελισσῶν καὶ εκ πετρῶν' πεμφθηκα δέ ἦ Τυπερβορέων φαεὶν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ 'Απόλ-
lωνος. In l. 1 the papyrus strongly suggests τοῦ, but the ν is not impossible and seems
essential for the construction. In l. 2 έμε [εις] or έμε [με] could be read, but the
vestiges between ε and μ are extremely slight; εμε[ς], however, appears unsuitable. The
first letter of the line is either α, δ, or λ, and the third may well be ρ; the fifth looks at first
sight like ε, but this is not convincing, and a crossed out ρ might have a similar effect. Τυπερβο-
ρικοιον ευ-| λυρε[ε][ε] εμε[με]ιασ would be consistent with the remains. The subject
in any case is presumably Apollo.

3. τον is clear, but τον depending on ρυθμος would be easier. Perhaps τον and τον here
and in l. 1 were transposed by an oversight; cf. n. on ll. 1-2.

4 sqq. Cf. Pausan. x. 5. 11-12 τα δε ἐς τον τριτον των ναων, ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐκ χαλκοῦ, βαθημα
οδον ... τα μοντα βλα με οικ ἐπιθεθ ὁ λόγος, ἡ Περαιατοκ τον ναόν τημην εἶναι, ἡ τα τοις ὁδοις
tαις χρονας, ἡ δε Πινδαριου μεν εν τε εκεινο το ναον, χρυσαι κτλ. (ll. 8-9, Pindar Fr. 53). The
two verses are also quoted by Galen on Hippocr. De artic. 18. 1, p. 519 Kühn. Scholars
have successfully treated the corruptions found in Pausanias and Galen, and the fragment
as printed by Schréder corresponds with the text here, except that he has mistakenly
preferred Bergk's ειςερθο' to Schneidewin's εις ὑπερ, which the papyrus now confirms. ρυθμος
in l. 5 = σχῆμα; the word does not occur elsewhere in Pindar.

10-12. Cf. Pausan. x. 5. 12 ὃν μν διδ τρόπον διαιναι αφανισθηκε συνέπες το ναό κατα
ταυτα ειρμην Εύρυσκον και γαρ ες χαμη ὡς εκστησε αυτων και ὑπὸ πυρον ταχρων λέγουσον.
Finard's version does not seem to agree closely with either of these, but the reading is
uncertain in several places. In l. 10 the letter before ρ looks more like ν than anything
else, though the space is rather narrow. i is hardly possible. σ could be read in place of
ε before τη. In l. 11 we may divide χθον αν [ε] or χθονα νο[ι], and the last letter may be either
ο or ο. In l. 12 the space is indecisive between ek[θι]ψ and ek[ν]ψ, and the termination
can be -αιρ or -ειρ. The following vestiges are ambiguous, but those of the second letter
rather suggest π or τ, and with the former there need be no letter before the doubtful α, e.g.
απαντω[ε] is possible; αφαντο[ι] is clearly excluded.

13. The slight vestiges are consistent with Διος, after which either σγ[ο] εις or εγ[λ] may be
read. The latter seems the more likely here, whether written with a capital or not. For
Αγλαία cf. Ol. xiv. 19 πότιν 'Α. φιλησιμολπε τ' Ευφροσύνα και Fr. 199 Μοίσα κατ᾽ Α.; but αγλ[α-
may of course be another adjective, e.g. ἀγγ[λ]ιαδρονα (κόραι;?], for which cf. Ol. xiii. 96
Μοίσας ἀγγλαθρόνου.

14. εις is very doubtful; the first letter is possibly δ. There may be two letters
between σ and φ, but if so the first of them is probably i, which might indeed be sufficient
by itself. The remains after φ suggest ε. εφ νιον is inadmissible.

15. ταιν αυτ το τεχν[α] looks likely.

16. What has been taken for the upper part of a φ is possibly the base of a letter
following ρ at the end of the preceding line, in which case ο (τεμεν[ως?]) would be probable in place of φ.

17. This is another rather puzzling line. Either μον or, ων is possible, and if any letter stood between α and κ, it is likely to be ς; there seems hardly room for σ or γ, and αναγενε would of course be a false form. At the end of the line μναν appears inevitable, μναμ being unsuitable.

18. For λυσιμβρότος, which occurs only here, cf. δεσιμβρότος, φθισιμβρότος, &c.; in Tryphiod. 437 λυσίμνωρ is an epithet of οἶνος.


διᾶδολον: or δ Λίδα?

1792. PINDAR, Paeain?.

Fr. i 16·9 x 13·7 cm. Second century.

The following fragments, of which only one, itself built up from several smaller pieces, is at all substantial, are written in a good-sized, rather heavy, semicursive hand which may be referred to the first half of the second century. Stops in two positions are used, and (besides the diaeresis) breathings, accents, and marks of elision and quantity have been supplied here and there. Many of these have the appearance of being by the original hand, which was no doubt also responsible for the occasional diacritical sign in the margin and the interlinear asterisk in Fr. 47; but some, e.g. the elision-sign in Fr. i. 14, are in a lighter ink and may well proceed from the corrector who altered the termination of the verb in the same line and is evidently to be distinguished.

Fr. i.

[... me]\n[... οισινενε]\n[... μαλαδαρτεμίδι... ηνασ]\n[... χοσαμμεπο... οιτια]\n5 [... μυσισισδρεπι... μαμάθφι]\n[... οθενλιπαραρρωσθυσι]\n[... λοικαριτεσσιμυδαν\n[... θιονταρακρημνονενθαί\nκελαινεφεαργιβρεντανλεγοΐ\n10 ζηνακαδεξομενον\nκορυφαισινυπερθευπλαθι... ονο... [ανικάγανοφρων]
That the author is Pindar is not definitely ascertained, but style and vocabulary seem sufficiently characteristic to justify that ascription. θυίγατηρ in Fr. 51 is a remarkable coincidence with a Pindaric collocation, and other linguistic parallels are pointed out in the notes; the reference to the Boeotian Πτῴῷον in Fr. 47 is also not without significance. The class of poem represented is still less certain; the passage in Fr. 1 describing the birth of the twin offspring of Zeus and Leto would be appropriate in a Paean for the Delians, but other categories are by no means excluded. As for the metre, whether the verses in Fr. 1 belong to one or more systems is not clear; a paragraphus occurs in Fr. 35, but no strophic division is marked in Fr. 1 among the few lines of which the beginnings are preserved.

The scheme of ll. 2–20 is as follows:—

Fr. 1.

\[\ldots\ld……
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]μεν [ ] [ ] χυτα[ ]μα[ ]
Κοίου θυγάτηρ λύετο τερπνᾶς
ωδίνως. ἐλαμψαν δ' ἀελίου δέμας ὑπάτι
15 ἀγλαὸν ἀν' ἐπεξε. ἀγλαὸς ἃς ἀν' ἐπεξ
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THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
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Fr. 1. 2. ἐν νεῖ: ἐννη[α, ἐννε[π. . .

3. Perhaps [δρυ]δα, but a single broad letter, e. g. κ, μ, might fill the initial lacuna.

4-5. If the subject is singular, ἀμφεπολεῖπθαν ἢ τῆς Τρέπου seems likely; cf. Lact. viii. 10 λέκτορος οἱ ἀμφεπόλησαν. But the verb in 1. 4 may be ἀμφεπέλασαν, which is combined with δρέπετον in Ol. i. 19-20 ἀμφετούσαι σκάπτων . . . δρέπων μὲν καυρφάς. Whether the word preceding δρεπῖ is an adjective (Γυμνῆσιος, γυμνῆσιος) or a substantive (ψυμῆσις, γύμνησις (ἡ), μνῆσις) is not clear. The remains of the first letter are slight, and e or σ is also possible.

5-17. . . and also brought from Naxos sacrifices of fat sheep for all the Graces to the Cynthian cliff where they say the cloud-wrapped wielder of the glancing thunder-bolts, Zeus, sitting on the peaks watched for the time when the gentle daughter of Coeus was delivered of her sweet travail; and when her twin children came forth to the light of day shining like the sun, Eileithyia and Lachesis sent from their throats a great clamour.'

5. What has been taken for the tail of a @ might be an acute accent on the « of θυσί, which, however, is less likely on account of the infrequency of accents in the papyrus.

9. ἀργιβρέντας: the word is novel, but cf. Ol. viii. 3 Δίος ἀργικεραύνου. A further confirmation is here provided of the form ἀναξιβρέντας in Bacchyl. xvi (xvii). 66; cf. the n. ad loc. on 1091.

12. ἀγανόφρως, like κελαινέφης in l. 9, is Homeric (Y 467).

13. Κοίου θυγάτηρ at the beginning of a line occurs also in 841. 19. 22 (meaning Asteria). For τερπνὰς ῥόθινα cf. Ol. vi. 43 ῥόθια ῥόθα.

14. The v. 1. (τερπνὰς) ῥόθινα does not commend itself. ἔλαμψαν . . . ὁπότε is a rather awkward inversion and the corruption ἔλαμψε is hardly surprising, though it leaves δίδυμοι παῖδες without a verb.

15. Cf. e. g. Ol. vii. 43-4 ἔλαμψε ὁπτὸ σπλάγχνων . . . τερπν. Νεμ. i. 35-6 σπλάγχνων ὁπτὸ . . . βουταίνας . . . 

16. Κεφαλαία. For τερπνὰς ῥόθινα cf. 841. vi. 128 ῥόθια. θρόον, which might be thought a more natural word here, cannot be read.

17-18. Either τέλειάς or τέλειος is possible, presumably referring to the two deities (cf. e. g. Ol. xiii. 115 οἱ τέλειοι, Νεμ. x. 18 ἢ θεά τελεία παρά ματέρι), but δεῖκα is inadmissible in l. 18, where the slight remains would be consistent with e. g. an a followed by a letter with a vertical first stroke.

21. Possibly ακταί, but the i is joined by a ligature which is too low for the normal α of this hand, and suggests rather δ, κ, or χ. The preceding letter might well be υ or υ, besides ρ.

22. γον or τον is certain, and if the ρ is right either ραγ or ρατ is likely. ηρφι is unsuitable. Ink is visible above the remains of the first letter, but whether it represents a diacritical mark or a correction is quite uncertain.

23. οψ was followed by some round letter.

Fr. 2-4. That these three small pieces are from the bottom of Fr. 1 is strongly suggested by their similar appearance, and this position is practically assured for Fr. 4 by the junction of two selides in the syllable κις of πολλάκις corresponding with a similar junction through the π of oμο in Fr. 1. 14; but Fr. 4 does not seem to join on immediately.

Fr. 5. 1. The diplo is probable but not certain.

Fr. 6. 1. υμ[ would be suitable.

Fr. 10. 2-3. Line 3 apparently ended at ο, and ον may be the end of 1. 2.

Fr. 16. Cf. 841. vi. 134-6 [ε]π' Ἀστίπου . . . α[ν]έψατο παρθένον. In 1. 2 here the doubtful τ can be π, but of course this may be quite fortuitous and e.g. ἐθρέψατο is an obvious alternative.

Fr. 24. 2. ἀριστοποίν . . (cf. Ol. vii. 51) would be suitable.

Fr. 30. This fragment and Frs. 34-5 are alike in being of a rather dark colour. Frs. 31-2 and 36 have a more worn appearance. Cf. Frs. 67-8. In Frs. 31 and 34 there are junctions of selides, but the pieces cannot be directly combined.

Fr. 31. 4. Perhaps ην Διός; but the letters can be variously interpreted.

Fr. 32. 8. The fourth letter may also be φ or ω.

Fr. 35. 3. A strophic division is denoted by the paragraphus below this line.

Fr. 36. 3. The overwritten ο may be due to the first hand.

Fr. 38. This fragment is a good deal rubbed, as are also Frs. 39, 41, 43.

8. ημελ[. παρθένον. Μπατ.

Fr. 41. 1. e.g. ἀδίσκοτοι, ην τοι.

Fr. 46. A junction between two selides occurs in this fragment and also in Fr. 47, which is otherwise similar in appearance.

2. θ may be the particle and ετσκε[ may of course be divided ἐπὶ κε[.
Fr. 47. 2. Cf. Pindar Fr. 51 b, d τρικάρανον Πτωτής κευθέων. There was a shrine of Dionysus here, and a temple of Apollo close by (Pausan. ix. 23. 6). The large asterisk below this line apparently takes the place of or supplements a marginal coronis in marking the commencement of a new poem.

Fr. 50. 1. αἰθερί[ or ]αεπ:| could be read.
3. πασσάλοι is rather suggested by φθογγον in the following line; cf. Ol. i. 17 ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου λάμβαν, 1861. i. 1-2 ὡ βάρβιτε, μηκέτι πασσαλον φιλάσ[σων] ἐπτάτον λιγυρὰν κάππαυε γάρν; but θείσαλοι is of course possible.

51. 3. The coincidence with Ol. iii. 26 Ἰλαρόβ οἰοσόρα ἄνεα, was observed by Lobel.
Fr. 52. 2. The first letter is probably δ, λ, or μ.
Fr. 55. 2. The supposed mark of quantity is very doubtful, and may equally well be a breathing or a vestige of an interlinear letter. The second α may be δ.
Fr. 67. Either there is a junction of sedes in this fragment, which in appearance resembles Frs. 32 and 36, or the papyrus has been strengthened by a strip gummed on the back. Fr. 68 is rather similar, though less worn.
3. It is not clear that any trace of writing is to be recognized in this line.

1798. CALLIMACHUS, Sosibi Victoria.

Height 10 cm. Late first century.

Callimachus after a long period of neglect has latterly been much in evidence in the papyri (cf. 1862 int.), and a further considerable addition is made by the present papyrus, which introduces us to a poem of which but three words were known (see vi. 7, n.), though one or two lines, cited without specification of their source and now shown to belong to it, were in fact already extant. This, as first perceived by Mr. Lobel, who has contributed much to the elucidation of the text, is the elegiac poem in honour of the victory of Sosibius alluded to in Athen. iv, p. 144 Εἰ διάφορας εἰ τῷ πρῶτον Κάσανδρον περί βασιλείας (ἐλ γινήσι τῷ σύγγραμμα· πολλο γὰρ αὐτό φασιν ἐγεν Σωσιβίου, ἐν Καλλίμαχος δ ’ποιητῆς ἐπιτύκου ἐλεγωικῶν ἐποίησε), τόνις Περσῶν φησι βασιλεῖς κτλ. and called in Schol. Lycophr. Alex. 522 (ed. Scheer) Σωσιβίου νίκη. The identification seems sufficiently established by the occurrence of the name Sosibius in v. 1, and the general tenor of the piece, which is full of references to games, prizes, victories, and dedications; see vi. 1–3, vii. 2, 7, viii. 1–5, ix. 4–7, x. 1. Who Sosibius was is not agreed. He has commonly been thought to be the same as the Lacedaemonian grammarian designated λυτικός or ἔπιλοτικος (Athen. xi. 493 c, Suid. s. v.), who was attached to the Alexandrian Museum under Philadelphus and wrote treatises on Spartan rites, on chronology, the poet Alcman, &c. (so e.g. Hecker, Com. Call. p. 66).

1 A convenient edition of the new fragments is now available in Lietzmann’s Kleine Texte, 145.
Schneider (ii, p. 220) questions this view partly on the ground of the *a priori* improbability that such a man would figure as an athletic victor, partly because the reference in Athen. iv. 144 to the Sosibius ‘to whom Callimachus wrote an epinician elegiac poem’ seemed to differentiate that Sosibius from his homonym whom Athenaeus elsewhere (iii. 78 c, xi. 493 e) speaks of as δ ὁντικός or δ Λάκων. For these reasons, which are plausible enough (though with regard to the second it may be noted in xv. 690 e Athenaeus mentions probably the same grammarian with no descriptive epithet), Schneider preferred to regard Sosibius as some wealthy Alexandrian, perhaps an ancestor of the well-known minister of Philopator. He appears to have overlooked a very suitable person, Sosibius of Tarentum, who is mentioned by Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 2. 2, as one of the captains of the bodyguard of Philadelphus and a courtier of some influence. Whether any relationship subsisted between that Sosibius and the *ψευδεπίτροπος* of Philopator is quite problematical; it has been suggested that they were father and son, but the father of the *ψευδεπίτροπος* was more probably Dioscurides (Foucart, *B. C. H.* iv, pp. 97–8). In any case, if, as would naturally be supposed, Col. x. 1–5 of the papyrus refer to the man in whose honour the poem was composed, the Laconian is practically put out of court. The wealthy and powerful personage there described can scarcely be the grammarian who accepted the royal alimony (Athen. xi. 493 c); Josephus’ captain of the bodyguard has better claims to consideration, though the attribution to him of the treatise *πρὸς Κάσανδρον* would hardly be expected. Sosibius’ success seems to have consisted in a double victory at the Isthmian and the Nemean games; cf. vii. 1–4 and nn., and the reference to Corinth in vi. 4–6. Hecker’s conjecture that Callim. Fr. 193 Zηνί τε καὶ Νεμέῃ τι χαρίσιον ἐδόν ὅψετο was the exordium of this poem is thus consistent with the new evidence, but remains very uncertain.

As now reconstituted the papyrus consists of the tops of ten columns, of which the last eight, and perhaps all ten, were consecutive, the tenth being also the last of the roll. A few small fragments, also from the tops of columns, are unplaced; they presumably belonged to the much broken first two, or to an intermediate column, if there was one, between Cols. ii and iii. The roll has evidently been subjected to severe pressure, causing the layers sometimes to adhere tightly and the ink to leave more or less legible impressions on the back of adjacent portions; by this means the order of some fragments, which could otherwise not have been certainly placed, has been fixed, and some missing letters have been supplied. With regard to the original compass of the roll, and the length of the poem on Sosibius, these are problems which depend on the view taken as to the number of poems represented in the present remnants. Col. iii happens to include (l. 2) the half line πρὶν ἀστέρι τῷ Βερενίκης
cited from Callimachus by Achilles Statius and assigned by Schneider and others to the poem on the Lock of Berenice which was translated by Catullus. That attribution, however, is by no means certain; it was rejected by Valckenaer, who first drew attention to the fragment, on the ground that the version of Catullus shows no corresponding phrase. Schneider evaded the objection by the argument that ἀστέρι Βερενίκης was a periphrasis for ἐμοί and was simplified by Catullus to μιχί [l. 83; cf. n. on iii. 2, where the passage is quoted). Unfortunately Col. iii is badly mutilated, and what remains of the context of l. 2 is indecisive; it is, however, noteworthy that the preceding verse ends with a feminine plural participle -άμεναι, which might well correspond to nudantes in Catullus (l. 81), and that if κλέ [ ... in l. 3 is κλέη, that too, though not translated literally, could be interpreted in a sense conforming to the Latin. A mention of the ἀστήρ Βερενίκης in an epinician poem to Sosibius is, at the least, unexpected; moreover, there is a second reference to Berenice in v. 6, and another to her father, Magas, king of Cyrene, in v. 2. Perhaps, then, Col. iii contained the conclusion of the Βερενίκης πλόκαμος, and the poem on Sosibius did not begin till after v. 6, being separated from the πλόκαμος by a shorter elegiac piece. On the other hand, it may be argued that the praises of Sosibius may easily have been coupled with those of more important personages, and that if the poem addressed to him included a passage referring to the king (viii. 5 sqq.) it may equally have included others relating to the

Col. i.

] ... ἕν

λ ... τ ... [ ] ... [ ]]

Col. ii.

[ ... πριναφα [ ... ] ... ικτ ... [ ]

πρυ ... [ ... ] ... [ ]

Col. iii.

] ... κα ... ἀ ... [ ... ] ... [ ] ... [ ]άμεναι

] ... μοικλέ ... πρι ... [ ... ]ομερενικη[...

] ... [δαβου[,] ... μ ... π ... [ ... ] ... [ ... ]]

] ... [ ... ] ... [ ... ] ... [ ... ] ... [ ... ] έθοσεν[...
queen and her father. Such irrelevances are natural in a court poet. On that hypothesis the roll may have been confined to this particular poem, which would have extended to some two hundred lines or more.

The text is written in medium-sized upright uncials, somewhat ornate and laborious, but not regular or well-formed. The scribe was evidently a bad copyist (see below) and possibly also had difficulties with his archetype; that this was considerably older is rather suggested by an apparent tendency to archaism, for example, the linking of H to Δ in viii. 2 and the varying formation of Ξ which in ix. 1 is written as two strokes with a dot between them. On the whole the hand gives an impression of artificiality, and is likely to be of a later date than the forms of some letters might suggest; it may, however, fall within the first century. Stops are rarely used (iii. 3, vi. 1), but accents breathings, &c., are fairly frequent in the earlier columns; rarer signs are a comma to divide words (vi. 4), and a ligature to connect the parts of a compound (ibid.). These additions, which cease after Col. vi, may come from the original scribe, who seems to be also responsible for corrections, including the insertion in cursive of an omitted line in Col. v. He has, however, left the text in a very imperfect state; its inaccuracy is demonstrated by the corruptions in lines previously extant (cf. viii. 1, ix. 7). This textual inferiority combined with the disjointed character of the fragments adds materially to the difficulty of interpretation.

Col. i.

[... ]

Col. ii.

[η πρὶν ἀναξ [...] νωτ [...] []

Col. iii.

[...] κα [... ἐ [...] [ ...] [μέναι
 [...] μισ κλεί [...] πρὶν ἀστέ[μ] ἦ Βερενίκης
 [...] ἵδα θεμ[...] μι π[...] ν
 [...] [ ...] πα [...] [ ...] ὑσεθεν

[... ]
Col. iv.

οἰδιονπολυπαλτονυπερ ἀληθευμονοσητ...
] τηρικαμηνευ σ... ειριτιαμ
] νηβασιλησατ πρ. δακρω... ευκε
] παντωνπαι... τετελεοσιατ
5 ουμετ... νον [χιστουν

Col. v.

2 τοσσαμαγανβασιληατ... ηλ... [... []
1 [..]μμαμεμειοι... [... μα
[..]φασατονεμη... [..] πευ [..] μηνανατι
φωκαεωμεχρισκεμενη... μαλαμυροσ
5 [..]ρατεκηπαλλα[..] [..]αμ[..] εμειδι
[..]εσαειπαναριστι [..] βερενικη

Fr. 1, to l. 6?

[νεινα]

Col. vi.

αζονοσασβυσ... [η[η[η]σπτ... σεναυλωνεχο
σημερινωνδωσειπερ... μοντεριξειλοσα[γ]στει
tουτ εποσηδειηλεχθενπαγγελην
δαιμον,δαμαφτεροβεναι... ξονοικαθητα
5 [..]τενενσαρχαιοσορ [..] [..] μφίδαιο
[..]τ [..] [..] [..] φουν [..] εσπελοση [..] μερονισθον
[..] [..] τητη [..] [..] [..] [η[η[η]
[..] [..] [..] [..] [η[η[η]ση]
Col. iv.

Ἰίδιον πολύπαλτον ὑπὲρ. αλ. ασον γάμος ητ...
 [. τηκαομην ευ... σ... ειριται
 [. νη βασιληα, σε... τρ [. [. δ' ακρω[. . . . . .].
 [. πάντων πάμα[τα τελειότατε.
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THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Col. vii.
οφρακεσωσιβιοντισαλεξανδροντεπνηθαυ
τηνεπικαιονικυνυφιδιστεφεα
αμελετρωπαπαδεκαςιγνητητελεαρχου
καταυμωιαντωιγαλαβισομω

θηλυτατωνακαιιλαυνιαυιανωιαυδωρ
οδητη[...],καλαμοι[...],κατεκεσθι[...]

ιοτ[[...],γαρποτ[[...],π[...].κεθλα
[...],φιοντ[...],18 letters]

Col. viii.
καλπιδεουκομουσμβδολοναλαπατη
ανδραστουδεισαντεσεδωκαμενηπνοησαι
νηνεπιγλαυκησκωμαγνιτοχοροι
αρχιλοχουκαιονεφυμιονεκδεδιαυλω

λαγειδηπαρααπανταοελασθοφορειν
ελομεθαπτολευ[...],ετης[...],μικελεχ[...],
[...],τετισθαι[...],πουκοι[...],
[...],βασι[...],τοιαθει[...]

Col. ix.
αμφοετερωοξεινοσεπηβολουσυμ
παίδασεμενηκωστησεμενευρωμονη
ωσφαμενωιδωτετισανηνομποφρομοσαονην
τουτομενεξαλλωνεκκλωνερονεγω

κεινογεμηνοδανουςαναρονποδικαθεντειλων
νειτατωικαιοσεπικωμοσαλα
κυπροθενθεδονδιο[...],εκατηγαγενθαδεγα[...],ετοι
[...],οικκε[...],φασα[[ν]]θ,φον
[23 letters]φι[...]

104
Col. vii.

ὄφρα κε Σωσίβιον τις Ἀλεξάνδρου τε πύθηται
(γ)ήν ἐπὶ καὶ ναίων Κίνυφι διστεφέα
ἀμφοτέρῳ παρὰ παιδ(ε), κασιγνήτῳ τε Δεάρχου
καὶ τὸ Μυριναῖον τῷ γάλα θησ(α)μένου,

5 θηλύτατον καὶ Νειλωτῶν ἐνιαύσιον ὕδωρ
ἀμφοτέρῳ παρὰ τὰς Κίνυφι διστεφέα
καὶ τὸ Μυριναῖον τῷ γάλα θησ(α)μένου,

θηλύτατον καὶ Νειλωτῶν ἐνιαύσιον ὕδωρ

καὶ παρʼ Ἀθηναίοις γαρ ἐπὶ στέγος ἱερὸν ἤνται]

Col. viii.

cάλπιδες, οὐ κόσμου σύμβολον ἀλλὰ πά(λ)ης.

ἀνδρας ὥστε οὐ δείσαντες ἐδώκαμεν ἡδὺ βοῆσαι

Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον: ἐκ δὲ διαύλου,

Δαιδάλη, παρὰ σοι πρῶτον ἀεθλοφορεῖν
eἰλάμεθα, Πτολεμ(α)[ε], τετπ, π[άτερ, ἥνικ’ ἐλεγχ[. . .]]

Col. ix.

ἀμφοτέρων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐπηβολος" οὐκέτι γυμνᾶς

παῖδας ἐν Ἡραίῳ στήσομεν Εἰὐρυνόμης.

τοῦτο μὲν εἰς ἄλλων ἐκλυον ἱέτως ἱερῶ

κεῖνὸ γε μὴν ἴδων αὐτός ὁ πάρ πολὶ κάθετο Νείλου

νεῖται τῷ Κασίου ἦς ἐπίκωμος ἄλας.

Κύπροθε (Σ)ιδόνιοῖς κατήγαγεν ἐνθάδε γα[θ]ός

κεῖνὸ ᾦ πάρ πολὶ κάθετο Νείλου

νεῖται τῷ Κασίου ἦς ἐπίκωμος ἄλας.
Col. x.

κατονεφονικαισιναιειδομεναρθμαθμωι
ειδοταουκεπικρανκεπιληθωμενου
παυριστοκενανδριπαραφωτισιδω
ωτικεπικεπιπρικεπικεπιμικω
ο ειἰδοταουκεπικεπιμικωμενον
παυριστονεκανδριπαραφωτισιδο
ὠτικεπικεπιπρικεπιμικωμενον

Fragments.

Col. i. This is a puzzling fragment. In l. 1 ξ and the circumflex are clear, and the letters ωή, which are faint, are assured by an impression on the back of Col. ii, to which Col. i was adhering. The relative order of these two pieces is therefore certain. There is no sign of any letter after έδοτε in either in Col. i itself or in the impression. Lines 2 and 3 are in a smaller hand and, if ξυν is the end of a verse, may be a marginal entry. No traces are visible after τ in l. 3, but the papyrus is rather rubbed, and it is not impossible that further letters followed.

Col. iii. The position of this is shown by a partial impression on the verso of Col. iv. The fragment itself has an impression on the back which provides a few letters from the earlier portion of the lines.

2. The end of this line coincides with Callim. Fr. 35 d from Achill. Stat. Isag. in Arat. Phaen. p. 134 δοθαν (sic) μνημονικος Πρίν ανάτευρ τὸ Βερενίκης ἐπι τοῦ πλοκάμου φησίν, ὅταν (stc) μέντοι ο Καλλίμαχος Πρὶν ἀστέρι τῷ Βερενίκης ἐπι τοῦ πλοκάμου φησίν, ὅταν (stc) μέντοι ο Καλλίμαχος Πρὶν ἀστέρι τῷ Βερενίκης ἐπι τοῦ πλοκάμου φησίν; cf. int. p. 100. The passage in Catullus to which Schneider supposes the fragment to correspond is (lxvi. 79–83)

prius quam mihi is regarded as a translation of πρὶν ανάτευρ τῷ Ἐ. If that is correct, it seems
Col. x.

καὶ τὸν ἔφ᾽ οὗ νίκασιν ἄείθομεν, ἀθροῖα δῆμῳ
eιδότα (καὶ) μικρῶν οὐκ ἐπιληθόμενον.
παρὰστον τὸ κεν ἀνδρὶ παρ᾽ ἀφυείῳ τις ίδοιτο
5 οὐτὲ τὸν αἰνήσω τόσον ἐξ[i]ον οὐτὲ λάθωμαι,
δείδα γὰρ δήμου γλώσσαν ἐπ᾽ ἀμφοτέροις,
ερ.’....]ψ[ε]υθ[ης] καπ[.......

Fragments.

2. 3. 4. 5.

τα[ ]γένω[ ]ρ[ ]ἐν[ ]ευ[ ]

strange that πρὶν was included in the citation, in which, as it stands, the natural sense of πρὶν
is rather quandam.

4. The doubtful θ may be σ or ε, hardly ρ.

Col. iv. The suggested combination of two pieces in ll. 1 and 2 (the point of junction
is indicated by vertical lines) remains uncertain in the absence of a satisfactory restoration
of the word after ὑπέρ. If the combination is incorrect, Col. v will become Col. vi and
]. ασον γάμος ἢτ.... &c. will become Col. v, with a possible lacuna between it and Col. iv.
The small fragment [χιστον] assigned to l. 5 was adhering to the back of Col. v, opposite
παναριστῖ, and its position is thus indicated with probability.

1. πολύπαλτος is a novel compound; the epithet would suit e. g. [ξυστΉίδιον.
2. Perhaps [γ’ ἠκάζσγμην or καϊτῃκά(σγμην, as Housman suggests, but with the context
in its present state emendation is not hopeful. Further on π could be read in place of υ and
ν or ω in place of α.

4. τελείωτα: the vocative has been substituted for some other case (accus.?).

Col. v. This column, like the two preceding, is partly deciphered from impressions on the
verso.

2. The original omission of this line, the place of which is marked by the ἄνω at the
end of l. 1, was evidently due to the circumstance that ll. 2 and 3 began with the same word.
The loss was supplied by the original scribe in letters of reduced size which become smaller
and more cursive as he proceeds, and the latter part, of which there only remains an
impression, is difficult to decipher. τὸν εν, which is suggested by l. 3, seems unobtainable.
Magas, whose enmity to Philadelphus terminated with the betrothal of his daughter to the Egyptian crown prince, is commonly supposed to have died in or about B.C. 258.

3. ἰουνα [i.e. ἰουνα] to which the insertion above the line apparently refers, remains obscure. ἐτι may be sound, though ἐτι would give a suitable substantive for the repeated τόσσα.

4 = Callim. Fr. 209, from Schol. Soph. Antig. 264. Valckenaer's correction of Φωκεῖων to Φωκεῖαω is confirmed. The various conjectures as to the source of the verse prove to have been worthless.

5. γάμος seems more likely than πόσις on account of the space.

6. Fr. 1, containing the letters [μεν] (a very uncertain : δ, λ, μ, χ are equally possible), was adhering to the lower part of the verso of a fragment which higher up has impressions of the middles of ll. 1 and 2-4. It will not combine readily with l. 5 and so has been assigned to l. 6, where it seems suitable.

Col. vi. 1. The 'Ασβυσταί belonged to the Cyrenaica (cf. Callim. Hymn. Apoll. 76 'Ασβυσταί ... γαίη), but the word may be loosely used as an equivalent of Λίβυς, as in Fr. 13 Τρίτωνος €6' δοσσων 'Ασβυσταί. Libyan horses were noted for their speed (Ael. Nat. An. iii. 2, xiv. 10), and according to Hdt. iv. 189 τέσσερα τοῦπο ζυγον παρὰ Λιβυῶν οί 'Ελληνες μεμάθηκαν: etc. e.g. Soph. El. 702, 727. ίππου ίππει is capable of two interpretations, either 'is in its stall', ἐγών depending on some phrase equivalent to λυθεὶς ἀπό, or 'has fresh in its ears', sc. the sound of the wheels. The letters ση are derived from an impression which gives just the doubtful μ in l. 2, and the rough breathing (also doubtful) on a in l. 4.

2. At the end of the line άγετεi seems to have been corrected to αίσσει, the γ (or τ?) being cancelled by a dot above and below it. The letters ση are fairly clear in an impression on the back of the next column, which also makes the overwritten ση certain. Of the two accents on περι the acute is slightly the darker and larger. [κ]υέο looks probable, but is not satisfactory after άτει περ (?) ; nor can [δ]ων be regarded as an improvement.

3. The ηδεῖα γάγειη is presumably the news of the victory of Sosibius.

4. δαίμον : i.e. Poseidon ; cf. n. on ll. 6-7.

5. κ οπε is not very satisfactory ; the vertical stroke must be supposed to have become entirely obliterated, and to have been written close to the ρ. Σισυφίδαις was suggested, no doubt rightly, by both Murray and Lobel.

6-7. [κ]υε[κό]ποτε[ρ]ς is very doubtful, but the letter before ou, if not χ, can only be ξ or τ, so that e.g. οικωτήτες is excluded. [τ]ή μὲν Κρώμαθος (μ)έγ[φ] (sc. καλότει or sim.) may be suitably restored from Schol. Lycochr. Alex. 522 (Scheer) Κρῶμαθος ... Παφλαγονίων πόλει εν ἣ Ποσειδώνος ιερόν ἄτιν. τότε δὲ καὶ Κρώμαθος τόπος, δα καὶ Καλλίπαιος εν Σισυφίδων νίκη, τή μὲν Κρ.

8. A dot slightly above the second (?) unless accidental, is more likely to represent a diaeresis than a high stop.

Col. vii. 1-2. This couplet is rendered intelligible by the slight alteration suggested by Housman of το γατ τη γατ of το γατ γατ at the beginning of l. 2: 'that even one dwelling on the Cinyps may learn that Sosibius and Alexandria have won a double crown'. For γη instead of πόλις cf. e.g. Eurip. Tro. 868 γη δορὶ πεσοῦσα, and for the order in l. 2 Callim. Fr. 530 επὶ τρύγα δ᾽ εἴηεν ἐδωδὴ.

3-4. For ἀμφοτέρῳ μαυδι(?) cf. e.g. Callim. H. Del. 168 ἀμφοτέρῳ μαυδη. Probably 'the brother of Learchus' means Melicertes, in whose honour the Isthmian games are said to have been founded (cf. Pausan. i. 44. 8. Platarch, Theseus 25, &c.), and the other child 'who was suckled on Myrina's milk' is Opheltes-Archemorus, who was commemorated by the games of Nemea and was the foster-child of Hypsipyle, daughter of Myrina after whom the Lemnian town Myrina was supposed to be named.

5. For ἀνθιστατων cf. Eustath. ad Hom. θ p. 1599. 25 ἄφιλος ἄφιλη, η τοῦ εὐκαρπεΐν και
πολυφορεῖν αἰτία. ἐδὲν καὶ Καλλίμαχος θηλύτατον πεδίον λέγει, τὸ πολύγονον (Fr. 296). ἐναίσθησιν of course refers to the annual inundation. What has been regarded as the top of the ι in νείλωτων may belong to the ο, which is sometimes written in this hand with a little hook at the top of the first stroke.

6. A vestige of the letter after οἱ would suit e.g. σ, and possibly πί is much more probable than τοί.

7. Παναθ.]. Col. viii. 1 = Callim, Fr. 122, from Schol. Pindar, Νεμ. x. 64. διὰ τούτοις σημαινεῖ τοὺς τὰ Παναθήναια νενικηκότας' τίθενται γὰρ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐν ἐπάθλῳ τίμη ὦρας πλῆρες εἰδώλων. διὰ καὶ Καλλίμαχος, καὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις κτλ., with ἀλλὰ πάλης, instead of which the papyrus mistakenly gives ἀλλ' ἀπάτης, at the end of the second line. Schneider proposed to assign this fragment to Αἰτία. 6; Bergk was no happier in suggesting that the source was the Αργαῖον αἰτίαμον.

3. Γλαύκης: i.e. probably the daughter of Creon and wife of Jason, from whom was named a spring near Corinth on the road to Sicyon: above it was τὸ καλούμενον φδεῖον; cf. Pausan. ii. 3. 6.

4. Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον: i.e. τήνελλα καλλίνικε, the conventional salutation of a victor in the games; cf. Archil. Fr. 106 τήνελλα, καὶ κάλλινικε χαίρε κτλ., Schol. Pindar, Ol. ix. 1. There is a somewhat similar allusion to φροίμιον Ἀρχιλόχου in Callim. Fr. 223. ἐκ διαύλου is perhaps metaphorical, 'we have retraced our steps,' as e.g. in Aesch. Ag. 344 κάμψαι διαύλου θάτερον κῶλον.

5. ἀεθλοφορεῖν: the verb occurs only here.

6. πίστευον was suggested by Lobel: πί is much more probable than τοί.

7. Χάριτες γυμνᾶς ἱστοροῦσι, διότι δωρεὰν δεῖ χάριτας τίθεσθαι: but the point in the present passage is not very clear. The Ἡραῖον may be that near Mycenae, which had ancient statues of the Χάριτες in its ἱλυξίας (Pausan. ii. 17. 4) and was not far from Nemea.

3. ομοῴρονος is evidently an error for ὁμόφωνος or -ον; Lobel's suggested correction of ἀοιδήν to ἀμοιβήν is also plausible, though for δώσει... ἀοιδήν cf. Callim. Fr. 310 ἀλάλαγμα νόμαιον δοῦναι.
110 THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

ἱστορεῖ, μετὰ κιθάρας περὶ τοὺς ἅλας ἰέναι καὶ ἐγκωμιάζει. As Schneider remarks, ἱστορεῖ does not exclude a poem, but that the present passage is the source of the citation is unlikely.

7 = Callim. Fr. 217, the various guesses as to the source of which were, as usual in the absence of a substantial clue, futile. This line is intelligible as the first verse of the dedicatory inscription of Sosibius.

8. The letter before the first ω was probably γ, π, or τ, and the doubtful ε after κ may equally well be ο. At the end of the line βίων is not excluded.

Col. x. 2. οὐκ επιτ after εἰδοτα, probably an inadvertent anticipation of οὐκ ἐπιληθόμενοι is clearly corrupt, and καί, which was suggested by both Murray and Lobel, or τὸν, is an easy alteration.

7. The restoration suggested gives a suitable sense, [τ]δ μὲν referring to the first alternative, i.e. ἐὰν αἰνήσω: but μή [μ' or μ' δ'] ὁ μέν would also serve. At the end of the line the very slight remains are consistent with either ἔλεξεν or ἔρεξεν. A vestige in front of the base of ω of ωδ is quite in keeping with a δ.

8. ψ[εἸυδής or ἀϊψ[ευδής accords with the context, but is very doubtfully read, the ψ being represented only by a stroke above the line equally consistent with φ; λ is possible in place of δ. The next word is perhaps δ[τ]κα, as Lobel suggests; the first a may be δ.

Fr. 3. 2. The grave accent on ε has apparently been cancelled.

Fr. 4. 1. The supposed β is strangely formed, rather like a figure 8. It is preceded by what looks like π or γ.

