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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.
I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1778. ARISTIDES, Apology.

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. theos is contracted in the usual way, but ἀνθρωπος 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
text with an English translation, Latin and English versions of the Armenian fragment, and the Greek text from Barlaam and Josaphat.

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. i., 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 Celsius, 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 ] μιαροις

Fol. 2, recto. Plate I.

[οντες την τον] ανε ημιν οτι
μιαροις την των[υ] αρε
dοιλειει επερη ποτε
ληγει ουκον αναγ

Fol. 2, verso.

[σημειον εις σημειον] vi.
καθ ημεραν φερομε
νον δυνοντα τε και
ανατελλονται του

30 θερμαινειν τα βλα 
στα και τα φυτα εις
την χρησιν των αν
θρωπων επει και [ ] με
ρησιμους εθ[οντα μη]

35 τα των λο[πων αςτε
ρων και ε[λατον]α
ontαι του [ουρανου
π[ο]λυ αυξει δε και
μειουται [και εκλυσι]
7. *μαιροις* is apparently a misspelling for *μαροις*. 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 γή and ὕδωρ, — φυσικόν, αἵματι φανερομένων μαίνεται, μαίνεται καί φθείρεται, αἵματι μολυνόμενω καί εἰς πάντων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων πλῆθυν ἀγάμενων. The original form of one of these phrases may have included the adjective *μαροις*, 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 ζῶα μεταμορφωμένους ἐπὶ πονηρᾶς καὶ αἰθρᾶς πρᾶξεν, and τούς μὲν ἄνθρωπος προσαγωγοῦσεν θεοὺς, κατὰ τάς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν τάς πονηρᾶς, ἵνα τῶντοι συνήρωσοσ ἐχόντες τίς κακίας μοιχεύσασι, ἁρπάζωσι, φονεύσωσι καὶ τὰ πάντεα ποιῶσι. 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: οἱ δὲ νομίζοντες τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων πνοὴν εἶναι θεῶν πλανῶσιν, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐστὶν ὅτι διωλεῖται ἑτέρῳ, καὶ χάριν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατευθύνοντα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς μεταγογὴν πλοίων καὶ συγκομίδας τῶν σιτίων, καὶ εἰς λοιπὰ αὐτῶν χρείας αὐξεῖ τε καὶ λήγει κατ΄ ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ. οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τὸς τῶν ἀνέμων πνοὴν εἶναι θεῶν, ἀλλ’ ἐργον 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(ε)ν εἶναι for εἶναι θεῶν, φανερά for φανερὸν, and the addition of ἡμῖν after ἐστιν. In the Syriac the simple directness of the original is obscured by unnecessary verbage: '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 fairly 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. δ(ε)ν: so also the Syriac, 'that it is God'. The extant Greek has θεῶν both here and elsewhere where the subject is feminine.

13. αὐ[τ]ε[ι: the identification of the exiguous traces is confirmed by the collocation αὐτεί τε καὶ λήγεις 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. ἀναγκαία: cf. the references in BJ to ἀνάγκη in connexion with other elements, &c., e.g. ἐν κινεῖται δὲ οἵρανα κατ' ἀνάγκην, νὶ ὧρμεν γὰρ αὐτῶν (ἐκ τῶν ἐκλούν) κινοῦμεν κατ' ἀνάγκην, and the application of the same phrase to the moon and to man. To read ἀναγκεῖν is less suitable, since of the doubtful letters before τα the second is the taller of the two, whereas if they were εσ the reverse would be expected. The top of the supposed ζ is not unlike that of ὑστερεις in l. 8.

16. The very scanty remains are not inconsistent with αὐτεί again, though the repetition of this word seems unlikely. Of the three letters printed the ε is the most probable; the other two are very uncertain.

17. The first ν is very doubtful. The next letter is apparently ω, ε, or η, which is followed by ν or ε.

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 οι δὲ νομιζότες τῶν ἡλίου δ(ε)ν εἶναι πλανοῦσαι. BJ continues: ὤρωμεν γὰρ αὐτῶν κινοῦμεν κατὰ ἀνάγκην καὶ τρεπόμενον καὶ μεταβαίνοντα ἀπὸ σημείου εἰς σημείον, δύνασται καὶ ἀνατέλλοντα, τοῦ θερμαίνει τὰ φυτὰ καὶ βλαστάτα εἰς χρῆσα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ μερασμὸν ἔχοντα μετὰ τῶν λυσιῶν αστέρων, καὶ εἀπτόντα ὑντα τοῦ οἵρανου πολύ, καὶ εἰκάζοντα τοῦ φωτός, καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοκράτειν ἔχοντα. διὸ οὐ κειμένατο τῶν ἡλίου εἶναι θέω, ἀλλ' ἑργον θεοῦ.