1794. POEM IN HEXAMETERS.

19 X 12.9 cm. Late second century.

This papyrus contains on the recto the ends and beginnings of lines of two partially effaced columns from an annotated list of property-holders, drawn up perhaps early in the second century. The Oxyrhynchite village Κερκε(ύρα)
is mentioned. On the verso is a nearly complete column of 21 lines from a hexameter poem, written in a medium-sized semicursive hand which dates probably from the latter part of the same century. The column has a slant to the right owing to the writer's tendency to advance to the left the commencement of the lines. A circumflex accent is once written (l. 8), but apart from this no other diacritical marks occur except the diaeresis on ι and ιυ. The poem and its author remain unidentified. The column is occupied by a speech of an elderly woman to a youth, whom she addresses as τέκνος. She dilates on the fickleness of fortune and explains that though now poor she had formerly been prosperous and had often entertained guests. This situation resembles that of the Hecale of Callimachus, who, moreover, puts into the mouth of Hecale the same adjective, ληπερνήτης, which is used of herself by the speaker here; cf. l. 17, κ. But ll. 2–6, so far as they can be made out, do not seem to suit the Hecale, still less ll. 20–1, in which the woman describes herself as a needy vagrant in a city, whereas Hecale when visited by Theseus was living in the country near Marathon. An identification must, therefore, be sought elsewhere, and some less polished poet of the Alexandrian school is more likely to be the author than Callimachus. The mention in l. 20 of ἥδ᾽ ὀλοὴ βούβρωστις as the cause of the speaker's misfortunes recalls the story of Erysichthon as told by Callimachus in H. Dem. 31 sqq.; in l. 102 there the ravenous hunger of Erysichthon is described as κακὰ βούβρωστις, and some further resemblance may be found between the following lines 105–6 χῆραι μὲν μάνδραι, κενεάι δὲ μοι αὖ λίθη τῆν τετραπόδων and ll. 18–19 of the papyrus: but this may be a coincidence.

dευόμενον τ. [. . . . ] τῶν παρ[ὰ π]αίδα νεέθαι,
τῷ οὐ χεὶρ [δρ][γειν; σέιτ] ἄρκεε[ι] νο[δὲ] μὲν αὐθή
oi . . . αυ [. . . ]μ. [. . . . .].μο [. . .] . . . π[ε]ι δοιής
5 τῶν δὲ γε[.].επ. [. . . . .]. ο μὲν θάνεν ὅσ μιν ἐφυο[ε]υ
ev μενοιτεν . [. . . . .]. ἀν][ηρ πρωιζ[όν ὀδεύων.
αὐτῇ δ᾽ οὐ [. . . . .].[π. . . . .] ἐλπωραί δ᾽ ἐάγησαν
ἡμετέρης βιοτῆ[ς, αὐ][νόν δὲ μοι ὁκος ἀὐτεῖ.
άλλοτε γὰρ ἀλλο[ις] ὀλβ[ο]ν λάχος ἀνθρώποισιν,
10 οἱ τοι πεσοῖς δίκη, το[ι]ήδε καὶ ὁλβου.
εἰς ἀγαθὸν πίτ[τει] καὶ ἀφνεῦν αἰγα τίθησι
She went up to him and said "My son, my son, being so much in want of... you should not go to a child, whose hand cannot proffer food, nor his voice... I myself am not... but the hopes of my life are broken, and my house gives a dry sound. Sometimes to one man, sometimes to another falls the lot of wealth. The way of wealth is as the way of a die, which in turn brings a lucky throw now to one now to another, suddenly enriching rich the man who was before poor, and making poor the man who was enriched. Even on wheeling wings goes wealth up and down among men, prospering first one, and then another. I whom you see have given drink and food to many, for formerly I was no outcast, nay, I had fields where the crops stood deep, I had a threshing-floor, and sheep in plenty; but they were all made havoc of by this baneful famine (?), and I, an uncareued for wanderer, creep thus about the crowded city".

1. Of the letter before σε there is only a very small vestige, and e.g. ἦ could equally well be read, but ὦ seems required by the sense.
2. The restoration of ἔφη μ᾽ [διειστήριον], for which cf. l. 16, was suggested by Housman.
3. κε: or perhaps σε.
4. τον is possible in place of τον.
5. If σε is rightly read there must be some error. αἰτία is an alternative, perhaps also ἀναθηματίζομαι, though the latter is less suitable.
6. There may have been only one letter (? between σα and μ; at any rate there is no room for οὐκ [μεν]' χριστίνυμι'. ι, φ, or ψ may be read in place of the following doubtful ρ.
7. The restoration of ἔφη μ᾽ [διειστήριον], for which cf. l. 16, was suggested by Housman.
8. The restoration of ἔφη μ᾽ [διειστήριον], for which cf. l. 16, was suggested by Housman.
9. γάρ might be altered to τόπος, but the a is perhaps lengthened as γάρ in Homer B 39 ἄθροισα γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἔμελλον, Η. Dem. 57 φωνῆς γὰρ ἔκνυσα. Cf. l. 12, where καὶ ἄφέναι, as Housman observes, also has Homeric analogy (e.g. Ω 641, H. Dem. 424), though the loss of τος after πίπτει would be easy.
10. ἀναπτευομαι and εἰσφερεῖν are apparently unattested. The latter can of course be eliminated by writing εἰσφερεῖν δὴν [α].
11. δεινηταμεῖα must be corrected to διανοηταμεῖα or διανοηταμεῖα. The ω is broken, but η cannot be read.
13. The verb presumably refers to the substantives of the preceding line as well as to ὡδε, to which it is more strictly suitable. Cf. Soph. Antig. 287, where Jebb's assertion that διασκέδασθαι could not possibly be joined with γὰρ is unconvincing.
Three fragments from two columns, one of which is practically complete, containing epigrams of precisely the same kind as those in 15, and perhaps belonging to the same collection. Each epigram consists of four hexameters in which the final foot is an iambus instead of a spondee or trochee (ἑξάμετροι μείουροι), and, as also in 15, each is followed by the words αὔλ(ε)ι ωρ. Another feature common to the two papyri escaped notice when 15 was edited, and seems not to have been observed since. The initial letters of the successive quatrains are in alphabetical order, Col. ii including the letters [Θ] to Ζ, while 15. ii includes Χ, Ψ, Ω, and so terminates the series. Whether the two papyri preserve different portions of the same collection is an open question. The absence of any coincidence in 15. i with 1795. ii is no argument against identity, since 35 lines would intervene between 1795. ii. 27 and 15. ii. 1, so that, unless the column in 15 exceeded 40 lines, no overlapping would occur. But of course the number of such collections current at Oxyrhynchus need not be limited to one. The epigrams, which are well turned and include some memorable lines, are on a variety of topics without logical sequence. Some have a hedonistic tendency, others contain moral reflections or maxims of conduct. Similar subjects occurred in the specimen previously discovered; cf. ii. 12–15 with 15. i. 7–10, ii. 1–4 (music), ii. 24–7 with 15. ii. 6–9 (instability of wealth).

The two minor fragments, of which one certainly, and probably the other also, is from the top of a column, are regarded as preceding rather than following the main piece on account of the handwriting, which in the upper part of Fr. 1 is distinctly smaller and neater than towards the end, where it begins to approximate

1 That αὐλεῖα in 15 is probably to be regarded as two words, not one, was pointed out by Wilamowitz, Gött. gel. Anz. 1898, p. 695.
to the larger and more irregular formation of Col. ii. If this indication is not
deceptive, the three stanzas of Fr. i began respectively with the letters A, B, Γ.
The script is an upright informal uncial of an early type, with some tendency to
cursive forms, notably in ε; it may be assigned to the first century. One rather
doubtful instance of a mark of elision occurs in ii. 3. The first line of each
quatrain is made to protrude by a couple of letters into the left margin. On the
verse is a partially obliterated account in second-century cursive. There is also
an illegible half line in cursive, which apparently has nothing to do with the
literary text, on the recto above Col. ii.

Col. i?

Fr. 1.

] κεφαλὴ στηφανο[[ ]
]υ μετὰ τοῦ μελαν[ος
]κοὶ καὶ κλανία [
]ω μετὰ μου διὸ κ[ ]
5  |ο[ς φανερο γ[α]ρ ε .[
] . ο[ι καὶ σισατε το[ι[
]κον ανεμον Ι .[
]ς περι δακτυλον [
π]λοκαμους λευκο[ς
10 ] βανειν στι[π[α[
] ε γυνατα ν .[
]σφυθε[ ]
.
.
.

Fr. 2.

] ν
] ωμω
] αυλι μο[ι
5 ]ω[. . . .]σου
] [. . . . ]
] εσας
] ηνι ] αυλι μο[ι
.
.
.

Col. ii.

μηδ αδικιν ζητει μηδ αν αδικη προσερισης
φευγε φονου και φευγε μαχας φιλουσαι διαφρονει[ν] [ 
εις δ' ολιγον πονεσεις και δευτερον ου μεταμελη αυ[λι μοι
[ ] δει[ν]εσ ειρ χειμωνα θεροσ ταυτ εστι διολου
5 ηλιος αυτος [εσυ] και νυξ τα τεταγμεν απεχει
μη κοτια ζητεις ποθεν ηλιος η ποθε[ν] νυ\[ερ
αλλα π[αθεν] πα[ροι] μυρου και τους στηφανους αγορασης αυλι μο[ι]
κρηνας αυτοντοιμους μελιτους τρις ηθελων εχειν
1795. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS


Fr. 1. 1. μερ' [ι] του. 
6. e.g. Ιμοι. 
9. This quatrain evidently deals with old age and the approach of death; cf. ii. 20–3. 

Fr. 2. As stated in the introduction, this fragment, like Fr. 1, is probably from the top of the column, since otherwise, unless the line preceding 1. 1 was abnormally short, some part of αυλη μοι should be visible. The spacing of the lines is also suitable.

Col. ii.

1 Try not to injure, and if you are injured, do not retaliate; shun murder, shun strife, avoid discord, and you will have little trouble and moreover will not repent. Pipe me a tune.

1 You see spring, winter, summer: these are general. The sun himself sets and night takes her appointed place. Toil not to seek whence comes the sun or whence the water, but where you may buy perfume and garlands. Pipe me a tune.

1 I should like three welling founts of honey, five of milk, ten of wine, twelve of perfume, and two of spring water and three of snow; I should like at each fount a boy and a maid. Pipe me a tune.

1 A Lydian flute serves me, and Lydian strains of the lyre, and Phrygian pipe, and drum of oxhide. While I live I long for these to play, and when I die, put a flute above my head and at my feet a lyre. Pipe me a tune.
Who has found the limits of wealth, who the limits of poverty, or who has found the limit of gold among men? For now he who has money wishes for still more money, and the rich man, poor wretch, is tormented like the poor. Pipe me a tune.

If ever you see a corpse or pass a silent tomb, you are looking at a common mirror; the dead man’s expectation was as yours. Life is a loan: the lender of life is stern, and when he wants to demand it back, in sorrow you will repay. Pipe me a tune.

Xerxes was a king who said that he shared the sovereignty of Zeus, and he sailed over the water of Lemnos with but two boats. Rich was Midas, trebly-rich was Cinyras, but who went down to Hades with more than an obol? Pipe me a tune.

1. ἄποθεσε: the remains of the termination are scanty, but seem too much for -σαι.
2. For διαφοροῦντο cf. Hesych. διαφοροῦντο διαφοροῦντο. καὶ ὁ ἐν διαφορῇ τινι γεγονὼς. The reading, however, is far from certain, a being especially doubtful; the letter after δ may well be ν.
3. μεταμελής as an irregular future form would balance πονέσως better than μεταμέλης.
6. 1. ἐδώ.
7. The first σ of στεφανοῦ[${\text{[}}$] is a correction, perhaps from a partially formed ρ. Cf. l. 15, where there is an unnoticed lipography.
13. ταφεία is a drum or something of the kind in Geop. xiv. 25. 3.
14. ζων provides a good antithesis, but the ζ is not altogether satisfactory and the other remains are very scanty. 1. ἔραμαι.
15. 1. λύραν: the correct form was written in l. 12.
16. 1. τις for τις, which has come in from the next line. For the tmesis cf. e.g. Eurip. H. F. 1055-6 ἀπολεῖ πόλιν, ἀπὸ δὲ πατέρα.
19. I. βασανίζεται. Perhaps βασανίζεται was written.
20. I. ποτ’. ἰδεῖν is one of the words often wrongly aspirated, being influenced no doubt by ὁρᾶν, e.g. Philipp. ii. 23 τίνω ἀν ἀφίδω; cf. Mayser, Grammatik, p. 201.
23. I. κἂν ποτ’. The (Ionic) forms διδοῖς, διδοῖ occur e. g. in the LXX, Ps. xxxvi. 21, Job xxxiv. 11.
26. 5 of ὕδωρ was converted from a. -σω for -σω is a common vulgarism.
27. τις seems inevitable here, but the remains suggest τ rather than τ. This may be deceptive, but possibly τ was written twice by mistake instead of σε.

1796. HEXAMETER POEM ON EGYPTIAN BOTANY.

The recto of this papyrus contains remains of three columns, the second of which is nearly complete, from a list of abstracts of contracts or other transactions concerning property, drawn up in the first half of the second century. The verso is inscribed with two columns of a hexameter poem dealing with Egyptian plants or trees. Col. i, besides lacking the beginnings of lines, is in bad condition, and does not seem worth reproduction; the second column, which is in much better case, is printed, and will probably be found a sufficient sample. Apparently the upper half of the column relates to the cyclamen, which was also the subject of
at any rate the greater part of the preceding column (πολυγλαγέων κυκλαμείνων l. 9, κυκλάμεινως l. 12; the form θέρμεται in l. 19 deserves to be noticed). At l. 12 of Col. ii the writer turns to the persea tree, to which the rest of the column is devoted. The style is diffuse, and the poem must have been of considerable length if many subjects were treated on a similar scale. Its author is hardly likely to be identified, nor need the loss of his name be regretted; his work seems to have been of small merit, whether from the literary or scientific point of view.

The text is written in a heavy upright semicursive with no diacritical marks other than the diaeresis. A short oblique dash is once used apparently for punctuation at the end of a line in Col. i, and paragraphi were also employed. Corrections in the body of the text are frequent, and there are also some marginalia in a closely similar if not identical hand: 1822, which was found at the same time as this papyrus, presents some analogous features.
There is not enough to show whether the initial ε written by a common confusion in εσθωνεται was deleted. The subject of ἀπολειπης is ὁ ποταμός.

2. In the margin in front of this line is a δ or ο having the third stroke protracted downwards; the meaning of this is obscure.

5. χατέοντες is perhaps for χατέοντες.

6. σιτω, if that is right word, is for σιτων. εν(?) in the margin looks like a correction of ο or variant on εν σιτω.

7. ηερος is perhaps for χατέοντες.

8. cero, if that is right word, is for σίτου. en(?) in the margin looks like a correction of ο or variant on εν σιτω.

9. ἐποίησεν" ev. might be read instead of εν, but seems no easier.

10. ζεσπεα is unexpected, since the subject under discussion both here and in the previous column appears to be the κυκλάμινος; cf. int. Perhaps, however, this was a digression; Dioscorides describes one variety of κυκλάμινος as growing in shady places, μάλιστα δὲ ὑπὸ τὰ δένδρα, and another as having καυλοὺς παχεῖς, γονατώδεις, περιειλισσομένους τοῖς παρακειμένοις δένδρεσι ἑλικοειδῶς (ii. 193-4). The cyclamen then may have been brought in here in connexion with some tree, to which δένδρα κεῖνα goes back. The tree, as Housman remarks, might be the ἄκανθα, which is planted on modern embankments because the roots bind the soil.

12. περσελη: cf. e.g. Nicander, Al. 99 περσελης κάρων, 53. 7. The persea, which was an exclusively Egyptian tree (Strabo xvii, p. 823, includes it among the ἰδιάζοντα of the country), is described at length by Theophrastus, Ἡ. P. iv. 2-5, who says that it κάρπον φέρει πολύν καὶ πάσαν ὄραν περικαταλαμβάνει γάρ ὁ νέος ὀλιγής ἀκάνθας; this illustrates the epithet ἄκμητος here. It seems to have become a rarity by the fourth century (53; cf. Wilcken, Archiv i, p. 127) and was protected by an edict of Arcadius (Cod. Iust. xi. 77).

The interlinear insertion is difficult both to decipher and to explain; χλοεροισι, as written in the margin, must in any case be read. The first ο of the marginal lection has been corrected.

13-14. According to Theophrastus, l.c., the fruit πέττει ὑπὸ τοὺς ἐτησιάς. l. πρότερον?

15. l. ἐγγεθεν. η was written over ν by mistake for γ.

17. Both this and the preceding marginal note are obscure. άθωπεται = 'harsh', as in Anth. Pal. vi. 168.

19. ημερινης = ημερότητος, 'culture,' resulting in continual fruitfulness, of which a wild tree would not be capable (Housman): this substantive does not occur elsewhere.

21. The interpretation of the abbreviation in the margin is doubtful.

22. λελοια = 'fluctuations'? The next word is puzzling. If Φ is right, the letter between this and σ was quite narrow (?) i. The penultimate letter seems to have been corrected, and ε is very uncertain.
These two columns of a philosophical work belonged to the same find as 1364, the fragments of the sophist Antiphon Περὶ ᾿Αληθείας, but owing to obvious differences both in handwriting and in the length and width of their columns, the two papyri were not supposed to be connected. Further investigation, however, now suggests that they represent the same author, if not actually related themselves. The subject of this new piece is the ethics of legal evidence, the justice of which is controverted in opposition to the current view. If justice consists in not wronging others when not wronged oneself, then, it is contended, to give adverse evidence, even when the evidence is true, is essentially unjust. A person so convicted is injured, and his resentment may result in further injury to the giver of the evidence. Legal procedure in general, which benefits one man at the expense of another, is vitiated by similar injustice. This sophistical argument is quite in the manner of 1364, where Antiphon, starting from another definition of justice as the observance of law, maintains that this is a matter of expediency and that, so long as the breach is unobserved, the law may be broken with advantage; cf. Part XI, pp. 92 sqq. In style also the present text recalls 1364; see op. cit., p. 95, where the literary estimate of Antiphon found in Hermogenes, De ideis, ii. 11. 17, and the stylistic analysis in E. Jacoby’s De Antiph. Soph. Περὶ Ὁμονοίας, pp. 48 sqq., are considered in relation to that papyrus. Among special characteristics the sophist’s tendency to poetic rhythm is exemplified in ll. 10–11, 16–18, 47–9, and 51–3 below, and his partiality for synonyms in ll. 64–5. It may be worth noting that the expression ἐν τούτῳ, which seems to have been rather favoured by the author of 1797, is found also in 1364. 272. No instance occurs of ξύν or σύν; the spelling ρρ, used in 1364, appears once in l. 44. The ascription to Antiphon thus seems sufficiently likely on internal evidence, and some external marks of relationship between the two papyri, in addition to the fact that they were found in close proximity, are also forthcoming. Though the hands are not identical they are of the same type and are certainly very close in date. The column in 1797 is about 3 cm. longer and 1 cm. broader than in 1364, but the height of the papyrus is approximately identical. Breathings, accents, and marks of quantity, which are rare in prose texts, have been occasionally inserted in both papyri, apparently by a second hand, to which may be also due the punctuation by means of high or medial dots (in 1364 one instance occurred of a low dot). The possibility is suggested that the same hand made these additions in both texts; in that case 1797 might actually be a later section of the
same roll as 1364, which is shown by a stichometrical figure to have belonged
to the earlier portion of the book; or alternatively 1797 may be supposed to be
from another treatise of Antiphon, the Πολιτικός or the Περὶ Ὅμονοιας, this copy
being more or less uniform with that of the Περὶ Ἀληθείας (1364) and belonging
to the same owner.

Col. i.

[... ...] του δικαιου
[σπουδ][ιων] δοκουν
[τοι το] μαρτυρειν
[εν αλ]ηθεις ταληθη
5 [δικαιο]ν νομιζεται
[ειναι] και χρησιμον
[ουδεν] ηπτον εις
[τα των] ανθρωπων
[επι]τηδευματα:
10 [τουτο] τοινυν ου δι
[καιος] εσται ο ποιων.
[και γα][ρ] το μη αδικειν
[μηδενα μη αδι]
[κου][μενον αυτον
15 [δικαιος] εστιν αναγ
[κη] γαρ του μαρτυ
[ρου]ντα και αλη
[θη μ][αρτυρηθη ομος
[αλ]λου] πως αδικειν
20 [εικος δε] ? αυτου α []
[δι]κεισθαι εις υπερτε
[ροι]ν ευεστη γε
[ε]ν οι δη δη [μ]παν εκει
[νου] μαρτυρηθεν
25 τα αλισκ[ε]ται ο κα
ταμαρτυρουμενοι κα
αι απολλυσιν η

Col. ii.

ληθη μαρτυρηθη
40 σας και ου μοι[ον
τοι μισε]ι αλλα κια
οτι δει αυτον τουν
αινα παντα φυ
45 λατεσθαι τουτον τυ
δι κατεμαρτυρηθη
σεν ος υπαρχει
γ αυτω εχθρος τοιον
τοσ οιος και λεγειν 
και δραν ει τι δυναι
50 το κακον αυτον και
τοι ταντα φαίνεται
ου σμικρα οντα τα
δικηματα· ουτε
α αυτος αδικειται:
55 ουτε α αδικει· ου γαρ
και α ειαι και το μη
και αυτον μη
60 α αδικει· μη
[δε] αυτον αδικεισθαι·
[δε] αναγκη εστιν
65 [α]λη φατερα αδικα· φαι
υεται δε και το δικα
justice is regarded as virtuous and at the same time to testify to the truth concerning one another is considered just and equally useful for human pursuits. The man who does so however is not just. For it is just to wrong no one when one is not oneself wronged; and he who gives testimony, even if it is true, cannot help to some extent doing a wrong; and there is a probability that he may himself subsequently be wronged: this is at any rate possible, in so far as the man against whom he testifies is convicted in consequence of his testimony, and loses either money or life owing to a person whom he is in no way wronging. Herein therefore he wrongs the man against whom testimony is given, that he wrongs some one who is not wronging him; and he is himself wronged by such a person, because he is hated by him although he testified to the truth, and wronged not by his hatred only but also because he must always be on his guard against this man against whom he testified, regarding him as an enemy prepared to do what damage he can, either in word or deed. These wrongs do not seem inconsiderable, either those received or those inflicted. For it is not possible that these acts should be just and that not to do or receive a wrong should also be just, but either one of them must be just or both must be unjust. Condemnation, judgement, and arbitration, whatever their upshot, are therefore seen not to be just; for what benefits some injures others; and in this those who are benefitted are not wronged, but those who are injured...

2. [πνεύματα η αὐτῶν: as is rather more probable than ἡ, but e.g. [αἴσιοι]ου, which is suggested by Murray, is not impossible.

20-4. The restoration proposed, if not altogether convincing, is fairly satisfactory. It is not quite certain that a line is not lost between ll. 20 and 21, the lower half of the column being detached, nor is it quite clear that in ll. 22 a small dot after the first ν was intended as a stop. [ντο]ρον instead of [κεκλει]ων would hardly fill the space in ll. 24.

28. αὐτῶν ἀποτλέων is an intelligible expression, but with χρήματα preceding it seems more likely than not that αὐτῶν (τὸν βίον) should be read.
34. έαυτον appears to have been written, not αδί[κο]υητο[ν] αυτον.

56. ταυτα: i.e. ταυτά, but ταυτα is wanted; cf. 1864. 194, where the same accent is given, though there perhaps correctly. Whether the marginal symbol, for which cf. e.g. 16. ii. 3, &c., has anything to do with the accentuation is doubtful.

Fr. That this scrap belongs to the same text as the preceding piece seems likely, but is not certain.

1798. ANONYMOUS WORK ON ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

Fr. 44 14:3 × 34:3 cm. Late second century.

These fragments from a historical work dealing with Alexander the Great are written in a medium-sized informal hand, probably of the middle or latter part of the second century; on the verso is 1802, an alphabetical lexicon of rare words, also in a semicursive but smaller script. The copyist, as often happened, tended gradually to advance the commencement of the lines to the left as he proceeded, so giving the columns a slant to the right. Paragraphi are sparingly used, but there are no stops, or other signs except the diaeresis. Two small corrections occur (Frs. 10 and 14), one clearly, and probably both, by a second hand. A stichometrical figure ˌψ, i.e. 2,300, in the margin of Frs. 5-6. ii, is due to the original scribe. Unfortunately the height of the column is unknown, but in consideration of the size of the handwriting it is not at all likely to have exceeded 50 lines and may well have been shorter. On the supposition that the column did not extend beyond that limit, Frs. 5-6. ii was preceded by at least 46 columns which would occupy some 13 feet. Since the fragment concerned apparently relates to the period of the battle of the Granicus, it is evident that the scale of the work was very considerable.

The text on the verso proceeds in the opposite direction to that on the recto, and did not extend over the whole of the roll, many of the smaller pieces (Frs. 1-43) having the verso blank. Since some of these clearly refer to a period prior to that covered by the fragments of which the verso is inscribed, they have all been placed in a group before the latter. Presumably the lexicon, which was of no small compass, was not completed. Of this group only two or three pieces are sufficiently well preserved to afford a clear clue to their subject. Fr. 1 apparently describes the circumstances of the death of Philip, of which an account is given differing somewhat from what is found in other sources; cf. the commentary. In Fr. 2 some hexameter lines are quoted evidently in connexion with the destruction of Thebes, which was 'left without a habitation among men'. Frs. 5-6 mention Spithridates, who was one of the Persian satraps opposed to Alexander in the battle of the Granicus.
The main fragment is No. 44, in which are preserved the upper parts of five successive columns, the fifth, however, represented by the beginnings of the lines only; on the verso of this fragment are two columns of the lexicon, containing words beginning with M (1802. 3). Col. i repeats the well-known story of the physician Philip who, after having undertaken to prescribe for Alexander when suffering from fever at Tarsus in the summer of B.C. 333, was accused by Parmenion in a letter to the king of being in the pay of Darius. Cols. ii–iv are concerned with the battle of Issus, which took place in the autumn of the same year. A large lacuna intervenes between this and Fr. 45, which mentions Alexander’s passage of the Euphrates preparatory to the battle of Arbela in September, 331 B.C. In the interval occurred the capture of Damascus, the sieges of Tyre and Gaza, and the expedition into Egypt, to the last three of which twelve chapters were given by Diodorus; an allowance of as many columns in the papyrus would certainly not be disproportionately large. The remaining fragments are insignificant.

To the identity of the writer a clue remains to be found. Since these fragments, so far as their contents are recognizable, are all directly concerned with Alexander, it is a natural assumption that they come from one of the many chronicles, historical or romantic, devoted to the career of that striking personality rather than from a history of wider scope. The main Greek authorities for Alexander are of course Diodorus, Arrian, and Plutarch, and on the battle of Issus, with which the principal fragment of the papyrus is mostly concerned, we have also the statements of Callisthenes which are criticized by Polybius xii. 17 sqq.; but with none of these are any marks of affinity discoverable. On the other hand, there are two clear coincidences with the Roman Quintus Curtius Rufus, an obscure personality whose monograph on Alexander is commonly attributed to the first century A.D. The papyrus agrees precisely with Curtius against Arrian and Plutarch as to the terms of the bribe said to have been offered to the physician Philip by Darius, and, what is more interesting, reaffirms more circumstantially the statement that Alexander on the eve of the battle of Issus was overcome by an attack of nerves (see nn. on Fr. 44. i. 8–10, ii. 6 sqq., 15). A reason given in Fr. 44. iii. 18–19 for abandoning the pursuit of Darius but not elsewhere recorded, may also be glanced at by Curtius; cf. n. ad loc. These coincidences imply either that our author was known to Curtius or that they had a common source; the supposition that the papyrus drew on Curtius is too improbable to need consideration. Curtius’ sources have been discussed at length by J. Kaerst in Beitr. z. Quellenkritik des Q. Curtius Rufus and Forschungen z. Gesch. Alexanders, and more recently by E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencycl. iv. 1871 sqq., and Rüegg, Beitr. z. Erforschung der
Quellenverhältnisse in d. Alexandergesch. des Curtius. The authority on whom Curtius principally depended, according to the current view, was Clitarchus, but since the same authority was closely followed by Diodorus, with whom no connexion is traceable in 1798, this clearly cannot be the connecting link between 1798 and Curtius. It is however, recognized that Curtius employed other sources, which as distinguished from those of Arrian and Plutarch are considered to be secondary and comparatively late (cf. Schwartz, op. cit. 1876); but what precisely they were is not known.

Curtius, then, is not rated as high-class company, and agreement with him against others will not establish a prejudice in favour of such statements as are peculiar to the papyrus. Of these the most significant is the estimate given of the numbers slain in the battle of Issus; this more than doubles the highest total found elsewhere for the Macedonian and approximately halves that for the Persian side; cf. n. on Fr. 44. iv. 9 sqq. Whatever may be thought of the historical value of these figures, they serve, like the description of Alexander's state of mind before the battle, to throw some light on the author's standpoint: the tendency to depreciate Alexander is less definitely affirmable than of Curtius, but evidently the aim was not glorification. Their claim to attention, however, is increased by the fact that the papyrus, alone among ancient authorities, estimates separately the loss of the mercenaries in the Persian service. It has been suggested by Kaerst (Gesch. des Hellenismus, i, p. 522), in agreement with Ranke, that the sources of Diodorus included information derived from Darius' Greek mercenaries. That theory now finds in 1798, which might here have the same source behind it, a certain support. Other points elsewhere unrecorded in connexion with the battle are the preliminary prayers and sacrifices to Poseidon, Thetis, Nereus, and the Nereids (Fr. 44. ii; see n. on ll. 9-11), and the anecdote about the slice of bread with which the conqueror had to satisfy his hunger next day (ibid. iv). The story of Philip the physician follows familiar lines, but no other account attributes to the incriminating letter of Parmenion the unworthy motive of private hostility, a statement pointing to an anti-Parmenion bias, which is traceable also in Diodorus and Curtius and goes back not improbably to Clitarchus. The fragment (i) referring apparently to the death of Philip of Macedon shows a marked divergence from the ordinary version of that episode, and it is highly unfortunate that more of the narrative is not preserved.

In form this writer is clear and straightforward, if somewhat monotonous. δέ is his favourite connecting particle, and there is but one instance of the genitive absolute; a certain partiality to the historic present is noticeable (Fr. 44. i. 5, 16, Fr. 45. 6). To hiatus he is indifferent. Some eccentricities like the poetical
spelling ἀγωγονίζων may be due to copyists, but the form ἄνελεῖ (Fr. 44. ii. 12) is not without significance, suggesting that the date of composition, though it may well be posterior to the Augustan age, was at any rate little in advance of it.

Fr. 1.

[...[...]τους μ[.] [...]
[...[...]θεατ[ρ]ω κα[.]
[...[...]ους απε[...
[...[...]ε περὶ θρόν[ον
5 [...[...]ν τοις μ[.]
[...[...]π']αρεδωκε []
[...[...] απετυπαν[ι
[...[...] καὶ ἄνω το[ς ἁμ[α]
[...[...] του Φιλ][πην θερα []
10 [...]πονθαψ[αι παρεδωκ[ε]
[...[...]περι την [...]
[...[...]σκλ[...]

Fr. 2.

[...[...]σου[.]
[...[...]δακρυ[.]
[...[...][Kα][δ][μον[. [...]] β[.]
[...[...][κ]κυλι[σ][ν] θηβα[ι[σ]
[...[...]και δη Θηβ[α][ι] ε[ν αν []
[...[...]ωτο[σ]ιν αοικ[ο]
[...[...]δικον τ αρνας τ[ς]
10 [...]ομ σαρος τε λε[]
[...[...]εν μ[. [...] δη[.]

Fr. 3.

ρομ[ ]
i[σ][ν[ ]]
βη[ι]ν[ ]
α[ ]

Fr. 4.

[ ] η[ ]
[ ]μ[νς τ[ς]
] δημοφ[ ]
] ουργο[ ]
5 ]μον[ ]
] διφ[ ]

Frs. 5-6.

Col. i.

κατα την[ ]
ης ἐβασ[λευε[ ]
νου κα[ι α[ ]
σ[ ]
5 δ[ ...[...][ ]

Col. ii.

κατα την[ ]
ης ἐβασ[λευε[ ]
νου κα[ι α[ ]
σ[ ]
5 δ[ ...[...][ ]
τε καὶ Σπιθαρατ.
βαρβαροι καὶ
οι νοσλου προ
[την του σωματος...]

λα γαρ μονή
των ειχον... ek?
πλησιν [... πλη?:
θος τη
παρει]

οντε
τραι και ανι... a?
γωνας εξ[i]
Μακεδον

Fr. 7.

επος ειπειν?
εξελιπε
των [πον]
προτοι
5 δι αυτο]

Fr. 8.

αι[ πη[ ακ[ ηθη[ περιθ[ 
κη[ μοου[ ι παρατ[ των αλ[ 

Fr. 9.

πο[ πο[ ον[ πο[ ηρον τ]
[... η[ έ[ μολα[ ε[ γλυκ[ 

Fr. 10.

Fr. 11.

Χων ρ[ ] μεγα[ Λον ]
περιδ[ ] μαν[ ] παρβειν
[.νοι[ ] αληθινον[ ]

Fr. 12.

[.πει[ ]α[ ]
[.η[ ]

Col. i.

Col. ii.

Col. iii.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 14.</th>
<th>Fr. 15.</th>
<th>Fr. 16.</th>
<th>Fr. 17.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κ. μ[</td>
<td>ρο[</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>ντα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δειφ[</td>
<td>με]γαλη[</td>
<td>[μ[</td>
<td>σκε]μα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ[πρ]]ουσ[</td>
<td>]αρα[</td>
<td>]ταδ[</td>
<td>]ελαι[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρα[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [. . ] [</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 18.</th>
<th>Fr. 19.</th>
<th>Fr. 20.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>ομ[.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περσικ[</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>λεγαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεικρ[</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>δρ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολμακις Λ[</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ολα γαρ[</td>
<td>μο[</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? δικαιως [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 21.</th>
<th>Fr. 22.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 23.</th>
<th>Fr. 24.</th>
<th>Fr. 25.</th>
<th>Fr. 26.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
<td>[. . ] [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fr. 27. Fr. 28. Fr. 29. Fr. 30. Fr. 31.

λιτη[ ]ης[ ]εις [ ]κιδ[ ]θας[ ]ειδ[ 
του[ ]γι[ ]ε οστ[ ]μεν[ ]ιθ[ ]παδ[ 
[.]η[ ]νη [ ]ειτ[ ]θ[ ]παδ[ 

Fr. 32. Fr. 33. Fr. 34. Fr. 35. Fr. 36.

], φ[ ]οντι[ ]λαι[ ]πι[ ]λας[ ]ται[ 
], ην[ ]ευ[ ]αμ[ ]πρια[ ]ιων[ 
], τω[ ]πο[ 

Fr. 37. Fr. 38. Fr. 39. Fr. 40. Fr. 41.

φον[ ]νσαι[ ]θ[ ]κ[ ]αβο[ 
], κε[ ]ειτ[ ]ει[ ]βε[ ]αβο[ 

Fr. 42. Fr. 43.

, π[ ]δε[ ]δεικ[ 

Fr. 44.

Col. i.

[? επιχειρ]ησεν αυτον φαρ
[μα]κω μελλοντος δ
[αυτ]ων διδοναι Παρμε
[νι]ων διαφορος αυ τω
5 [Φι]λιτπων γραφει προς
[Αλ]εξα[δ]ρων κελεων
φιλαξασθαι τουτον α
κονειν γαρ χειλια τα
λαντα Ναρειον αυτοι

Col. ii.

eιχε τους Μακεδονας
eξηκουτα γαρ των βαρ
βαρον μυριαδε[ς] ησαν
οι δε Περσαι των Μακε
5 δονων κατεφρονουν
Alexα[δ]ρων δε πλησι:
on ορον την κρισιν
eν αγωνι(α) υν και προσ
eυχας ετραπη Θεην
10 διδοναι και την αδελφήν γυναικα εφ οι αυ του αντεις Αλεξαν
dρος δε λαβων την ε πιστολην και ουθεν
15 προσποιησαμενους πενει[ei . . . . . . . ] . τι[ .

Col. iii.
σαν οι Περσαι ειτα το λοιπον των Βαρβαρων
πληθος μεθ ους οι ξενοι οι δε περι τον Αλεξαν
5 δρον ιππεις μεν ιππευ αυ των πεζοις
επικολουθουν και το πεδιον πληρες ην υπερ κρων πολυ δε μερος
10 των Μακεδονων επι τας σκηνας των Βαρβαρων
αισθηματα εις δι
[α]ρπαγνυ των εν αυταις
πληρεις δ ησαν ποικι
15 [Λ]ης γαζης Αλεξανδρος
[δ]ε απιθημου λαβειν
[Δαρ]ιεν εδιωκεν με [τα δρ]μον πυθομε [νας με ηπη α]μετρον α[ . ] [ ]

Col. iv.
εχοντι υπ αθεραπ[ε]ν
στας της ενθη προση
νεγκε τες των υπασπιστων
στων λαβων παρα [θου]
5 κολου αρτου τρυφος [ο]
δε δια την ενθη
φαγων ασμενως παν-
tεσ αρα ειπεν ανθρω
ποι ζωσιν ηδεως α
10 πεθανου δε των μεν
Μακεδονων πεζων
χειλιοι και ιππεις δια
κοσιοι των δε Βαρβαρω
ρων πεζου μεν ουκ ε
15 λαττους πεντε μυρια
dων ιππεις δε τρισχι
λιοι των δε η]μενου πε
[ρι . . . . . . . . . . ] η

Col. v.
λα[ ]
ω . [ ] Αλεξαν
δρο[ ]
κ
15 ρα και [ ΚΟΙ[ . ] ] [ ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>και [ εν ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επ[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ναθ[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σεσθ[αι ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 45.

| [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] |
| [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] |
| λυσας απαντας α [. . . e | [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] |
| βαινεν επι Δαρε[ιον | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| 5 διαβας τον Ευφρατη[ | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| και μαχην αυτου[ συν | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| απτει δευτεραν [. . . | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υ[. . . ]θα[. . . ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ] . . . . . . | [. . . . . . ] . . . . . . | [. . . . . . ] . . . . . . |

Fr. 46.

| [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] |
| [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |

| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |

Fr. 47.

| [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] |
| [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |

Fr. 48.

| [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ο[. . . . . . ] |
| [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] | [. . . . . . ]ασκ[. . . . . . ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτοτ[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |
| [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] | [. . . . . . ]υτο[ ] |

Fr. 49.
Fr. 50. 


Fr. 51. 

ἀπετυπανζισαν με [να] 

Fr. 52. 

Fr. 53. 

Fr. 54. 

Fr. 1. The mention of a theatre in l. 2, in conjunction with the burial of Περδίκκα (Diodor. xvi. 94, Justin ix. 6), for whose name there seems to be here no place; moreover, according to Diodorus he was pursued and killed forthwith by Περδίκκα. Apparently, then, the object of Περδίκκα is some other person, whose identity is obscure; cf. Justin xi. 2. 

Prima illi cura paternarum exsequiarum ful; in quibus ante omnia cædis conexit ad tumulum patris occiti ussit. 

1 sqq. The length of the lacunae is estimated on the basis of ll. 8–10, which can be restored with probability. In ll. 1–4 τους με [εις] | τους θεατίρωι κα[θημενους ame| [πους δε] may be suggested. 

Ἰν : Ἰων is not possible, and ιας is unlikely. The doubtful μ may be λ. 

6. Both this line and l. 9 look as if they were complete at the end, but there is not margin enough to be certain. If l. 9 ended with -κε, it was rather shorter than its neighbours. 

7. The spelling ἀποτυπανίζω seems to be novel; τύπανον is a poetic form. 

Fr. 2. This fragment, like the preceding, has lost both margins, but the point of division of the lines is fixed by ll. 7–8, where the restoration is certain, and on that basis the other lacunae have been estimated. Most of the fragment, if not all of it, is occupied by a quotation in hexameters referring to Thebes, brought in no doubt in connexion with Alexander's destruction of the city. Owing to the aorist in l. 6 it is not likely to be oracular; κυλισει would not fill the lacuna. 