The Syriac is: 'So too those who 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. θερμαίνει 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. καὶ ἡμερα, which the Syriac connects, probably rightly, with δύνασται τε καὶ ἀνατέλλοντα, has also been discarded. The article has been omitted with βλαστάτα and χρῆσα (confirmed against the v. l. χρείαν), and βλαστάτα 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. μερασμοὺς (l. 33) was read by Boissoneade, with some MSS. (μερασμὸν W, διόνυσιμον Lat.; cf. Syr.). In ll. 38–40 αὐτεί δὲ καὶ μειώσαι καὶ εἰκάζοντα (ἡ) εἰς is represented by καὶ εἰκάζοντα τοῦ φωτός, and this or something like it is probably to be regarded as the correct text, since the indicatives αὐτεί, &c., interrupt the participial construction, which is carried on in ll. 40–1 by καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοκράτειν εχουντα;
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 αὐξεῖ, κτλ., has been brought in here from the succeeding paragraph concerning the moon, where BJ has αὐξαμομείνη τε καὶ μεσαμομείνη καὶ ἐκλήψεις 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. ἐν 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 μήδεμαυ αὐτοκρατεῖν ἔχοντα. The reference to eclipse has disappeared. Raabe, l. c., was rightly critical of this passage.

33. ἐπει is obviously an error for ἐν (arising not improbably out of an intermediate misspelling ἐπει), and BJ's addition of δὲ 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 li. 26 sqq. ἐκλήψεις is assured by the parallel there quoted from BJ and would not overlord the lacuna if ἐκλήψεις or ἐκλῆψις were written, as is quite possible.

1779. Psalm i.

11-5 × 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.
---|---
οὐχ' οὖντο[ς] | 1 [σ]προσομείναι a
οἱ αἰσθεῖς | σέβεις εὖ
οὐχ' οὖντος | κρίσεις οὔδε a
αλλ' ἡ ὡς χνοῦς | μαρτωλοὶ εὖ
5 ὥν | βουλὴ δικαίων
ἐκρίπτει | 15 στὶ γυνώσκει
οἱ αἵμεος | καὶ ων καὶ όδος
ἀπὸ προσωποῦ | 6
τῆς γῆς· διὰ | καὶ όδον δικαί
τοῦτο οὐκ' ανά

4. ὡς χνοῦς: so the cursive 281 (Laur. v. 18, 11th cent.); χνοὺς other MSS.
10. aἰσθεῖς: so ΝΑRα and many cursives, including 281. oἱ aἰσθεῖς others.
1780. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1780. ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL viii.

25.6 x 8 cm. Fourth century.

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.

[ ]
[καὶ εἰπὲν] ἀυτοῖς viii. 14 καὶ μ[αρτυρεὶ περὶ
[καὶ εἰπὸν] μαρτυρῶ
[περὶ ἐμαν]τοῦ ἡ μάρ
[τυρία μοῦ] ἀληθῆς
5 [εἰσὶν ὁτι οἶδα γ]ό
[θεν ἡλθὼν καὶ πον
[ὑπάγω υἱ]εὶς δὲ
[οὐκ οἰδα]τε ποθὲν
[ἐρχομαι] ἡ ποὺ ὑπά
[γω υἱε]ὶς κατὰ τὴ
[σαρκα κρ]υ[ν]τεὶς εγω
[ον κρι]νὼ οὐδὲνα
[καὶ εαυ κρι[ν]ω δὲ
[εγὼ ὡ] κρήσις ἡ εἴη
10 [ἀληθινὴ ε]στὶν ὁ
[τι μονος] οὐκ εἰ
15 19 30 πηρ ἐλεγον οὖν
35 39 ἔτη οὐτε εμε οἰδα
40 επισκέψειν αὐτὸν ὁ
ματα ελαξησεν εν
tω γαζο[ά]φυλακω
διδασκαλῶν εν τω
[iερω κα]ὶ οὐδεὶς
ti ουτ[ίω ε]λη[νυθε]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

[μι] [αλλ] [εγω] [και] [ο] [η] [ωρα] [αν] [τον] [ειπεν] 21

[πεμ] [ψας] [με] [πηρ] [ουν] [πα] [λιν] [αυτοις] 17

[kαι] [εν] [τω] [νομω] [εγω] [υπ] [αγω] [και] [ζη]

20 [δε] [τω] [υπ] [ετερω] [η] [σετε] [με] [και] [εν] 45

[γεγραπτ] [αι] [οτι] [δυ] [η] [αμαρτ] [αια] [υμων] 18

[ο] [ανων] [η] [μαρτυρι] [απο] [θα] [εισ] [θε]

[ια] [ληθν] [εστιν] [ε] [που] [εγω] [υπ] [αγω] 50

[γω] [ειμι] [ο] [μαρτν] [υμεις] [ον] [δυνασθε]

25 [ρων] [περι] [εμαυτου]

3-5. η μαρτυρια μου] αληθης [εστιν: this is the order of B. αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου

W(estcott)-H(ort) and T(exuxus)-R(ceperus) with most MSS.