3. The vestige after σ is indecisive; ι or ε would be suitable, but other vowels are not excluded. 

4. θ is preceded by a vertical stroke consistent with η, ι, ν, and is followed by the base of another short vertical stroke; Θηβηί would be quite suitable. 


9. The first letter is more probably δ than θ. τ αρνας is recommended by the apparent repetition of τς, but whether αρνας or Αρνας should be written is not clear; cf. Homer B 507 (Τάρνας αφ. Strabo 413). 

10. No compound -ομομορος (e. g. κυδομομος) is known. 

11. The first letter was η, ι, or ν, and δρη was preceded by one of the same three letters. 

Fr. 3. 3. If βαιων is right, Θηβαίων is the natural restoration, but δαι ων is possible. This fragment differs in appearance from Fr. 2, but is very similar to Fr. 4. 

Frts. 5–6. These fragments were combined after the text was in type, and the numeration was therefore retained.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

ii. 6. Σπιθαΐραδατ. .: this is evidently the son-in-law of Darius and satrap of Lydia (or Ionia) whose name is spelled Σπιθροβάτης by Diodor, xvii. 19, 20, Σπιθριδάτης by Arrian i. 15, 16 and Plutarch, Alex. 16.

9. µ is represented by a very slight vestige which, however, well suits that letter.

17. ψ = 2,300; cf. 852. 25 n. For other instances of stichometry in prose papyri cf. e.g. 1364. 188, P. Grenf. II. 11. ii. 4.

Fr. 7. 3. τον οπτου: perhaps a reference to Bucephalas, but the fragment is too small to be understood.

Fr. 10. 6. If the reading is correct, ες has been amended to εσ, but εσ is by no means clear, nor is it certain that the ε is by another hand.

Fr. 12. 4. αληθιδιουν is suggested by κυκτι in the preceding line, but ιδιουν would also be suitable.

Fr. 17. 4. Some case of ελατινος presumably.

Fr. 18. There was a junction between two ελειδεις near the right-hand edge of this strip, the surface of which is worn, as also is that of Frs. 19, 20, and 22.

6. Αλεξάνδρος is one of many possibilities.

Fr. 21. Like Fr. 18, this piece shows a junction between ελειδεις along the right-hand edge, but the appearance of the two fragments is otherwise not very similar.

Fr. 22. 3. This was apparently the last line of a column.

Fr. 24. 3. Perhaps ολιγομεδια, either as the mother of Alexander or a date.

Fr. 25. 1. α or a round letter like ε or σ is probable after τ.

Fr. 36. 3. ΠΙαυσα: or possibly ΠΙαυσαίνιας; cf. n. on Fr. 1.

Fr. 44. i. 1-16, '(Philip was induced?) to try a medicine. When he was about to give it, Parmenion, who had a quarrel with Philip, wrote to Alexander bidding him beware of Philip to whom he heard Darius was offering a thousand talents and his own sister in marriage as the price of the king's destruction. Alexander received the letter, and suppressing it drank the medicine...'

1 sqq. Cf. Plutarch, Alex. 19, Arrian ii. 4, 12, Curtius iii. 6, Justin xi. 8; Diodorus xvii. 31 is more concise and does not mention the letter of Parmenion. For [επιχειρησε]ειν cf. Plutarch, l. c. επιχειρησε φαρμακεια, but αυτον may mean Alexander (cf. Arrian, l. c. καθηρα εβδελει Αλεξανδρον φαρμακεια), in which case another infinitive may have preceded, e. g. επηγειλατο δια της επιχειρησειν, or επηγειλατο επιχειρησειν, or επηγειλατο επιχειρησειν,

4. διαφορος αν: this detail is not given by the other authorities.

7. φωλαξαθαι is the word used also by Plutarch and Arrian, ll. cc.

8-10. χειλα ταλαντα ... και την αλεφειν: so Curt. mille talentis ... et spe nurtiarum sororis eius. Plutarch says διορισεις μεγαλαι και γαμω θεγατρος, Arrian χρηματων only.

12. The form Δω occurs in Aristoph. Εγ. 290 (πουελα), but otherwise belongs to a much later period, e. g. D. Hal. xi. 18.

14-15. αδειων seems to be an error for αδειου, the meaning being similar to e. g. that in Polyb. v. 25. 7 σαφες ειδωσ ... αυ προσποιηθειει δι. A use of προσποιηθειει with the dative in the sense of κοινωνει does not occur.

ii. 1-16. '... The Macedonians were seized by dismay, for there were 600,000 of the barbarians, while the Persians held the Macedonians in contempt. When he saw that the decision was imminent Alexander was in a torment of suspense and had recourse
to prayer, calling on Thetis and the Nereids and Nereus and Poseidon, for the last of whom he ordered that a four-horse chariot should be brought and cast into the sea; and he offered sacrifices by night...

1. εἴη: sc. φόβος or some synonym. For the confidence of the Persians cf. Arrian ii. 6. 8 καταπατήσειν τε τῇ ἱππῷ τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν στρατιὰν ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν αὐτῷ (sc. Δαρείῳ) ἐπαίροντες ἐλεγον, Plutarch, Alex. 20 ἀποκρυμαμένον δὲ Δαρείον δεδύναντι μὴ φθάσωσιν αὐτὸν ἀποδράντες οἱ πολέμοι, Diodor. xvii. 32 describes the effect of the disparity in numbers on the local population, τῆς μὲν τῶν Μακεδ. ἄλλοποταυταυταυτας, τὸ δὲ πλῆθος τῆς τῶν Περσ. στρατιάς καταπεπληγμένα. Panic is not, however, attributed to the Macedonians in other Greek sources; as Kaerst remarks (Gesch. des Hellenismus, p. 364), it cannot be inferred from Arrian ii. 7. 5 παρεκαλεῖ θαρρεῖν, though it may be hinted at by Diodor. xvii. 33. 1 τῶν δὲ κατασκόπων ἀπαγγειλάντων... τὸν Αρείον... τῇ δυνάμει προσίεναι καταπληκτικῶς: cf. Justin xi. 9. 3 periculosius differre bellum ratus, ne desperatio suds cresceret.

2-3. εξηκοντα... μηναθ[ε]ρ[ε]: so Arrian ii. 8, 9, Plutarch, Alex. 18. Diodor. xvii. 31. 2 puts the Persian infantry at over 400,000, the cavalry at 100,000 at least, and Justin gives similar figures at this point (xi. 9. 1), though he had shortly before (6. 11) stated the number of the Persian army as 600,000.

4-5. See n. on l. 1 above.

6 sqq. Cf. Curt. iii. 8. 20 Ceterum, ut solent fieri cum ultimis discriminis tempus adventat, in sollicitudinem versa fiducia est. Iliam ipsam fortunam, qua adsirante res tam prospera gesserat, verebatur... ipse in ingum editi montis ascensus multisque conluctibus facibus patrio more sacrificatum dis praestibus loci fectit. Kaerst, l. c., pronounces the statement of Curtius to be worthless, and that of Diodor. xvii. 33. 1 that Alexander regarded the approach of the enemy as a heaven-sent opportunity to be 'an sich angemessener'; cf. Plutarch, Alex. 20. But the one does not necessarily exclude the other, and some anxiety on the eve of this critical battle would be only natural. Justin goes further in speaking of actual fear (metum xi. 9. 3), which is not involved in sollcitudo nor ἀγωνία, the latter being attributed to Alexander on several occasions by Diodorus; cf. xvii. 31. 4. 56. 3. 116. 4 (we owe these references to Mr. W. W. Tarn).

9-11. Cf. e. g. Plutarch, Alex. 33 παρεκάλει τοῦς θεοὺς, ός Καλλισθένης φησίν, ἐπευκίμονοι... ἀμῦναι. The choice of deities on the present occasion is somewhat surprising, even when allowance is made for the proximity of the sea (cf. Curt. L. c. dis præsidibus loci) and the legendary descent of Alexander from Thetis and Nereus. As Mr. Tarn observes, this story looks like an adaptation from another occasion when the invocation of marine gods is recorded in a more appropriate setting; cf. Nearchus ap. Arrian, Ind. 18. 11, where when starting down the Hydaspes Alexander sacrifices to Poseidon, Amphitrite, the Nereids, &c. (this no doubt is a genuine instance), and Anab. i. 11. 16, where he is said to have made libations to Poseidon and the Nereids when crossing the Hellespont.

15. ἐσφ[αγν][ά]το ὁ τοῦ νεκροῦ: cf. the passage of Curtius cited in the n. on ll. 6 sqq. Sacrifice is repeatedly mentioned by the historians of Alexander, and according to Arrian vii. 25. 2 it was his daily habit.

iii. 1-19. '... (first) the Persians took to flight, then the rest of the barbarian host and after them the mercenaries. The cavalry were pursued by Alexander's cavalry and the infantry by his infantry, and the plain was filled with corpses. A large number of the Macedonians fell on the barbarian camp, which was full of treasure of all kinds, in order to plunder the contents. But Alexander desiring to capture Darius pursued him at full speed; when he learned, however, that he...'

1-3. l. e. g. εἰς φυγὴν ὄρμη[σαν], which happens to be the phrase of Diodorus at this
point (xvii. 34. 7). The statement here is in substantial agreement with the account of Arrian ii. 10-11, who says that Darius fled as soon as he saw his left wing giving way, but that the Greek mercenaries in the centre stood their ground and fought well until attacked on their exposed left flank.

7-8. Cf. Diodor. xvii. 34. 9 τὰς ὅ συνεχή τόπος νεκρῶν ἐπιληψθῆ, but this was a conventional phrase which reappears e.g. xvii. 61. 2.


18. ὑπέρδομοι: the vestiges do not suggest κ, but are not inconsistent with the irregular formation of that letter as sometimes found in this text. μητρατμα λλος could be read.

18-19. According to Diodor. xvii. 35. 1, Arrian ii. 11. 8, Curtius iii. 12. 1 the pursuit was cut short by nightfall. Apparently another or a further reason was here stated, e.g. that Darius was beyond reach; cf. Curtius, l.c., postquam et nox adpetebat et consequendi spes non erat. At the end of l. 19 the broken letter might be ε, α, β, σ, and this may well have ended the line.

iv. 1-17. 'On the next day when he was suffering from want of attention one of the guards brought him a piece of bread which he had taken from a herdsman. In his hunger he ate it readily, remarking “Every one likes to live”. There were killed of the Macedonians 1,000 infantry and 200 cavalry, and of the barbarians not less than 50,000 infantry and 3,000 cavalry, and about... of the mercenaries.'

1-9. This somewhat insignificant anecdote has not been traced in other authorities.BARPOS is to be supplied before εξευρημένος.

5. τροφὸς: the straightness of base in the final letter suggests ν rather than ι, but the masculine form is unknown.

9 sqq. The numbers of the slain in this battle as reported by other authorities are: Diodor. xvii. 36. 6, Persians: infantry, 100,000; cavalry, 10,000. Macedonians: infantry, 300; cavalry, 150. Arrian ii. 11. 11, Persians: as Diodor. Plutarch, Alex. 20, Persians: 110,000. Curtius ii. 11. 27, Persians: as Diodor. Macedonians: infantry, 32 (?); cavalry, 150. Justin xi. 9. 10, Persians: infantry, 61,000; cavalry, 10,000. Macedonians: infantry, 130; cavalry, 150. Compared with these estimates, our author largely reduces the Persian and increases the Macedonian loss, and he also stands alone, if the restoration in l. 17 is right, in giving a separate figure for the mercenaries in the Persian service. Of these 30,000 took part in the battle (Callisthenes, ap. Polyb. xii. 18. 2, Arrian ii. 8. 9), and 8,000 are said to have escaped with Amyntas (Arrian ii. 13. 2; 4,000 according to Diodor. xvii. 48. 2), 8,000 to have been subsequently got together by Agis (Diodor. xvii. 48. 1), and a few others to have been included in the 4,000 fugitives collected by Darius (Arrian ii. 13. 1). The number slain can hardly have exceeded a few thousand. At the end of l. 18 εξηκόσια is not impossible, though not very satisfactory.

v. The remains of this column are insufficient to afford a clear clue to its subject. In l. 19 εὐτάρατος seems not unlikely.

Fr. 45. Cf. Arrian iii. 7. 1-6, where the crossing of the Euphrates is described in more detail. According to Curtius iv. 9. 12 the march from Phoenicia had occupied eleven days. On the verso of this fragment are words beginning with λ (1802. 2).

3. Perhaps εἰμί.

Fr. 46. Since the verso of this fragment contains words beginning with κ (1802. 1) it came later in the roll than Fr. 45.
Frs. 47–54 = 1802. 4–11. The character of the writing on the verso suggests that Fr. 50 came from the neighbourhood of Fr. 48, and Fr. 53 from that of Fr. 49.

Fr. 49. o of ρο has apparently been converted from ε.

Fr. 54. That this small piece belongs to 1798 is hardly certain.

1799. ORATORICAL FRAGMENT.

9·9 × 9 cm. Second century.

This fragment, containing remains of two columns of an unidentified speech, is written in a small sloping hand which is on the border line between literary and cursive, some of the forms, e.g. the ligature of ει, being of a thoroughly cursive character; the MS. may fall within the second century. ι at the end of a line is once written as a stroke above the preceding vowel. No stops or other signs occur.

Of the first column only a few letters from the ends of the lines remain, but the second includes a continuous passage of 25' nearly complete lines in which apparently the policy of Demosthenes is vindicated. The declaration that disaster would have been avoided by a thorough acceptance of that policy points to a period subsequent to the battle of Chaeronea, but the occasion of the speech is not made clear. There seems to be a defect in the text in ll. 20–1, besides minor errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i</th>
<th>Col. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [..] τον λέγει τῶν νῦν, προειρήμενον η. | [..]
| τετολμημένον ἐπειδή | [..]
| τὰ μὲν παρ αὐτῶν λέξις | [..]
| τὰ αληθῆ καὶ συμφερόντα | [..]
9–10. εκα[στον is very uncertain, but seems to suit the construction. ι might be e.g. ἡν.
11. Not ἡ τίων nor, apparently, ἡ και.
20–1. A blank space sufficient for four or five letters has been left at the end of l. 20, and the sentence is apparently incomplete. If οὐτο[ς]ι ou γαρ is right, the apodosis may be completed in some such way as suggested in the text; but there is barely room for the second o of οὐτο[ς]ι, which, however, is sometimes written very small in this hand. At the end of l. 21 φι is not satisfactory, since more of the vertical stroke of φ would be expected to be visible, though the surface of the papyrus is damaged here; moreover, λι can barely be got into the lacuna at the beginning of the following line (the division Φι[πτος would be contrary to rule). But εκείνω in ll. 24 and 27 clearly point to a mention of the Macedonian king earlier in the context. With regard to the word after γαρ, the ink in the first letter has run somewhat and the reading is doubtful; ηι is perhaps more suitable than νι but neither is convincing.
27. η at the end of the line has been corrected from ου, whether by the original or a subsequent hand is difficult to say.
The handwriting of the following fragments, from a roll containing various biographies, is a fine specimen of the common oval type, and may be referred to the latter part of the second century more probably perhaps than the beginning of the third. The columns as usual are inclined slightly to the right. One apparent instance of a high stop, probably a later insertion, occurs in Fr. 1. 40. Short lines are filled up by means of the angular sign commonly used for that purpose. Whether the few small corrections are by the original or a later hand is doubtful. A small coronis marks the conclusion of sections. The titles prefixed to the biographies are sometimes enclosed by the short slightly curved strokes often employed in the colophons of literary papyri.

As at present reconstituted the papyrus consists of 30 fragments, of which a few are fairly substantial, but their relative position, except in a few instances, is uncertain. If, as is possible, the top of Fr. 3. i is concerned with Thucydides (cf. note ad loc.), that fragment must have followed Fr. 2, and there is no doubt about the order of Frs. 4–7; but otherwise the arrangement adopted is often more or less arbitrary. The biographies which can be identified are of Sappho (Fr. 1. i, ii), Simonides (Fr. 1. ii), Aesop (Fr. 2. i, ii), Thucydides (Fr. 2. ii, Fr. 3. i?), Demosthenes (Fr. 3. i, ii), Aeschines (Fr. 3. ii), Thrasybulus (Frs. 4–7), Hyperides (Fr. 8. ii), Leucocomas (Fr. 8. ii), and Abderus (Fr. 11). This is a strange medley, and no intelligible principle seems to have guided the compiler either in the choice of his characters or their grouping. They are mainly literary, but the soldier-politician Thrasybulus does not come under that category, and Leucocomas and Abderus are entirely mythical. The inclusion of the former, whose name will not be familiar to many, is singular; Abderus was at least the eponymous hero of a considerable town. As for the disposition of the Lives, like sometimes consorts with like: two lyric poets, both beginning with the same letter, figure in Fr. 1, and in Fr. 3 Aeschines is appropriately placed next to Demosthenes. But a reason why Thucydides should have been sandwiched between Demosthenes and Aesop, or Leucocomas should rub shoulders with Hyperides, is not easy to imagine. Nor are the biographies themselves, so far as they go, of much moment. Concerning Sappho there is nothing new beyond a variant of her father's name, and the statement that Charaxus was her eldest brother. The aspersion on her character, mentioned also, among Greek authorities, by Suidas, reappears here at a much earlier date. Reference is made in this section to the Grammarian Chameleon, the only citation in 1800 of a definite authority;
elsewhere the compiler contents himself with the vague 'some say' or the like. A mutilated passage referring to Simonides' reputed innovation in the alphabet apparently has the negative merit of differing from the statement in Suidas (cf. A. Kirchoff, Gesch. des Griech. Alphabets, p. 1). Of the death of Aesop, who was a favourite subject for biography (fragments of three Lives of Aesop have already been found in papyri, of the 4th–7th centuries; cf. Collart, Rev. de Philol. xliii, pp. 38 sqq.), there is a circumstantial account, including some new but not very valuable details. The Lives of Thucydidès and of Hyperides are too fragmentary to be informative; of Demosthenes little that is fresh could be expected, and the only novelty is a blunder, on a par with the statement that Aeschines was the eldest of his father's sons, which Aeschines himself refutes. An anecdote, found also in Plutarch, about the generosity of Demosthenes to his defeated rival is given with greater elaboration in the account of the latter. One would gladly have had more of the section concerning Thrasybulus, which included some details not otherwise known, although errors like those just noticed do not give a good impression of the accuracy of the writer,—regarding whose identity we are entirely in the dark.

Fr. 1.

Col. i.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pερι Σαπφήνου</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Σαπφόω το μεν γενός] Ὑν Αὔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[σβία πόλεως δὲ Μιτρυληνᾶς]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[πάτρος δὲ Σκαμανδρόν καὶ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[τα δὲ τιμαί Σκαμανδρῶν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[μου αδελφὸς δὲ] εἰσὶ τρεῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ερ]γίουν καὶ Δαιρίχου πρὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σβίτατον δὲ Χαραξίου οὐ πλεῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 σας εἰς Αἰγυπτιὸν Δαιρίχαι τι
νι προσόμελησι κατεδα
πανηγεν εἰς ταύτην πλεί
στα τοῦ δὲ Δαιρίχου (γενόντος) οὖν μαλ
λον ἡγατηπεν ὑψητερὰ δὲ ε

15 σὲ Κλειν ομώνυμον την ε
αυτὸς μὴ τρὶ κατηγορηται

Col. ii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pερὶ Σαπφήνου</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 letters ωσ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pερ Χαμαλεωίν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 τοις επλανηθην . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>απ αυτον λεγει [. . . Άιολιδι?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διαλεκτω κεχρη . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γραφεν δει βυβλια ενεα μεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λυρικα ελεγειων δε και αλλων?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 εν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

>———

περὶ Σιμωνίδου

Σιμωνίδης το μεν [γενος την]
Κεῖος πόλεως δε Ιουλιδος
πατρὸς δὲ Δεσποτοὺς γεγο

40 νεν δε φιλαργυροις τήνες
δ. αυτω την των μνήμο
νικων ευρεσιν προστίθεα
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δυκαταφρονητος δοκει γεν
[γν]ην μεν γαρ οφιν φαινει
gνηρχει το δε μεγεθος-
μεικρα παντελος το δ αυτο
25 [συ]μβεβηκε και περι τον
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Fr. 2.

Col. i. Col. ii. Col. iii.

30 [. . .] των Δελ[φων . . .

35 φ[. . .] σετηκασι τον βω

45 θυσιασαντα αυτον αμοι

45 μο[τ]ων προσευρεθον δε φαι
συ [αυ]τον των καθ. [. . .

20 [ευ]καταφρονητος δοκει γε
[γον]ηην κα η δυσειδεστατον[ν]
[τη]ν μεν γαρ οφιν φαινει
gνηρχει το δε μεγεθος-
μεικρα παντελος το δ αυτο

5 [. . .] κ[ο]μιζοντες σφαγιασα

10 [. . .] μενου δε του ιερειου και

15 [. . .] λαμ επεσκωψεν εφ οις διοργι
Ἰντοις Ἰον Ἰυσᾶς δὲ λόγων Ἀποκριματῶν Ἐμενὸς Ἀποστολὸς

σθεντες οἱ πολλοὶ λίθοι 50 αὐτῶν βαλλοντες κατα
κρημνον εωσαν μετ ου
πολυ δὲ λοιμικον πάθος

ἐπεσκηψε τη πολει χρη
στηριακομενοι δ αυτος

ο θεος ανειπεν ου προτερ

ρον [λης]ειν τον νοσ[ο]ν με
χρις [αν Α]ισωπον εξι[λασ
κωντ]αι οι δε περιτει [>
χισ]αιτες τον τοπον [εν

60 [οι κ]ατεπεσεν βαμοιν θ ι
δρυσα]μενι λυτηρ]οις
της νοσου ας ηρωι δυσιας
προ[ς]ηνεγκαν

περι Θουκυδιδου

65 Θουκυδιδης το μεν γενος
ην Αθηναιος παις δ Ο]λο
ρον διαβαλλουσι δε τον πα
τερα αυτου Θραικα οντα
eιν Αθηνας μετοικισθη

70 ναι δυνατος δε εν λογοις α

υπ[η εν]αμενος ανεγρα
φειν το[ν] γενομενον Αθη
ναιοις [και] Πελοπονη
[σιοις πολεμον

Fr. 3.

Col. i. Col. ii.

[ [
[.............] ev[...
[.............] etων [...

25 [γεφυσαμενος του φ[αμα [κ]ου συντομος εξεπνευ
[σε] μεχρι τελ[ο]υς της [ε
Αθηναιοὶ ἀκενοταφίῳ σαν δημοσίᾳ εν Ἀ...οῖσι των Σηπεροῖν

Δημοσθένης ο Ῥητωρ Ἀθηναῖος μὲν ἣν Τὸ γένος

κομίθη δὲ νηπίων υποτού πατρός απελεύθη υπερπροφή ν

Δημοσθένης καὶ Δημοσθένους Παιανίους δε τῶν δημῶν

κριναῖς τους επιτροπίους ἐνοσφίσιν χρημάτιος

των [αυτοῦ εἰς] το βῆ [μα [παρελθὼν] αριστα]

[λεγοθείας [αξιωμα δια]
[φυλαξάς Ἀθηναίου διὰ πα []

λίπ τὴν ελευθερίαν α

νακτησμοῦ θύμων χαλκῆς

ἀναστησαί τε εν Κέραι []

μικρεῖ πετράρχῃ ἐν []

στήλῃ ενεκολάψαν τοίς

οὐδὲ εἰπὲ ἵνα γνωμαῖς

ρωμαῖς Δημοσθένεις εσχές

ὑποστὸν εἶν Ελλήνων νη>

ζεν Αρης Μακεδων

[αξιωμα ὅπιις]

φυλάξας Ἀθηναῖος δὲ πα 

νων ἦν [Ἀθηναῖος παῖς το]

Ἀτρομητοῦ Κατὰ μητρὸς

Γλαυκοθεᾶς πρεσβυτατος

των αδελφῶν Φιλοχαροῦ καὶ Ἀσφόβου κατὰ ἀρχας δὲ

ἐπιταγωνίστη ἀρχαῖος υποκρίνομεν εὐφυὴς

ἐν λογίας γενόμενος

μεταλαβὼν δὲ το πεμπτὸν μὲ

νωσε Δημοσθένη ἡρώ

σω στεφανοὶ καὶ τραγῳδίῳς οὺ μετὰ

βῶν δὲ τὸ πεμπτὸν μὲ

τῶν Ἀθηνῶν

Δημοσθένης δὲ οὐ μὴν
σικακησας επι τοις γεγε
νμενοις το δε αστατον
ησ τυχης επιλαβηθεις ε
65 [φοδ]ιουν αυτωι αργυριου
[τα]λαυνιν προσεπεμψεν
[ο δε] ου δεξαμενος εδα
[κρυ]σεν πυνθανομενου
[δε τ]ινοις επι τινι δακρυνοι
70 [ειπ]ε οτι τοιαινης πολεως
[απα]λλατομαι εν ηι και
[εχ]βροι συνπαθειντερου
[φι]λων ευρισκομενα] γενο
75 [. . . . . . . . . .] Αττικον
[. . . . . . . . . .] Ροδιοις

Frs. 4 + 5.

ναιοι[...
μη[...
δε τ[...
κτο[...
5 λει[...
οτε[......] α[...
]
[περι] Θρασυβουλου
Θρασυβουλος παῖς μεν ην Δικου
[to δε γ]εν[o]s Αθη[ναιος Στει
10 [ρευς] δε των δημων ......
[. . . .] Λε πατ[...

Frs. 6 + 7.

Col. i.

. . . . . .
...? συνι αυτωι απο Φυλης
[καταγ]οιτι των δημον οσ
[κατ]αλμησαν οι τρια
5 [κοντα] εγραφειν ψηφισμα
[Θρασυβ]ουλος μεταδιδους
[αυτοις?] της πολιτειας α
[προβουλευ]του δε του ψη
[ψηφισματος] γεναμενου ου
10 [κ ετυχου? τ]ης τιμης ο δε παν
[. . . . . . . .] νας αγαπη
[σα]ις αλη[...]|εν τοις δικα |
[στ]ηριοις οι κινδυνευ
[. . . . . . . .] ος δ εκαλυ

15 [θη ? . . . . . .] ψηφ[ . . . . . .]
Fr. 8.

Col. i. | Col. ii.
---|---
Ἰμηι 20 abews | 20 ἀθεως [
Ἰδε | εὐγενεία[ ἐπει δε?
Ἰσθετα | η Ἀθηναίων στρατεία? περι
Ἰοσιν | Δαμιαν της [Θεσσαλίας
] | συνηπιγησ[εν ὡς συνερ
ἀπο | των τοι Αἰμιο[σθενεί ὡν
] | ύπο Αντιπατρο[υν εν τοις
σχα | δεκα ρητοροι [ητῆθη και παν?
τους | των ατυχο[σας...
| | αυτος εν Μακεδονιαί ἂ
Ἰοσχα 25 γος τῶν Δημο[σθενεί ὡν
| | υπο Αντιπατρο[υν εν τοις
Ἰτους | δεκα ρητοροι [ητῆθη και παν?
جموعة | του αναχθει[ης ανμ[ος εν Μακήδο]αι
απσηρ αυ | λα[προσ αὐτος εν Μακεδονϊαί α
των Ἀθηναί | 30 πολετο Αθηναίων δε πα
| | [περι] Δευκο[ομα
| | [η]περι Λευκοκιομα
 dõiσ κ αυτος εν Μακεδονϊαί α
>()-> | 35 Δευκοκομιας το γε[ων μεν
| | ην Κορη[σ] πολεω[ς δε Κνω
Ἰμετα τον 'λιν την ελευθερ[αν ανακ
| | σου μι[ρακισκος δε [ων εν
Ἀθηνα των ατυχησίας 

Fr. 9.

| Fr. 10.
---|---
λγος αὑ | ] [ ...
[politeus[a | ]εδιδων
[ | ]ἀνω της
[ | ]ς βανων
[ | ]ς παρά
[ | ]ς ντ [.
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Fr. 11.

[...] νῷ[(περὶ Αβδηροῦν
Αβδηρος] εν Θρα;
κη τῇ
5 εν Ἰονιαι
cαμ. [α
τρεφ[
γης α[...

Fr. 12.

[...] γενεόθαμι απ[ἐφον τρο[προ[ἐκτηςιν αυτος [5
ψαμ[ε]ν[
πε[ν[. [[...

tω[.αθείν [μτο[
tρο[ις] χρησα[]
μαρτεν σεο[]

Fr. 13.

[...] σενιο[ يون[
[στατο[]
[μεν[
ητης[
ο τε την []

Fr. 14.

[...] εν[
[...] ευ[
[...] ων[
[...] ημε[ν[
[...] ν[

Fr. 15.

[...] γενο[
[...] αρτ[]
[...] ωσιασ[)
[...] ομεν[
[...] ν[

Fr. 16.

[...] γενο[
[...] κοι []
[...] ρω[
[...] ηςας ου[...
Concerning Sappho. Sappho was a Lesbian by birth, of the city of Mitylene, and daughter of Scamandrus, or, as some say, of Scamandronymus. She had three brothers, Erigyius, Larichus, and Charaxus, the eldest, who sailed to Egypt and associating with one Doricha expended large sums on her; but Sappho preferred Larichus, who was younger. She had a daughter Cleis, so named after her own mother. She has been accused by some of immorality and of being a lover of women. In appearance she seems to have been insignificant and ugly, being of dark complexion and of very small stature; and the same happens to be true also of ..., who was undersized ...

4. Μιθυληνῆς: cf. Hdt. ii. 135, who calls her brother Charaxus a Mitylenean, Strab. xiii. 617, &c. According to Suidas and others her birthplace was Eresus.

5–6. Ἀκαμήνδρου: this is known as a Lesbian name (cf. Dion. Hal. ix. 18, Lebas, L

Fr. 1. 2–26. 'Concerning Sappho. Sappho was a Lesbian by birth, of the city of Mitylene, and daughter of Scamandrus, or, as some say, of Scamandronymus. She had three brothers, Erigyius, Larichus, and Charaxus, the eldest, who sailed to Egypt and associating with one Doricha expended large sums on her; but Sappho preferred Larichus, who was younger. She had a daughter Cleis, so named after her own mother. She has been accused by some of immorality and of being a lover of women. In appearance she seems to have been insignificant and ugly, being of dark complexion and of very small stature; and the same happens to be true also of ... , who was undersized ...'}
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Inscr. Gr. 191) but is not attributed to Sappho's father elsewhere. Charaxus is called the son of Scamandronymus by Hdt. l. c., and this is one of the several alternatives in Suidas to Simon, which he considered correct.

8. [Er]γνων: in Suidas s.v. Σαπφώ, where alone this brother is mentioned, the name is spelled Εὐρύγνως, and [Ε]ρίγνως could equally well be read here, but cf. Arrian iii. 6. 8 'Ερίγνως ὁ Δαρίχων, Diod. xvii. 81, 83; moreover in Suidas, l. c., the name of Sappho's father was according to some authorities Ηερίγνως, which is no doubt a corruption of 'Ερίγ.

Δαρίχων: cf. Suidas, l. c., Athen. x. 424 f.

8-9. That Charaxus was the eldest is not elsewhere stated; Suidas puts the sons in the order Larichus, Charaxus, Erigyius.

10. Αἰγυπτον suits the space better than Ναυκρατιν (Strab. xvii. 808, Athen. 596 b). Λαρίχωχ occurs in 1281. 1. 11; cf. Strab. l. c. τὴν ἑταίρα ... ἤν Σαπφώ μὲν ... καλεῖ Δωρίχαν ... ἄλλοι δὲ ὄνομαίζουν Ροδίαν (ἄλλοι include Hdt. ii. 135; cf. Athen. 596 c).

11. προσομιλησάς, which would be expected, cannot be read, the letter preceding ε having a vertical stroke consistent with η or i, but neither προσομιλητίς nor προσομιλησάς is satisfactory with the dative Δωρίχαν. Possibly a verb has dropped out, or προσομιλησάς may have been written in error.

13. An adjective is evidently missing; the loss of νεον would be easy between Δαρίχων and οστα.

15. Κλεω: cf. Suid. l. c., who also gives Κλ. as the name of Sappho's mother, Sapph. 85.


26. Perhaps [Αλκαίο], which would give some point to the coincidence, but shortness of stature does not seem to be attributed to Alcaeus elsewhere.

γεγονα is probably for γεγονα, since there is not room for ἐλλοττων γεγονος. Perhaps θε stood in the lacuna.

27. η is preceded by the top of a vertical stroke, which would suit i or ν; μι may be read in place of ν at the end of the line.

28-35. Probably Sappho is still the subject, for though the columns are long her biography would naturally occupy a considerable space and there would hardly have been room for another; moreover, the mention of Chamaeleon, whose treatise on Sappho is known from Athen. 599 c, suits the view that she is concerned here.

29-30. Perhaps Ποντικός, since Chamaeleon was a native of Heraclea, but Ποντικός would rather be expected, as e.g. Athen. 273 c Χαμ. ὁ Ποντικός. The doubtful θ in l. 30 may equally well be σ.

33-5. Cf. Suid. s.v. Σαπφώ έγραψε δὲ μελῶν λυρικῶν βιβλία θ' ... καὶ ἐπιγράμματα καὶ ἐλεγεία καὶ ἑυμβολαὶ καὶ μονῳδίας. The suggested restoration assumes what is quite uncertain, that the non-lyrical poems were included in a single book. ω of ελεγείων is very doubtful, only a very small vestige remaining which would also suit a, but ελεγεῖον ψι would not fill the line, and the epigrams &c. ought not to have been ignored.

ll. 36-46. Concerning Simonides. Simonides was a Ceian by birth, of the city of Iulis, and son of Leoprepes. He was an avaricious man. Some ascribe to him the invention of mnemonics; and he himself declares this in an epigram. Some say that he further invented ...'

39. l. Λεωπρ.

40. φιλόγνωρος: cf. Pindar, Isthm. ii. 6 ὁ Μώση γὰρ οὖν φιλοκρῆν κτλ., and Schol. νῦν,
φησί, μισθοῦ συντάτου στὸν ἑπικούσιον πρῶτον Σιμωνίδου προκαταργημένου... εἰ έπει καὶ Καλλίμαχος.

καὶ τὰ μάκρα τῶν στοιχείων καὶ διπλὰ, ἀλλὰ ἐπειδή ἦταν ὡς αἰσχροκερδής ὡς Χαμαιλέων φησίν, ἄνθεν καὶ Καλλίμαχος. οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω τὴν Μοῦσαν, ὡς ὁ Κεῖος Ὑλίχου νέπους. λέγει δὲ (σκ. Πίνδαρος) ταῦτα πρὸς Σιμ., ὡς φαλάργουν διατίραφεν τὸν ἄνδρα, Athen. 656 ν ὡς ἀληθῶς καθήκειν οἱ Σιμ. καὶ αἰσχροκερδῆς, ὡς Χαμαιλέων φησίν, Schol. Aristoph. Pax 691, Suid. s. v. Σιμ., &c.

40-5. Cf. Marm. Par. 54 Σιμ., ὡς τὸ μνημονικόν εὐρύν, Suid. s. v. Σιμ., καὶ τὴν μνημονικὴν διέτησεν εὑρέν οὖσαν, Pliny, N. H. vii. 24, &c., and Simonid. Fr. 146 μνήμην δ᾽ οὔτινά φημι Σιμωνίδη ἱσοφαρίζεσθαι παθεῖ Αισθητῶν, which is presumably the epigram referred to.

45 sqq. From the number 24 in l. 47 it is evident that this passage describes an invention concerning the alphabet, which is also attributed to Simonides by Suidas, l. c. προσεξεύρε δὲ καὶ τὰ μακρὰ τῶν στοιχείων καὶ διπλὰ, but the statement in the papyrus does not coincide and a suitable restoration remains to be found. At the beginning of l. 47 either κτ or χτ may be read, and στοιχεία suggests itself, but διίπλα στοίχεια would be too long and does not well accord with the rest of the line. The letter before στ is either ο or ω, and an may be αγί.

48. εὐ: Or συ; αὐτο[ρ]}γιας is possible.

Fr. 2. 1-29. That the remains of these lines relate, like l. 30 sqq., to Aesop is uncertain, but is suggested by l. 18 μίθ. ... (?) ; αποκριματων has been restored in l. 21 on this hypothesis.

31. εὐωμα is apparently meant, in spite of the unusual diaeresis; the letter after μ may be either ο or ω, and the vestige at the end of the line is consistent with ι or ν.

32-63. 'The cause is said to be this: whenever a man comes to offer sacrifice to the god the Delphians bringing their knives with them stand round the altar, and when the priest has slaughtered and flayed the victim and taken the inwards each of the bystanders cuts off whatever portion he can and goes away with it, so that the man who offers the sacrifice often goes off with nothing at all. Aesop taunted and mocked at the Delphians for this, which enraged the populace and they pelted him with stones and threw him over a cliff. Not long after a plague fell upon the city, and when they consulted the oracle the god told them that the pestilence would not cease until they propitiated Aesop. So they inclosed the place where he fell and set up an altar, and brought sacrifices to him as if he were a hero to avert the pestilence.'


38. l. εἱρευ: εἱρευον has come in from the next line.

48-9. According to Aristoph. Vesp. 1446-7 Aesop was accused of having stolen a cup, which the Schol. adds they concealed among his belongings, a story also found in Heraclid. Pont. Resp. Mag. 2. Plutarch in De sera numinis vind. 556 has a different version which represents Aesop as coming to Delphi with offerings from Croesus and brings in Iadmon, as in Hdt. ii. 134.

51. κρηστοῦ: the πέτρα Υάμπεια according to Plutarch, l. c.

56. Whether the interlinear insertion here and in l. 71 is by a different hand is uncertain.

64-74. 'Concerning Thucydides. Thucydides was by birth an Athenian, and the son of Olorus; his father is maligned as being a Thracian who migrated to Athens. Having literary skill he wrote the history of the war between the Athenians and Peloponnesians.'
67-9. Cf. the anonymous Life 1 Θρᾳκιόν δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ γένος· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῷ ἦσαν Θρᾳκῆς εἶχε τοῦνομα.

73. About 7 lines are missing at the foot of the column.

Fr. 3. 1-9. If these lines relate to Thucydides, Fr. 3. i may be supposed to follow immediately Fr. 2. iii. Those two columns cannot be combined into one on account of the vestiges in Fr. 2. 75-6, which do not suit the beginnings of Fr. 3. 8-9. Whether the historian died abroad or at Athens was disputed. For the tradition of a cenotaph cf. Marcellinus, Vita Thuc. 31 ἐπὶ τοῦ τάφου κεῖσθαι, τοῦ κενοταφίου δὲ τούτου γνώρισμα εἶναι. But according to the same authority, 17 (cf. 32 and 55), the tomb was among the Κιμώνια μνήματα πρὸς τὸν Μελιστήρα τῆς Κοίλῃ, which does not suit the deme-name in ll. 8-9, and the reference of this passage to Thucydides is therefore very questionable. The letter after a in 1. 8 seems to be » or A, pointing to ᾿Αμαχαντεῦσι, ᾿Αλαιεῦσι OF ᾿Αλωπεκεῦσι: Αλιμουντι can certainly not be read. In 1. 6 avroly ἐπὶ τῆς Arz|tx|s suggests itself, and Αττϊκης is not inconsistent with the scanty remains. [ἢ]. 7 ao or Aco is more suitable than vo.

10-39. 'Concerning Demosthenes. Demosthenes the orator was an Athenian by birth, the son of Demosthenes, and of the Paeanian deme. When quite a child he was left by his father under the guardianship of Onetor and Aphobus; and when he came of age he displayed his skill in speaking by bringing his guardians to trial on account of the money belonging to him which they had appropriated. Coming forward to the tribune (he acquitted himself) excellently . . . and when he had taken some of the poison he immediately breathed his last, having maintained to the end the claim to freedom. The Athenians, when they regained their liberty, honoured him by setting up a bronze statue of him in the Ceramicus, and carved on a tablet the following epigram. "Had your strength been equal to your will, Demosthenes, the arms of Macedon would never have ruled Greece.""

17. Οὐρυτος: this is an error. The guardians were Aphobus, Demophon, and Therippides (In Aphob. 4); Onetor was a brother-in-law of Aphobus and acted in collusion with him against Demosthenes (cf. the C. Onet.).

22. εἰςοντρισμένον: cf. Plutarch, Dem. 4 τὰ μὲν νοσφισαμένων, τὰ δὲ ἀμελησάντων.

24. παρελθών suits the space better than απαρεσών.


32-3. Cf. Plutarch, Dem. 30 ὁ τῶν Ἀθ. δήμος . . . εἰκόνα τε χαλκῆν ἀνέτησε. According to Plutarch, X Oral. Vit. 847 a, the statue was πλησίον τοῦ περισχοινίσματος καὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν: Suidas says ἐν ἄγορᾳ. αὐτῶν rather than αὐτών is expected.

34-9. The epigram is quoted also by Plutarch, II. cc., and Suidas, who rightly give ἴσην ρώμην γνώμῃ. Plutarch, Dem. 30, and Suidas say that it was on the base of the statue.

40-74. 'Concerning Aeschines. Aeschines the orator was an Athenian by birth, the son of Atrometus and Glaucothea, and the eldest of the family, his brothers being Philochares and Laophobus. At first he was a tragic actor in minor parts, but being a naturally clever speaker exchanged the stage for the tribune at Athens. He indicted Ctesiphon for unconstitutional action in wrongly crowning Demosthenes with a gold crown when the new tragedies were brought out, but failing to get a fifth part of the votes he left Athens as an exile. Demosthenes, however, bearing no malice for what had taken place and taking heed of the fickleness of fortune sent him a talent of silver for the expenses of
his journey; but he refused it and wept. When he was asked why he wept he said "Because I am leaving a city where even enemies are found more sympathetic than friends".

He went to Rhodes and kept a school.

44-5. Aeschines, Fals. Leg. 149, says that Philochares was the eldest.

46. Λαοφο[βΙἼου : 1. Αφοβητου ; cf. Aeschin. l.c.

56-7. καυνος τραγωιδοις : i.e. at the Dionysia.

61-73. This story is not mentioned in the biographies of Aeschines, but is given by Plutarch, X Orat. Vit. 845 e, though apart from the amount the details are quite different. The passage is:—φεύγοντος δ' Λαοφού μετά τήν καταδίκην, ἵππῳ κατεδίωξεν αὐτόν (sc. Δημοσθένην) τοῦ δ' οἰηθέντοι αὐτῶν συλλαμβάνον καὶ προσπεισότοι καὶ συγκαλυψαμένοι, ἀναστήσας αὐτῶν παρεμ-θήσατο καὶ τάλαντον ἐδώκεν ἄργυριον.

72-3. [εγκριθ] and [φιλω] Murray.

74. Cf. Plutarch, X Orat. Vit. 840 d ἀπάρας εἰς τήν Ῥόδον ἐνταῦθα σχολὴν καταστησάμενος ἐδίδασκεν... σχολήν τ᾽ ἐκκε προσκατέλιπε τὸ Ῥωικόν διδασκαλεῖον κληθέν.

76. Ῥοδίοις : the story of the reading of the speech against Ctesiphon may well have followed here; cf. e.g. Plutarch, l.c.

Frs. 6-7. Whether these pieces are from the same column as Frs. 4-5 or a succeeding one is doubtfull; the dissimilarity of the versos rather favours the latter alternative.

1. Possibly Πειράζει... but the doubtful ρ may be any long letter—ν, φ, ψ.

2. ἕνιοι : the doubtful ν may equally be ι.

5 sqq. Cf. Aristole, Ath. Pol. 40. 2 καὶ δοκεῖ τοῦτο τε πολίτευσαι καὶ δοῦλος Ἀρκίνοις καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα γραφάμενον το ψήφισμα το ὁμολογούντων, καὶ του ἀνικότητα πάντων ἡ τε Πειραίων συνακολουθεῖ, δον ἔσονον φανερῶς ἢναν δοῦλον. A comparison of that passage suggests that δοῦλων were mentioned in the lacuna preceding l. 2 αὐτων ἀπο Φυλης, and that αὐτοῖς or ταῖς should be restored in l. 7; but ll. 11-15 are more difficult.

10. There is not room in the lacuna for μετεσχοχ : a slightly shorter supplement than that suggested would be preferable.

11. Ρασ is preceded by the base of a vertical stroke (γ or ι).

12-14. The position of the small detached fragment containing the letters ] κην[ and ]πνω[ with vestiges of a third line is made practically certain by the similarity of the fibres of the papyrus. In l. 12 the η is quite uncertain, and e.g. ελη[εν] would be possible. In l. 14 the vestige of the first letter suits i and the following have rounded tops like στ, σε, or ιο.

Fr. 8. ii. 20-33. The references in this passage indicate that the subject is Hyperides, who took an active part in the Lamian war (l. 23; cf. Plutarch, X Orat. Vit. 849 l, Phocion 23), was one of the orators whose surrender was demanded by Antipater after the battle of Cynnaion (l. 26), and according to some accounts was put to death in Macedonia (l. 29; cf. Plutarch, X Orat. Vit. 849 b ἐρμίππος δὲ φησιν αὐτὸν γλωττοτομηθῆναι εἰς Μακεδονιῶν ἔλληνα). 22-3. For the loose reference to Lamia cf. e.g. Pausan. vii. 10. 4 ἐστι τὸ ἐν λαμίᾳ πταίσαμα ἐγγένετο.

26-7. That the surrender of as many as ten orators was demanded by Antipater is apparently novel; that was the number, according to some authorities, asked for ten years before by Alexander (cf. Plutarch, Demosth. 23, Diod. xvii. 15), and possibly the two occasions are here confused.

Concerning Leucocomas. Leucocomas was a Cretan by birth, of the city of Cnosos. Being a comely youth (he was beloved by Promachus ...).

The story of Leucocomas and Promachus is known only from Conon τό. The passage is: ρα περὶ Προμάχου καὶ Λευκοκόμα τῶν Τνωσίων ... διέξεισι ὡς ἦρα Πρόμαχος νεανίου καλοῦ τοῦ Λευκοκόμα' ὡς ἄθλα αὐτῷ μεγάλα προὔτεινε καὶ κινδύνων μεστά' ὡς πάντα ὑπέστη Πρόμαχος ἐλπίδι τοῦ τυχών ' ὡς δὲ οὐκ οὕτω τυχώνει, καὶ ἀντιλυπεῖ Λευκοκόμαν τὸ τελευτάον τῶν ἄθλων (κράνος ἐγέρνει περιθεὶς τοῦ Λευκοκόμα' καὶ οὐκ ἔνεγκὼν τὴν ζηλοτυπίαν ξίφει αὐτὸν διεχρήσατο.

Fr. 9. This fragment resembles in appearance Frs. 6–8, and the contents are somewhat analogous; Fr. 10 is also rather similar.

Fr. 11. 3 sqq. No other name than Αἰβδηΐρος seems at all likely, especially as it is clear from Fr. 8. ii. 34 sqq. that this collection of biographies included mythical persons. For Abderus cf. Steph. Byz. s. v. Ἀθηνίας, Apollodor. ii. 5. 8, 841. II. 1–2, n. He is said to have been loved by Heracles, who founded Abdera in his honour after he had been killed by the horses of the Thracian king Diomedes.

4. κρί: or λή, but θρακίζει suits the context.


Fr. 18. This small piece possibly formed part of a third column of Fr. 3, the point of junction being opposite ll. 37–9; but the combination is unconvincing.

Fr. 20. 4. ἐν: the ε has been converted from a straight stroke (ι or η).

Fr. 21. ? δημευσαν was probably the end of the line, as is indicated by the diminution in size of the three last letters, as well as by a short blank space after φυ in l. 4.

Fr. 30. 2. ] t seems to have ended the line.

1801. Glossary.

This and the three following texts form a group of fragments of glossaries, still something of a novelty in papyri, and are an interesting sample of the work of early lexicographers. 1801 is the most ancient of the group, being written in a small semicursive hand which is rather similar to that of 1087 (Part VIII, Plate 4) ascribed to the latter part of the first century B.C. One of the early characteristics shared by 1801 with 1087 is a tendency to link letters at the top, e.g. π and the uncial form of κ; in 1801 ξ is similarly linked, which is unusual. On the other hand the η-shaped η, commonly regarded as characteristic of the Roman period, occurs in an abbreviation in l. 46, while the general aspect of the hand is less archaic than that of 1087; a date about the middle of the first century A.D. seems, on the whole, most likely. Paragraphi are used to mark off the various notes, and the words to be explained project slightly into the left
margin, and are also followed by short blank spaces; similar spaces are used to indicate a pause in the body of the note, and in one instance (l. 21) an oblique dash fulfils the same purpose.

Parts of two columns are preserved, broken at the top and bottom, as well as down the outside of each. An index to the original length of the lines is, however, afforded by ll. 21–2, on the basis of which the extent of the initial lacunae in Col. i has been roughly estimated in the printed text. As for Col. ii, the break from l. 32 to l. 58 is nearly vertical, and if the length of lines is taken at about 30 letters, the loss in the central part of the column will be about 10 letters, the number slightly increasing above and diminishing below on account of the slope of the column to the right; but the loss cannot be accurately gauged, since in texts of this kind no great care was taken to keep the ends of lines even, and Col. i shows that 1801 was no exception in this regard.

Both columns relate to rarer words beginning with the letter B, and the alphabetical arrangement may have been strictly observed up to the second letter, but certainly did not extend to the third, e.g. βεβυσμένον follows βέλος. All the words, so far as identified, appear in Hesychius, except one, which is in Suidas. But the treatment is fuller than in Hesychius, especially in the wealth of citation, to which there is more approximation in the Etymologicum Magnum (cf. ll. 21–7 n.), a feature which would have made this glossary, had much of it been preserved, peculiarly valuable. Most of the citations are from Comedy or Satyric drama, the authors quoted including Eupolis, Cratinus, Hermippus, Aristophanes, Alexis, and Sophocles. The only prose writer whose name occurs is the historian Phylarchus (l. 44). This glossary thus seems to have followed lines similar to those of the Συναγωγή of Artemidorus (cf. Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1169, &c.), though whether it was confined to the Comedians and Satyric dramatists can hardly be determined from the present specimen. That this is actually a fragment of the work of Artemidorus is hardly likely; the makers of Lexica were many (cf. Susemihl, Alex. Lit.-Gesch. ii, pp. 185 sqq.), and very little is known about them.

On the verso of the papyrus are remains of two columns, written in a small upright hand dating perhaps from about the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, from a treatise on grammar. In Col. ii, after referring to the declension [Δ]ρακωνος Δρακωνι (cf. Choerob. In Theod. Can. p. 79, Gaisf.), a new section begins 12 Περὶ δὲ τῶν αστηρ βατηρ καὶ τῶν ομοι 13 ἐπιλαμβανεται Κ[...]. 14 λέγον μή ἐσται τῶν τοῦτων ὁμοί 15 μὴ διαλυσθαι τ[...]. 16 τῆς (ἡ corr.) ἀναλογίας Ἐλληνίζομαι; οὐκ ὁρ[...]. 17 ὡς επείδη τὰ ομοία οὔτα ... 18 μοιώς σχηματιζεται [οὔτω γαρ ἀν 19 λεγοιτο πρῶτον μεν οτι ...
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Col. i.

[...]

[βειρακες] εις και στρατων...

[β] και Ευπολις εν

[βελεκος Αριστοφανὴς] εν Πολυιδωι και

[θος 15 letters] βελεθηκουν καλουσιν

Col. ii.

[...]ν η[...]

[...]η[...]}
1801. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

35 [....] τα [....]μενον[,] εξο [....]

ai και τον Κρατ[....]νον εν Θραίταις

35 [....] διλογχον θεον ην [,....

[....]μηνα[,] [,....]περ [,.....

[....] ου ποδηρη ,ομικα [,....

ε [,....] [,....]κεντυς ει και φι [,....

α [,....] ο βελτιστη πειστε[....]

40 β[εμβίς ] περιστρ[ο]φη Αριστοφανης [,....

[,]θον ειν[....] δε σχημ[....

Βελ[βιν]α κωμη της Λα[κονικης [,....

[,] στης ακριδασ[,] [.], ατρο[....

και Φυλαρχος εν τηι δ [....]

45 [Βερεσχετοι ανοητο[ι] πεθ[λασται παρ Αριστο(ανει) βελος Αριστοφανης εν Αχαρνευσι ....

εν παρην λεγειν εγχος δι [,....

βεβυσμ[ε]νον πληρες τη [,....

γη βεβυσμενη Αριστοφανης εν ....

50 Βεργαιος Αλεξις εν Ησιο[η]ι ....

εστι και κομπασματα [,....

Βεργαιον αποδειξειν υθλον [,....

αυτοι σκοπειτε νυν εγω δ[,....

νοι γαρ ως πεπαικεν εις τ[....

55 εστιν δ η Βεργη της Θρα[ικης ....

Βελλερον του Βελλεροφον[ην ....

βερβινων Ερμηπος εν Στρατωταις [....

ων τας ληκυθους κατη [,....

βηηηκες Αριστοφανη[ης] [,....

60 [,....] βηηη[κ ] φυραιματα ....
4. There seems to have been no other letter in front of the doubtful i, which might also be a dash like that in l. 21.

7. Cf. Hesych. βείρακες' ἱέρακες. It is not possible to read η or και before γλαυκ(e), though one of those words should perhaps be restored. o could well be read in place of ai but would be unintelligible. The similar gloss of Hesychius βάραξ' ἵππας παρὰ Διόνυσο suggests that Διόνυσο may be the name in the lacuna after παρά; but the name may also have been that of the author who used the form.

10. Σαλ[μ]α[νέ]ι is consistent with the remains, which do not suit Σατυροί (cf. l. 17).

11. προστασιον is apparently novel.

13. or: perhaps σω.

16. μας ουτί: οΤ μα σου τι.

19. The first letter may be e, g, β, δ, p. Neither αρσε for αρσιι nor αρ σε is attractive in this context.

21-7. Cf. Etym. Magn, βελέκκοι' δαπρώς καὶ τῶν βελέκκων, Ἀριστοφάνης, Hesych. βέλεκος' δαπρώς τι ῥέματι λαβίφων µέγεθον ἐφρίου ἤχοι. The papyrus, besides giving the name of the play of Aristophanes, confirms the view of earlier editors that καὶ τῶν was part of the citation; Kock prints βελέκκων only (Fr. 755). Lines 23 sqq. are an excerpt from a prose writer who described the βέλεκος. κριωπός from κριός (vetch) is unattested.

34 sqq. Cf. Hesych. s. v. διλογχος, τὴν Βενδίου οὗτος Κρατίους ἐν Θράτταις ἐκκελεσθε, ἦν ἄνθροπός τις ἄνθρωπος Ἐρεβίνθου ἐκεῖ, ἦν δεύτερος τις τιμᾶς εὐθραυστός, οἰκονικὸς τε καὶ χολιακὸς τε. From this it is plain that ll. 34-5 at any rate are part of a note on Βενδίνη, of whom Hesych. says s. v., ἡ Ἀρεόπαγος, Θράτατι παρὰ δὲ Ἀρεόπαγος ἐκκελεσθε. How many of the preceding lines were included in the note (to which the small fragment, ll. 61-3, perhaps belongs) is, however, uncertain, nor is it clear whether ll. 36-9 are all part of the same excerpt from Cratinus: οὐν in l. 36 is possibly οὐν (cf. Hesych. δύο τιμῶν). In l. 37 κωμικῶς is apparently not to be read, unless ο was here written differently from those elsewhere. In l. 38 τιμῶν[σ]ε is not impossible.

40. Cf. Hesych. βέβηξε . . . δίνη. If, however, αρ is Ἄριστοφάνης, as is natural to suppose, the name of the play seems to have been omitted, contrary to the compiler’s usual practice. βεβηξεν εἰς[ενεκ]εὼν (Vesp. 1530) suggests itself, and might not be too long if Ἀριστοφάνης were written; πείραι[ο]ν ὀρνιθῶν (Ael. 1461) is a not very satisfactory alternative.

42. Cf. Hesych. βελβίνα' κόμων Λακωνικῆς.

43-4. This seems to be a separate gloss, but it remains obscure. Phylarchus was the author of a history of Pyrrhus and other works.


50-5. Antiphanes of Berga was a byword for his mendacity, and hence ἐβεργαίως acquired a similar connotation; cf. e.g. Strabo ii. 100 τὸ δὲ ἐβεργαίων διήγημα τοῦτο ἐν πίστεως μέρει τιθείσ. Steph. Byz. says that a verb βεργαίζειν was also coined.


56. Cf. Eustath. 632. 8 ἐν δὲ ῥητορικῷ Λεξικῷ εὗρηται καὶ Βέλλερος λεγόμενος, Hesych. Βέλλερος ὑπὸ Βελλεροφόντου κτανθείς. Steph. Byz. says that a verb βερβίνιων was also coined.

57-8. Cf. Hesych. βερβίνια: κᾶθηλωμένα, ἐξ ὧν τὰς ληκύθους ἐκρέμων. The Στρατιώται is the only known play of Hermippus beginning with Σ. As to the following words, the restoration depends on whether they are taken as a quotation (e.g. βερβίνιων τὰς λ. κατ' γαγ.), or as explanatory (e.g. ἐξ ὧν τὰς λ. κατ' γαγ.), or as explanatory (e.g. ἐξ ὧν τὰς λ. κατ' γαγ.), or as explanatory (e.g. ἐξ ὧν τὰς λ. κατ' γαγ.).


62. Possibly Ἐβεργαῖος, in which case the fragment would come from the neighbourhood of l. 34-5.

1802. GLOSSARY.

Fr. 3 14.3 × 34.3 cm. Late second or early third century.

The following fragments of an alphabetical glossary are on the verso of 1798, a historical work on Alexander the Great. They are written for the most part in an irregular but clear simicursive of medium size, but in two or three fragments the hand is markedly smaller (cf. n. on Fr. 6) and in a couple of others (Fr. 7-8) it becomes more cursive. v at the end of a line is sometimes written as a horizontal stroke above the preceding vowel, but otherwise there is no abbreviation. As in 1801, the several glosses project into the left margin by the width of three or four letters, and are also followed by a blank space; but no points or paragraphi are used. The text on the recto is assigned to the middle or latter part of the second century, and that on the verso may date from the end of the same century or the beginning of the third. Some rather unintelligent mistakes, which have been left uncorrected, are noticeable (l. 49, 61, 63).

As explained in the introd. to 1798, the two texts proceed in opposite directions and the glossary did not occupy the entire roll, many of the minor fragments of 1798 being blank on the verso. Since those fragments, so far as their contents are recognizable, are not separated from the rest by any wide interval, and the remains of the lexicon, which was on a considerable scale, include words beginning with κ to μ, the copy of this seems not to have been finished. Fr. 3 is the only substantial piece, containing the upper portions of three consecutive columns, the two latter of which are sufficiently well preserved to give some idea of the scope and method of the compiler, at whose identity it is hardly worth while to guess. His alphabetical arrangement is more strict than that of 1801 or of ancient lexica generally, and is indeed remarkably correct, so far as it can be followed. He confines himself to uncommon words, or words used in
an uncommon sense. Besides Greek local peculiarities, several terms from non-Hellenic speech are included—Persian (Fr. 3. 45, 64, Fr. 6. 13), Lydian (Fr. 3. 46), Chaldaean (Fr. 3. 63, 67, 72, Fr. 6. 6), Albanian (Fr. 3. 65); in the last instance the authority quoted is a work in two or more books on Ξένη φωνή, by a certain Heraclides. The writer's interest in foreign countries is further shown by references to e.g. writers on Scythia (Fr. 3. 1), Asia (Fr. 3. 10, 17), and Babylon (Fr. 3. 67, 72), to Glaucus on the region West of the Euxine (Fr. 3. 36), to Andron on 'the war with the barbarians' (Fr. 3. 46). In contrast with 1801, most at any rate of the authorities cited are prose works, and are often comparatively obscure. Sometimes a considerable excerpt is given (Fr. 3. 29-35 37-42), but more commonly only a brief mention is made of author and work. How far these references can be trusted is somewhat problematical; in the two that occur to an extant book, it is incorrectly cited (Fr. 3. 50, 57). In one place epigraphic evidence is appealed to (Fr. 3. 54-6).

Of the words and uses reported in this papyrus about one half are not found in the existing lexica, but a large proportion of the novelties are non-Hellenic. Several terms are otherwise known only from Hesychius, whose evidence is generally less explicit; it is noticeable that in one instance where both cite an authority, this is not the same (Fr. 3. 58-9, n.). A striking coincidence of phraseology between the papyrus and the Etymologicum Magnum and Zonaras occurs in Fr. 3. 40-1, and no doubt the passage there cited is their common ultimate source. The parallel with Photius noted in Fr. 3. 61, n. is hardly less close; evidently such glosses often underwent little variation in their descent from one compiler to another.

Fr. 1. Fr. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 1.</th>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Fr. 2.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κ[</td>
<td>ν σέ[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ε'ν πολειτεία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ[</td>
<td>? φιλοπονίαν</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>άντηροφ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>λα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>λα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ[</td>
<td>εν τη Θετη[γλων πολειτεία</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>λα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>λικ'</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Μαργιανοί? ἐν Ἰεροτείας Ττίκον Ἱεροτείας Ἐρείπιας. Αἰσχρός Ἀρτέμις. Αἰσχρός Ἀρτέμις. Αἰσχρός Ἀρτέμις.

2. Οὐκ οἶδα ὅτι ἔστω τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις. Ἀθηναίοις τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις.

3. Ἐπειδὴ ὅτι ἡ Αἰσχρός Ἀρτέμις ἐστὶν κατὰ τὸν Παρθένον κατὰ τὸν Παρθένον κατὰ τὸν Παρθένον κατὰ τὸν Παρθένον κατὰ τὸν Παρθένον.
λι ετι δε και το ζυτος ο ποιουσιν εκ της κεγχρου
μελωδια η τραγωδια το παλαιον ελεγετο ως Καλλιμακος εν υπο
μηνησιν
45 μενεραιν το νδσρ παρα τοις Περσαις Ζεινων [ν . . . . .]. ων
μερνιδαι οι προρχοι παρα Αυδοις Ανθρων [ν του Πολε
μου του προς τους βαρβαρους
μερους οι αφρονευ υπο Ευβεαων Διονυσιου εν [. . . . . . .
μερου ειδος οριευν οπερ αντεκτριετε τους κ[. . . . . .
50 Αριστοτελης εν η περι των εν τοις ζωοις μοριων
μεστελεσσον το ημιτελεσσον Αιτωλους [. . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . .]ματιν
[. . . . . . . . .]κοι[. . . .]μ ηκοισα .[

Col. iii.

[Μητις] η Αθηνα και εν τω ναω της Χαλκιδικου Λακεδαιμονι;
55 ων εστι μεκρον Αθηναιδιν και επιτη[γραφθαι φασιν αυτω?
την Μητιν
μηται ειδος μελισσουν Αριστοτελης εν η περι των εν τοις ζωοις μοριω
μηται εν Ταρσω και Σολιν τας δελτους εν αις αγγαρφουσι τας
οικιαι μηταις προσαγορευσθαι α . και δημ[. . . . . . . Αριστοτε
56 λης εν τη Σολιν πολειτεια
μεστηρ ο ειδος εαυτου μη καθαρον αιματω[y και ελθων ενα μη
dει και μεινων Αυτοκλειδης εν τω επιγραμματι?
μιθραγ γενους τι αρχοινες παρα Χαλθαιως περ[. . . . . . .
Μιθρας ο Προμηθευς κατα δ αλλους ο ελλος παρα Περσαις . . . . . . .
65 μηλη ο γενειον υπο Αλβαινων των ομορουντων [. . . . . . .
οι Ηρακλειδης εν η Αινης φωνης
μινοδοιοσσα αρισμων συνταξις παρα Χαλθαιως [. . . . . . . εν των
κατα Βασιλωνα
Μιναια ου μονον Ορχομενοι αλλα και οι Μαγνητες . . εν το πε
70 ρι ποταμων
μινοδες αμπελου τινων ουτω λεγονται παρα Ροθ[οις . . . . .
μισαι ο παρα Χαλθαιως η των μελλοντων προγνωσις [. . . . . . εν τω
κατα Βασιλωνα
Μινυληναι οι καπηλοι ατι[. . . . ]. ας Ηγησανδρος [εν υπομηνασι?
Fr. 4.

Εν 5.1... με 22 letters πε | tiie.  
Fr. 6.  
] του βασιλέως [  
λογικών]  
ειγε [  
εν τω Τροικώ  
δρος ο Αντιοχεύς [  
deι  
ες ουτ[  
5]  
μεφε[  
βλεφά[ρα] παρά Χριλ  
περιστ[  
apθιο...μπηλ[  
eοικεν [  
περ το[  
σ μοιχ[  
πειν [  
ισ [  
μητρ[  
kata την ν[  
λι [  
ενοι τρο[  
παρά Περ[σαις...  
Fr. 5.  
]  
ε...[  
|  
σι...[  
Fr. 10.  
ιμ[  
|  
|  
Fr. 9.  
]  
|  
|  
|  
|  
|  
|  
|  
|  
|  
|  
|  
|  
Fr. 2. 5. Antenor may be the historian of Crete referred to e. g. by Plutarch, *Mal. Herod. 22.*  
8. Αριστοτέλης εν? Cf. Fr. 3-59. Aristotle’s treatise on the Thessalian constitution is cited by Harpocrate s. v. τετραρχία as ἡ κοινὴ Θεττ. πολ.; Athen. xi. 499 b omits κοινή.
10. The doubtful τ is preceded by a horizontal stroke above the line like those above numerals.

Fr. 3. 1–4. These lines seem to form a connected note on the Μαρμανοτ; cf. Strabo xi. 510–1, where the Ἀμαρδοί, Μαρμανοτ, and Σκύθαι are mentioned in close connexion; possibly Μαρμανο扭 is to be restored in l. 2. εὐθυναὶ οὐκ (in l. 3 suggests that the name may have been connected with μάργος; cf. Hesych. μαργινῆ: μαργάνει, εὐθυναὶ, μαίνεται. Several writers of Σκυθικὰ are known, e.g. Agathon of Samos (Plut. Flut. iv. 5) and Ctesippus (q.f. cit. v. 2).

5. There is perhaps just room for Ἀντικλεζιδῆ, i.e., presumably, the Athenian historian; the preceding word was possibly δηλοῖ.

6. Which of the various writers named Asclepiades is meant is not clear. A relative perhaps followed επί; a numeral and επιγραίμματων is less likely.

8. Ἡρακλεῖδης: perhaps the author of the Ζέην φωνή mentioned in l. 66, or e.g. Heralclides Lampus, who was probably the compiler of a work on Πολιτεία (cf. Fr. 2. 4, 8, Fr. 3. 21) among other treatises (cf. 1367 int.).

10. καὶ τὰ Ἄσιαν: cf. l. 17; but the division τὰ Ἀσιαῖα is of course possible.

13. Possibly Διονυσιοῦ ὁ Ἑκταῖος, the writer of a Ριζοτομικὰ who is mentioned by Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἱττης.

19. οὐσματαὶ may well be part of the title of some treatise.

27. Παῆρθοι more probably than οἽρθοι, perhaps.

29–35. μελισσαὶ: the priestesses of Demeter. The same Apollonia (?) in the first book (says): “When bringing to the Nymphs the basket together with the loom and the work of Persephone she first went to Paros, and having been entertained in the palace of the king Melissus she presented to his daughters, who were 60 in number, the loom of Persephone, and delivered first to them her sufferings and mysteries; whence the women who took part in the Thesmophoria were thereafter called Melissae.”

1. 29. A spot of ink in the margin is very doubtfully identified as ε, but its position points to a projecting word, so that a new paragraph is indicated. Cf. Hesych. μέλισσαι οἱ τῆς Δήμητρος μυστίδες, Porphyr. ἐν ᾿Αντρ. Ἕμνθ. 18 τὰς Δήμητρος ἱεραίας ὡς τῆς χθενείας θάς μυσταῖς μελισσαῖοι ὁ παλαιὸς ἐκάλου, Schol. Pind. Ρυθ. iv. 106. Though the letters at the beginning of the line are mostly broken, the remains well suit the reading adopted, with which Απολλώνια or Απολλῶν ως seems unavoidable.

30. For the κάλαθος cf. e.g. Callim. H. Cer. 1 sqq., 121 sqq., and Schol. H. Cer. 1 ὁ Φιλαδέλφος Πιγλεμαῖος κατὰ μνήμην τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔθη τὰ δύσειν ἐν ᾿Αλεξανδρείᾳ, ἐν νύν καὶ τὴν τοῦ καλάθου πρόοδον. ἔθα γὰρ ἢν ἐν ᾿Αλήμου ἐν ᾿Ορμοῦ ἡμέρα ἕτερος ἄθροιστος κάλαθον ἐν τῷ ἔτερῳ τῆς Δήμητρος. The κάλαθος worn on the head is a common emblem both of Demeter and Persephone. References to the ἱστός of the latter do not seem to occur.

tαῖς Νυμφῶν: cf. Schol. Pindar, Ρυθ. iv. 106 ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὰς περὶ τὰ ἱερὰ νύμφας μελισσαὶ ἔλεγαν Μνασέας ὁ Παταρεύς οὐχ ἕφηγετο λέγων... ὅταν γὰρ Νυμφῶν οὔτε Δήμητρος ἱερόν τιμᾶται... οὔτε γάρος οὖσα ἄνει Νυμφῶν συντελεῖται.

31–2. ἔπερος: l. ἔσσατος. Melissus king of Paros and his 60 daughters are not elsewhere mentioned. Paros, however, was prominent in the worship of Demeter; cf. e.g. Homer, H. Demet. 491, where Paros is mentioned next to Eleusis, Nicanor, Ἀρ. Steph. Byz. s.v. Παῦρο, who says that the name Δημητριάς was applied to the island, and the statement in Schol. Aristoph. Ἀ ν. 1764 that Archilochus wrote a hymn to Demeter at Paros. According to Pausan. x. 28, 3 the ὄργια τῆς Δήμητρος were said to have been brought to Thasos from Paros; other references are collected in Pauly-Wissowa, Realecyel. iv. 2722–3.

36-42. 'Μελύγιον: a Scythian beverage. Glaucus in the 1st book of the description of places lying towards the left of the Black Sea (says) "when the drivers agreed, he dismissed the assembly and dispersing each to his home they prepared the *μελύγιον*. This drink is more intoxicating than wine and is made of honey boiled with water, with the addition of a certain herb; for their country produces much honey and also beer, which they make out of *μιλιτον*.'

Cf. Etym. Magn. *μελύγειον* = *πομάτιον Σκυθικόν, γινόμενον ἐκ μόνου μέλιτος μεθ᾽ ὕδατος, λεσάνης τινὸς ἐμβαλλομένης* (similarly Zonar. *μελύγιον* = *πόμα τι Σκυθικόν*), Hesych. *μελίτιον* = *πόμα τι Σκυθικὸν μέλιτον* ἑψομένου σὺν ὕδατι καὶ πόῳ τινὶ. The Etym. Magn. is especially close to the papyrus, and the spelling *μελύγ(ε)ιον* is confirmed as well as *πομάτιον*, which Dindorf wished to emend to *πόμα* from Hesych.; a more probable alteration would be to write ἑψομένου for ἐκ μόνου. In l. 36 l. Σκυθικῶν. The treatise of Glaucus is unknown and his identity doubtful. Of the recorded writers of that name, the author of a work on Arabia often referred to by Steph. Byz. appears the most suitable. *Ελάτης* (l. 37) = *Ελατήριον* in Eurip. *Fr.* 773. 28 ποίμνων ελάτης; *'Ελατήριον* is hardly likely in this context.

43-4. This is a new piece of information, apparently. The term *μελῳδία* may have been applied to tragedy in its germinal dithyrambic stage.

45. l. Ζηνων, i.e. not improbably the grammarian of Myndus, who is cited e.g. in Etym. Magn. 590. 44 s. v. μορίαν. The vestiges before ω are consistent with e.g. ὀ, λ, μ, but *Δεξιων* is unsuitable. As for *μεκευμαν*, Mr. R. Levy tells us that *πυγμα*, the Aramaic word for water, was used in Pehlevi, and a reduplicated form of this might produce something sufficiently close to the papyrus. Dr. Sayce notes the similarity of *αννισ*.

46. Cf. Hesych. *μέρμνης* = *τρίσχος*. The family name of Gyges was *Μερμώθα* according to Herodotus 1. 7. 14. *Ανδρων* is perhaps more likely to be the historian from Haliacarnassus than the Alexandrian who wrote *Χρονικά* (Athen. iv. 184 Ὁ), though a work by him with the title here given is not elsewhere cited. To read *Ανδρωνίκος* for *Ανδρων* is possible but not attractive.

48. This sense of *μέροπες* is not otherwise attested. Among the many writers named Dionysius the most suitable in this context seems to be, if not the prolific *Διονύσιος Θράξ*, *Διονύσιος Τρύφωνος*, whose extensive treatise *περὶ ὀνομάτων* is cited by Athenaeus, Harpocration, and Steph. Byz.

49-50. l. μεροφ. *ε* of *οπερ* has been corrected from *α* or *ο*. The word beginning with *κ* should mean 'parents' or something analogous; *χρίμωνας* is hardly satisfactory. The *μέροφ* is mentioned by Aristotle in *An. Hist.* ix. 13, p. 615 b 25 φασὶ δὲ των τούτων μ. . . *ἀντεκτέφθεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκγόνων*: cf. Hesych. *μέροπες* . . . καὶ ὄρνεα τινα, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης. It is strange that the reference given in l. 50 is mistaken both as to the treatise and the number of the book (there is no eighth book of the *De part. anim.*); cf. l. 57, n.

51. *μεσοτελεστόν*: *σοί* is doubtfully read and the *σ* may be *ρ*; also the space between the supposed *ο* and *τ* is rather wide and another letter may have intervened; but a compound of *μέρος* does not seem very likely. For *μεσο* = *ημι-* cf. Hesych. *μεσόφημον* ἡμίξηρον. A few Aetolian forms are given in Hesych., e.g. *κιβα*, *άρος* in *θαγόνες*.

54. *Χαλκιοίκου* was restored by Lobel, no doubt rightly. The identification of Μήτης and Athena is apparently novel; Apollodor. 1. 3. 6 puts them in the relation of mother and daughter. Cf. Hesych. Μήτης = *ύκακες* . . . καὶ ἦ θεόσ.

57. τοι was originally written after εν, i.e. the writer began to write τοις owing to the repetition of *ευ*. *μήτραι σφηκῶν* and *ἀνθρῆνων* are described by Aristotle in *An. Hist.* ix. 41,
pp. 627 b–628 a (cf. An. Gen. iii. 10, p. 761 a 6) so that there is the same mistake in the citation here as in l. 50. Cf. Hesych. μήτρα' εἶδος αφικός.

58–60. Cf. Hesych. μήτρα' ... καὶ ὁ κλῆρος ὑπὸ Σολέων, ὡς Κλείταρχος. In l. 58 απογραφοῦσι would also be possible, or the letter after α might well be ι. In l. 59 neither ας nor αις καὶ suits the remains; perhaps there was a correction and ας καὶ was intended. That Σόλοι was included among Aristotle's collection of constitutions was unknown.

61. μεσημβρία is presumably a copyist's error for μασθαρο; cf. Photius μασθαρο' ὅτεν τις αὐτῶν μὴ καθαρὸν εἶδος παράχεσται τινα μὴ διά, μεμαχισμένος, whence the supplement in the latter part of the line has been derived. The identity of Ἀντοκλέιδης is doubtful; he is not likely to be the writer of ἐνθηρητικά mentioned by Plutarch, Nic. 23.

63. l. αριστον. Hesych. gives several Chaldaean words, but μεθοριγ is not one of them. It is conjectured by Sayce to be the opening of a Sumerian hymn, possibly =me la-ra-ga, from some Tammuz dirge, as Prof. Langdon suggests.

64. The equation of Mithras to Prometheus, though not unnatural, is apparently unusual. For the latter part of the line cf. Hesych. μεθοριγ ὁ ἥλιος παρὰ Πέρσαις, and the similar but longer notes in Suidas and Photius.

65–6. At the end of the line e. g. Ιβηρσι or Αρμενιοις would be suitable; cf. Strabo xi, p. 501. The work on ζέφυρος φωνῆ is apparently not mentioned elsewhere, and with which, if any, of the known grammarians named Heraclides the author is to be identified is doubtful.

66–7. Cf. Hesych. μισάλωσας' ἀριστός, καὶ τὰ περὶ οὐράνια σύνταξις. Βαβυλώνιοι. In consideration of this compiler's fondness for giving authority it is preferable to treat Βαβυλώνιοι as part of a title rather than to read e. g. Χαλδαιοζις τοις over; cf. Il. 72–3, where τῶν κατὰ Βαβ. is most easily explained in the same sense and as a citation of the same treatise. The writer's name must be as short as possible.

69. Cf. Hesych. Μινύαι' οἱ ᾿Ορχομένιοι, καὶ Μάγνητες. As in l. 67, the name of the author cited should be quite short, since the line would really be sufficiently filled with no further addition, especially if, as is quite possible, ἐν τοῖς stood in the title. There were many writers of works on rivers, besides Callimachus; cf. Schneider, Callimachea, ii, p. 326.

71. Cf. Hesych. μυττιλανός' ἀπόπληκτος, καὶ ἐνάτεσσας. Ἀπόφασις is presumably Hegesandrus of Delphi, the author of a collection of anecdotes called Υπομνήματα, in several books, cited by Hesych. s. v. ἀπόφασις and Suidas s. v. ἅλκυονίδες as well as by Athenaeus.

Fr. 4. The blank spaces in ll. 7 and 9 indicate that the preceding words were γλῶσσαι, and ll. 5–6 are no doubt complete at the beginning. The fragment may be from the top of a column.

Fr. 6. The writing in this fragment containing the ends of lines from the top of a column, is considerably smaller than in Frs. 2 and 3; that of Fr. 9 is similar and so is that of Fr. 1 so far as it goes.

1. ἔνθηρητικα: Or βασιλείας; Or βασιλικος of -κου is less suitable.

6. παρα Χαϊλίδαιος: cf. Fr. 3. 63, 72.

Frs. 7–8. These two fragments are more cursively written than the rest.

Fr. 9. Cf. n. on Fr. 6. In l. 1 a narrow letter may be lost between the supposed β and p.

Fr. 11. Either the beginning of a line or of the explanation of a word.
This sheet from a papyrus book was probably the uppermost of a quire, since the space between the two pages of the recto, down which the binding string passed, has an ornamental band of light purple colour, and the string itself, some of which still adheres to the sheet, showing the knot, is partially coated with the same colour. The style of the rather heavy sloping uncial points to a date in the sixth century perhaps rather than the fifth; the ink is of the brown shade characteristic of the Byzantine period. As usual, the words of the glossary, which all begin with $\sigma$, are made to protrude slightly into the margin; and the conclusion of the notes is marked by paragraphi, accompanied here and there by stops in the high or medial position. Quotations are sometimes indicated by the angular signs commonly employed for that purpose, but they are often omitted. Marks of elision are used, and there is one instance of a rough breathing (l. 42); all these additions are due to the original scribe, who was apparently a person of small intelligence, though he need not of course be the originator of all the slips that occur.