7. δε: so BD, W-H, T-R; om. Ν.

9. η: so BD*γ, W-H; και Ν, T-R.

13. It is clear that the papyrus did not read καω with Ν for και εαυ.

15. Considerations of space are indecisive between αληθην (BD, W-H) and αληθης (Ν, T-R), but in view of the general agreement of the papyrus with B, αληθην is the more probable reading.

16. There would be no room for εγω after μων (D).

18. π(ατρι)ηρ: so ΝεΒ, T-R; om. Ν*Ν*Δ. W-H print πατηρ in brackets.

21. [γεγραπτ] [αι]: so BD, T-R, W-H; γεγραμμενον εστιν Ν.

31. η(σου)ι: so BD, W-H; ο 1(ησου)ο Ν, T-R. ND further add και ειπεν (ειπ. αυτου D).

34. The omission of μου with Ν would make the line unduly short.

αν η(σου)ι: so B, W-H; η(σου)ι η Ν, T-R.

36. The line is sufficiently filled without the addition of ο 1(ησου)ο, which is read after ελαθην by some of the later uncial MSS 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 1(ησου)ο, which is added after αυτου by T-R with inferior authority.

47. ο]που: the variant και απου is possible though not probable.


24.5 x 6.8 cm. Third century.

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 S is supported by one or more of the other
chief uncials the papyrus is usually in harmony. Coincidences with NA are found
in ll. 47, 48, with ND in l. 12, with NBD in ll. 13, 20, with NBC 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 εγώ 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., 12, 14–15, 17, 1781. 6,
12, 13, 20, 26, 38, 44, 47, 50–1, and nn.

Recto.

[οτι εκ του εμου λημψεται και αναγ [ xvi. 14
[γελει υμιν παντα οσα εχει ο πρε ε 15
[μα εστιν δια τουτο εισον] ν οτι εκ τουν
[εμου λαμβανει και αι] γελει υμει

5 [μεικρον και ουκετι θεωρειτε με ι]αι
[παλιν μεικρον κ]αι οψεοθε [με εισπαιν]
[ουν . . . εκ του] μ οθων ι αυτου
[προς αλληλους τι] εστιν τουτο ο λε
[γει ημειν μεικρον και ου] θεωρει[τ]ε με

10 [και παλιν μεικρον και οψ]εοθε με και [οτ]
[υπαγω προς τουν] πραδελεγον ουν
[τι εστιν τουτο] μεικρον ουκ οιδα

μεν τι λαλε ιγνω] ις οτι ηθελου

[αυτον ερωταν] και ειπεν αυτο]ησ
15 [περὶ τοῦτον ζητεῖτε μετ' ἀλληλῶν]
[οτί εἰπον μεικρὸν καὶ οὐ δεώρειτε]
[μὲ καὶ παλιν μεικρῷν καὶ οὐφεσθε μὲ []
[ἀμὴν ἁμὴν λεγὼ ὑμεῖν ὡτι κλα[ν]
[σετε καὶ θρηνηστε ὑμεῖς ὃ δὲ]
20 [κόσμος χαρησται ὑμεῖς λῆ[σ]υπ[η]θη]
[σεσθε ἀλλα η λυπ[η] ὑμων εἰς χαραν]
[γενησεται η γυν[η] οταν τικτη λοι]
[πε[ν] εχει οτι ηλθ[ε]ν η ωρα αυτης]
[οταν δε γεννηση το παδιον ουκε]
[σα την χαραν οτι εγενηθη ανθρω]
[πος εις τον κοσμον και ὑμεις ουν]

Verso.

υνν μεν [λυπην εχετε παλιν δε]
οψομαι ὑμ[α]ς καὶ χαρησται υμων
30 η καρδια [και την χαραν υμων ου]
δεις αρει [αφ] υ[μων και εν εκεινη]
τη ημερ[α] ε[μ]ε [ουκ ερωτησετε]
ουδεν αμην α[μην λεγο υμειν]
αν τι αυτη[σ]ητε [τον πρα δωσει υμειν]
35 εν τω ον[ο]ματ[ι] μου ατειτε και]
ληψεθε ἵνα η χαρα υμων η]
πεπληρω[μ]ε[ν]η [ταυτα εν παροι]
μιας λε[λ]ηκα [υμειν ερχεται]
ωρα οτε ουκετι εν παροιμιας η[α]
40 λησω ὑμειν [αλ[α] παρησια περι]
του προς απαγ'γε[λ]ω υμειν εν ε]
κεινη τη ημερα [εν τω ονοματι]
μου αιτησεσθε και ου λεγω υμειν]
[ο]τι εγω ερωτησω τον πρα αυτος]
45 [γ]αρ ο προ φιλει υμ[α]ς οτι υμεις εμε}

πεφιληκατε και [πεπιστευκατε]
3. έπο[ν]: to read έπο[ν] να[λ]ον with Νσ and others would overload the lacuna.
4. Whether λαμβανει (BD1b, W-H) or λη(μ)ψεται (ΝσΑ, T-R) was written cannot be determined.
5. On the basis of the preceding and following lines, ωνκετε (ΝBDסרΤβ, W-H) suits the length of the lacuna better than ων (Α, T-R).
6. T-R with Α1b and others adds οτι εγώ υπαγω προς τον πατέρα after ωψεθε 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 ων, which is the order of Κ. There is no authority for the insertion of τινες before η.
9. μερε[τ]ε: ωψεθε D.
10. The reading after ωψεθε is very uncertain; there was perhaps a correction.
11. The lacuna would not admit of εγώ υπαγω (D, T-R). ελεγων ονων is omitted in D*.
12. τοντο] so ΝσD*; for τοντο o λεγει (ΝσΑΒDsrΤβ, W-H, T-R) there is clearly no room.
That το was omitted before ] μερε [so B, W-H] is probable but hardly certain.
13. Either το λαλει o o λεγει (D*) is required in the lacuna; om. B.
εγνω: so ΝBD, W-H; εγνω ουν Α, T-R, εγνω δε και εγνω being other variants.
η(σον)ε: so B, W-H; so Α, T-R. η(σον)ε ΝAD, T-R.
ηθελων: μελελω Ν.
14. D’s reading επερωτησαι περι τουτου is obviously excluded. A omits αυτωι.
20. νημει: so ΝBD, W-H: νημει δε Α, T-R. ν of λυπηθη has been converted from an η, i.e. λυπηθη was first written. The correction is perhaps due to the original scribe.
Cf. i. 22.
21. Whether αλλα or αλλ was written cannot be ascertained.
22. The corrector has substituted ν for οι without cancelling the original spelling, for which cf. i. 20.
23. ορα: ημερα D.
25. θλην[ψισ]ων: λυπης D.
27. ουν: Ν* places this after νυν μεν.
28. νυν μεν [λυπη: so ΝΒC*D, W-H; λυπην μεν νυν AC3, T-R.
31. αρει: so BD*, W-H; αρει ΝACD3, T-R.
33. οτι may have been added at the end of the line as in ΝD2 (T-R).
34. ου τι is the reading of BCD, W-H; o αυ Ν, o τι αυ Α, οσα (ε)αυ some later MSS., T-R.
34-5. δωσετ...ον[ο]ματ[ε] μου: so ΝΒ* C-H; εν τω ωνομ. μου, δωσει υμιν ΑΓ*D, T-R.

35. The first sentence of verse 24, εως απρι...ονοματε 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 (ΑΓ*D²) before ερξεται, especially as a short blank space may well have been left after υμιν.

39. οτε: ωνομ Ν*.
40. απαγγέλω: so ΝΒ*D C, W-H; απαγγελω C², T-R.
41-3. αυτ. εν τω ωνομ. 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(ατρ)α or περι υμιν was omitted, and for the latter omission there is some authority (the cursive 36, Itala MSS. bee, Cyril Acta 49, Aug. De Trin.). D adds μου after πατερα, and this may have been written, though not required.

45. Whether εμε (ΑΒΓΔ) or με (Ν) was written cannot be decided.

47. οτι: οτι εως MSS.

48. παρα: so ΝΑ C², T-R; εκ BC* W-H. D omits εξηλθον...πατερος.

50-1. ην όνομα, the original reading, is that of ΝΒ*D*, W-H; αυτω, which has been inserted above the line, is added by AC²D², T-R.

51. εν may have been omitted, with А.

1782. Didache i-iii.

Fol. 1 5-8 x 5, Fol. 2 5-7 x 4-8. Late fourth century.

Two vellum leaves, containing a few verses from the first three chapters of the Διδαξή των δόθηκα 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 1618 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, υμείες). ν at the end of a line is commonly represented by a horizontal stroke above the preceding vowel, and the usual abbreviation of πνεῦμα 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 zwölfe 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 Κανώνες έκκλησιαστικών τῶν ἁγίων ἰποστόλων, a treatise called by Bickell, its first editor, the ‘Apostolische Kirchenordnung’ and by Hilgenfeld (N. T. extra Canonom) ‘Dueae Viæ vel Iudiciwm 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. zwölfe 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 ἄκον τί σε δεὶ ποιώντα σῶσαι σου τὸ πνεῦμα. 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 παντὸς in iii. 1, the insertion of πράγματος in iii. 1, and the substitution of ἔπειδη ὁδηγεῖ for ὁδηγεῖ γάρ in iii. 2. How should these novelties be appraised? The two last are not very convincing, and ἀπόσχου 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 ἀκοῦ ... πάντων 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 ἀγαπᾶτε. Similarly, one coincidence occurs with Καβ. ἐκκλησία (Hilgenfeld's Duæ Viae) against M and Const. Apost., ὁν ὅ for ὅν ὅν, 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.