1803 is of a less interesting character than 1801–2 and the purpose suggested is rather scholastic than scientific; citations, however, are commendably frequent and from these the papyrus largely derives its value. They are taken either from prose (Demosthenes, Thucydides, Xenophon) or Comedy, both Old and New, and additions are thus made to the extant fragments of Eupolis Χρυσοῦ Γένος, Aristophanes Γῆρας, Menander Συναριστώσαι, 'Εγχειρίδιον, Φιλάδελφοι, and Φανίον; the poet’s name is omitted in the case of the last three of these, but there can be little doubt that Menander is meant. The alphabetical arrangement, apart from the initial letter, is very negligent.
10 προς θεος
συγγίγνεσθαι λεγεται κατ e
πενθεσιν του ἦ και γιγυν
σχειν μαλι[ν]ο[ν]τα οι παλαι
οι αξιωσιν δε και χωρις

15 αυτον
σημιαν γην σφραγιδα και
σημηνασθαι το σφραγισαι
ως . [ C]

\\
Fol. 2 recto.

οργωι ως σχολη πορευ

εται ουτοσι

σιτων κατ την τροφην απλων
ως Ζενοφων εν β Ανα

40 βασεως το δε στρατευ
μα εποριζετο σιτον οπως
ε[. ]δυνατο εκ των υ

πολυμιων κοπτοντες

βους και ονους και τον

καρπον ομοιως ως Δημοθεος εν τω κατα

Διονυσιωδορον παλιν
καταδυνασθην και σιω

στας τας τιμας του σιτου

50 και τον αρτον αυτον σιτο
καλουσιν ως Ζενοφων

εν τη Αρ[ι]θησι . [ . . . . .

\\
Fol. 2 verso.

των επιτηδιων ως ταχι

οι στα βουλομενοι διακιν

duneuein

σαβυττοις κουρας ειδος τι

Ευπολις εν Χρυσω Γενει

και καρα . . . . τις ως μ' ηλθες

εξιε[ε]φημενος σαβυττοις

60 σιωπησομαι ακτι του σιω

πησι και σιωπησει και

σιωπησεται ως εν τω πε

μι του στεφανου καγω στερ

εω και σιωπησο[ο]μαι και

65 Μενανδρος εν Φανω

σιωπηση παλιν εν τω με

ρει κατα ταυτα δε και α

κουσμαι και ακουσει και

ακουσεται και πηδησομαι

2–4. The line from the Θηρας cannot be correct as quoted, but is easily emended, e. g.
καὶ μὴ ὑπόστιφρον σοῦ... οἱ ὑπόστιφροι σε... ἐχειν. In place of ὑπόστιφρον (ἅπαξ. εἰρημ.), which is obviously to be read, the copyist lapsed into the non-Attic υποστριφνον, but after noticing the error unintelligently made only a partial correction; there is no form στιρφνός.

5-7. 1. στιῴρας. If the a at the beginning of στιῶρας has been correctly cancelled by the copyist, something has dropped out either before or after στιῶρας. The final s of ecopevas was converted from «.

8. Instances of the shortening of the second a in Σπαρτης are found only in Latin (e.g. Prudent. Adv. Symm. ii. 531). The Ἐγχειρίδιον is no doubt that of Menander, who was the last author to be mentioned.

11-15. Cf. e.g. Heraclid. ap. Eustath. 1722. 55 oι μὲν παλαιοὶ εὖ δολι γάμα ἔχρωτο, γέρομαι λέγωσιν.

12. 1. γ for τ: the converse error occurs in l. 16.
13. ρι of μαλοστα is written through λ, i.e. μαλλον was first written.

16-18. 1. την. Cf. Photius σημείων 'τιν προγάλ' αἱ σημαίνενθ' το προγάλισσαθα, Hesych. σημείων τέρας, ἤ σημαίνας, and σημανύνας σφραγίσσαυθα. Ηρακλ. σημείων οὐτω λέγουσιν τὰς σφραγίδας. Νησιοθένθ' εὖ το πρὸς Φαϊνήν. In l. 18 οι is followed by what seems to be the top of a vertical stroke, so that neither Αμαστοφανὴς (cf. Ε. 952) nor Δημοσθένης is probable.

19. πολλακις: ei has been converted from σο
20. 1. την. Cf. Photius σημείων 'την σφραγίδα' καὶ σημαίνενθα το σφραγίζεσθα, Hesych. σημείων τέρας, ἤ σημαίνας, and σημανύνας σφραγίσσαυθα. Ηρακλ. σημείων οὐτω λέγουσιν τὰς σφραγίδας. Νησιοθένθ' εὖ το πρὸς Φαϊνήν. In l. 18 οι is followed by what seems to be the top of a vertical stroke, so that neither Αμαστοφανὴς (cf. Ε. 952) nor Δημοσθένης is probable.

22. 1. την. Cf. Photius σημείων 'την σφραγίδα' καὶ σημαίνενθα το σφραγίζεσθα, Hesych. σημείων τέρας, ἤ σημαίνας, and σημανύνας σφραγίσσαυθα. Ηρακλ. σημείων οὐτω λέγουσιν τὰς σφραγίδας. Νησιοθένθ' εὖ το πρὸς Φαϊνήν. In l. 18 οι is followed by what seems to be the top of a vertical stroke, so that neither Αμαστοφανὴς (cf. Ε. 952) nor Δημοσθένης is probable.

23-6. Two iambic verses apparently, but the first of χωρίδιον should be short and to is likely to have preceded.


31-4 = Ε. 655-6. The papyrus supports the usual reading εἰσηγγελμένας. R omits εἰο, whence Cobet proposed ἀγαθαῖς ταῖς ἤγγελσι.

35. Perhaps και | χωρίς αὐτού, as in ll. 14-15., dia του ι presumably refers to the spelling εἰσηγγελμένας, which is used metri gratia, e.g. in Pythag. Carm. aur. 35, but there seems to be no instance of συνειθ. apart from augmented forms.

36-7. This is no doubt part of a note on σολην in the sense of βραδέως οὐσίαμοι. Cf. Suidas σκολή ι αν αντι του ουδ' δος, βραδεας, οδιομοι. l. Γεώργιοι, i.e. most probably the play of Menander; cf. ll. 8, 22, nn.

38 sqq. Cf. Harpocrat., and Suid. σιτίας πᾶς ο ουτος καρπός, οὐχ ο πυρὸς μόνον καὶ αὐτά τα στίρα, Hesych. σιτίας τροφή. The references in ll. 39 and 45-7 are to Xen. Anab. ii. 1. 6 and Dem. In Diogen. 7. In l. 41 the papyrus correctly agrees with the 'deteriores' against CBAE in omitting καὶ πότον after σιτία. In l. 52 the reference may be to Anab. v. 4. 29 and σιτία can be read; but ἐπιβαθι is not very satisfactory, though τη, which seems to be right, points to that work or the Συγγρ., which is irreconcilable with the remains, ην αὐτὴ being also unsuitable.

53-5 = Thucyd. vii. 60 διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων σπάνιον ὡς τάχιστα κτλ., cited no doubt in illustration of the word σπάνιον. Cf. Photius and Suidas σπάνιος ἐνιαία. Either σπάνιον preceded τῶν εἰτη, in the papyrus, or it was omitted.

56-9. Cf. Hesych. σάβυττος εἴδος ξυρήσεως εἰς καλλιστατομον πόντον δι το Πόντον ή τῆς κεφαλῆς, ἄθροις τοια το το γυναικείων. Photius gives the latter meaning only to σάβυττος and spells the equivalent of ξυρήσεως εἴδος, σάβυττος, but Hesych. is confirmed by the papyrus. ll. 58-9 look like a pair of trochaic acatalectic dimeters (cf. e.g. Aristoph. Ατ. 1478-80), but if so, there is apparently some corruption in l. 58, where, though it would be easy to write ας (ες) ι̣, the preceding word remains a difficulty. The doubtful κ after και can be
χ or ζ; ηο is probable, but ως very uncertain. There is a reference to a κουρεύς in an already extant fragment of the Χρ. Τέε. (Kock 273).

61. σιωπησει: ε has been converted from ι.
62-4. De Cor. 112. 1. σιωπησομαι, as originally written.
65. Φανοι: the papyrus confirms the spelling of this title, as to which there has been some doubt.
66. εν τω is very uncertain, but consistent with the meagre vestiges.

1804. Λέξεις Ρητορικαί.

Fr. 4 16.6 × 13.4 cm. Third century.

Fragments of a roll containing an alphabetical series of oratorical terms with notes thereon, the pieces preserved dealing with words which begin with the letters Π, Ρ, ΢. They are written in well-formed sloping uncialls of medium size, in style recalling P. Rylands 57 (Vol. i, Plate 10), though perhaps of a somewhat later date. An angular sign, the angle pointing to the left instead of, as usual, to the right, is used to fill up short lines. As in 1801-2, the terms to be explained are given prominence by a slight protrusion into the margin and by the short blank spaces which follow them. A second hand, using ink of a different shade, has introduced one or two alterations.

Many of the words included in this glossary occur also in Harpocration, but its relations to that standard authority are less close than to the Λέξεις Ρητορικαί Seguerianae edited by Bekker in Anecd. i, pp. 197-318. This affinity is evident not only in the substance of the glosses but also in their order, e.g. the four terms in Frs. 1 + 2. i Πυθαίος (?), προστρόπαιος, περίστατοι and πορείον follow the same sequence in Anecd. pp. 295-6, though separated there by a few additional words; similarly in Anecd. pp. 299, 303, Ρητορική γραφή, ρώπος, ρυτήρ, and σκειραφεῖα, συμμορία, συμμορίτης, σύμβολον are successive, corresponding to Frs. 3 and 4 of 1804 with one additional word in each fragment (Fr. 3. 5-8 [?], Fr. 4. 4-6 στρατηγοῦ). Material similarities are pointed out in the commentary, and though such matter is often common to e.g. Photius and the Etymologicum Magnum, the verbal correspondence is generally greatest with the Seguerian Λέξεις; see for instance Fr. 4. 14, n. (on the other hand, for a coincidence with Photius, Frs. 1 + 2. 9-13, n.). Points of difference between the Λέξεις of the papyrus and the Cod. Seg. are the omission in the latter, with a single exception, of the series of proper names in Frs. 1 + 2. ii, most of which, on the other hand, figure in Harpocration, and the disappearance of citations of authorities, to which 1804 occasionally refers (Demosthenes Fr. 4. 16, Aeschines Frs. 1 + 2. 9, Hyperides Fr. 4. 5; Dinarchus Fr. 3. 7). The relationship is nevertheless
distinct enough, and if the papyrus Λέξεις were not among the more or less immediate sources of the Seguerian, the two compilations must have had a common ancestor.

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. i.

Πυθαιος? ονομα ε]ρρ[της Αθηνη
[σιν αγομενης του Α]πολ[λ]ωνος ...[
[... 
[5 [ν . ] ... [ ............. μ αρμενος ασταριος 
[π]τονους ...[ ... ? κομιουντας Πυθα
ει τας τ[. ... ]ημ[τε]
[.α[.][αιος [ ... ... ]]

προστροπαιοις Αισχυνης εν τωι πε

πι της πα[ρεθεσθει]ας δαιμον τις ε
πι των αληηριων? αφομασθησαν δε
οι μετα το [σταθηναι τροπαιον] πολεμι
ους λαβοντ[ε]ς προστροπαιοι
[π]ερισταται [ οι περιβλεπο]+

πορ[ειον [το διδομενον τοι]ς πρει[σβυ
[ταις ωθεσε] εφοδιον ... ] [ ... ]

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. ii.

[.] ... [
Παισι[σικα] δημος της Ερεχθηδος?
Παισι[σικα] δημος της Αλεουτιδος?

Παισι[σικα] 
Παληη[ης] δημος της Αντιοχηδος?
Περισ[ή] δημος της Ερεχθηδος?
Περισ[ή] λυμην Αθηνησιν?
Περισ[ή] 
[Π]ερισ[ή] 

25 [. . . ] [ . . . ]
Fr. 3.
[ros πραγάντος τι η γραψαώς η ε[ι
[ποιτος τι φαύλον η νὺν] γγ[ω]ψισα[ν []
[to οἱ ρητορεσ ....... εγρ]αψαυτο—
[..............................]
5 [ρ ........ ? σημειει] μεν τον της πα
[..............................]δας σημειει
[δε ? .................]κον Διώναρχος
[ἐν τωι κατα Πολυευκτ]ον [δ]ροδοκιας
[ροπος ο παντοδαπος φ]ορτος Δημο—
10 [σθενης εν τωι προσ τη]ν Φορμεωνος
[παραγραφην]
[ρυτηρ ο μιας κυριως δ'ε αι ημιαι

Fr. 4.

σκε[ραφιον οικημα τι? κυ]βεντικον παρ[α
[ερον Αθηνας εξω πολει]ας ευθα οι
κυβε[ναι επααιον ]
5 εκασ[ης Α]περειδης εν τω κα[τα
Αυτοκλεους
συμμοριαι συμμοριαι ησαν κ]π η
ανδρων εξ ον ησαν οι τριηρα[ρξαι
συμμορειτης δε ο] της συμμοριας κ[οι
10 νονος και φυλετης και δημοτης ηςαν
δε τουτωι και γημονεις οι παρ αυτωιν
tα αναλωματα ποιουμενοι υστεροι [δε
παρα των αυτων κομιζομενοι

συμβολα: σημ[α]υει και τον λογον τον
15 δια της φημης γεινομενον επισημαι
νει και τα συμβολαια Δημοσθενῆς εν
Frs. 1-2. I. 1-8. Apparently a note on Πυθαέα or an analogous form. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 295 Πυθαίος' δυσμα ἐφορθὴς Ἀθηναίων ἀγομένης τοῦ Απόλλωνος, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πύθωνος, Etym. Magn. 696. 22 Πύθαια καὶ Πυθαίος' δυσμα ἐφορθὴς ἀγομένης τοῦ Απόλλωνος. Harpocrat. gives a reference for Πυθαία to Hyperides πρὸς Ἀπελλαῖον. In l. 1 o of εἰρην is very insecure and the initial supplement a little short, otherwise the restoration suggested suits well enough, and in view of other correspondences with this Anecd. is not improbable. In l. 5, if the word before αμαρσός was εφί, part of the τ should be visible. In l. 7 the ε is blotted and seems to have been cancelled. The first letter of l. 8 was either ο or χ.

9-13. Cf. Harpocrat. προστρόπαιοι Αἰσχύλης περὶ τῆς πρεσβείας κτλ., Photius προστρόπαιος· δαίμων τις ἐπὶ τῶν ἐναγῶν (so too Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 296, and Etym. Magn. 700. 10), ἐπεὶ οἱ μετὰ τὸ σταθῆναι ἤδη τὸ τρόπαιον ἅντι τῶν πολεμίων πρόστροποι καὶ ἐναγεῖς εἰσίν. The reference in l. 9 is to Aesch. Fals. Leg. 158. In l. 11 a after τῶν is clear, so that ἐναγών must be replaced by some synonym like ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀκαθάρτων. In l. 13 προστρόπαιοι seems preferable to the πρόστροποι of Photius, which is perhaps an error. The verbal correspondence in l. 12 with Photius makes it preferable to omit of before ἀναιροῦντες rather than to emend ἐπεὶ of to ἐπειδή with Naber.


15-16. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 296, and Etym. Magn. 684. 8 πορεῖον· τὸ παρατίθειν τοῖς πρεσβευόντας ἑπὶ τὸν τρόπον ἀναιροῦντες δοστήρια, ὡστε τὸν προεπειδεὺς ἐπὶ τὴν πρεσβείαν ἀναιροῦμεν. The papyrus apparently had practically the same note, but the sign of the line ends of the page after.
20. παιωνίσα occurs in Dem. De Cor. 287, but in this series of proper names, a misspelling of Παιωνίσα is perhaps more likely than a derivative of Παιωνίσα. The form Παιωνίσα occurs in Hesych. s.v. Διάβολος.

21. Cf. Harpocrat. Παιωνίσα occurs in Hesych. s.v. Διάβολος. In this series of proper names, a mis-spelling of Παίονες is perhaps more likely than a derivative of Παιών. The form Παίωσιν occurs in Hesych. 8. v. Avados.

22. Harpocrat. Παληνεύς ὕπερείδης ἐν τῇ ἱπέρ Χαιρεφίλου ἀπολογίᾳ. Παληνεύς δήμος τῆς ᾿Αντιοχίδος τοῦ μέστου δημότης δεχόμενος λέγεται θαυμάσιον, ὡς δὲ δημότης Παιωνίσας.

23. Harpocrat. Περιαίνετ’ Λυδίας ἡ Ἀθήνη is a gloss in Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 288.

24. Fr. 3. 1–4. These lines are evidently part of a note on ῥητορικὴ γραφή, beginning probably in the last line of the preceding column (ῥητορικὴ γραφή ἡ κατὰ ρήτορος γράψαντός τι ἢ εἰπόντος ἢ neeome παράνομον ... ἴσως δὲ κατ... ὅτι κατὰ διαφόρους νόμους αἱ κατὰ τῶν διαφόρων γράφαι εἰσάγονται, ὡς Ἀντιφῶν ... ὑποσημαίνει, Photius Ῥητ. γραφή" ἣν ἠγωνίζοντο οἱ ῥήτορες" οὐ γὰρ πάσας ἤγωνίζοντο τὰς δίκας τὸ παλαιὸν οἱ ῥήτορες, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνίας" ἄλλοι δὲ ῥητορικὴν γραφὴν εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν κατὰ ρήτορος γινομένην, γράψαντός τι ἢ εἰπόντος ἢ πράξασι παράνομοι, Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 299 Ῥητορικὴ γραφή καὶ ῥητορικὴ γραφεῖον ἡ ῥητορικὴ γραφεῖον ἡ ῥητορικὴ γραφεῖον ( ) εἰσόδουτ’ ἡ ῥητορικὴ γραφεῖον. The papyrus was evidently close to Photius and Bekker, Anecd., but put the alternative explanations in the reverse order.

5–8. This gloss, for the form of which cf. Fr. 4. 14–15, remains unidentified. The speech of Dinarchus κατὰ Πολυεύκτου δωροδοκίας is cited e.g. by Harpocrat. s.v. δώρων γραφή. It is identified with the κατὰ τὴν Π. ἐκφυλοφορηθέντος ἔνδειξις.

9. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 299 ῥόπος οὗ παντοδαπὸς φόρτος, Photius ῥόπος μίγματα ... τινες δὲ καὶ τῶν παντοδαπῶν φόρτων ῥόπων εἰρήκασι, Eym. Magn. 377. 30 s.v. ῥωπίζομεν, ῥόπως γὰρ ὁ ποικίλος καὶ λεπτὸς φόρτος (ποικίλος also Ael. Dionys. ap. Eustath. 92. 7; but this would not fill the lacuna so well). For Il. ro—11 cf. 6. g. Harpocrat. 8. v. ἐπιθέτους ἑορτάς, ἧπερ ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Χρυσίππου πρὸς τὴν Φ. π. ; the reference is to the C. Phorm. 9.

12. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 299 ῥυτήρ τί ἐστιν ὁ ἱμάς. κυρίως δὲ τὰ ἡνία κτὰ., Photius ῥυτήρ' ἁπλῶς μὲν ὁ ἱμάς, κυρίως δὲ ἡνία κτλ. The supplement printed hardly fills the lacuna, but there is not room for ἤματος μεν: perhaps ῥυτηρες οἱ ἐμαντεῖς Was written.

Fr. 4. 1–3. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 300 σκειραφεῖας σκειραφεῖά ἐστι τὰ κυβεῖα, ἢτοι ἐπεὶ σκείραφός τίς ἐστίν ὄργανον κυβευτικόν, .. ἢ ὅτι ἐν τῷ τῆς Σκειράδος ᾿Αθηνᾶς ἱερῷ οἱ κυβεύοντες, ἐπειδὴ διέτριβον ἐν Σκίρῳ οἱ κυβεύοντες, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ ν’ ὑποσημαίνε. The gloss in the papyrus seems to have lost in clearness owing to compression.

4–6. Cf. Harpocrat. στρατηγοῖ· ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῆς Ὑπερείδου κατ’ ἄκτοκλον ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῆς Ὑπερείδου κατ’ ἄκτοκλον ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῆς Ὑπερείδου κατ’ ἄκτοκλον. The vestiges in the middle of l. 4 are very scanty but so far as they go suit the letters suggested.

7–13. Cf. Harpocrat. συμμορία· ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν ‘ὑπερείδου κατ’ ἄκτοκλον ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν ‘ὑπερείδου κατ’ ἄκτοκλον ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν ‘ὑπερείδου κατ’ ἄκτοκλον ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν ‘ὑπερείδου κατ’ ἄκτοκλον. The verses in the middle of l. 4 are treated separately by Harpocrat. and defined as ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν 'ὑπερείδου κατ' ἄκτοκλον ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν 'ὑπερείδου κατ' ἄκτοκλον.
The financial responsibility described by the papyrus is apparently not elsewhere stated. At the end of l. 7 κ, which is clear, is an error for κ (cf. e.g. Dem. De Symm. 17), perhaps arising from the ambiguity of an original εκατον εξ εξηκοντα, where εξ should have been read as εξ not εξ. The ε is very uncertain, but the scanty remains are sufficiently suitable. In l. 11 παρ αὐτῶν may be interpreted παρ' αὐτῶν, but more probably παρ is a mistake for ὑπέρ, or ὑπέρ by a common misspelling became ὑπερ and then ὑπερ.


Fr. 5. πλινθεῖον in l. 2 suggests that this may be part of a note on πλινθεῖον, a word which occurs a little above Πινθᾶς (cf. Frs. 1+2. i. 1–8 n.) in Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 295 πλινθεῖον τὸ πλινθουργεῖον, ὅπου πλίνθοι γίνονται; cf. Harpocrate. πλινθεῖον ὃ τόπος ἐν ὅ πλινθος πλάττεται Λυσίας ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λυσίθεου. If so, the fragment would probably belong to the upper part of Frs. 1+2. i.

Fr. 6. 4. There is an appearance of a colon just in front of ε of αὐτῆς, but this may be due to a correction, e.g., perhaps the scribe began to write αὐτῆς ἄλλος (ὅτι).

5. At the end of this line the second hand has made an alteration, and it is not clear what was originally written or what was intended to stand.

Fr. 7. That this fragment comes from the ends of lines is indicated both by l. 6, where there is a narrow margin after the remains of the final letter, and in l. 8 by the lengthening of the cross-bar of the supposed ε, which might also be read as the dash used for filling a short line.

6. Probably ροι or ρος (προς?).
III. EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS.

1805. SOPHOCLES, Trachiniae.

Fr. 15 10 x 9.6 cm. Late second century.

These scattered fragments from a roll of the Trachiniae are in a medium-sized hand of the common sloping type, of which it is a fair specimen, though less regular than e.g. 1800. Some annotations in cursive point to a date in the latter part of the second century rather than the beginning of the third. Stops in all three positions occur, and accents, breathings, and marks of elision and quantity have been introduced not infrequently, some at any rate of these being no doubt subsequent additions, due probably to the corrector whose hand is to be distinguished here and there.

Textually these fragments are, in the main, conservative. A few new readings occur, including one or two which are definite improvements, e.g. l. 1136, where a generally accepted correction is confirmed. For one of the unknown variants the authority of, probably, Aristophanes of Byzantium is cited. On the other hand, the papyrus apparently agrees with the MSS. in a passage requiring alteration on metrical grounds, and occasionally offers evidence which is inferior to theirs. In supplementing lacunae, Jebb's text has been followed, of course with no implication that the papyrus necessarily agreed with it.

Possibly further additions may eventually be made to the remains of this MS, the script of which is with difficulty distinguished from that of numerous other fragments which accompanied them.

Fr. 1.

1 [δρακων ελικτος αλλοτ ανδρεω τυ]π[ω
[βουκρανος εκ δε δασκιον γενειαδ]ος
[κρουνοι διερραιωνοτο κρηναιον ποτον
15 [τοιωθε εγω μητηρα προσδεδεγμ]υ[νη
[δυστηνοι αει κατβανειν επευχουμι]ν [
1805. *EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS*

[πριν τησδε κοιτης εμπελασθην]αι πι[οτε
[χρωνω δε εν υστερω μεν ασμενη] δε μ[οι
[ο κλεινος ηλθε Ζηνος Αλκμηνης τε παις
20 [ος εις αγωνα τωδε συμπεσον μ]αχης [
[εκλυεται με και τροπον μεν αν π]οιον[ν

Fr. 2.

37 [εν]ταύθα δη μαλιστα ταρβησασ εξω
[εξ ο]υ γαρ [εκτα κεινος Ιφιτου βιοι
[ημε]ς μ[εν εν Τραχινι τηδ αναστατοι

Fr. 3.

275 [ο των απαντων Ζευς πατηρ Ολι[μπι]:
[πρατων νιν εξεπεμψε]ν ουδ ηνεχετο
[αθουνεκ αυτου μονου] ανθρωπων δο[λω
[εκτεινεν ει γαρ εμφαν]ω[ς] ημινατο
[Ζευς ταν συνεγνω ξυν] διη[χειρ]ομενω [ ]
280 [υβριν γαρ ου στεργουσιν ουδε δ]αιμου[ς
[αυτοι μεν Αιδου παντες] ειτι οικητορες
[πολις δε δουλη τασδε δ ασπε]ρ εισορα[ς

Fr. 4.

[φρονει νιν ως ηξοντα τουτο] γαρ λο[γ]ου
290 [πολλου καλως λεξθεντος ηδιστων κλων
[αναστα νιν σοι τερψις εμφαν]ης κυρε[ι]
[των μεν παροντων τα δε π]επισμ[ενη λογω
THE OXYRHYNChUS PAPYRI

Fr. 5.

301 [ai προν με]υησα[ν εξ ελευθερων ισως
[ανδρων τα]ντου δε δουλον ισχουσιν βιον
[ο Zευ τροπαιε] μηποτ εισιδοιμι σε

Frs. 6–10.

αγορα συνεξηκουν
λειμων ταυτα

360 [τη]ν παιδα [δουναι] κρυφον ας εχοι λεχος
[ευκλημα [μικρον] αιτηαν θ' ετοιμασας
[επιστρατευει πατριδα την ταιησ εν η
[το]υ Ευρυτο[ν τον δ ειπε] δεσπο[ειν θρονων
[κτε[μει [π]] τ [ανακτα πατερ]α τησδε και πολιν

365 [επεροσε] και νυν ας ορας ηκει δομους
5 lines lost

370 [δεσποινυ] α τουδε τυγχανω μαθων παρα
[και ταυτα πολλαι προσ μεση Τραχινων
[αγορα] συνεξηκουν ωσαιειμι εμοι
[οστ εξελεγχειν [ει δ]ε μη λεγιο φιλα
[ουχ ηδομαι το δ [ορθο]ν εξειριηχ ομος

375 [ομοι τα]λαινα [πον ποτ] ειμι πραγματος
[τιν ειςδεδημαι πημονην υποστεγον

• [αθρα]κον δι[υτηνοι α]ρινονομος
[πεφυκεν ωσιπερ ουπαγε]αυν διωμμυτο
[η καρτα λαμπρα και κατ ονομα και φυσιν

380 [πατρος μεν ουσα [γενεαν Ευρυτου ποτε
[Ιλα μα]λειτυ τηις εκεινας ουδαμα
[βλαστας] εφωνει δηθεν [οιδαν μα]μοτων
[ολομνυν μη τι παντες οι δε

385 [τι χρη ποιη μην θυμαικες οις εγω λογοις
1805. **EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS**

[τοὺς νῦν π]ρονυστὸν εκπληγμένην κυρίων πευθοῦ μολουσα τα]υνδρο[ι ως ταχ ἀν σάφη

**Fr. 11.**


**Frs. 12, 13.**


**Fr. 14.**

602 οπως φερη]ις μοι τονδε ταναυφη πεπλου δώρημι εκ[εινο τανδρι της εμης χερος διδους δε τονδε φρας οπως μηδεις βροτων 605 κεινον παρ[οιθεν αμφιδυσεται χροι μηδε] ωψεται μην μητε φεγγος ηλιου

**Fr. 15 Col. i.**
744 [πως είπας ὦ παῖ τοῦ παρ ἀνθρώπων] [παρον ἀνθρώπων] [Αρ(ἴστοφανῆς 1)]

Fr. 16.

763 [καὶ πρῶτα] μὲν [δείλαιος ὅλω φρένιν]
[kosmω τε] χαϊρων καὶ στολὴ καθηκέτο

Fr. 15. Col. ii.
[k]οµη δὲ λέικον μνελον εκραινεί μεσον
[kpàτος διαπαρετς [αιματος θ' ομιν

785 κουδεις ετολμα τάνδρος αὐτον μολειν
[εσ]πατο γαρ πεδου[ε] καὶ μεταρισος
[βο]ων ὡκ[ου]ν· αμβ[ε] [θ εκ]πατουν πτεραι
Λοκρον ορειοι προ[υ]σις Εἴνβοιας τ' ακραι
επει δ' απειπε πολλα μέν ταλας χθων

790 οφθατων εαυτον' πολλα δ [οιµωγη βων
το διπάρευνον λεκτρον [ευδατομηνος
σου της ταλαινης. και τον [Οἰνως γαµον

795 οφθαλμον αρας εἰδε µ' εν [πολλω στρατω
δακρυουντα· και µε προσβλέψας καλει
ὁ παῖ προσέλ[θε]· µη φυγη[ς] τοµον κακον
Fr. 17.

851 μοιρὰ προφαίηνε δολιαν
και μεγάλαν [αταν
[ερρωγεν] παγι [δακρυων κεχυται?
[νοσος?] ὀ ποτήρι οιον αναρσιων
[ουπο αγα]κλείτων

Fr. 18.

τι δ ὦ γεραια καινοποιηθεν λεγεις
[βεβηκε Δη]ανειρα την πανυστατην
875 [οδων απασω]ν εξ ακυντων ποδος
[ου δη ποθ ως]αυνου[σα]
[παντ ακηκοας]
[τεθυκεν η τα]λαι[να

Fr. 19.

[ω παι γενου μοι παις ετητυμον γεγως
1065 [και μη το μητρον ουλμα πρεσβευσης πλεον
[δος μοι χερων σαιν αυτος εξ οικου λαβων
[ει χειρα την τεκουσα]ν ως ειδω [σαφα
[ει τουμον αλγεις μαλλον η κεινης ορον
[λοβητον ειδος εν δικη] κακομενον
1070 [θω ω τεκνον τολμησον ουκτεθρον τε με
[πολλοιςιν οικτρον οστις] σωτε [παρθενος
[βεβρυχα κλαιον και τοδ ου]δ αν [εις ποτε
[τονδ ανδρα φαιη προσθ ειδειν δεδρακοτα

Frs. 20, 21.

[προς τον τερας τοι δια κακω]ν εθεσπισας
[αὐτὴ πρὸς αὐτῆς οὐδὲνος πρὸς εκτὸπον
ομοὶ πρὶν οὐ χρὴν σφ ἐξ ἐμὴς θανεῖν χερὸς
καὶ σοῦ στραφεῖν θυμὸς; εἰς τὸ παν μαθὸν
[δείκνυν λογοὺς κατηρξάσθαι, ἐπεὶ δὲ η νοεῖς
[αὐτὰν τὸ χρῆμα ἡμαρτέ] ἁρπατα μωβ[ενὴ
[χρηστὸν καὶ κακίστη πατέρα σου στραφεῖν θυμὸς
[στεργήμα γαρ δοκουσα προσβαλεῖν] σε[θεν
[απήμπλαχ ὡς προσεὶδε τοὺς εὐδίοι γαμους

1140 [καὶ τὰς τοσοῦτας φαρμακευς Ἱακύν[ιων
[Νεόεστος παλαι Κενταύροις, ἔ, ἔσπεισὲ νιν
[τοιωθεὶς φίλτρῳ τον σον εκμηναί ποθὸν]
[ιὸν ιὸν δυστηνὸς οἰχομαι τα[λας.
[ολοι ολοια φεγγος ουκετε] ἐστὶ μο[ι

1145 [αἰοὶ φρονῳ δὴ συμφοράς] ἐν ἐσται[μεν
[ἰὸ ὥ τεκνου πατηρ γαρ οὐ]κε[τ ἐστι σοι
[καὶ[ες τὸ παν μοι σπερμα σιὼν [ομαθυνων

Fr. 22.

[ταχεῖαιν ὁ παι προσθες ὡς πῖριν εμ[πέσειν
[σπαραγμὸν η τιν οἰστρον ε[ς πύραιν με θης

1255 [αγ εγκονειτ αἱρεσθε παυλα τ]οι κακ[ιων
[αὐτὴ τελευτὴ τουε ταῦδρος] νοτα[τη
[αλλ οὐδεν εἰργει σου τελειουσθ[αι τα[δε

Fr. 23.

[τα την[δ ατην υπεχο[ν]

1275 [λειπον μηδε σε] παρθείνει επ οἰκων
[μεγαλος μεν ἴδιον] κα[νεις θανατους
12. Unfortunately it is not clear whether the papyrus agreed with the MSS, in having τυπώ(ι) βουκρανος, or supported Strabo's κύτεε βουπρορος, which is generally preferred. On the whole τυπω seems a more satisfactory reading than κυτεε.

17. Bergk wished to reject this line.

275. Apparently Ολυμπιανος was originally written, but a dot between ι and ω and a vestige of ink above the line point to the insertion of -ος as an alternative. The genitive would spoil the line.

278. ημύνατο: so L &c.; ημύνετο B.

281. η of εξ is directly above the first ε of εισι in l. 282, so that with υπερχλισσης the number of letters in the respective lacunae coincides. But υπερχλισσης (L corr. ι A &c.) cannot be excluded.

292. Since the initial lacuna is of the same length as in the three preceding lines, it is likely enough that the papyrus agreed with LA in reading των ιε.

Frs. 6-10. The cursive note at the top of this column refers to |. 372, and evidently explains the apparent inconsistency of ἀγορᾷ here with ἐν βουθεῖ λειμῶνι in 1, 188, the inconsistency vanishing if ἀγορᾷ is taken in the sense of assembly or gathering; cf. Schol. ἀγορά ἀθροίσματι. The reading suggested in the latter part of the third line is, however, highly doubtful, the μ being rather cramped and the ς very insecure. λων or των is possible.
through the final word of the line. Possibly ανθρωπων was similarly cancelled and ανθρωπον μαθων rewritten above.

764. Why a was written again above the line is not evident, the original letter being sufficiently well formed.

781. [κ]ομη: κόμης MSS., a reading retained by Jebb but often suspected. κόροςς, κόγχης, κόπη, υδη have been conjectured in its place. κόμη is unacceptable, but the papyrus reading might be used as an argument in favour of a dative like Hense’s κοπῇ.

783. ανευφημησεν: this reading had been restored by Bruncck from Hesych. s. v. ανευφημησεν and is also in Schol. Eurip. Τρο. 573. ανευφωνησεν ου ανεφώνησεν other MSS.

788. Jebb following Porson accepts τ’ after Λοκρῶν from Diog. Laert. x. 137, where ll. 787-8 are quoted with several other variations from the MSS. reading, which the papyrus supports.

790. ριπτῶν: cf. l. 780; ριπτων MSS.

793. The alternative reading οιν implies the corresponding v. l. λυμαντίν later in the verse; οιν... λυμαντίν only MSS.

796. δακφρονωντα: analogous spellings are not infrequent in the papyri.

852-4. Unfortunately the papyrus brings no light here. In l. 854 the MSS. reading οὔ ποτε δύσκλετοι suits the space. What stood in the lacuna at the beginning of l. 853 is more doubtful. κεχυται νοσος, if that was read, must have been divided between ll. 852-3, and κεχυται would fill the space better than νοσος, but there is no evidence for that order.

1071. οὕτω: L mistakenly has ὡστε.

1135. το is preceded by something that looks like α surmounted by a rather thick dot; perhaps εσ was inadvertently written and the superfluous η subsequently cancelled; or the dot might be explained as a high stop after θυμοῖς, ει being omitted.

1136. μωμίεν confirms the correction of Heath, which according to Subkoff was the reading of L?; μνωμένη LA &c.

1138. The stop after προσβαλειν shows that σέθεν was constructed with ἀπήμπλακε instead of with στέργημα.

1141. Some other letter than ε was originally written before ξ; that the alteration was made by the first hand is possible, but uncertain.

1254. πυραιν: the accent is a probable indication that μεθης was regarded as one word, as in L, since otherwise an acute on the α would be the normal accent. It is however possible that both accents were inserted, that on the α being lost.

Fr. 24. It is by no means certain that this small fragment of a title belongs to 1805.

1806. THEOCRITUS, Idyll xxii.

Height 29 cm. Late first century. Plate IV (Col. iv).

Remains of four consecutive columns, of which the first two are represented by tiny scraps, with a small unplaced fragment. This was a handsome MS., the tall columns being carefully written in rather large uncials, round and upright, of an ornamental type exemplified in several Homeric papyri; cf. also e. g. 844 and
The cross-bar of ε and θ is placed rather high, as in P. Brit. Mus. 271 (cf. Kenyon, Palaeography, Plate 15). On the whole a date rather before than after the close of the first century seems appropriate. One stop occurs in the middle position (l. 68), and there is also a doubtful rough breathing in the same line, and a circumflex accent in the unidentified fragment. A few corrections are from a second hand. An unusual feature in this roll is that the upper and lower margins are strongly tinged on the recto with yellow, probably due to cedar oil, which was used as a preservative against insects and gave a yellow tint (Vitruv. ii. 9. 13, Ovid, Trist. iii. 1. 13).

The Hymn to the Dioscuri is not well represented in the MSS. of Theocritus, and fresh evidence of so early a date is welcome. In l. 40 an obvious correction of Stephanus is confirmed. But the papyrus, in spite of its early date, is less enlightening than 1618; it solves no crux, and its distinguishing feature is the presence of several unknown variants of rather neutral character, l. 45 τεθραυμένος for τεθλασμένος, l. 60 ἀπέλθοις for ἱκάνοις, l. 77 κόγχον for κόχλον; cf. 694. 34, where σφιν παρέκειτο replaces γάρ σφιν ἔκειτο. The text shows a mixture of dialects similar to that found in the MSS., e.g. ἀπένθοις (so originally; ἀπέλθοις the corrector) and πύκτας side by side with Μαγνήσησ ἀπὸ νηός.

In the transcript below, the supplements follow the edition of Wilamowitz in the absence of any indication that the papyrus read otherwise; the collation appended is derived from the same source, supplemented by the edition of Ahrens.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

[ευθα ὃ ανὴρ υπεροπλος ἐφημενος ευδιασκεν
45 [δεινος ιδειν σκληρησι τε]θραυμενος ου]ατα πυγμαις
[στηθεα ὃ εσφαιρωτο πελ]ωρια και π]λατν νο[τον
[σαρκι σιδηρησι τφυρηλατο]ς οια κολοσσος
[ἐν δε μυες στερεοισι βραχιο]σιν ακρον ὑπ ὁμον [
[εστασαι νυτε πετροι ολοιτρο]χοι ουστε κυλινδ[]ων
50 [χειμαρρους ποταμος μεγαλαις περ]μεγεσε διν[α]ς
[αυται υπερ νοτοιο και αυχενος] γιορειτο
[ακρον δερμα λευντος αφημε]]ον εκ ποδεω[νον
[τοι τρεπεος προσεεπε]αι]ς εις εις τε[θραυμενος Πολυδεξις]
[καπρε ξειν οτις εσσι τινε βροτοι ὁ]πις οδε χαρος
55 [καρω πος στ]αι τ ανδρας ρο]ς τους μη] πριν οπωπια
[θαρσοι μητ αδικους μητ εξ αδικων φοβεις λευ]σειν
[θαρσοι κουκ εκ κουκ με διασκεσθαι]ς τοι[οι με]κεν
[αγριος ει]ς προς παινα παλιγκοτο]ς η]δω υπεροπτης[
[τοιο]ις οιον ρας της σης γε μεν] ουκ επιβαινω

λ
60 [ελθος και ξεινων κε]ς τυχων παλιν] οικαδ επε[ν]θ[οις
[μητε συ με] ξεινιγε τα δ εξ εμεν ουκ] εν ετοιμω
[θαιμοι ουδ αν] του]τε πιειν υδατο]ς συγε δοιης
[νυστει ει]ς διενοριεμενα]ς φειδε αειτι εις
[αγνυσοι η τις ο]ς μπιδες ερειοι ω κ]εν εις πιθομεν
65 [εις ενι χειρας αειρον ενατος ανδρι] καταστας
[πυγμαχος η και ποσι θειον σκελο]ς κομματα δ ορθοι
[πυξ διασκειμενος σφετερας μη] φειδεο τεχνης
[τις γαρ στω χειρας και εμοις συνερειοι]ς [ι]αιτας,
[εγγυς ορας ον γυνωι εων (?) κεκλησε]θ ο πυκτας

Col. iv. Plate IV.

70 / η και α[θ]ιον ητοιμοι εφ ο δηρισομεθ αμφι]
[σος μεν εγω απ ]εις [εμοι κεκλησαι αι κε κρατηω]
[ορυθου φοινικο]ς οποιοι ειτε αιτοιμαι
[ειτ ουν ορυθους εις εοικοτε ειτε λεωσι]
1806. EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS
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8. The fact that this small fragment is from the bottom of a column makes its identification with 1. 8 probable; Col. ii will then have been one line longer than Col. iii.

39. That the papyrus had Ruhnken's λάλλαι in place of the ἄλλαι of the MSS. is of course quite uncertain, but there would apparently be plenty of room for it.

40. πεφυκασιν: so Stephanus; πεφύκασιν ΜΙ ΤΥ.

41. πλάτανοι τε is required, but cannot be read. The supposed ι (which is not ο) is followed by another vertical stroke, after which there is a blank space of about two letters' width. It looks as if the scribe had begun to write καὶ immediately after πλάτανοι and then changed his mind and left a space for the missing syllable. The loss of τε may have been caused by a misunderstanding of λευκαί, which was taken for λευκαί.

43. λειμώνας MSS.

45. τεθλαγμένος: τεθλασμένος (τεθλαγμ. M) MSS.

49. κυλίνδων MSS.

60. απενθοις (Η from απενθοις): ἱκάνοις MSS.

62. δοῖς, as originally written, is correct.

63. τερέσι MSS.; the occurrence of τερέσι with v. 1. -σοι at the end of the line points to εἰ σου or σεν preceding. εἰτέ σε ... τέρεσι Wilamowitz.
64. ε of πιθομεν was converted from a vertical stroke.

66. θενω ... ὀρθοί: θέων... ὀρθός M, θένων... ὀρθά Tr. ὀρθοί for ὀρθός is no improvement, but is consistent with θενω, which also suits the space better than a shorter reading, the lacuna being of the same length as in the next four lines. θέων σκέλος ; ... ὀρθά WM.

68. There is something above the line, though whether it was intended for a rough breathing is rather doubtful.

69. It is unfortunate that this line is not better preserved, though o πυκτας, which Wilamowitz obelizes, is at any rate something. οὐ σὺ με ἀμός Tr., οὐ γυνίς (γύνις M) ἑκὼν MD, οὐ γύνις ἑκὼν Meineke, οὐ γύνις ἀμός Haupt. The spelling πυκτας is that of D (a corr.).

70. A short oblique dash in front of this verse has no evident significance. Cf. 694. 21.

77. κονχου: κόχλου MSS.

82. συναγον is the spelling of the MSS., as originally written here. Whether the termination is rightly read as -γοῖν is not clear; the penultimate letter looks more like τ than γ, but the writer is apt to make the horizontal stroke project to the left, and this may be an extreme instance; moreover there is a suggestion of ξ in the remains of the supposed o. ξυνατεῖ would however be meaningless.

83. Consistency with the ordinary reading seems only to be obtained by the supposition of an original lipography of ξ, which may of course have been supplied subsequently.

Unidentified fragment. This small piece is apparently in the same hand as the other fragments, though there is no instance in them of an accent (l. 2).

1807. ARATUS, Διοσημεία.

17.3 x 18.6 cm. Second century.

This fragment contains the lower part of a column, preceded by a broad margin in which some cursive notes, both textual and explanatory, referring to the preceding column are entered. The notes on ll. 895 and 901 are in smaller and more lightly formed lettering than the v. l. on l. 897, but whether they really proceeded from a different writer the evidence is hardly sufficient to determine. The text of the Aratus is well written in a rather large hand, round and upright, somewhat similar to that of B. Berl. 6845 (Schubart, Pap. Gr., Plate 19, c), though less heavy; it may be assigned with probability, like the Berlin papyrus, to the first half of the second century. Paragraphi were employed, and there are two instances of a high stop, inserted well above the line. The latter, and the occasional accents, are unlikely to be original and are due perhaps to the corrector, who may also be the author of the marginalia.

So far as it goes the papyrus shows a good text, which is in substantial agreement with the Marcianus (M), the oldest and best of the manuscripts. Readings found in later MSS. have, however, twice been subsequently incorporated, in one
place as a marginal variant (l. 897), in another as a correction (l. 930). A departure from accepted tradition in l. 927 is supported by Joh. Philoponus and also by another early Aratus papyrus at Berlin (Berl. Klassikertexte, v. i. iii. i) in which a few letters from the last 14 lines of Col. ii are preserved. The papyrus reading is condemned very positively by the Berlin editors, but the coincidence of ancient testimony is worth notice; it is of course possible that the alternative lection was given in 1807 as a v. i.

For the accompanying collation the edition of E. Maass has been utilized.

Col. i.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l.</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>ιφατνης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>νοτω δ επικεκλιται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>εγγυς αληλων φαινοιται</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Col. ii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l.</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>η νεφελη ορειος μηκυνεται εν κορυφησιν ηηγ και παμποι λευκης γηρειον ακανθης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>επερχομενοι περισκοπείειν ανεμοιο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remains of the upper parts of five narrow columns which are successive but for the loss of one column between the third and fourth; the original length of the columns was approximately double the amount preserved. The text is well written in good-sized uncial of the sloping oval type, in which the smallness of ε, θ, o, σ is in marked contrast to the breadth of the square letters η, μ, ν, π; their
date is more probably second century than third. Single points in the high and middle position are used as stops, as well as a colon, which serves both for punctuation (iv. 5) and to mark a change of speaker, in combination with paragraphi (v. 13); a short blank space is sometimes employed instead for the same purposes (iii. 10, v. 14). One instance occurs of a rough breathing, due very likely to the corrector whose hand is in evidence here and there and who may also have been the author of at any rate most of the marginalia, which are the interesting feature of this papyrus.Cols. i–ii covered the famous passage 546 b–c describing the Platonic Number, and the margins contain a quantity of explanatory annotations, for the most part well preserved, but rendered difficult by the frequent use of tachygraphic symbols, the interpretation of which is not always clear. The writer is strangely inconsistent and seems sometimes to have dropped into short-hand almost unawares, e.g. in Col. i, marg. 8 it is not easy to see what was gained by a tachygraphic η in ἵστησιν. In the existing scarcity of material for the study of early Greek tachygraphy this well-dated specimen, exiguous though it is, has a value. The two columns have been printed, so far as exigencies of type permit, as they stand, and a reconstruction is attempted in the commentary; the exact forms of the symbols can be better followed in the accompanying facsimile (Plate IV). With regard to the matter of the notes, to the elucidation of which Prof. A. E. Taylor has kindly contributed, there is a noteworthy coincidence with Dercylides, the earliest writer whose view about the numbers reached is given by Proclus in his commentary on the Republic; see Col. ii, marg. 12–13, n. The annotator’s interpretation of the mathematics would therefore appear to be based, directly or indirectly, upon Dercylides, and thus gains considerably in interest; cf. Col. i, marg. 9–10, n., where a further small point of contact with οἱ περὶ Δερκυλίδην is observed.

In its testimony for the text of Plato the papyrus is undistinguished; some inaccuracies have been corrected by the second hand, which has introduced a novel variant in Col. ii. 8.

Col. i. Plate IV.

Col. ii. Plate IV.
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[τί δε θειω μεν]
5 γεννητων περι ] κοσμω , [ . . ] 1
[οδος ην αριθμος ] μ' αυλ επι [ . . ] ν α . 2
[περιλαμβαιει ] δω . 3
[τελειος ανθρω ] Πρακλεω ετη μ. 4
[πειω δε εν αι ] τελιον οτ' ε' . 5
[πρωτων ανγησεις ] οικ' τη τρ ο δε αφ . 6
[διαναναι τε και ] ατη αυτον 7
[δυναστουμεναι ] δυναται το ανθρωπω . 8
[τεταρτα σε ορ] και το τηνοσ αυτον αποστασεις 9
[λαβουσαι ομοιο] αυτων . 10

Col. iii. Plate IV.
[λ]ευ [φυλακει εν ψυ] 546 d
tες π[αρ ελαττον
tον δε[λοντος ημιν] 1
σαμενηι τα μου
5 σικης δευτερω
δε τα γυναικας
κης οθεν [αμον]
σωτερω[ι] [μυ]μι μεν γε
ησου[ται οι νε]
10 οi εκ [δε τουτων αρ

Col. iv.
πλουσια[ι] τας ψυ
χαζε επι την αρη
t
χην και την αρ
κατα
χαιαν αποστα
5 σιν ηγετην: βι

Col. v.
nυ μεν ουν: με
ταβησται μεν
dη ουτως [μετα
βασα δε πως [οι
5 κησει: η φανε
ρον στη τα μ'εν
Col. i, marg. 1. Perhaps κοσμιων, the word in any case being explanatory of θειω γεννητων. The two following lines, at the beginnings of which, to judge from the notes below, two or three letters may be lost, are obscure. μ′, if right, should = μπιν or -μεν, and the next word may be a form of αυτδα, perhaps αυτδαν: tachygraphic τ becomes a vertical stroke, and ν = =ω, and the combination of these might produce something like the symbol in the text, though different from that e.g. in Wessely, Ein System der allegr. Tachygraphie, Plate II. 9. 6. Further on, ν is surmounted by a small semicircle (perhaps incomplete), which may represent ω or ώ.

4. The collocation of figures after ετη is peculiar. If η = μητας, since the ω is written above and connected with α by enclosing dots, it would seem natural to suppose that the number meant is 1,800 x 10,000. On the other hand α ought to mean 1, not 1,000, and seeing that, as Prof. Taylor observes, the value 10,800 is assigned by some writers to the 'great year' of Heraclitus (cf. Censorinus 18. 11), there is a probability that ιωξ should have been written.

5-8. These four lines, which appear to be in a different hand from that of the rest of the marginalia, are an explanation of τελευς αριθμος, but are not easy to interpret. Perhaps τελευς (ες) αριθμος, since the word is written after the sign. But the order is not in favour of this. In l. 7 σ′ is a recognized abbreviation of συν, and συν(αριθμος) would be unobjectionable but for the occurrence in l. 14 of a similar curved symbol which remains unexplained. In l. 8 αποκαθιστησιν is the compound expected, but this will presuppose considerable irregularity at the beginnings of the lines. Taylor suggests that ουρ ει may stand for ουρ (αριθμος) ει(ναυς), followed by ει(ες): such drastic abbreviation, however, seems hardly possible, especially as the word ναυς does not actually occur in the text.

9-10. δυναμεν (ας) (τοις) υποτεινοναι: a similar sign represents as in Wessely, op. cit. Plates I. 2. ii. 2. III. 10. 1. That the same symbol should stand for both -ας and τοις is not a serious objection, since there are analogies for this in tachygraphy, and the alternative δυναμεν (ας) (αι) not only necessitates the alteration of υποτεινοναι but also involves a similar incongruity in l. 11-12, where the same sign occurs in conjunction with accusatives. Why, however, that case was used in these two places remains obscure. For the substance of the
note cf. Alex. Aphrod. In Arist. Met. A 8, 990 a 23 of the Pythagorean triangle ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἡ ὑποτείνουσα ἴσον δύναται ἀμφοτέραις ἅμα, διὰ τούτο ἡ μὲν δυναμείναι, αἱ δὲ δυναστεύομαι, and Dercylides cf. Proclus, In Rempl. II, p. 25 (Kroll) τῶν μὲν περιεχομένων τῶν πρῶτων ἐν συμφωνίᾳ λόγων ἐχομένων (i.e. 4 : 3), τῆς δὲ ὑποτείνουσας ἡ (sic: εξεταζετα διπλάσιαν, Kroll; but what is expected is surely ἰσον) δυναμείναις ἀμφοῖν.

11–12. τῶν μὲν περιεχομένων τὸν πρῶτον ἐν συμφωνίᾳ λόγον ἔχομεν (i. e. 4 : 3), τῆς δὲ ὑποτεινούσης ἡ (exspectas διπλάσιον, Kroll; but what is expected is surely ἰσον) δυναμείναις ἀμφοῖν.

Col. ii. marg. 1–5. This mutilated note refers to ll. 4–8 of the text, the value of ἀριθμῶν ἀπὸ διαμέτρων ῥητῶν περιεχόμενων being explained by the aid of diagrams. The 'rational diameter of 5' means the rational number nearest to the diameter of a square, the side of which is 5. This diameter is \( \sqrt{50} \) (Euclid i. 47), to which the nearest rational number is 7. The number 48 in ll. 1 and 9 marg. is of course arrived at by subtracting 1 from the square of 7 (ἀριθμῶν ἀπὸ διαμέτρων ll. 3–4). In marg. 2 perhaps ἐπομήνα δὲ should be restored, and τῷ before λ(ειπ(ει)) cf. marg. 8. In marg. 4 something like ὡς εἰ τῷ Μένων sees required, and the symbol before Μένων, which recurs in marg. 12–13, no doubt represents τῷ; cf. e.g. Wessely, op. cit. Plate II. 7, 2, where the sign for το is analogous, though the straight stroke is diagonal instead of being horizontal. Whether the preceding curved sign, which resembles a sigma (cf. ii, marg. 10), could represent ε ἔ is doubtful; at any rate the previous group is not in the least like the tachygraphic symbol for ὡς. The passage of the Μενο referred to is 85 b ἀπὸ τῆς διαμέτρου . . . γίγνεται ὡς τὸ διπλάσιον χωρίον. In l. 5, ἀπὸ δ(ι)μετ(ρου) γ(ε)ν(ειραι). Of the following diagram only a small part is preserved, and its nature is not clear; there seems to have been more than a square with a diagonal.

6–7. It would be natural to expand this note ῥητ(ῶν) ἀριθμ(ῶν) ὁ πλευρὰν ἔχω(ν), but this is an obviously incorrect definition of a finite number, Taylor suggests that ῥητ(ῶν) ἀριθμ(ῶν) κτλ. is meant, 'the square of a "rational diameter" is a square number', which less tautologous in Greek than in English, but might have been more clearly expressed as ἀριθμῶν ἀπὸ ῥητῶν ὁ πλευρὰν ἔχων. Cf. marg. 10–11.

8–9. λειπ(ει) μονάδι, εἰ πλευρ(α) μὴ. These words seem intelligible only if πλευρ(α) here
is taken as referring to the side of the oblong; ‘it is less by a unit, if the side = 48 (x 100)’. This is certainly not very satisfactory, and there is something to be said for Taylor’s proposal to insert € before μη: ‘it is less by a unit; i.e. if the side is 5, the number will be (49 — 1 =) 48’. But emendation of this kind is better avoided, if possible. Cf. marg. 1–2, where there was a somewhat similar note.

10–11. ὅρητον (?). ‘If the side = 48, the number will be (49 — 1 =) 48’. It seems simplest on the whole to regard the first two words of this note as a lemma from the Platonic text; cf. margin 6. The curved symbol is rather like that in margin 4, but some part may be lost in a hole in the papyrus, and at any rate the head differs in having a downward bend. With regard to (μη), the usual tachygraphic equivalent of ov is an upward curve, but this sometimes degenerates into a straight stroke, as e.g. in Wessely, op. cit. Plate III. 10. 1.

12–13. (τῷ) ΚΣ γήρονοντας (τῷ) γυναικείῳ. In this note the number 27 appears to have been connected with the female γυναικείον. For the symbol for το cf. margin 4 above and n. ad loc.; if that is right, the group next to the figures in l. 13 must govern the dative, and hence ἄρα(ολοκόλως) is suggested. In the number ΖΦ the first figure might be taken for Α, but is no doubt Ζ, since, as Taylor points out, 7,500 is given as the value of one of the ἁρμονίαι by Dercylides ap. Proclus, In Remp. ii. 25 (Kroll) ο μὲν ἐστιν ὁμολογήτης φύλος, ο μὲν ἀνομολογήτης, ο ὅποιος καὶ ο μὲν (γεννάω) ταυτόν ἄλλον τῷ μέρε, ο τῷ ἀνόμοιον μετ ’ ἑκείνον τῷ ΖΦ. Proclus obtains the number ΖΦ by the addition of ΚΣ and μη (ii. 36 sqq.), but whether he is here following Dercylides he does not say.

Col. iii. 8. ζυμὸν γινορκοῦντα: the vestige before the lacuna and the arrangement of the lines makes the reading practically certain; γενορκοῦν ημῖν (FDM, Burnet) or ημῖν MSS.

10. καταστασιν, as amended, is the ordinary reading.

12. To which hand the insertion of the missing syllable is due is uncertain.

Col. v. 1. μεταβηθήσεται: so AM; μεταβηθήσεται D, μεταβηθήσεται F.

14. The superfluous adscript has been crossed through and a dot was also placed above it.

15. ου: so A, Burnet; τό FD. The vestige of the ο is very slight, but the reading is confirmed by the spacing.
denote alternations in the dialogue; whether they were accompanied by a colon, as usual, does not appear. Accents and breathings have been inserted here and there, more probably than not after the text was written; they may be due to the hand which has added some notes in a small second-century cursive in the upper margin. Though the general purport of these annotations is clear they are obscured by mutilation, and it is a matter of doubt to which lines precisely they referred. Possibly the symbols in the margin of Col. iii were intended to mark the place of other notes which have been lost.

The text is a good and interesting one, of the eclectic type frequently met with in papyri. Of the four readings in which the papyrus agrees with TW against B, three are accepted by Burnet (whose edition is the basis of the collation given below) and the fourth (iii. 13 ἐφη, ὦ Κέβης for ὦ Κέβης, ἐφη) may be right; on the other hand, in ii. 14 it agrees with B in καὶ τοιοῦτο τε of BTW, and in ii. 12 has the preferable οὐδὲ of BT against οὔτε of B²W.

Col. i.

1]ην εκ των εναντ[ων

2]τα

3][μέγεθος μηδε. . . . . . . ἀν αλλα

4]αλλα τα . . . . . . . [ . . . . α]λλαν τα εκ

5]μεσος της εἰ . . . τ . . . μεζων

6]αι μικρον του τε

7]τητα μικρον[ν] αν ειη και παλιν μεγε

Col. ii.

1]ην εκ των εναντ[ων

2]τα

3][μέγεθος μηδε. . . . . . . ἀν αλλα

4]αλλα τα . . . . . . . [ . . . . α]λλαν τα εκ

5]μεσος της εἰ . . . τ . . . μεζων

6]αι μικρον του τε

7]τητα μικρον[ν] αν ειη και παλιν μεγε

10]ος δ αυτως και το σμικρον [το

11]εγ γιγνεσθαι ουδε ειναι ουδε
1809. EXHIBIT CLASSICAL AUTHORS


20 [τις ειπε των παροιμων α] [κουσας οστις] δ ην [ου σα

Col. iii.
[tων εξουσω τα εναιτια ε] λεγομεν ενομαζοντες αυτα τη [εικιων επωνυμι αι νυν δε περι εκεινων αυτων

5 ων [εινουν εχει την επω νυμαιν τα ονομαζομενα αυ τα δ εκεινα ουκ αυ ποτε φαιμεν εθελοναι γενσιν αλλοιων δεξιαιαιι και αμα βλεψας προς τον Κεβητα ειπεν αρα μη του εφη ο Κεβης και σε τι τουτων εταραξεν [ων οδε ειπεν ου

3 δ ου εφη ο Κεβης ουτως εχω καιτω δουτι [λο]γω αυ ου πολλα

15 με ταρατει συνωμολογη

και [μεν

Marginal note. 1. The letters [η] are on a small detached fragment which seems to belong to this line, though whether it precedes or follows [αυ εκ των εναιτων] is doubtful.
4. It is not clear whether the interlinear η signifies an abbreviation (αλληλος) or was added by way of correction; possibly there is a second letter (σ?) and a double dot should be recognized between the ηα (or α) and τ, as apparently also in l. 5.
5. ηναγων is possible, though the vertical stroke before ι is rather long for τ and
would better suit e. g. ρ; but εκ [τῶν εὐα]ρισκον is unlikely, since ll. 6–7 indicate a longer line. 
εἰ: τ cannot be εν apparently.
6. τοις is crossed through and ]αι μικρον τοις τε/ inserted above it, probably by the same hand. A very unintelligible collocation is left.

Col. i. This column would be expected to begin about 102 b 5, but the scanty remains are not easy to identify. The best point of departure is l. 6] , ες, followed by ]α (or ]λ) in l. 7. Φαιδω[νος] [δε ελαττω λεγεις ταυτα] (T for τότ(ε)) could here be read, but the vestiges of ll. 1–4 do not seem to bear out this identification. Κ 6 μεγεῖθος and Κ 8 ηδος are unsuitable, and though c 4 προς is possible, ]αλθεθα would give too short a line. The double dot in ], τι is not of much assistance, since this may represent either a stop or a change of speaker; cf. int.

8. εκείνοι: so B°TW; εκείνος Β.
4. ού: so B°TW; om. Β.
10. γενέσθαι W.
8. εκείνοι: So B°TW ἐκεῖνος Β.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
12. γενέσθαι W.
10. ὡσαύτως T.
and the height of the roll must have approximated to 30 cm. Short lines are filled by the common angular sign. Paragraphi are used for purposes of punctuation, and the letter following the pause is sometimes slightly postponed; points in the high and medial position are also employed, though some of these look like later additions. A later hand is also responsible for one or two small corrections, for the coronis at Olynth. iii. Fr. 5. ii. 10 and the mark of elision in Phil. i. 15. 17.

The text is on the whole a good one, of the usual ‘eclectic’ kind. Peculiar variants (Olynth. ii. Frs. 14–18. 19, 22, Olynth. iii. 7. 2–3, Phil. 17. 4–6, 21. 3–5) are unimportant, and there is no tendency to depart from the tradition of the MSS. Of these S, by common consent the best, is often supported, in several places against all other testimony (Olynth. ii. Frs. 9–11. i. 3, Frs. 12–13. 5, 12, Phil. 4. i, 27. 2, De Pace 2. i. 6, 22); in Phil. 11–13. ii. 5 a vulgate spelling has apparently been converted later to that of S. On the other hand agreements with the readings of other MSS. against S are not uncommon (Olynth. ii. Frs. 2–3. 11 (= YOF), 9–11. i. 2, 14–18. 1, Olynth. iii. 5. ii. 19 (= A), Phil. 4. 2 (= Y), 5–6. 15 (= FB), 11–13. i. 10. ii. 4, 14. 1, 10, 18–20. 10 (= YO)).

In the transcription given below, lines in minor pieces have been completed for the sake of convenience in reading, but in such cases the division of lines adopted is often quite hypothetical. In consequence of the fragments being so widely scattered over five speeches identification of small scraps is difficult, and a number of these have not been printed.

Olynth. i.

Fr. 1.

Fr. 2.

[βουλου εγω] δ ουκ αγνιοω § 16
[μεν ω ανδρες] Αθηναιοι τωντο
[οτι πολλακις] ουεις ου τους
[αιτιος αλα τους] υστατους

5 νυν [αν εχρωμεθα των Φιλιπ

Ο 2

Olynth. i.

Frs. 3–4.

[λεπτον λαμβαμεν ει δε του
7 lines lost
[μουν ηδιον αν και ελευθε]§ 23
10 [ρους η δουλους ειναι και] γαρ

την αδεως καρπουμενοι
[αν δ εκεινα Φιλιππος λαβηθη
tis αυτων κωλυει δευρο βαδι
ξειν. Θηβαιοι μη] λειαν πι § 26
Fr. 1. The identification of this fragment is made with hesitation, since the reading προσῆκον in place of προσῆκεν, though intelligible, is unattested, and it is not clear that any letter preceded ε in l. 1; on the other hand, the fact that l. 5 is apparently the last of a column affords some confirmation, since the end of a column is expected at about this point, and no other suitable position for the fragment has been found in these five speeches.

Fr. 3-4. 11. ὃ is only a shade to the right of ἃ and ἃ in the preceding lines, and the omission of τοῦ before κατακουεῖν (so Bl(ass) with Liban.) seems probable.

Fr. 8. The length of l. 2 appears to suit this passage better than § 15 πολλῶι φανῶμεν ἔρραθυμηκότες, but the identification is not certain.
εισιν θαυμαστῖοι καὶ οὐλύπους τα του πολεμου—ὡς εύο ταῇν ἱμενων Τινοὶς νῦν τοα λεμίου. Καὶ άυων τουτους § 18 μεν [φιλοτιμιαί παντας απω]

15 θειν [αυτον εφη Βουλομεν νον [πανθ αυτου δοκειν ει ναι ταργα προς γαρ αυ τοις αλλοις [και την φιλοτιμιαν

Frs. 5–6.

[σκεψατι ου χαλεπως οι δε § 17 [δη περι αυτου οντες ξενοι [και πεξεται]οι τις δοξαν μεν [εχουσιν ως] εις τω βανμαστιοι


4 lines lost

λεμιου και αγωνων τουτους § 18 μεν [φιλοτιμιαί παντας απω]

15 θειν [αυτον εφη Βουλομεν νον [πανθ αυτου δοκειν ει ναι ταργα προς γαρ αυ τοις αλλοις [και την φιλοτιμιαν

Frs. 2, 3.

[καπιο]ροκουντα και πυνο δ § 10 [μενουν] δυναμιν βεβαιαν

7 lines lost

10 [και πλαιαν και των αλλων [των τοιουτων [τα] κατοβεν ις [χυροτε]ρα ειναι δει οντω [και των] πραξειον τας αρχας [και τας νποδειοιεις

Frs. 7–8.

[ανπερβηλη]του ειναι ει [δε τις σοφρ]ων η δικαιος [αλλως την καθημεραν ακρα [σιαν του βιου και μ]εθην και

5 [κορδακισμους] ου δυναμε [νος φερεν παρεωθαι και [εν ουδενος ειμαι μερει [του τοιουτου] λοιπους δη § 19 [περι αυτου ειμαι ληιστασ]


15 [τ εσιν αληθη] και γαρ ους [ενθευν παντεις απηλαυ [7 lines lost

ποιοις εινεκα του γελασθη 25 και τοιουτους
198 THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Frs. 9-11. Col. i.

το]ς σωμασιν § 21
[ημων τεω]ς μεν αν ερρωιμε
[νος η τις] ουδεν επαισβα
[νεται επα]ν δ αρρωσνημα
5 [τι συμβη] πιαντα κενειται:
[καν ρηγμα καν στρεμμα [καν
[αλλο τι των υπαρχουντων>
[σαθρων η τι ουτω και των το
[λεων και τον] τυραννων
[εως μεν αν εξω] πολεμω>
7 lines lost § 22

νομιζει σωφρονος μεν
ανθρωπον λογισμοι ξρη
20 ται [μεγαλη γαρ ρο]τη μαλ
λον [δ αλον η τυχη] παρα παν
τε[στι τα των ανθρωπων

Frs. 12-13.

[ει μηδεις ημων] οι αινδρες A § 25
[θηραιοι] δυναται λογισασθαι
[ποτον πιλεμειτε χρ[ονον Φι
[λιπτω] και τι ποιοφυντων
5 [ημων] ο χρονος διεληλυθεν ου
[τοσ ιστε γαρ δηπο]υ τουθ στι
[μελη]πτων υμων [ετερους
[τινας] ελπιζοντων πραξεων
[αιτιωμενων αληθεως
10 [χρισοντων παλιν ελπιζουν]
[tων σχεδου ταυθ απερ] γη[ι
[ποιουντων απας ο χρόνος
[διεληλυθεν ειθ] ουτωις αγιω § 26
[μονως εχετ οι αινδρες] Αθη

Frs. 14-18.

[γεγονε]ν δια των αυτων του
[των ελπιζετε πραξεων
[εκ φαιλων αυτα χρησατα γε
[νησε]θαι δια ποτα ευλογον
5 ουτ εχο]ν εστιν [φυσιν τουτο
γε πολυ γαρ] βοιον εχοντας
φυλαστειν η κηςασθαι παν
τα πεφυκεν νυν δ ο τι μεν
4 [φαλαξον] ν ουδεν εστι
10 [υπα το πολεμου λιον]
tων προτερον κηςασθαι
των δει αυτων ουν ημων ερ
δει αυτων ουν ημων ερ
γον τουτ η ηι δη φημι δι δειν § 27
eισερειν χρησατα αυτους

3 lines lost
15 [ναίοι ωστε δι' ον κρήστων [καυτά] δε απ' αυτῶν τών ερ
[φαυλα τα πραγματα της] πολεως [γαν κρίνοντας τους [μεν
20 [αξιοις ε]παινου τιμαν του[ις [δ' αδικουν]τας κολαζειν τας
[προφασε]ις αφελειν και τις [καθ υμας] ελλειμματα: ου γ'αρ
[ε]σι τις [κρ]ους εξετασαι τις τε
25 [πρα]κται [τοις] αλλοις αν μη [πα]
[ρ υμαν αυτω]ν πρωτον υ[παρ
[ξηι τα δεον]τα: τι[ς]ρος γαρ ει

Fr. 19.

[μηδε] οτιον [συμπονειν ου § 30
[Χε γενη]σεται των δεονων
[ημιν] ουδ[εν εν καιρω το γαρ
[ηδικημε]νιον αει μερος ελ
5 [λειψε] ειδο μεμν

Frs. 2-3. i. ἵσχυροτείρα: so YOF corr.; ἱσχυρότατα other MSS., Bl., Butcher.
Fr. 4. This fragment is not very certainly identified.
Frs. 5-6. 1. A stop may be lost before οι.
Frs. 7-8. 1. τάνθρωπος, which is omitted by Bl. and Butcher with SFB, was clearly not
in the papyrus.
6. παρασκευα: so SAFBY: παρασκευαθεοι vulg.
16. In estimating the number of lines lost below this one it has been assumed that the
papyrus had και τοιούτους ἀνθρώπους, which Bl. brackets.
Frs. 9-11. i. 2. ημων; so FOPQ; om. SY, Bl., Butcher.
3. The papyrus agrees with S1 (so Bl., Butcher) in omitting των καθ ἐκαστα σαθρων
which is commonly added after ἐπαισθάνεται.
8. Whether the papyrus had σαθρων (S1 &c., Bl.) or σαθρον (vulg., Butcher) is
indeterminable.
21. Judged by the preceding and following lines there should be eleven letters in the
lacuna, and the omission of το before ωλων with S and Dion. Hal. 1089 is therefore probable.
Bl. follows S, Butcher the vulg.
Fr. 11. ii. The identification is doubtful; δ[ιμ] . . . πολ[λακ]ις is another possibility.
Frs. 12–13. 5. χρόνος: so S, Bl., Butcher; χρόνος ἁπας vulg. 7. ὑμων: so S; αὐτῶν other MSS., Butcher, om. Bl. with Schaefer and Cobet. 12. ἀπας ὁ χρόνος: so S, Bl., Butcher; ὁ χρόνος ἁπας vulg. 13–18. 1. τῶν αὐτῶν . . . πράξεων: so most MSS.; τοὺς ἅπας ἀπίστε τῶν αὐτῶν πράξεων S, Butcher, and Bl. with [πράξεων]. Cobet bracketed τῶν αὐτῶν πράξεων, Gebauer πράξεων only.

12. A high stop may be lost after δε.
19. κρίναντας: κρίναντας MSS. 22. προφάσεις : προφάσεις δ MSS. If δ were similarly omitted after τοῖς (l. 20), which is quite possible, the asyndeton would balance those earlier in the sentence.

Olynth. iii.

Frs. 2–3.


Frs. 4.

5 [τα δε] παραδοξον τοινυν φιλιππον ὁμοι μη πεισίομεθ ανπο 5 [πεπειΐϊσμαι yap εξ υ ου α φηταξαντας τουτο θε 5 [οις μη πεισίομεθ ανπο 5 [πεπειΐϊσμαι yap εξ υ ου α φηταξαντας τουτο θε

OLYNTH. III.

Frs. 4–5.

5 [τα δε] παραδοξον τοινυν φιλιππον ὁμοι μη πεισίομεθ ανπο 5 [πεπειΐϊσμαι yap εξ υ ου α φηταξαντας τουτο θε 5 [οις μη πεισίομεθ ανπο 5 [πεπειΐϊσμαι yap εξ υ ου α φηταξαντας τουτο θε

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
1810. Extant Classical Authors

Col. i.
3 lines lost

§ 11

5 [ous. kathistasin e vita kai t]ous
ta deontai poiein boulome-
Tony ada}[p]eirous poionu
[epideia] de tauta loyste kai
[tein tnu t]a beltista legein odo

10 [parasx]i]te asfalen kthikan

ta ton grapofata a panta iste

Fr. 5.

§ 11

poreiai ton tnu ta beltista. § 13
eipou]tai y]miai gevesbhai pr

de tauta evtrapiasu y]miasmos

ω an]res A[y]nai μηδεν

5 a]xiote μη υ[likonou ei

ntar umin woste touts vnomous
toutous parabaineta μη δουναι
dikhe μηde o[v]tos anopton

waste eis proo[pt]on kakov

10 auton embaile w [ou μην ou

§ 14

δ εκεινο γ]mas ay]noei de

ω an]res A[y]nai oti ψηφi

σμ]e ουδενο ax]ion estein

an μη prosygenetai to poi

15 eiv εθελειν τa dox]aonta pro

thumos umas e iap αυταρκη

ta ψηφισματα ēn κα]mas anay

gas a proskei prattnein

η peri oγ eis graphe] diapra

Fr. 6.

[theis plhν mikp]on [eis ata

§ 35

[tiu anelkou eis] ta]x[v]n yga

[yon tnu poli]n t]nu a[lynv]

[xapheia [v]ou stratanvsibai tou

5 [diak]ein]v ton poieiν t[ou]bd o

[ti kath y]likian ekasto[s ehoi

[kai stou] kairos eit]ax[v]n poi

[ynas ou]ke estin o[pon μηθεν

Fr. 1. 5. Either πεισομεθ or πεισ[ωμεθ could be read.

Fr. 7.

§ 36

[τη]i polei kai] apasian υ[ν

[synoisein] mel]leiv]

Fr. 2–3. 4–5. Bl. brackets peri adtps and inserts kai before paron with Isidor. x. 126.
Fr. 5. i. 11-12. The interlineated readings are those of the ordinary text.  
19. του: so MSS. except S, Isidor.; om. Bl., Butcher with S.  
ii. 5. μη has been cancelled by dots placed above.  
12. Bl. brackets ὦ ἄνδρες ᾿Αθηναῖοι. ἦ  
15. τα: ταγε MSS.  
16. υμας is bracketed by Bl. and Butcher with Cobet.  
19. av γραφἴηι: so A suppl.; γραφεῖν corr. to γραφῆ S, with ἄν γραφῇ in a late hand, γράφει vulg. γραφεῖν Bl., Butcher.  

Fr. 6. i. Either μικρ]ων (S corr. h. i B corr. AO, Butcher), or μικρ]ων S'B1 can be read; μικρω Bl. with Dionys.  
7. Bl. brackets τὰιν ποιήσας.  

Fr. 7. 2–3. ἀπασιν νη[ιν συνοισειν: ἀπασι συνοισειν ιμιν MSS.  

 Phil. i.  

Fr. 1.  
] κακως τ[α] προ[γματα § 2  
Fr. 2.  
[σκοπων το τε] πληθος τ[ης υπαρ § 4  
[χουνσ αυτ]ων δυναμεως [  
[και το τα χωρια παντα απο [  
[λωλεναι τηι πολει ροθως] μεν [  
Frs. 5-6.  
[τοσοηντον επειδαν απαυν α § 14  
[κουουητε κρινατε μη προτερον § 17  
[προλαμβανετε μηδ αν εξ αρ [χι]σ δοκιω τινι καιθων παρα [  
5 lines lost  
[το μενα τηι νωνυ βοηθειαι § 15  
[κωλυσαι δινηθειμεν αλ  
Fr. 3.  
[δρες Αθην]α[ι]και και υμεις § 7  
[επι της τοιαυτης εθεληστε § 7  
[γενεσαι γνωμης νυν επει [δηπερ ου προτε]ρομν και [  
Frs. 7. Col. i.  
[δοκιωντων οικειως εχειν § 8  
[και τιανθ ονα περ και αλλοις [ανθρωποις ειν [  
Fr. 4.  
[κουατς ἂθηναι τω τε πληθος τας εθελησε]ν § 8  
[κωλυς δοκιω τινι καινην παρα [  
5 lines lost  
[ιους εκειουν παρ ημι]δ[ν] § 12  
5 §  
[αιτων πλειους τον δεοντος § 15  
5 §
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λ ος αν δει[ηη] τις πορισθει
sa para[σκευη και ποση και
ποθεν διαμειναι δυνησεται
15 τεως [αν η δι] καλυσμεθα πει
σθενται τον πο[λεμον η πε
ριγενομεθα των εχθρον
ουτω γαρ ουκετι του λοι

Fr. 8.
[μακρον τουτων αλλ] οσον § 21
[αν δοκηι καλως εχ]ειν εκ δια
[δοχυς αλληλοις τω]υς δ αλ
[λους εξενους ειναι κε]λεω
5 [και μετα τουτων ιππε]ας δια
[κοσιους και τουτων πε]ντη
[κοντα Αθηναιους του]λαχισ

Fr. 9.
[π]αντελω[ς] § 23
[ταπεινην] ειναι δει πολιτα[ς]

Fr. 10.
[ναι]μηθ [εκεισ αφικεσθαι δει
[τ]οινν [§ 32

Frs. ii—i3.

Col. i.
εμποριων στομασι[ν ραιδι
ως [ε]σται α μεν ουν χηρησε § 33
[ταί κα]ποτη τη δυναμεί μαν
[οι το]υ καιρον ο τουτων [κυ
5 [οιοις καταστας υφ υμι[ων] δου
[λημεσται α δ υπαρψαι δη]ει πα
[ρ μ]εν χαιρησαται εις του τη
[γρα]φαι αν [τ]αυτω ανδρ[ου]ς A
[θη]ναιοι πορισοητε [τα χρημα
10 [τα] προ]σων α λεγω [ειτα και
[ταλ]α παρασκευασιτε]ς τους
[]πρατιωτας τας τριπεις τους]
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[σπε]εας εντελή πασαν την
[δυνα]μιν νομωι κατακλεισθη
15 [τε επι] τι πολεμωι] [μενειν]
[των] [μεν χρηματωι] [αυτοι]
[ταμαι και πορισαι] [γιγνομεν]
[και] των δε πραγματων παρα του
[στρατηγου τον λα]γους [ησουν]
20 [τες πανσεθε αει] [περι]
[των αγητων] [βουλευομενοι]
[μεπαχυν αγων και φερουν τους]
30 πλεον]τας την διαλληταν ε
[πειτα τι προς τουτωι του]

Fr. 14.

[ατακτα α]οριστα: α[διορθω] § 36
[τα απαντα] τα τοιγαρων αμα
[ακηκοαμεν] τι και τρι[ηραρ]
[χους καθισταμε]νυ και τοι[ντοι]
5 [ανδιοσεις] [ποιου] μεθεια και
[περι χρηματου] πορου σκο
[πουμεν και μει] ταυτα εμ
[θαυμεν τους] μετοικους
[εθοξε και τους] χωρις οικουν
10 [τας εις αυτους] [παλ]ιν αντεμ
[βιβαζειν εις εν οσιω ταυτα] § 37

Fr. 15. Plate IV.