Fol. 1.

Recto. 

οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ε ἦν τοῦτο
ποιοῦσιν μὴ εἰς δὲ φιλεῖτ
5 εὶς τοὺς μισοὺ τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ οὐχ ἐξετε εχ

Verso. 

i. 3 ὑρον ἀκου

εἰς τὸ σε δεῖ ποι

10 οὐντα σωσάι

σοῦ τὸ πνεα π[ρ]ω

τὸν παντὸ

αποσχοῦ τῶν

σαρκε[ί]κων ε

15 πιθυμειὼν

Fol. 2.

Recto. 

ελεγξεῖας περὶ ὁ δὲ προσευξεῖ οὐς
δὲ αγαπησεῖς

υπερ τὴν ψυχὴ

20 σοῦ θεὸν μου

τεκνὸν μου

ἐφευ ἀπο

Verso. 

ii. 7. 

[[ἀπὸ]] παντὸς

πραγματὸς

25 πονηροὺ καὶ ομοίου αὐτοῦ

μὴ γεινοῦ ὀργῇ

λος ἐπειδῆ ὁδη

γει ᾗ ὀργῇ πρὸς

iii. 2

iii. 30 τὸν φόνον
2. touto: to auto M; cf. Matt. v. 47 ovei kai oI etnikoi to auto piooivn; On the other hand Const. Apost. (vii. 1) have kai yap oI etnikoi touto piooivn, and so Justin, Apol. i. 15 (with παρναi instead of έθνικοι).

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

7. oux ekete εχθρον is also the order of M. εξθ. oux εξ. Const. Apost.

8-12 akou...παντων: there is nothing corresponding to these words in M or Const. Apost., which pass abruptly to απέχου των σαρκικών κτλ. For σωσι το πνευμα cf. e.g. 1 Cor. v. 5 (κα το πνεύμα σωθη ἐν τῇ ημέρᾳ του κυριου).

13. σπανχων: απεχου M, Const. Apost. The present tense is expected.

14. σαρκικον επιθυμων: σαρκικών και σωματικών ἐπιθ. M, σαρκ. και κοσμικών ἐπιθ. Const. Apost. κοσμικών was adopted by Bryennios and preferred by Harnack (pp. 5, 172) who however hesitated to accept it in his text; cf. Titus ii. 12 ἀρνησάμενοι... τις κοσμικάς επιθυμιας, 2 Clem. xvii. 3 μὴ ἀντιπαρελθώσα τοῦ 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, παρακαλώ... απέχουσα τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθ.

16. ελεγξες: so M. The ε, though little of it remains, is practically certain, and ὅπε δὲ ελέγξες, which Hilgenfeld inserted after ελεγξες from Kav. ἐκκλ., is therefore excluded. Const. Apost. (vii. 5), like M, make no reference to ἔλεος, but are here rather compressed.

18. οὐ (v) δὲ: so Kav. ἐκκλ.: δὲ ὃ ὑν M. Both M and Kav. ἐκκλ. have προσέβη.

23. aπo was inadvertently repeated in turning over the page. There seem to be traces of a bracket after the a and of a horizontal dash underneath the three superfluous letters, but this corner is so much discoloured and rubbed that it is difficult to be sure whether or how they were cancelled.

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 homeoteleuton would make the loss easy.


28. ἐπειδὴ ὄδηγη: so Lat. quidiam... subit; ὄδηγη γάρ M, Kav. ἐκκλ.; Const. Apost. omit the epexegetical clause. ἐπειδὴ ὄδηγη occurs three times in verses 4-6 of this chapter.

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, 1172, 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. θεός and κύριος are contracted as usual, but not ἀνθρωπός (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 περιεσχυσθήν, 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 (cd. 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.

**Verso.**

Recto.

πολυςπ[α]γχμιαν αυτων οτι Μανδ. 15 ανώστερησος εση εαυ αδιστα ἰχ. 4
ου μη σε [ε]γκαταλειψει αλλα τα ιχ. 2
αιτημα της ψυχης σου πληρο
φορησει ουκ εστιν ο δε ως οι
5 ανθρωποι μνησικακοντες
αλλ αυτος αμνησικακητος εστιν

2ο θυ νουτι ειςων οι διψυχοι και

1. την πολυςπ[α]γχμιαν: so recent edd. with Grabe's fragment; την πολλην εισπλαγχνιαν ca, Ant(iochus), Athan(asis) Cod. Guelf. (την πολλευςπλ. Cod. Paris.).
3. estiν o θεος: ἐστι γὰρ ca, omitting οθεος, which Hilgenfeld and Gebhardt-Harnack add from Grabe's fragment, Ant., Athan., both Latin versions, and the Aethiopic.
4. l. οι μνησικακητος, with ca and Grabe's fragment; the omission of οι (due no doubt to the termination of ἀνθρωποι) is found also in Ant. and Athan. Grabe's fragment adds <εις> ἀλληλους after μνησικακητος.
5. αμνησικακητος: ἀμνησικακος ca, &c. ἀμνησικακητος occurs elsewhere only in Polyb. xl. 12. 5 in a passive sense.
THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1783. 