[τουθ ιβι] δεοσ εληλυθειν ουσ
[τ επιστελλειν] [Ευφρουσιν]
[ηδη τοι] αντας επιστολας>
[επιστολης α]φαγνωσις
5 [των ανεγνωσ] με] τα και
[μεν εστι τα πολλα οισ ουκ οις]
[μην αλλ ιδιων ουχ ηδεα ακοιν]
[ειν αλλ ει μεν] οσα αν τις υ
10 [περβη] τωι λογιωι μα μη λυ
[πησι και τα] γραμματα υπερ
[βιοται] δει προς ηθονην
[δημη] [ορειν ει δ η των λο
[γαι] χαρις αν η μη] προσηκο
15 [σα εργωι] ζημω] γιγνεται
[αισχρου] ειστι φευκακιειν [εαυ]
[τους και] απαντα] αναβαλλ
[μενους α] αν] [η] [υ] [εργωι]
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[...] προβάλλεσθαι δε η βλε
[πεν εν]αντιον]ν ουτ οιδεν
5 [ουτ εθελει] και

Fr. 17.

[περι] του πολ[εμου ουδε προ § 41
[τω]ν πραγματον προορατε
[ουδεν πριν [αν η γεγενη
[μενον τι η γηνομενον
5 [πυθησθε] ταντα δ [ισος προ
[τερον] μεν ην. νυν δ επ αν
[την η]κε[ι] την] ακμην

Fr. 21.

[χοι τ]εθραι [των δεει τους § 45
[τοιομνουσ α]ποστολους ου
[γαρ ε]στιν οικ εστιν ο αν
[δρες Αθη]ναιοι εαυτοι εν αυδρα δυ
5 [νηθη]ναι μοτε ταυθ ομιν

Fr. 23.

[γματ αισ]χυ[νης ωστε τους] στρα § 47
[τηγων εκαστοις, δις και τρις
[κριε]ται παρ ημιν περι θα
[νατου] προς δε τους εκθρους
5 [ουδεις] ουδ απαξι αυτου α

3 lines lost § 39
[λουθειν τους πραγμασιν [αλ]
[Λ αυτους εμπροσθεν] ειναι
25 [των πραγματων και του αν
[του τροπου ωσπερ των στρα
[τευματων αξιωσει της αν

 le 18. 20.

[δεις ημων μη τε]νθον αιμαται § 43
[μη οργιζεται] ορ]ων ω α]ν
[δρες Αθη]ναιοι την μεν α[ρ
3 lines lost
[σαν ηδη υπερ του μη π]αθειν
[kακως υπο Φιλιππο]ν] αλλα
[μην οτι γ ου στησεται] δηλον
10 [ει μη της αυτου]ν [κωλου]ει ειτα
[tου ανα]μενον και τρι
[ηρεις κ]ενας και τας παρα του
[δεινος ε]λπιδας αν αποστειλη

Fr. 22.

π]ραξην προς ημας § 46
[ψευδομε]νοι ραδιως

Fr. 24.

[του προσηκοντος κακοιργου] § 47
[μεν γαρ εστι ορ]ισθενα απο
[θανειν στρατη]γου δε μα[χο]
[μενον τους πολ]εμιον [ ]
[Fr. 25.]

| Fr. 26. |

| γωνισασθαι περὶ θανατου | [παγ]μενων [και πολλα τοι | § 49 |
| τολμαὶ αλλα του πων ανδραπο | [αυτα ονε]ρο[σε]λειν εν τη | |
| διστων και λωποδυτων θα | [γνωμη] την |
| [νατον μαλ]λον [αιρουνται |

| Fr. 27. |

| Fr. 28. |

| [ουντ]εις αλ[α αυ αφεντες | [σθαι λεγειν αιρουμαι νι | § 51 |
| ταυτ εκειν ειδωμεν οτι | [κων δ οτι πα]σι μελλει συν |
| εχθρος αυ[θρωπος και τα η | [ουσειν ] |
| μετερα ημας αποστερει |
| 5 και χρονοιν πολυν υβρικε |
| } κατα ] Φιλιπποι |

[Fr. 4. 1. The addition of αυτω after εχνω would make the line too long; om. S, Bl., Butcher. |

2. παιθ: so Y; ἀπανθ' others, Bl., Butcher. |

Frs. 5-6. 11. Bl. and Butcher write δυνηθεῖμεν. |

15. τεος: so FB Proacon. 21, Bl.; τεο S, vulg., Butcher. |

Fr. 7. ii. Since no letter can be read with certainty, an identification of these lines is too doubtful to be of any value. |

Fr. 8. 1. There is no trace of writing above this line, but the surface of the papyrus is rather damaged. |

3. Bl. brackets ἀλληλοις, which is omitted by Dionys. and Liban. |

Fr. 10. A spot of ink on the edge of the papyrus is doubtfully identified as a paragraphus, which would however be quite in place. Whether -ραιμεθ or -ρωμεθ was written cannot in any case be determined. |

Frs. 11-13. i. 1-2. The papyrus seems to have had the ordinary reading, which is retained by Bl. Butcher obelises ῥαδιας ἔσται, for which Dindorf reads ῥαδιως εἰσεσθε with Wolf. |

10. α ληγω: so vulg., Butcher; om. a S, Bl. |

ii. 4. εχνω: so SAY, Butcher; ἀγω vulg., Bl. |
5. The deletion of the first ε of Γεραιστῶ seems to have been intended. There is a dot just above and slightly to the left of the ε, and on the line between a and ε something like a comma, both marks being in rather lighter ink. Γεραιστῶ SBO, Bl.; Γεραιστῶ vulg., Butcher.
12. Either προβήσαθε (SFB, Bl., Butcher) or προσβήσαθε (A) might have been written; προελήσαθε vulg.
Fr. 14. 1. αἱρεστὰ αἱδιορθωτα: so vulg.; ἀδιορθωτα ἀδιόρθωτι SAY, BI., Butcher.
Fr. 15. 18. α: so S; other MSS. have ος, but for this there is not room unless ἀναβαλλομενου was differently divided, which is improbable.
19. νυ[ρέν (S, Bl., Butcher) is possible as a reading, but considerations of space favour νυ[ρέν.
27. τῆς: so SY, Bl., Butcher; τῆς others.
Fr. 16. 2–3. παράγοντι τις: or παράγοντι, with S.
Fr. 17. 3–4. γεγενημένον τι ἢ γιγνομεν: γεγ. ἢ γιγν. τι most MSS., Bl., Butcher; Y transposes γεγ. and γιγν., and the same order is equally possible in the papyrus, to which the position given to τι is apparently peculiar.
6. ην: ἐνυ SA, Bl., Butcher, ἐνυ ποιεῖν YO, ἐνυ ποιεῖν FB. The loss of the syllable eu would be very easy after μεν.
Fr. 18–20. 2. Either ἀρχιζεται (SAY) or λογιζεται (vulg.) is possible.
10. αὐτοῦ[καλεῖ: so YO; αὐτὸν καλεῖ F, καλεῖ S, καλεῖ Β, Bl., Butcher.
Fr. 21. 1. τοις, which Bl. omits with Schol. Aristid. p. 196, was evidently in the papyrus.
3–5. There is apparently no authority for the insertion of ὁ ἄνδρες ᾿Αθ. after ἐστιν here, but this seems the easiest explanation of the clear ὅμως in l. 5, which cannot be δεῖν unless there was a considerable omission; moreover if ὅμως can be read in l. 4, the supplement at the end of l. 3 becomes rather long. Cf. Ol. 2. 10, where ὁ ἄνδρα Ἀθηναίων might help to account for either the dropping or insertion of ὁ ἄνδρα ᾿Αθ. ὅμως.
Fr. 24. 1. This line was probably the first of a new column, which is expected about this point. The margin above it, like that below Fr. 23. 9, is broken, but that the two fragments belonged to different columns is indicated by their dissimilar appearance.
Fr. 28. 2. παῖς: so S (πῶς), Bl., Butcher; πῶς ὑμῖν other MSS.

De Pace.

Fr. 1.

οὐ ςύν § 16
[ἐπιστρατευεῖν ουδεὴ]ρος
Fr. 2.

Col. i.

[πάντες αὐτὸν βουλοῦνθ ενάκεια § 17
[αὐτῶν κρατησάντας δε τους ε
[τερνος δεσπότας] ὑπαρ[χ]ειν
[αὐτὸν οὐδὲ εἰσ] τι οὖν ἡγουν
[μας φοβερον καὶ] τι φυλάξα
[σταί δειν ἡμας] μη κοινὴν
[προφασιν καὶ κοι]νον εγ
[κλῆμα ο μέλλων] πολέμος
[προς απαντασ λα]βην ει γαρ § 18
[Ἀργειοι μεν και Μεσθενη[σ]ινκα
[και Μεγαλοπολιτι]ζι και τινες
[των λοιπων Πε]λοποννησην
[σιων οσια ταυτα τοι]τωιο φρο
[νουσι δια την προ]σ Λακε
[δαιμονον] μην επικι]θηρν
[κειαν ενδρος σχησουσι καὶ]
[το δοκειν ενδεχὴ]σθαι [τι]
[των εκεινοι πεπραγμενον]
[Θηβαιοι δε εχο]νουσι μεν ωσ
[λεγουσιν απεξ]θεσιν.

Col. ii.

[περὶ [των ἰδιων εκαστος ορ... § 19
[γιοψε]νος κοινον εφ ἡμας
[ἀγαγο[σ]] του πολεμου τα των
[Ἀμφικτυων δογματα προ

5 στηρ[σαν]ευνει ειτα επιστα
[σθωσιν εκαστοι περα του]
[συμφιεροντο εαυτοις ημιν]
[πολειμησαι ωσπερ και περι]
[Φιλιπ]εας ιστε γαρ δηπου του
§ 20

10 θ οτι [νυν Θηβαιοι και Φιλιπ]
[ποσ κα Ετεταλου ουχι ταυτα]
[εκαστοι μαλιστα εσπουδακο]
[τες ταυτα παντες επραξαν]
[αι των ευθε]ν ημας των αυτων
[μαι φοβερον και τι φυλαξα]
[πολειμησαι ουν δηπου το]υ
§ 21

[Απειορ κα και Μεῖσσην οι ταυτη]
[και Μεγαλοπολιτεις και τινες]
[των λοιπων Πελοποννησια]
[σιων οσια ταυτα τοιτωιο φρο]
[νουσι δια την προ]σ Λακει
[δαιμονον] μην επικι]θηρν
[κειαν ενδρος σχησουσι καὶ]
[το δοκειν ενδεχὴ]σθαι [τι]
[των εκεινοι πεπραγμενον]
[Θηβαιοι δε εχο]νουσι μεν ωσ
[λεγουσιν απεξ]θεσιν.

Fr. 1. 2. ἐπιστρατευειν (O) suits the length of the line better than -σεω, but remains of course uncertain.

Fr. 2. i. 2. Either αὐτον or αὐτων can be read.
6. δειν ἡμας: so S, Bl., Butcher; φημι δειν ἡμας (τιμ. δους, for which there is evidently not room, vulg.
ii. 7-8. ημιν] πολειμησαι: so MSS.; Bl. and Butcher bracket, following the indications of Schol. p. 164.
22. π[πρακται τι] so S Bl., Butcher; καλλιστα πεπρακται other MSS., Isidor.
1811. Demosthenes, C. Timocrates.

16 x 23 cm. Third century.

Parts of three consecutive columns, written with a rather coarse pen in well formed medium-sized uncial letters of the sloping oval type, for which an approximate terminus ante quem is provided by remains of three columns of an account inscribed on the verso in cursive of about the middle or latter half of the third century. The hand of the recto, which does not suggest a date before A.D. 200, may therefore be appropriately referred to the first half of the century. Cols. i–ii consisted of 39 lines each, and the height of the roll, if the margin at the bottom was of similar depth to that at the top, was about 27 cm., while the width of the column was about 6 cm. Another hand, using a thinner pen and lighter coloured ink, has inserted a marginal adscript at Col. ii. 5 and supplied an omission in Col. iii. 22, and this hand may well be responsible for both the dots of punctuation (in all three positions) and a few rough breathings, which are no doubt secondary.

Though, as usual, inconsistent in its support, 1811 shows some affinity with F (Marcianus 416), with which it agrees four times against the other MSS. Coincidences with A (iii. 13–16) and SAY (ii. 7) are also noticeable.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

ton t[ω]ν επ εκεῖνοις
σταθεῖν το καλλος προ
πυλαία ταυτα ο παρθενων
στοιν νεωσοικοι· ουκ αμφο
5 ρισκοι δυο ουδε χρυσιδες · φιαλ(αι)
tετταρες η τρεις αγουσα ε
καστη μναι ον γαρ εαντων § 183
δεκατενουτες ουδε α κα
ταρασαντ αν οι εχθροι ποι
10 οντες διπλας πραττον
tες τας εισφορας ταυτα α
νεθεδαν ουδ οιουσπερ αν
χρωμενοι συμβουλοις επο
λιτευντο· αλλα τους εχθροις
15 κρατουντες και α ποι [τις
[α]ν εν φρονων ευζαίτ[ο]

P
πι μικροις τις σεμνυνν
[ταυ τοσουτ απεχει του τιμης
ταυς δια ταυτα τυχευν]

15 [ωστ [απειροκαλος προς εδο
[ειν ειναι ουτος τοινυν
ανελων τα] τυς δοξας κτη
[ματα του πλουτου] πεπουη
[ται μακα λκαι ουχ ομων α]

20 [δια αλλ ουδ] εκειν ειδεν
[οτι προς μεν χρηματων]

Col. iii.

ναι τοιοτου επιτηδευν
ματων οια τουτω βεβιω
ται και περι μεν τουτουν § 187
κατα σχολην α δε τιμοκρα

5 τει συνερετο πολλα λεγειν ε
τι προς τουτοις εχων πανου
μα ειδεν δ οτι ους μεν [ουκ
ασυμφορος ομων εσθ ο νο]
μος και παντα αδικως [ε]

10 νομους εισενηθανεινος
και κατα παντα αδικως [ε]
χων ουχ εξει λεγειν [ακου

ο δ αυτου οως εκτειναι
[τα χρηματα Άνδροτιουν]

15 [και] Γλαυκετη και Μελαινω
[πω λεγειν και οτι [δε]υνιν
τα[τα] αν παθοι παντων[ν] ον
θρωπων ει πεποιηθηκοτοιν
εκεινον τα δικαια ιπτερ

20 ον αυτου αιτιαν εχει θει
ναι τον νομον. ηδεν ητ
αυτος
tον αλισκοιτο εγω δε του
λογον ηγουμαι τουτων

[ο]νδε

i. 7. Bl(ass) brackets i ... κρήματα, which words are absent in c. Androt. 75.
18. The papyrus apparently agreed with the MSS. in omitting τα which is read by edd.
before του with c. Androt. 75.
19. ους ομων ο[δια οτι: so F and c. Androt. 75.
20. ειδεν: so Bl. and Butcher with SLFYO; οιδεν vulg.
i. 6. αγοναι: άγοναι F.
7. After μον most MSS. insert άς, δια σου δικη, πολιν γραφεις καταχωνευειν, which is read
in c. Androt. 76 (γραφεις) ; om. SAY1; Bl. brackets.
8-9. a καταρασσαν αν: so MSS.; αν καταρασσαν τι Bl., Butcher with c. Androt. 77.
12. ὀιοσπερ: so MSS., Butcher; ὀιοσπερ Reiske with c. Androl. 77, Bl.
18-19. αὐτῶν κλεος: so F; κλέος αὐτῶν other MSS., edd.; AYO have ἀγαγότες for ἄγοντες.

1812. ISOCRATES, Ad Demonicum.

19.7 × 13.7 cm. Fifth or sixth century.

This practically complete leaf from a papyrus codex is inscribed in a sloping uncial hand, similar in character to that of P. Rylands 58 (Plate 3), though rather more careful and regular, and is no doubt of about the same period. The ink, at the bottom of the verso partially obliterated, is of the characteristic reddish-brown shade. Stops in the middle position only are used. Whether a second hand can be distinguished is doubtful. The few alterations and insertions which occur are similar in style of writing and colour of ink to the body of the text, and must at any rate be practically contemporary.

The pages are numbered 17 and 18 respectively, the numbers being placed as in a modern book in the top outside corners. In the corner opposite to that containing the figure 18 is a ὃ, which seems to be a stichometrical figure marking the 400th line. With about 25 lines to the page, if the outer page at the beginning of the book was left blank (cf. e. g. P. Rylands 58), the first line of the 18th page would be approximately 1. 400. Survivals of the application of stichometry to the speeches of Isocrates are to be found in the Codex Uribinas (Γ), but the unit there is rather larger than that indicated by 1812. As Drerup observes in his edition, p. lxxxii, the hundreds of Γ correspond to about 93 lines of the Teubner text, but page 18 in the papyrus is preceded by only 316 such lines, or more than 50 short of what would on that proportion be expected. On the other hand, the length of the stichometrical line on the system of Γ is calculated by Drerup at 37 letters, which is precisely the length of line in 1812. The inconsistency is due to his estimating the Teubner line at 40 letters, whereas in the Πρὸς Δημώνικον, at any rate, that number is usually exceeded.

The fact that the Πρὸς Δημώνικον stood at the beginning of the codex suggests at the outset an affinity with the so-called vulgate (ΛΠ), but the textual
position of the papyrus as between that family and \( \Gamma \) is a neutral one, the agreements and disagreements being fairly equally balanced. In one place a vulgate reading has been inserted as an alternative (l. 41). No support is given to the peculiar readings of \( \Sigma \). Besides the mediaeval MSS. there are available for comparison the eccentric second-century Berlin papyrus No. 8935, with which, among many natural discrepancies, two agreements on minor points are noticeable (ll. 36, 42), and also for a few lines another papyrus fragment, of the third century, at Strasbourg, with which 1812 differs twice (ll. 42, 48). Readings not otherwise attested are found in ll. 2 and 40, but they are unimportant.

Verso.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{ματι: πειρω } & \text{το } \mu \varepsilon \nu \sigma \alpha \mu \nu \iota \\nu \sigma \alpha \nu \iota \iota \varepsilon \iota \quad \text{ναι των } \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
& \text{της } \phi \upsilon \omega \nu \kappa \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \ \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
& \text{§ 41} \\
& \text{§ 42} \\
& \text{§ 43} \\
\end{align*} \]
μεν μετα καλης δοξης αλλα μη μετ' αισχρ[ας]
25 φημης το μεν τελευτησαι παντων η [π]επρω

Recto.

§ 44
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ριαν μετα καλης δοξης αλλα μη μετ' αισχρ[ας]
25 φημης το μεν τελευτησαι παντων η [π]επρω

Recto.

§ 44
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ριαν μετα καλης δοξης αλλα μη μετ' αισχρ[ας]
25 φημης το μεν τελευτησαι παντων η [π]επρω

Recto.

§ 44
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ριαν μετα καλης δοξης αλλα μη μετ' αισχρ[ας]
25 φημης το μεν τελευτησαι παντων η [π]επρω

Recto.

§ 44

1812. EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

ριαν μετα καλης δοξης αλλα μη μετ' αισχρ[ας]
25 φημης το μεν τελευτησαι παντων η [π]επρω

Recto.

§ 44
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ριαν μετα καλης δοξης αλλα μη μετ' αισχρ[ας]
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ριαν μετα καλης δοξης αλλα μη μετ' αισχρ[ας]
25 φημης το μεν τελευτησαι παντων η [π]επρω
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ριαν μετα καλης δοξης αλλα μη μετ' αισχρ[ας]
25 φημης το μεν τελευτησαι παντων η [π]επρω

Recto.
11. **φοιν** as originally written here is also in P. Berl., but this is probably a chance coincidence.

14. και λυπου: so Δ; λυπου δε others, Dr.

26. A rather tall hooked top makes the δ in the margin above the end of this line look something like the symbol for 4,000, but that figure can hardly be meant here.

27. η φωνη: so πΣΥ; om. ι, Dr.

29. ηυ: om. P. Berl. SY.

32. αμα: om. ΣΥ, which have συμβουλην.

34. l. καταλειπεω. The spelling of the papyrus is no doubt merely an instance of the common confusion of ι and ει; cf. e. g. l. 35 ραδεων.

36. συμβουλευσοντα: so P. Berl., though placing this word before μετ ευνοιας, which is also the order of ΔΠ. SY insert σοι before συμβ. l. χαλεπως.

37. τα λ. μη παρ ετ. P. Berl. (στεφων) ΔΠ.

39. παραλειπειν: so P. Berl., but cf. ι. on l. 34. ιυ is added also in ΑΠΣΥ.

40. ΔΠ read τα θεφ.

μη, ι. μηδεν: μη, as first written, is the reading of the MSS.

41. The superscribed reading ηη is that of ΔΠ.

42. γαρ: so P. Berl.; μεν γαρ others, including P. Arg., Dr.

45. εξαρμαντ. ΣΥ.

48. σοιυ: so ΑΠΣΥ; om. P. Berl. P. Arg. ι, Dr.

1813. **CODEX THEODOSIANUS vii.**

r8-1 x 9-1 cm. Early sixth century.

Plate I (recto).

The hand of this fragment from a vellum book is a fine specimen of Latin uncial writing, the letters, which are of medium size, being executed with much precision, and distinguished by both breadth and delicacy. If it belongs to the sixth century rather than the fifth, it is to be placed not later than the first third of the century, not only on the evidence of the hand but also because of the unlikelihood that after its supersession by Justinian's Codex of 529, the Codex of Theodosius would remain in demand. The fragment is thus approximately a contemporary of Paris. 9643 (R), on which the text of Book vii, the part of the Codex here concerned, principally depends. Eight lines are lost at the bottom of the recto, and if the margin below these corresponded to the deep margin at the top, the height of the page was approximately 29 cm.; its breadth, on the supposition that the lateral margins were half as liberal as the upper one, would be something like 22-5 cm., a little broader than in 1097, from a papyrus codex of Cicero, which in height practically coincided. Beginnings and ends of the lines are missing throughout, and the precise point of division is obscured by the uncertainty whether or how much the first lines of paragraphs protruded into the left margin; in the transcription below a protrusion of not more than one or two letters has been assumed. Double dots mark off the addresses and
dates of the rescripts from their texts. Abbreviations and numerals are usually accompanied by a medial dot; p(raefectus) p(raetori)o, in the one place where it occurs, is written with a horizontal line above, and a similar stroke was placed above numerals. There is no instance of punctuation, but the evidence is insufficient to infer that this was neglected.

The text of 1818 is close to that of R. In vii. 8. 11 the name Eutychianum, over which R blunders, is correctly given, but some other misspellings are common to both; in vii. 8. 12 they agree on vela, where bella is restored from Cod. Iust., and at the end of vii. 8. 10 in the insertion of conss.

Recto. Plate I.
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dates of the rescripts from their texts. Abbreviations and numerals are usually accompanied by a medial dot; p(raefectus) p(raetori)o, in the one place where it occurs, is written with a horizontal line above, and a similar stroke was placed above numerals. There is no instance of punctuation, but the evidence is insufficient to infer that this was neglected.

The text of 1818 is close to that of R. In vii. 8. 11 the name Eutychianum, over which R blunders, is correctly given, but some other misspellings are common to both; in vii. 8. 12 they agree on vela, where bella is restored from Cod. Iust., and at the end of vii. 8. 10 in the insertion of conss.
[idem aa. Probo c-s-l. post] alia: de hospitalitate indicum et om 8, 11
5 [nivum personarum quid sit ius etiam ipse possessor præae
.sunem debeat quare censura] omnia quae ad sui d[ispoundm
[.pertinebunt submota sint iam missa super mac re auctoritas
[declaravit: praelata litteris ad Eutychianum p- urbi
[die iii- id- Iau- Constantio et Constante cons-
8, 12
[.idem aa. Hadriano ppo : Afric. hoc prospection est ut infæusta hospit
[talitatis praebitio tolleretur nec privatum quisque a
[Constantio et Constante conss-
[.idem aa. Eustathio ppo : devotissi]mos milites ex procinc[etu
[.redeuntes vel proficiscéntes] ad vela muri novi sacratis
[sinae urbis singulae turres in] pedeplanis suis suscipiant
[.nec aliquis possessorum graviter fact quasi illa dis
[positione quae super publicis aedificijis processerat vio
[lata cum privatae quoque domus tertia partem talis rei
[Honorio xxii- et Theod. x- aa. cons-
[.impp. Theodosius et Valentinianus] aa. Haelioni patricio et
[magistro officiorum : universi cum jubit

Recto 11. predium is written for the sake of shortening the supplement, which still-
seems a trifle long, though dium alone would be insufficient.
14. l. ipysique; cf. l. 18, where quæ is again written for que.
18. The omission of prior, which is absent in R but appears here in Cod. Iust., would
make the line rather short.

Verso 2. conss-: this is also the spelling of R.
3. conss: so R; om. Mommsen-Meyer.
8. elychiarum praef. R. Some reduction in the number of letters is required and is
most easily obtained by writing p. for praef.
9. Constante ἡπ ἴ R.
What 1818 had here remains of course uncertain; R’s abbreviation of Africae is adopted
as suitable to the space.
15. vela: so R; bella Cod. Iust.
20. Constantinopol(iti) R.
22. Haelioni is also the spelling of R (l. Hel.).
This mutilated leaf from a papyrus book proves to be both from the juristic and the palaeographical point of view exceptionally interesting. It contains part of an index of rubrics and inscriptions of Justinian's Codex, not, however, of the extant second edition, but as originally issued in the year 529. This explanation, for which we are indebted to Professor de Zulueta, of the divergences of the index from the Codex as we have it, accounts so completely for the facts that no reasonable doubt can be entertained of its correctness.

Of the relation of the two editions of the Codex a good account is given by Rotondi in Bull. dell' Instituto di diritto romano, 1918, pp. 153 sqq. The second edition, which was five years later than the first, was a thorough revision designed, as stated in the prefatory constitution of Dec. 534 De emendatione codicis, to embody and co-ordinate the many new decisions and constitutions issued in the interval. It is precisely the absence of later matter of this kind that distinguishes our index. The most significant passage is ll. 42-6. Here the ordinary text of the Cod. Iust. i. 17 gives two constitutions of the years 530 and 533 under the rubric De veteri iure enucleando et auctoritate iuris prudentium qui in digestis referuntur. In 1814 the rubric is much simpler, approximating to the corresponding one of Cod. Theod. i. 4, and the two new constitutions of 530 and 533 are replaced by two others, of which one emanated from Justinian but the other is Cod. Theod. i. 4. 3, of A.D. 426. This evidence, which of itself would be sufficiently conclusive, is supported by analogous indications elsewhere. Thus the papyrus omits i. 14. 12, of Nov. 529, and the anti-Manichaean i. 11. 10, the exact date of which is unknown but which, as Krüger states, is probably posterior to i. 5. 18, being connected in substance with i. 5. 19-21 of 529-31. Its absence in the first edition of the Codex would therefore be expected. Again, the papyrus index passes directly from Cod. Iust. i. 11 to i. 14, omitting the two titles 12 and 13, which are both concerned with the Church. It is clear from the numbering of the rubrics preserved on the verso of the leaf that in this edition, as in the second, the principle of beginning with the ecclesiastical titles, which in the Codex Theodosianus had been placed at the end (Cod. Iust. i. 1-11 = Cod. Theod. xvi. 1-10), had already been adopted. That principle was only carried out with more completeness in the second edition by the insertion after i. 11 of two other titles connected with ecclesiastical matters from other parts of the Codex. In this procedure the revisors were acting quite in accordance with their powers as laid down by the constitution De emendatione codicis § 3 si quae
Though primarily valuable as a relic of the original edition, the papyrus makes some contributions also to the text of the extant Codex. While agreeing with the MSS. in the omission of Septimio in l. 20, it inserts the name Sext(io) in l. 49 (with Cod. Theod.), Julio in l. 48, and apparently M(arco) before Palladio in l. 13; it adds prov(inciarum) (again with Cod. Theod.) after vic(ario) in l. 8, but omits consuli designato in l. 27 and nobilissimi in l. 52. Evidently in the inscriptions of the constitutions little reliance can be placed upon the evidence of the MSS. on such matters; the tendency to abbreviate was not to be resisted, and Krüger's rule (cf. ed. mai. pp. xv, xxiii sqq.) of supplying a full inscription from any available source is justified. Thus he had already adopted Sextio in i. 18. 2, and at any rate Julio can now be added in i. 18. 1: consistency would suggest the acceptance also of quinque provinciarum in i. 11. 3. There is further some useful evidence on individual points of detail. Lines 16-17 show that Cod. i. 31. 9, the inscription of which was missing, is to be attributed to Anastasius, and ll. 31-2 confirm the attribution of i. 14. 10 to Leo and Anthemius; the name of the addressee is in both cases lost. After l. 41 there is nothing corresponding to the supposed Greek constitution to which a place is assigned by Krüger at i. 16. 2, and the existence of that constitution, though not disproved, becomes more questionable.

Palaeographically the fragment is of importance, since there are few examples of early Latin unciala that can be so precisely dated with equal security. It is highly improbable that the first edition of the Codex would continue to be copied in Egypt after being superseded by the second, especially in view of the express prohibition in the constitution De emendatione codicis § 5 ex prima Lustiniani codicis editione alicui committere. The date of this manuscript may therefore be placed with small risk of error in the six years following April 529. The letters, written in brown ink, are of medium size and well formed, but the pen was rather coarse and the papyrus not of the best quality, so that, especially on the verso, the effect is not elegant. In rounded letters the separate strokes are not always closely joined. As in 1813, abbreviations are commonly followed by a medial dot often accompanied, in the case of aa, cc, pp, &c., by a horizontal stroke over the letters; but the scribe is inconsistent, omitting sometimes the dot and sometimes the stroke; he writes both imp. and imp.p. but the latter is probably due to inadvertence. Ᾱ = -bus in l. 18. When rubrics or inscriptions extend to a second line or more, these are considerably indented. Rubrics are marked off by horizontal dashes above and below them and the letter ΒΖ is placed both in front and at the end of each, as in the Verona fragments, whose practice
is followed by Krüger in his large edition. The prefixed ῆ is accompanied by the number of the rubric, in Greek figures; constitutions, with one exception (l. 37), are not numbered. The first rubric on the recto is written in enlarged uncial letters. Apparent remains of pagination are visible in the top right-hand corner of the verso, probably [, κε, or [, κθ, which are higher figures than would be expected unless the index was preceded by other matter.

Recto.

| L | [α] ὀθὲν παγανι[σ] sacrificiiς | Cod. Iust. i. 11. |
|   | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 5 | [imp:] Const. ? Diadocho | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 6 | [imp:] Constantino ad Taurum | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 7 | [imp:] Gratianus Valentin. et Theod. | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 8 | [ααα] Cyngio pp. | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 9 | [imp:] Arcadius et H[onorius] Δ | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 10 | [c]rovio et Pr[ocr]ian. vic. v prov. | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 12 | [imp:] Honor[.] et Theodosius aa | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 13 | populo [Car tac]gen[i]niss | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 15 | [imp:] Valentin. et Marcian. aa | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 16 | Palladia[io pp | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 17 | [imp:] Leo et An[themii]aa | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 18 | Dioscoro pp | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 19 | autokr(α)or[α] Anastasios a | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 20 | Επαρχ(ων) πρ(ατωριων) | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 21 | [imp:] Constantin[ae] | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 22 | [a] Basso pp | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 23 | [imp:] Theod[osius et] Valentinian. aa | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 24 | [a]d s[enatum] | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 25 | [id:] aa ad senatum | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 26 | [id:] aa ad Volusian[um pp | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 27 | [id:] aa Florentio pp | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 28 | [id:] aa Florentio pp | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 29 | [id:] aa Cyro pp | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 30 | [id:] aa ad senatum | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 31 | [imp:] Valentinian. et Marchian. aa | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
| 32 | ad Pal | β | τεμπλις | | ῆ |
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
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This constitution is absent in Cod. Iust.

\[ \text{Autokratores } \Delta\{\text{ou } k\}\{\text{ai } \text{An}[\text{epimos aa ...}] \} \]

\[ \text{impp. Leo et Zeno aa } \]

\[ \text{R} \text{ η } \text{de mandatis } \text{principum } \text{B} \]

\[ \text{impp. Gratian- Valentinian et Theodosius aa ad Eu[signium } \text{pp} \]

\[ \text{B } \eta \text{ die tov tov } \text{de[p]st[ou]v Iou[st]inov kai } \text{Iou[st]} \]

\[ \text{tunavov } \text{[aa} \]

\[ \text{R} \text{ η } \text{de seniat- consultis } \text{B} \]

\[ \text{impp. Val[ent- Theodosius et Arcadia- } \text{a- ad } \text{senatum] } \]

\[ \text{R} \text{ η } \text{de auctoritate } \text{inris } \text{[prudentium] } \text{B} \]

\[ \text{[impp. Theodosius et Val[ent- a ad se } \text{[ad] senatum] } \]

\[ \text{Cod. Theod. i. 4. 3} \]

\[ \text{[impp. Iust[ian]us } [\text{Menae } \text{pp} \]

\[ \text{[R} \text{ η } \text{de inris et facti igno[ran]ia } \text{B} \]

\[ \text{[impp. Ant[on- a Iulio Max- mil-} \]

\[ \text{[id- a } \text{S} \text{esxt In[the]n[i]s} \]


\[ \text{[impp. Dioclet- et } \text{Maximin- aa Iuliana} \]

\[ \text{[id- aa } \text{et } \text{cc } \text{Ma}[r]tial[i} \]

\[ \text{[id- aa } \text{et } \text{cc } \text{Taur- et } \text{P[o]llioni} \]

\[ \text{[id- aa } \text{et } \text{cc } \text{Zoe} \]

\[ \text{[id- aa } \text{et } \text{cc } \text{Dionysiae} \]

\[ \text{[id- aa } \text{et } \text{cc } \text{Gaio et [Anthemio} \]

\[ \text{[id- aa } \text{et } \text{cc } \text{Amphiiae} \]

\[ \text{[impp. Constantin- a } [\text{Val} \text{[r]i[no} \text{vic} \text{. } \]

3. This constitution is absent in Cod. Iust. Since a pagan emperor is excluded by the subject, and the first constitution should be older than the second, the choice of the emperor is limited to Constantine or Constantius, and the name in either case must have been considerably abbreviated. As the scribe uses the form Constantin- (ll. 4, 20, 58), it is perhaps better to suppose that Const- here = Constantius; cf. l. 5, where Theodosius is shortened to Theod. Di'odoto is preferred to Theodoto as the shorter.

4. Constantin(us): l. Constantius. The same error is found in SCR.
7. 1. Malc[enio].
8. υ prov(iniciarum): 80 Cod. Theod. xvi. 10. 15 quinque provinciarum; om Cod. Iust.
11. 1. Carthagin[iensi; that the 4 was omitted (so SCRM) is hardly certain.
13. M, representing the praenomen of Palladius, is a more suitable reading than | o both in itself and because the lacuna is sufficiently filled without further addition. Om. Cod. Iust.
16-17. Om. Cod. Iust., where the constitution is given without the name of the emperor or addressee. The papyrus omits the anti-pagan Const. 10.
18. Titles 12 De his qui ad ecclesias confugiunt vel ibi exclamant, and 13 De his qui in ecclesiis manumittuntur, are here omitted.
20. Basso: so MSS. and S(umma Per.) ; the nomen Septimio is supplied from Cod. Theod. In the abbreviation of praefecto urbi the horizontal stroke passes through the letters.
24. Cyro pp. et consuli designato Cod. Iust. There would not be room for et... design.
even if shortened to et cons. d.
29. 1. Marcian.
31-2. Om. Cod. Iust., but the names of the emperors could be restored from the date. The name of the addressee must have been very short, unless it was abbreviated: the remains do not suggest Ἰω.
36. pp. Cod. Lust., proconsulem Africae Cod. Theod. ; what stood in the papyrus is of course uncertain.
37-8. The inscription of this constitution is deficient in the MSS. of Cod. Iust., but is restored from Nov. 124. 4 as Ἀυτοκράτορες ᾿Ιουστῖνος καὶ ᾿Ιουστινιανὸς aa. The reading of the papyrus is unintelligible and it is not clear what was intended. β which is placed in the margin and has a horizontal stroke above is evidently a numeral, though there seems to be no reason why this particular constitution should have been numbered when others are not. Possibly δα is the survival of διάταξις, and δ τῶν διστοτῶν κτλ. should be restored.
41. Below this constitution Krüger marks the place of a lost second one, following indications in MSS. of P. Pithou. If it had any existence, that constitution was presumably issued by Justinian between the dates of the first and second codices.
42-3. Cod. Iust. here has De velerti iure enucleando et auctoritate iuris prudentium qui in digestis referuntur, with two constitutions of A.D. 530 and 533. In Cod. Theod. i. 4 the rubric is De responsis prudentum, under which there are three constitutions, the first two of which are of Constantine, one placing a ban upon the commentaries (notas) of Ulpian and Paulus on Papinianus, the other upholding the authority of Paulus, while the third corresponds to ll. 44-5 here. It is possible that responsis, not auctoritate, stood in the lacuna of 1. 42, but in any case the rubric is not the same as in Cod. Theod. and is much shorter than that of Cod. Iust., occupying in fact an intermediate position. That the first two constitutions of Cod. Theod. i. 4 are dropped is an anticipation of Cod. Iust. i. 17. i § 6 aa, quae ante in notis Aemilii Papiniani ex Ulpiano et Paulo nec non Marciano adscripta sunt... non statim respuere, &c. On the other hand Cod. Theod. i. 4-3, the law of citations, is retained pending the enucleation of the ius vetus in the Digest. Cod. Theod. i. 4-2, which is virtually repeated in 3, may well have been regarded as superfluous.
44-5. Impp. Theod. et Valentin. aa. ad senatum urbis Rom. Cod. Theod. In l. 44 the scribe wrote Valenti and then inserted the dot between i and i. a was written for aa, probably owing to confusion with the a of ad, and there was apparently a ditography of ad se.
46. This constitution is unknown, but the name of Menas, to whom the constitution
of a.D. 529 De codice confirmando, prefixed no doubt to the first edition, was addressed, may be restored with great probability. § 3 of that constitution relates to former codices and to veteres iuris interpretatores, but it is unlikely that that section, still less the entire constitution, stood in this position, where some other rescript to Menas, superseded subsequently, like Cod. Theod. i. 4. 3, by Cod. Iust. i. 17. 1-2, would be more appropriate.

§ 3 of that constitution relates to former codices and to veteres iuris interpretatores, but it is unlikely that that section, still less the entire constitution, stood in this position, where some other rescript to Menas, superseded subsequently, like Cod. Theod. i. 4. 3, by Cod. Iust. i. 17. 1-2, would be more appropriate.

49. l. Sext(hio); this name, which is absent in the MSS., had been rightly restored from Cod. Greg.
50. That the superfluous o was cancelled is not certain. A difficulty arises at the end of the line, where with the reading Marcellae the letters lae are expected, in place of which there is something that may be read as [. . .]. or perhaps as [. . .]. This constitution is apparently to be connected with iii. 44. 8, issued on the same date and addressed to Iuliac, and some variation here in the name of the addressee is therefore not surprising; but whether the insertion of Iul. is correct remains very doubtful.


HOMERIC FRAGMENTS

(The collations are with Ludwich’s text.)

1815. 14.5 X 19.1 cm. Parts of two columns, written in an informal sloping hand on the verso of a fragment of a second-century taxing-account. Col. i contains A 33-50, Col. ii. A 59-75. 44 wo of χωρμενος corr. from o. 45 εχων added above the line. φαρετρης 65 ov was written for o γ, but the third stroke of the v is blurred and o y may be intended. 67 αυτισας 71 και ερασατ. Third century.

1816. 25.7 X 7.7 cm. Fragment containing ends of O 332-70 (complete column) and 386-409 (end of col., the upper part of Col. ii being lost), in nearly upright somewhat irregular uncialss of about the middle of the third century. A mark of elision in l. 340. 338 om. 340 δ’ διος 344 ειναιστε 345 τειχεως 348 νεων εθελουσα 386 In place of this line ναι stands in the papyrus, l. 389, which is omitted in its proper place, apparently having been inserted here. The papyrus is broken above ναι[. 389 om.; cf. l. 386. On the verso a late third-century account.