17. δὲ: so edd. with Athan. Cod. Paris., the Palatine Latin, and Aethiopic; om. ca.

1784. CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED.

6·5 × 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 ο and a common abbreviation of καὶ is used in l. 6. θεός, κύριος, ἠγιος, and Χριστὸς are contracted, but not πατὴρ, νόης, or ἀνθρωπος. o 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. μονογενην: this form of the acc. is a vulgarism common from the Roman period.
4. δι(εων): the υ has been written over an original ς, which being in darker ink looks at first sight like the later letter, but that this appearance is deceptive is shown by αληθ[ει]ν.
1785. Homilies?

Frs. 2 + 3  6·6 × 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 concupiscence, of which a series of Biblical instances is cited, recalls that of 1603, now identified as (Pseudo-)Chrysostom In decollationem Precursoris (λόγ. θ), 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.

... [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [ ... ] [...
Frs. 2–4 recto.


Fr. 4


Fr. 5.

β] αιλ[ 

Fr. 1 verso.


C 2
2nd hand

\[ \omega \nu \alpha [\ldots] \sigma [\ldots] \epsilon \nu \mu \tau [\ldots] \]

Frs. 2–4 verso.

\[ \epsilon [\ldots] \alpha \rho [\ldots] \omega [\ldots] \]
\[ \epsilon [\ldots] \rho [\ldots] \theta [\ldots] \alpha \nu [\ldots] \]
\[ \alpha [\ldots] \nu [\ldots] \alpha [\ldots] \]
\[ \alpha [\ldots] \phi [\ldots] \theta [\ldots] \]

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 \( a, \delta, \) or \( \lambda, \) and if, as seems probable, the vestiges above the line represent a rough breathing, \( \delta \delta \nu \) or \( \delta \delta \nu \) is indicated, the word following perhaps being \( \sigma \nu \); otherwise \( \delta \delta \nu [\sigma] \nu \) could well be read.

8. \( \theta (\epsilon) \) is doubtful, the cross-bar of \( \theta \) 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 \( \nu \) and \( \kappa \nu, \) but it is rather farther away from the \( \nu \) 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 \( \alpha [\ldots] \) in l. 11, is less clear.

2. Either \( \chi \alpha [\tau \epsilon \psi \epsilon [\nu] \sigma [\alpha] \tau \) or \( \chi \alpha [\tau \epsilon \psi \epsilon [\delta \beta [\mu] \alpha [\rho] [\nu] \sigma [\alpha] \) (cf. l. 4) is probable and the former must be preferred if \( \alpha [\tau \epsilon \beta [\tau] \epsilon [\sigma] \tau \) is right. \( \Sigma \omega \sigma \alpha \nu \alpha \) is the spelling of BAQ; \( \Sigma \omega \sigma \alpha \nu \alpha \) B rescr.

3. \( \alpha [\chi \mu] \gamma [\epsilon [\rho] \nu \) 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 \(\sigma\pi\omega\lambda\alpha\nu\pi\tau\omega\pi\alpha\lambda\) is very conjectural, especially as there is barely room for \([\lambda\alpha\tau]\) before \(\sigma\pi\nu\) in l. 6.

7. \(\circ\sigma\delta\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\) (Gen. xix) and the following nominatives lack a verb, e.g. \(\delta\epsilon\varphi\beta\alpha\rho\mu\sigma\alpha\nu\), and the angular symbol preceding \(\sigma\iota\) may be interpreted as referring to this loss, which was perhaps supplied in the margin.

8. Dr. Bartlet suggests that \(\kappa\alpha\ldots\) may be \(\kappa\alpha\pi\rho\epsilon\nu\alpha\omega\nu\gamma\nu\), 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 \(\epsilon\) and \(\xi\) of \(\epsilon\xi\omega\nu\iota\alpha\zeta\epsilon\) is not evident. There is a hole in the papyrus immediately below it. \(\nu\) of \(\alpha\nu\tau\zeta\eta\varsigma\) may be \(\lambda\), e.g. \(\alpha\lambda\xi\lambda\alpha\circ\).

Fr. 5. 3. A combination with Frs. 2-4. l. 2 \([\epsilon]\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\epsilon[\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\rho\tau\nu]\nu\rho[\sigma\alpha\nu]\) 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. \(\nu\), 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. \(\upsilon\) of \(\tau\sigma\nu\) has been corrected, perhaps from \(\eta\).

8. \(\phi\rho[\tau\nu]\mu[\sigma\tau]\ldots\) or possibly \(\phi\rho[\nu]\mu[\omega\tau\varsigma]\), a form found in some MSS. of Philostratus 705, which would suit the space rather better than \(\phi\rho[\nu]\mu[\).

10-13. The letters \(]\ldots[\epsilon]\), \(\kappa\lambda\upsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\) in ll. 10-11, and ll. 12-13 are on Fr. 4 which is doubtfully placed; cf. note on Frs. 2-4 recto. In l. 10 the signs resembling inverted commas above \(\sigma\alpha\) (or \(\mu\)) may perhaps be regarded as marks of cancellation.

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 \(\epsilon\) of \([\pi]\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\) 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.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

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 acatalectic, catalectic, or brachycatalectic. A short syllable is allowed to replace a long at the end of a colon, and the first syllable of ἀβγ 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.¹ The notes which can be recognized with certainty are eight, ρ φ ο ζ ι ξ ζ. 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 Teknessa (Leipzig), reviewed with severity by Schröder, Berl. Phil. Woch. xl. 351.
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 \( \chiρόνοσ \) \( κένωσ \) 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 \( \pi \), 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 \( \deltaιαστολή \) or sign of division between two \( \text{cola} \). 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 \( \text{cola} \). According to Thierfelder, \( \text{l.c.} \), 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 \( \text{arsis} \): \( \text{η} \ \muεν \ \omegaν \ \text{θέσις} \ \sigmaμαίνεται, \ \circταν \ \απλώς \ \το} \ \sigmaμείου \ \αστικτον \ \text{η} \ldots \ \text{η} \ \delta' \ \αροις, \ \circταν \ \εστιγμένου \ (3, 85) \). Some critics have considered that in that passage the terms \( \text{θέσις} \) and \( \alphaροις \) 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 \( \chiρόνοσ \) \( κένωσ \) is dotted, looks like a confirmation of the latter view. Apart from this however, if the metre of 1786 is rightly regarded as anapaestic, 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 \( \chiρόνοσ \) \( κένωσ \) 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 \( \text{arsis} \) 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.
1 [31 letters] ὁμοῦ πασαὶ τῇ θεοῦ λογίμοι
    α. [..] [..]ο[..]

2 [28 letters] προτανῦχω σιγατω μηδ' αστρα
    φασσφορά λ[ειπ[ε]

3 [σ]θων [..] λει [..]β[..] ποταμων ροθιων πασαὶ υμνουν
    φ[ο]υ[ο]

4 [π]ατερα Χ' υιον Χ' αγιον πνευμα πασαὶ δυναμεις επιφωνοντων αμην
    ε[ε]υ[ε]

5 [..........] δ[ο]τη[ρ]ι] μονω παντων αγαθων αμην αμην

\[\text{music notation}\]
1. Only slight vestiges of the musical notation are visible above this line.

2. τρήταινο: 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 = εω and that ταν = την or -την is much more difficult.

φατσφόρα: the surface above the note φ is damaged, and a dot has probably disappeared.

λ[ει][θ]ων is very doubtful; the initial letter may be μ or χ, and θ may be β, of which no other example occurs in the papyrus. μηθ', φατσφόρα can be constructed with συγωνω, and another μθ[θ]ε might stand at the end of the line; or if . . . ε[θ]ων is rightly taken as an imperative, this may belong to what follows.

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

4. A dot is probably to be restored above the notes on πων, the papyrus having been rubbed here. The dots on the notes from χ' νων to πνεύμα are carried on in regular succession to those of the preceding words, as if there were no pause at [π]στερα. Another dot is most probably lost above the second syllable of the first αμην. A dot above the α of κρατος (a little below the ι of τον in l. 3) is ignored in the transcription, since it is more to the right of the note ξ than usual and would also interrupt the sequence. The note ξ above α of δυσμεις is very uncertain. δυσμεις is used of heavenly bodies (e.g. Matt. xxiv. 29 αι δ. των ουρανων: 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: σ 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 ι, 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 φθων and the ι over the second syllable of δ[ωρ][θ]ρ[ι]; the surface is a good deal rubbed hereabouts.

With regard to the text of l. 5, the scanty vestiges well suit μωνυ, but δ[ωρ][θ]ρ[ι] 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 anaepost. One more syllable at least, however, seems necessary for the metre, and it is perhaps just possible that a note is missing between σ and σ, where there is a rather broad space and the surface is not well preserved. Something like νυν κειν αιωνας (or δοξαν νυν κειν) διδομεν is wanted; cf. e.g. the eleventh prayer in the Greek morning service (Ευχολογιον το μεγα) φτι σε αινοι φασσαι αι δυσμεις των ουρανων και σοι την δοξαν άνπεμπομεν τω Πατρι και τω Υιω και τω άγιο Πνευματι νυν και δει και εις των αιωνας των αιωνων. 'Αμην. The double αμην at the end of the line appears to be extra melium.
II. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1787. Sappho, Book iv.