1817. Fragments of three leaves, written with brown ink in a good-sized sloping and fairly regular hand in which light and heavy strokes are strongly contrasted. Probably sixth century. Accents, breathings, and marks of elision are frequent, and apparently all due to the original scribe. Stops in
the high and middle position are used. These fragments were found with 1818, and possibly belonged to the same codex or corpus, but the scripts, though they may be contemporaneous, are quite distinct.

Fol. 1 4.1 x 2.5 cm. Verso ends of P 379-84, recto beginnings of 418-24.

Fol. 2 1.5 x 2 cm. Verso a few letters from Σ 412-14, recto do. from 455-6.

Fol. 3 14.4 x 13.8 cm. Verso Σ 564-81 (end of col.). 571 ομαρη
574 τετευχετο 576 ροδαφον 577 χρυσοι 579 [δι]ου[τω], corr. H1? Recto 603-17 (end of col.). 604 δω τε 612 Ἰαδαλέην. The scribe perhaps began 1. 614, being misled by the homoioarchon of 611 and 613. 615 Αχιλλῆις. 617 Below this line is a row of angular marks, followed by the title Ἰλιαδος ὁ enclosed in ornamental flourishes.

1818. Parts of five leaves of a papyrus book, written with brown ink in an ugly sloping hand of the fifth or sixth century, rather similar in type to that of 1818. Accents, breathings, and marks of elision have been freely inserted, partly by the original writer, but many being due to a second hand which has also added some of the stops (high and middle position) and made corrections in the text. The method of accentuation hardly differs from modern practice, except with regard to the retracted accent. ε has frequently been written for α or vice versa, and many such misspellings have been corrected both by the first and second hands; these variations, and the common confusion of ι and ει, are generally not noticed in the following collation. A few scraps have not been identified.

Fol. 1 16.8 x 14.7 cm. Verso X 109-37 (ends of lines). 111 καται-
θ[ν]οιμε[ν] οπλα τε παντα 113 αμυνονος 114 κτηματι 115 η οτην
converted from ε 116 νικος 118 οσα τε 121 was included. 125 κε[ι]
απο, corr. H2, apparently neglecting to delete the a. 128 αληλοισι 129 ὀφρα
τάχιστα 134 αντη. Recto 153-77 (beginnings). 154 [κ]οιλαίων 163 τρω-
χωσι corr. to τρέχουσι by H2. 164 τράπες 171 κορυφησι 172 ακροτάη
174 ἄγε 176 Πηλείδη.

Fol. 2 Recto X 190-202, 283-93, 203 (?). Lines 283-93 are each followed by a small comma-shaped mark by the first hand, implying that the verses, which were rewritten in the proper place (cf. Fol. 3), were to be cancelled. The dislocation may have been due to a defective archetype, or
the scribe's having turned over two leaves in mistake. 194 Δαβδανδων

195 εγγίτων 196 αλάλκονεν. βελέεσσις[ν] 200 υπὸ δ 283 ει οι πηξεις converted from η 290 υπὸ. Verso 216-43. 220 πολα 222 ἀμηηε

224 ἐφάτ᾽ 226 λιπε[ν] 228 ἵσταμεν πτέρευσε; 233 Δηφοβ[ν] 238 προσ- e πετε 239 πολὰ.

Fol. 3 Verso X 255-78. 260 Αχιλλεύν 264 αλλῆλον 265 οὔτε


Fol. 4 Recto X 336-57. 347 μ'[[ε]] ἐφορας 353 αυτη[[ν]]]. Verso 376-97.

380 ὑπὲστεν βο[[ν]] 383 καταλείψωσι[[ν]]] 391 [μ'] 392 γλαφυρηαι.

Fol. 5 Verso Ψ 345-70. 348 ἐτρεφον 350 πιρατ[[ν]] ἑίπαν 351 ωπλσαθ, a corr. 353 κληρο 354 τόνδ[[ε]] ἐλαχε, a converted from ε. 355 δουρικλυσον, but a straight stroke was begun after λ. 356 ελανεμεν ἵππους 359 εισαι 363 ομοικλησαι τ[[ε]] ἐπέεσσα. 365 κοινή[[λ]] 367 πνοιης. Recto 383-406.

388 ελ' αφηραμεικος 392 οκε... οι de 393 δο' ου 395 αγκώνας de 396 θρυλχθη

397 δακρυοφιν 401 Ατρεδης (ε from ε) δουρι κλυσο 405 ἵπποις.

1819. Fragments of a roll containing κ, λ, μ, well written in small upright uncialis which may be assigned to the second century. Two marks of length and many accents (acute-angled), breathings, marks of elision, diaereses, and stops in the high position have been inserted by a later hand, probably that of the corrector who has made a few alterations in the text. The columns had a marked slope to the right, the last line of Fr. 2. ii beginning about 6 letters in advance of the first line. A facsimile of that fragment with a transcript of the text was given in the New Palaeographical Society’s Series II, Plate 76.

Fr. 1 4·1 x 2·2 cm., κ 3-12. Fr. 2 26·4 x 14·2 cm., Col. i ends of λ 244-83, Col. ii 284-323. 259 Δαβδανδων θ' 285 βασιλεύε[[ν]]], corr. H²
HOMERIC FRAGMENTS

287 ρ of Πηρῶ retouched by H² 292 κατ[[e]] 297 θεσφατ᾽ ἀπαυτ᾽ 298 κα for κα. Τυνάρεω 301 αμψω ους - 302 πα[ρ] Ζηνοσ 303 In the margin opposite this line is 7 (= 300). 306 Ποσίδαιων ζηνος 308 Ὄντον 309 θρέψειν 311 εὐνε[[o]]φο, corr. H²? 314 πολυ[[e]]κας, corr. H² 316 Πηλ[[e]]κον, corr. H². Frs. 3–5 beginnings of λ 414–26, 428–32. 418 καὶ πα[ῦ] 429 καὶ-κέωνη. Fr. 6 2·2 x 1·5 cm., a few letters from μ 1–4. Some small fragments remain unidentified.

1820. 17·8 x 38·5 cm. Lower portion of a sheet, which was the uppermost of a quire, from a papyrus codex. The hand is a good example of the formal upright type commonly designated ‘Coptic’, resembling e.g. P. Grenf. II. 112, and is of the sixth or seventh century. Stops in two positions (high and medial), accents, breathings, and marks of elision and quantity are fairly frequent; a few of these are evidently original, but the majority, which are more lightly written, are later additions, due probably to one of the correctors, of whom two, one using cursive forms, seem to be distinguishable. Besides these common signs a comma to separate words, and its converse, the sub-linear hyphen, occur among the subsequent insertions. The dimensions of the complete page may be estimated at about 34 x 19 cm.

Fol. 1 Verso σ 55–80. 63 πλεονεσσι embracing 64 βατης. In marg. αυνανατολικάς H² 65 Ευρυμαχός τε καὶ Αντίψοος. Marg. καταειρων H² 67 marg. 1ερ ἵ ἐν ε. [2 τ. . . . [ H² 70 ἱδὼνεν 73 επίσκαυτον. Marg. αε[ει H² 78 ἐφαβ' ἐκ τ. ἱδωμην] 80 In left marg. a diagonal dash. Recto 95–121. 96 Ιπ[α] 5 ἰ 101 εἰκέ 102 αὐθοῦσις 105 In the left marg. a flourished sign 7. 107 On ω of εων an acute substituted for a grave accent. 109 On η of αορτῆ an acute substituted for a grave accent. 110 [αυ[η'] 111 εἰκανόωντ᾽, the epsilon cancelled by a dot placed above it (H²?). 111 5 om. 118 ἐπι γαστέρα.

Fol. 2 Recto σ 137–63. 142 marg. εἰτε κα[λ]αψις (not κα[λ]αψιν or -λα apparently) | εἰτε κακ[ως H² 146 Against this line and ll. 148–51 there are oblique dashes in the left margin. 149 διακρίνεσθαι 152 δ of δέπας corr. 153 κατα δωματία In the margin below this line μηδενος προκειμενου H². Verso 178–205. 185–7 Oblique dashes in the left margin against these lines, and a coronis between ll. 186–7. 185 γραμ 190 marg. το [τη]ηψι-κα[ν][γ] H².
IV. MINOR LITERARY FRAGMENTS

1821. 6.8 x 4 cm. Beginnings of 9 verses, hexameters or elegiacs, from the bottom of a column, written in a rather small, informal, upright hand of the third century. Marks of elision are used.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kai tοξω} & \text{ μυη[} \\
\text{νοστοι} \text{ τε} & \text{[} \\
\text{ενθ χολων} & \text{πι} \text{[} \\
\text{μηνιν} & \text{χαρομενον]} \\
\text{μοχθησας} & \text{δ’} \text{ ατελ’} \text{[} \\
\text{ως} & \text{σε} \text{ παλιν} \text{[} \\
\text{σαπασιου[} & \text{[} \\
\end{align*}
\]

1822. 35.3 x 17 cm. On the recto remains of two columns of an account. On the verso ends and beginnings of lines of two columns from a hexameter poem, apparently relating to astronomy, e.g. i. 17 α]κροθι νυκτος] ειδεται ειδος’ 19 ]αι φημιζωντο’ 21 ]μεγα χειμα 22 ]ον αυχυμον 28 ]ενιαυτω’ 23 ]μιση κομηται. 32 ]σεληνι ζευς Κρονος Ερμειας. Most of the lines of Col. i have a high or medial stop at the end. The last line of Col. ii is opposite i. 30, but the column begins at a higher point than Col. i and the lines are rather closer together, so that the number of the lines was probably the same in both. This papyrus was found with 1796, and is in much the same condition; the texts on the verso are apparently in the same hand, and the marginalia, too, are similar. But the height of 1822 is quite different from that of 1796, and there is no connexion in subject; the hands and contents of the rectos also differ, so that it is clear that two distinct rolls are represented. Second century.

1823. 20.8 x 6.6 cm. Strip from a column containing parts of 28 lines of a tragedy, ll. 7-15 at least being stichomuthic. Resolution is frequent. The upright well-formed uncial hand is evidently early, and may go back to the beginning of the first century B.C.
1824. 9.9 × 6.1 cm. Fragment of a (Menandrian?) comedy, from the top of a column. Alternations of the dialogue are indicated by double dots, and the names of speakers in abbreviated form have been entered above the line in cursive, as e.g. in 211. The speakers are Λάχης and Μιξιζ( ), a name which does not occur in comedy but may stand e.g. for Μιξιδήμος, Μιξίας, Μίξων, or Μιξωνίδης, and one of them is betrothing a girl called Pamphile (?) to the other. The text is written across the fibres of the verso (the recto being blank) in medium-sized sloping uncials, probably of the third century. Besides the double dots a high stop is used; a mark of elision (H? ?) occurs in l. 10. Several lines are evidently nearly complete at the ends.

Λάχης


Μιξιζ

[ν οιδα δηπουθεν: γεμι[ει: μη ποτ ειπης ωμηνυ

Λάχης

5 ε]πιδωσειν: ποθεν λα[βων ?

].. ομολογω σοι λαμ[βαινιν ?

] αμα πανθ εξει .[

]ς διδωμι Παμ[φιλην ?

παιδων επ αροτο γνησιων


[με . [. . . .]δη Θ

Q 2
In l. 3 there is a small mark after Μιξ' on the edge of the papyrus, but it does not suggest any letter. For l. 9 cf. e. g. 211. 38–9; it may be inferred with some probability that the fragment is from the conclusion of the play. In l. 11 the small interlinear dash probably belongs to an abbreviation of one of the speakers' names.

1825. 11.9 x 13.1 cm. Fragment from the top of a leaf of a papyrus codex, containing on the recto ends of 8 lines, and on the verso beginnings of 10 lines, from a comedy. The hand is a round upright uncial of medium size, dating perhaps from the fifth century. Accents, &c., which are fairly frequent, may be by the original scribe, but a corrector's hand is apparently to be distinguished in verso 2. Brown ink, rather faded and effaced in places.

Recto.  

| τον πονοὺς γαρ αλλα που τυχη'. | ίον πονοὺς γαρ αλλα που τυχη'. |
| παρακολουθων εξομαι | παρακολουθων εξομαι |
| ... ων γαρ υπο τατης εγω | ... ων γαρ υπο τατης εγω |
| πολυ μαλλον ευς | πολυ μαλλον ευς |
| δε δε πειραν λαμβανειν | δε δε πειραν λαμβανειν |
| ... | ... |

Verso 2. ἐν ἄφανεϊ? But the correction is unexplained. 6. Trochaic tetrameters begin here, but l. 8, where l. τίθας, is irregular.

1826. 9 x 7.3 cm. Fragment, in places rubbed and faded, of a leaf of a papyrus codex containing a romantic prose narrative concerning King Sesonchosis. The hand is a medium-sized upright uncial of late third–fourth century type

Recto.  

| Ινη. Σεσόγχωσις | Ινη. Σεσόγχωσις |
| περικρατη | και τυγχανουν |
| παιδη ν]νυ | παιδη ν]νυ |
| Σεσογχωσις ανηθε | Σεσογχωσις ανηθε |

Verso.  

| Σεσογχωσις | Σεσογχωσις |
| και τυγχανουν | και τυγχανουν |
| παιδη ν]νυ | παιδη ν]νυ |
| Σεσογχωσις ανηθε | Σεσογχωσις ανηθε |
| ινη | ινη |
| περικρατη | και τυγχανουν |
| παιδη ν]νυ | παιδη ν]νυ |
| Σεσογχωσις ανηθε | Σεσογχωσις ανηθε |
| οπερ επεκλωσαι του | οπερ επεκλωσαι του |
The length of line seems to have been greater than that suggested by recto 7–8; in ll. 6–7, where the lacuna is approximately the same, something like κατὰ τὰ εἰωθὸν is required. In verso 10 the final ν of εὐαμονᾶν is corrected.

1827. Fr. 1 10.7 × 5.6 cm. Upper part of a narrow column, with a small detached fragment, containing a few nearly complete lines of prose, perhaps an oration, mentioning Phormio. Third century, written in medium-sized sloping uncial ; a high stop in l. 11.

Fr. 1.

[... ηρο[.]] τούτωις
μεν εὐ[κ]τον οὐν εν εν
[τ]ωι τῆς πολεως α
[ε]κοματι και αγω
5 νιζεσθαι και κη
[ρ]ιπτεσθαι τηι δε
[π]ολει τον τούτων
[στ]τεφανον ον δο
[τ]ης γεγονοτα αλ
10 [λ] αισχυνης αιτ
[ον] αμα γ εκηρυτ
[τ]ε]γο Φορμιων...

In l. 2 there seems to be barely room for [κ], but ευρονον is not attractive, still less ευγονον.
1828. 4-9 x 2-9 cm. Fragment of a vellum leaf, inscribed in well-formed rather small sloping uncials of, probably, the third century. The contents are of an ethical character. Apparently the lines were of no great length, but their point of division is not fixed. The vellum is thin and rather discoloured.

Recto or flesh side.

\[ \text{καὶ γὰρ οὐχ ὅσος.} \]
\[ \text{o ἰκανὸν ποιῶν τρυφῆι} \]
\[ \text{καὶ ὁ μεθυσὸς καὶ ὁ καταλαλὸς} \]
\[ \text{καὶ ὁ ψεῦστης καὶ ὁ πλεονεκτὴς [καὶ} \]

5 o ἀποστερητικὸς καὶ ὁ τοιοῦτος τα [παραπλησία?] ποιῶν [τῇ] δί[α]νο[ιαί] τον["

Verso.

\[ \text{μὴν ἐπιλανθάνεται} \]
\[ \text{πραξὶν ἡ γὰρ τρυφή καὶ [·} \]
\[ \text{ἐμαὶ οὐκ ἔχει διὰ τὴν α.} \]

5 ἡν ενδεδυτιὴ ἡ δὲ τειμίωρια?

[ὁ, ὁ]παῖ πολλα [.] τω["
INDICES

(1700 is to be supplied before 79–99, 1800 before 0–28, such figures referring to papyri; figures in small raised type refer to fragments, Roman figures to columns; sch. = scholium.)

I. 1787–9 (Sappho and Alcaeus).

| Alfred 87.13 10. | ἀναφέρεται 88.2 4. |
| ἀνάθεμα 87.33 3. | ἀνέγκασθαι 87.53 1. |
| ἀλήθεια 87.12 7. | ἀρμανίας 87.13 9. |
| ἀλίτερ 87.7 4, 32 2. | ἀφροτόπῳ 88.5 8. |
| ἀλλαθέν 87.16 6, 2, 27 4. | Ἀρτέμις 87.37 4. |
| ἀλλός 88.4 25. | ἀστάν 88.7 4. |
| ἀλλικός 87.7 4, 332. | ἀστασις 87.22 4. |
| ἀλλίτοις 87.8 5. | ἀστασις 88.16 2 sch. |
| ἀλλός 87.9 9. | ἀστέρας 87.15 3. |
| ἀλλήλοις 87.11 4. | ἀκίδιος 89.16 1. |
| ἀλλήλων 87.1 4. | ἀκίδιος 87.22 2. |
| ἀλλήλων 87.3 22. | ἀκίθοι 87.8 3. |
| ἀλλίθεοι 88.5 6. | ἀκίθοι 87.12 2 7. |
| ἀλίθρωται 87.19 1 2. | ἀκούσθαι 88.24 2. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.8 3. | ἀκούσθαι 87.13 8. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.7 4. | ἀκούσθαι 88.24 2. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.7 4. | ἀκούσθαι 87.13 8. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.7 4. | ἀκούσθαι 88.5 2. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.7 4. | ἀκούσθαι 88.5 2. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.7 4. | ἀκούσθαι 89.7 3 sch. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.7 4. | ἀκούσθαι 88.5 2. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.7 4. | ἀκούσθαι 88.5 2. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.7 4. | ἀκούσθαι 89.7 3 sch. |
| ἀλίθρωτος 87.7 4. | ἀκούσθαι 88.5 2. |
II. OTHER NEW TEXTS.

α 3. 8. = εἰς 4. 4. 5; 8. i. sch. 4.

"Ἀθάνατος [0. 11 [2]. 3.
ἀγαθός 86. 5; 94. 12; 3. 29.
"Αγαμέμνων 90. 20.
ἀγανόφρων 92. 1 12.
ἀγαπᾶν 0. 1 14; 64. 11.
ἀγέλη 93. vi. 3.
ἀγείρω [87. 74]; 93. viii. 3; [4. 142 2]; 20. 73 sch.
ἀγιός 86. 4.
ἀγκάδος 92. 1 15. 20. ἀγκάδος 91. 13.
ἀγγέλος 27. 17.
ἀγνώσθω 94. 7.
ἀγοράζω 95. 11. 7.
ἀγών 90. 21.
ἀγωνία 95. 5-8; 93. 16.
ἀγώνια 98. [4. 142 2]; 27. 4.
ἀδεια 95. ii. 14.
ἀδελφή 98. 44. 10.
ἀδελφὸς 0. [1. 7]; 45.
ἀδελφίκου 95. ii. 1; 97. 12 ἐτ.
ἀδίκημα 87. 52.
ἀδίκως 97. 63.
ἀδίκωσιν 96. 18.
ἀδίκωσις 99. vii. 7.
ἀδέλφοφορέω 93. viii. 15.
ἀδέλφος 98. 6.
ἀδελφός 91. 9; 93. x. 1.
ἀδελφός 92. 1 14.
ἀδέλφος 91. 8.
ἀδελφός 26. recto 12.
ἀδέλφος 92. 65; 3.
ἀδέλφος 85. 4 recto 5. ἀδέλφος 90. 8.
ἀδερφή 98. 44. 1 iv. 1.
ἀδερφή 23. 54; [4. 4 2]. Ἀδέλφα 91. 4.
ἀδερφῶν 2. 3. 55.
ἀδερφοθυμόν 0. 2 69. 60; 4. 142 1.
ἀδερφός 0. 2 66. 73. 3. 7. 11.
ἀδερφός 42. 45. 1. 9. 8. 9.
ἀδερφός 22. 30; 4. 142 4; (7); [23]; 27. 13.
ἀδερφή 9. 5. 372 sch. 7.
ἀδερφή 98. 17.
ἀδερφή 90. 34.
ἀδερφός 90. 28.
ἀδερφός 0. 1 10.
Ἀθήνα 95. 11. 27.
ἀδερφὴ 90. 46.
ἀδερφή 93. 3. 61.
ἀδερφή 93. x. 5; 20. 64 sch.
ἀδερφή 96. 4.
Ἀδριάν 0. 31.
ἀδέρμα 91. 10.
ἀδέρμα 4. 4 4. ἀδέρμα 93.
Ἀδριάν 91. 3.
Ἀδριάν ὁ 0. 3 49. 41; 14. 4 2 9.
Ἀδριάνη 97. 10.
Ἀδριάν ο 0. 3 49. 47.
ἀδριάν 80. 9. 5.
ἀδριάν 0. 3 27.
ἀδριάν 91. 2.
ἀδριάν 94. 11.
ἀδριάν 97. 43.
ἀδριάν 91. 19.
ἀδριάν 96. 12.
ἀδριάν 80. 9; 98. 44. i. 7; 3.
ἀδριάν 67-9.
ἀδριάν 1. 43.
ἀδριάν 96. 21.
ἀδριάν 22. 1. 17.
ἀδριάν 88. iv. 3.
INDEXES

᾿Αλβάνιος 2. 36.
᾿Αλεξάνδρος 98. vii. 1; 98. 15
�新 98. 12 4?
�新 94. 20.
�新 98. vi. 4.
�新 92. 37.
�新 94. 20.
�新 90. 13; 98. ix. 4;
�新 94. 9, 15; 97. 69; 98. 12.
�新 94. 15.
�新 91. 14.
�新 92. 37.
�新 92. 37.
�新 90. 13; 93. viii. 4,
�新 94. 9, 15; 97. 19, 69,
�新 98. ii. 4, v. 22 (?); 0.
[new 34 ?] 2. 3 64; 8. 1.
[new 11; 9. sch. 4; 23.
�新 90. 13.
�新 92. 1; 24. 7; 27. 11.
�新 91.
�新 96. 4. 5.
�新 92. 1; 41. 2.
�新 93. viii. 3, ix. 1, x.
[new 67; 97. 62.
�新 93. vi. 4.
[new 90. 23; 97. 67; 99.
[new 18; 0. 42, [57], 338;
[new 17; 9. sch. 7; 25.
[new 3.
[new (= ειν)] 95. 1, 2; 97.
[new 17.
[new 92. 1; 20; 94. 21; 95. ii.
[new 16 (ειν).

αναιματοιος 90. 8.
αναβαίνειν 90. 39, 52.
ανάγονας 98. 44; ii. 14.
ανάγονας 78. 14.
ανάγκη 97. 15, 16.
αναγράφειν 0. 3? 71; 2. 3 58?
αναθινάδων 2. 3 33.
αναστάτων 94. 12 (ανελεῖ).
αναστάτων 99. ii. 20?
ανακύκλωσαί 0. 8 31.
ανακτάσθαι 0. 5 30.
αναλογία 1. int.
αναλογία 4. 4 12.
αναφ 98. 9.
αναφι[93. ii. 1.
αναπληρόοντας 95. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναιρεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναίτιος [99. iii. 20 Ἡ].
ανακόμιζεσθαι Ο. 2. 31.
ανακτᾶσθαι Ο. 3 30.
αναλογία 1. int.
αναλογία 4. 4 12.
αναφ 98. 9.
αναφι[93. ii. 1.
αναπληρόοντας 95. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
αναρροεῖν 98. * i, 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
αναρροεῖν 98. 15. 4.
αναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
INDICES
II. OTHER NEW TEXTS

᾿Ἡγήσανδρος 2, 374.

ἤδη 90, 43; [98, 44, iii, 19].

ἡδύς 98, vi, 3, viii, 2. ἡδέως 98, iv, 9.

ἡδύς 98, vi, 3, viii, 2. ἡδέως 98, iv, 9.

ἡμέρα 78, 273, 8, ii, sch, 12.

ἡμερίη 96, το.

ἡμετέρος 94, 8; 99, ii, 25.

ἡμιτέλεστος 2, 351.

ἥν 96, τ.

ἡνία 4, 12.

ἡνίκα 92, 112 (ἁν.); 98, vii, 6.

ἦρ 96, 22.

Ἡραῖον 98, ix, 2.

Ἡρακλείδης 2, 351.

Ἡράκλειτος 8, 1, sch, 4.

ἥρως 90, τό, 19; Ο. 2562.

Ἡσιόνη 1, 50.

ἥττον 97, 7.

Ἥφαιστος ('Ad.) 91, 4.

θάλαττα 99, ii, 31.

θάνατος 85, i, recto 2; Ο. 813.

θαυμαστός 99, 11, 27.

thetao, 95, ii.

θεασθαι θεός 78, 9, 43; [93, 4, recto 2, 0, 8, 13.]

θέσεις 98, 110.

θεσμοφοριάζειν 2, 351.

Θεσσαλία 8, 22.

Θέτις 98, ii, 50.

Θῆβαι 98, 22.

θῆβαιοι 98, 22.

θηλύτατος 98, vii, 31.

θηνήσκειν 94, 5; 95, i, 10, ii, 21; 0, 10, 4; 28, 9.

θηνητός (θνατ.) 90, 39.

Θουκυδίδης 98, 364, 65.

Οπιν 98, 110.

Θρᾷξ 98, 368.

Θρασύβουλος 98, 365, 7, 8, 6, 7.

καθαρός ο. 61.

καθάσθαι 92, 115.

καθήσθαι 98, vii, 4.

καινός ο. 56.

κατά 8, 27; 885, 5, recto 7; 86, 1; 93, ix, 7; 0, 34.

κατα捐款 93, vii, 6.

καταλύειν ο. 4, 31.

κατατάλος 2, 351.

καταλαμβάνειν 90, 50, sch, 9; 93, vi, 1.

κατασκευα 90, 5, 3.

καταφθ 95, 2, 4, recto 4.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.

καταργείς 2, 9.
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INDICES

νόστος 21. 1.
νομφίζεων 0. 3 22.
νοῦς 85. 1 verso 5; (93. x. 4);
νοῦς 26. recto 3.
Νύμφαι 2. 3 30.

νῦν 90. 10; 95. ii. 18; 1. 53.

νυξ 95. il.

ἘΠῚ δ᾽ ΘΙ 1. 1:
νύσσειν 90. 5 il. 4.

ξανθός 90. 5.

ξέιιαπάτας 90. 10.

ξένος 91. 14(?); 98. vill. (ξεῖν); 98. vi. 3, iv. a 2.° 66.

Ξενόφων 2.9 2(?); 8. 39, 51.

Ξέρξης 985. il. 24.

ξυρεῖν 8. 59.

ὁ (dem.) 98. Χ.1,3,5; 94. 11.

ὁ μὲν 20, 23, 46; 58: πον μὲν γι. δ δὲ
91. 1-2; 98. vi. 7. ὁ μὲν
... δέ 90. 41, 4 ii, 6 (roi δέ); 94. 5; 0. 2 53; [> 67), "re:
6 (rel.) 94. 3, 17, 19.

dapos 98. 7 τοῦ ὀβολός 95. ii. 27.

ὀγδοος (7) 2.° 50, 57.

ὅδε 85.1 verso 5; 93. x. 7(?); 94. 20; 3. 25.

ὁδέυειν 94.6; 96. 8.

ὁδός 85.1 recto 7.

ὅθεν 2.° 34.

οἴεσθαι 24, 4.

Ἰοικεῖν 2. ὃ 8,

οἰκήμα [4.4 1]

οἰκία ἃ. 5 59.

οἶκος 94. 8.

οἴμοι 23. 10.

οἰνοψ [4. 12.2.4.

οἶνος 95. ii. ο; 2. 5.40

οἷος 90.5 4; 94.10; 97. 48.

οἷός τε 97. 50.

οἴχεσθαι 25. verso 6.

οἰκεῖν 82. 20.

ὁΙ 92. 1.17.

ὁΔίως 90. 2; 95. ii. 26.

ὁμιός 94. 9, 10, 15.

ὁμής 85. 3-4 recto 6; 95. ii. 3.

ὁλογορία 99. ii. 25.

ὁλύμπος 25. recto 5.

ὁλόδος 94. 20.

"Ολορος 0. 6 66.

ὁλος verso 13?

ὁλο 98. 24.3.

"Ολίμπος . . . 92. 24.1.

ὁλομαγεία 24. 6.

ὁλομετεώτας 90. 3.

ὁλομέτειν 1. int.; 3. 45.

ὁλομαγεία 24. 6.

ὁλομετεώτας 90. 3.

ὁλομέτειν 1. int.; 3. 45.

ὁλομαγεία 24. 6.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμοῦ 86. I.

ὁμόφωνος 98. 3X. 3.

ὁμώνυμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμοίως 1. int.; 3. 45.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.

ὁμολογεῖν 24. εἰ

ὁμορεῖν 2. 5. 65.

ὁμωνύμος ΘΟ. 45; 1. int. τ: 6}.
πλευρά 8. 1. Sch. 11, ii, sch. 6, 9, 11.
πλήθειν θ4. 21.
πληθος 98. 5 ii, 12, *iii. 3.
πλημύρειν 96. 20.
πλήρης 98. * iii. 8,14; 1. 48.
πλήρουν 88. int.
πλησίον 98. ** ii. 6.
πλίνθος 4. ° 2.
πλόκαμος 95. 1. 9.
πλούσιος 985. ll. 19.
πλοῦτος 95. ii. τό.
πνεῦμα 2.11. ἅγιον ᾿ν. 86. 4.
πνοή 78. 9.
ποδήρης 1. 37.
πόθεν 985. li. 6, 7 ; 25. recto 1.
ποθί 94. 21.
ποιεῖν 82. 9; 96. 7(?); 97. 92.4 28. recto 2, 6.
πολέμιος 4. 142 12.
πόλεμος 90. 73 [0. 2 14]; 2.3 46.
πόλις 99. ii. 16, 28; Ο. 1[4], 48, 253, 3 70,836; 4.4 2(?); 27.3, 7. πτόλις 94. 21.
πολιτεία Ο. 8t7 7; 2.3 21, 60.
πολιτεύεσθαι Ο. 3 2.
πολλάκις 92. τ; 98.18 4; Ο.7 445-3. 19.
πολυγλαγής 96. int.
πολύγομφος 90. 18.
Πολύευκτος 4. * 8,
Πολύιδος 1. 21.
πολυπληθής 96. 3.
πολύς 78. 38; 92.1 6; 94. 16 (πολεσίαν), 19; 98. 6; 98. 44 iii. 9; 0. 4 49, 52; 1. 16; 2. 4 41; 3. 1; 25. verso 1; 28. verso 6.
πολύπαλτος 90. 6. 92. 3 39.
πομά 2. 3.30.
πομάτιον 2. 3.36.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
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χώρος 92. 37; 93. viii. 3.
χώρια 95. ii. 18; 97. 28; O. 3 22.
χώροθα 0. 1 32; 12. 8.
χώσιμος 97. 6.
χρήσις 79. 32.
χρήσιμος 97. 6.
χρήσιμος 97. 6.
χρήσις 78. 32.
χρησιμοποιεῖσθαι 0. 1 35.
χρήσις 78. 32.
χρήσιμος 97. 6.
χρήσις 78. 32.
χρησιμοποιεῖσθαι Ο. 3. 53.
χρόνος 92. 11; 98. ii. 22.
χρυσί 92. 2 49; 2.
χρυσός 91. 8; Ο. 1 35.
χρυσεόστροφος 90. 40.
χρυσός 90. 40.
χρυσεόστροφος 90. 40.
χρυσέος 90. 40.
χρυσή 92. 30; 2.
χρυσοέθειρα 90. 9.
χρυσός 90. 42; 95. ii. 17.
χύσις 96. 6.
χύσις 96. 6.
χύσις 96. 6.
χύσις 96. 6.
χύσις 96. 6.
χύσις 96. 6.

III. PASSAGES DISCUSSED.

(a) Authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcaeus Fr. 19</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus ed. Bellermann 3, 85</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristides ii. 56</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes, Eq. 655</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callimachus Fr. 35 d</td>
<td>99, 100, 106-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchylides xvi (xvii). 66</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bekker, Anecd. i. p. 299</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catullus lxvi. 79-83</td>
<td>100, 106-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtius iii. 8. 20</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus xvii. 33. 1</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etym. Magn. s. v. μελέτης</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesych. s. v. σάββατος</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephus, Ant. xii. 2. 2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philostratus, Imag. ii. 1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photius s. v. προστάτες</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pindar Fr. 53</td>
<td>84-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proclus, In Rempub. ii. p. 25 (Kroll)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho Fr. 39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles, Ant. 287</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suidas s. v. Ἰδικάς</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucyd. vii. 60</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tzetzes, In Il. p. 68</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon, Anab. ii. 1. 6</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDICES

#### (b) Papyri.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P. Berl. 6870 Sitzungsb. Preuss. Akad.</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>P. Oxy. II. 208</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918. 763</td>
<td>22-3</td>
<td>VII. 1011</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Halle 2</td>
<td>41, 45-6</td>
<td>XI. 1360. 1. 9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Oxy. I. 7 6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Egypt Exploration Society

GRAECO-ROMAN MEMOIRS.

THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY, as recently reconstituted and renamed, proposes to continue with but slight modifications the work of the Egypt Exploration Fund, which was founded in 1882 to conduct archaeological researches in Egypt. In 1897 a special department, called the Graeco-Roman Branch, was initiated for the discovery and publication of remains of classical antiquity and early Christianity in Egypt. The volumes published by the Graeco-Roman Branch are to be continued under the name of Graeco-Roman Memoirs. It is intended that they shall appear annually, as heretofore, under the editorship of Profs. Grenfell and Hunt. Each will consist of 250 quarto pages or more, with facsimile plates of the more important papyri.

All persons interested in the promotion of the Society's objects are eligible for election as Members. An entrance fee of £1 15. is payable on election, and an annual subscription of £2 2s. is due annually on January 1. Members have the right of attendance and voting at all meetings, and may introduce friends to the Lectures and Exhibitions of the Society, and have access to the Library now in course of formation at the Society's Rooms.

The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology or, if preferred, a Graeco-Roman Memoir is presented gratis to all Members, and other publications may be purchased by them at a substantial discount. Full particulars may be obtained from the Secretary, 13 Tavistock Square, London, W.C. 1, or from the Secretary of the American Branch, 503 Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
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V. TANIS, Part II; including TELL DEFENNEH (The Biblical ‘Tahpanhes’) and TELL NEBESHEH. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, F. LL. GRIFFITH, and A. S. MURRAY. Fifty-one Plates and Plans. 1888. (Out of print.)

VI. NAUKRATIS, Part II. By ERNEST A. GARDNER and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Twenty-four Plates and Plans. 1888. (Out of print.)


VOL. XV
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Plates or Pages</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part I. By Edouard Naville. Plates I-XXIV (three coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1895.</td>
<td>30s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part II. By Edouard Naville. Plates XXV-LV (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1897.</td>
<td>30s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. DESHASHEH. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Photogravure and thirty-seven Plates. 1898.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part III. By Edouard Naville. Plates LVI-LXXXVI (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1898.</td>
<td>30s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. DENDEREH. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Thirty-eight Plates. 1900.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part IV. By Edouard Naville. Plates LXXXVII-CXVIII (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1901.</td>
<td>30s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX. DIOOSPIS PARYA. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Forty-nine Plates. 1901.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV. ABYDOS, Part II. By W. M. F. Petrie. Sixty-four Plates. 1903.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI. EHNASYA. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Forty-three Plates. 1905.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ROMAN EHNASYA. Thirty-two extra Plates. 10s.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part V. By Edouard Naville. Plates CXIX-CL with Description. Royal folio. 1906.</td>
<td>30s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII. THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY TEMPLE AT DEIR EL BAHARI, Part I. By Edouard Naville and H. R. Hall. Thirty-one Plates. 1907.</td>
<td>(Out of print.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part VI. By Edouard Naville. Plates CLI-CLXXIV (one coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1908.</td>
<td>30s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX. THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY TEMPLE AT DEIR EL BAHARI, Part II. By Edouard Naville and Somers Clarke. Twenty-four Plates. 1910.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI. PRE-DYNASTIC CEMETERY AT EL MAHASNA. By E. R. Ayrton and W. L. S. Loat. 1911.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV. CEMETERIES OF ABYDOS, Part II. By T. E. Peet. 1914.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXV. CEMETERIES OF ABYDOS, Part III. By T. E. Peet and W. L. S. Loat. 1913.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVII. BALABISH. By G. A. Wainwright. Twenty-five Plates. 1920.</td>
<td>42s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Edited by F. Ll. GRIFFITH.


II. BENI HASAN, Part II. By Percy E. NEWBERRY. With Appendix, Plans, and Measurements by G. W. FRASER. Thirty-seven Plates (two coloured). 1894. 25s.

III. EL BERSHEH, Part I. By Percy E. NEWBERRY. Thirty-four Plates (two coloured). 1894. 25s.

IV. EL BERSHEH, Part II. By F. LL. GRIFFITH and Percy E. NEWBERRY. With Appendix by G. W. FRASER. Twenty-three Plates (two coloured). 1895. 25s.

V. BENI HASAN, Part III. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. (Hieroglyphs, and manufacture, &c., of Flint Knives.) Ten coloured Plates. 1896. 25s.

VI. HIEROGLYPHS FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. Nine coloured Plates. 1898. 25s.

VII. BENI HASAN, Part IV. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. (Illustrating beasts and birds, arts, crafts, &c.) Twenty-seven Plates (twenty-one coloured). 1900. 25s.


IX. THE MASTABA OF PTAHETEP AND AKHETETEP, Part II. By N. D. G. DAVIES and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Thirty-five Plates. 1901. 25s.

X. THE ROCK TOMBS OF SHEIKH SAİD. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Thirty-five Plates. 1902. 25s.

XI. THE ROCK TOMBS OF DEIR EL GEBrABI, Part I. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Twenty-seven Plates (two coloured). 1902. 25s.

XII. DEIR EL GEBrABI, Part II. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Thirty Plates (two coloured). 1902. 25s.

XIII. THE ROCK TOMBS OF EL AMARNÂ, Part I. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Forty-one Plates. 1902. 25s.

XIV. EL AMARNÂ, Part II. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Forty-seven Plates. 1902. 25s.

XV. EL AMARNÂ, Part III. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Forty Plates. 1902. 25s.

XVI. EL AMARNÂ, Part IV. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Forty-five Plates. 1902. 25s.

XVII. EL AMARNÂ, Part V. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Forty-four Plates. 1902. 25s.

XVIII. EL AMARNÂ, Part VI. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Forty-four Plates. 1903. 25s.

XIX. THE ISLAND OF MEROE. By J. W. Crawfoot, and MEROITIC INSCRIPTIONS, Part I. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. Thirty-five Plates. 1911. 25s.

XX. MEROITIC INSCRIPTIONS, Part II. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. Forty-eight Plates. 1912. 25s.

XXI. FIVE THEBAN TOMBS. By N. D. G. DAVIES. Forty-five Plates. 1913. 25s.

XXII. THE ROCK TOMBS OF MEIR, Part I. By A. M. BLACKMAN. Thirty-three Plates. 1914. 25s.

XXIII. MEIR, Part II. By A. M. BLACKMAN. Thirty-five Plates. 1915. 25s.

XXIV. MEIR, Part III. By A. M. BLACKMAN. Thirty-nine Plates. 1915. 25s.

GRAECO-ROMAN MEMOIRS.

I. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part I. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Eight Collotype Plates. 1898. (Out of print.)

II. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part II. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Eight Collotype Plates. 1899. 25s.

III. FAYUM TOWNS AND THEIR PAPYRI. By B. P. GRENFELL, A. S. HUNT, and D. G. HOGARTH. Eighteen Plates. 1900. 25s.

IV. THE TEBTUNIS PAPYRI. By B. P. GRENFELL, A. S. HUNT, and J. G. SMYLY. Nine Collotype Plates. 1902. (Not for sale.)

V. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part III. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 1903. 25s.