Fr. I 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
which Hephaestion 64 describes as
an Ionic a maiore tetrameter acatalectic, adding that it was called Αἰολικῶν
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 Σαπφικῶν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκαστιλλαβον (ισό-ισό-ισό-
ισό-ισό: cf. Hephaest. 42), Book iii of the Εκκαιδεκαστιλλαβον (ισό-ισό-ισό-ισό-
ισό-ισό-ισό-ισό-ισό: 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 tetra-
meter that Sappho πολλαφ αυτῳ ἱχρὴσατο 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. Saph. 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 accompaniments of delicacy (αβροσώη), splendour (τό λαμπρόν), and beauty (τό 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 Saph. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 2 (a)</th>
<th>Frs. 1 + 2</th>
<th>Plate II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>άκιοσσα</td>
<td>δαδα</td>
<td>έκλαην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέρι</td>
<td>να</td>
<td>άλλα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εικε</td>
<td>γοσσα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5

| | | 
|---|---|---|
| άλλα | .. | .. |
| άτιλ | .. | εισα |
| \νάταρ | .. | \άνυμώναρ |

10

| | | 
|---|---|---|
| άλλα | .. | .. |
| οκομαλαδωρα \άδεσ | | |
| φιλάοιδουλιγύραν \χελύνναν |
| \νταχραγήρασθήν |
| \ντοτρίκεσεκμελαιναν |
| \γοναδίφεροισι |

15

| | | 
|---|---|---|
| έλατίκεσκοπς \ήν |
| ουδυνατονγενεσθαι |
| \βροδόπαχυνάνων |
| \καταγασφεροισάν |
| ουνύμωσε \εμαρψε |
| \άτανάκοιτιν |
| \μενανομισδι | |
| \αίσοπασδοι |
| \τούτοκάιμοι |

20

| | | 
|---|---|---|
| \λουλέ \γγχε |
| | .. | vs |
| φίλει | .. | .. |
| και | .. | .. |
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).

| mentions | Andromeda, a rival who is alluded to in several already extant fragments. |
| Frs. 1 + 2. | In the small Frs. 33 and 34 further coincidences with previously known verses are probably to be recognized. |

Plate II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 2 (a).</th>
<th>Frs. 1 + 2.</th>
<th>Plate II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>

| | | |
| | | |
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Fr. 3.

Col. i.  Fr. 4.

Col. ii.

.

.

. .

5  πανδάδιον[ ]

. .

ης[ ]

καιταισιμενα[ ]

. .

οδοιποροσάνιν[ . . . ] . . [ ]

μύγισδεποτ' εἰσαίον' εκ[ ]

10  ψύχαδαγαπάτασσει[ ]

τεατ[.] ψευδευνέμη[ [.] κεσθ' αγανα[ ]

. .

εφθατεκαλαν[ ]

τατ' εμματακα[ ]

15  ονοιρεμελαινα[ ]

! .

φ[.] ιταισοτατ' ύπνοσ[ ]

γλυκυς . ερσ' ηδειν' ονίαςμι[ ]

ξάχωρισ' χνητανυναμ[ ]

επισωδεμ' εχειμηπεδέχη[ ]

20  μηδεμμακαρονελ[ [— ]

ονγάρκενονυτω[ . ]

απίρματακαλ[ ]

γενοιστοδεμοι[ ]

ηποσ .

toισπαντε[ ]

Fr. 5.

.

. .

σιτα[ [.] ρομμακ[ ]

. .

ρομ[ ]

. .

δελα[ [.] αιτούτ' επικε . [ ]

. .

[.] αιμωνόλαφ[ ]
Fr. 3.

Col. i. Col. ii.
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. . . . . .
] } ϑεντ[ο
] ' ου γαρ κ'[ε
] ]
] 
] 
] 'Επτάξατε [ 
] δάφνας ὅτα [ 
] ης 5 πἀν δ' ἄδιον [ 
] . ἦ κῆνον ἐλο[ 
] ... καὶ ταῖς μὲν α[ 
] οὐκόπορος ἄν[. . .] [. . 
] μῦσι δὲ ποτ' εἰσάιον' ἐκλ[ 
] 10 ψύχα δ' ἀγαπάτα συν[η] 
] τέανθ(α) δὲ νῦν ἐμ[ 
] [. ]κεσθθ' ἀγανα[ 
] ] ἐφθατε' κάλαν [ 
] ] τὰ τ' ἐμματα κα[ 
] ]
] ]
] ]
] 15 'Ονοιρε μελαινα[ 
] ] φ[ο]ύτας ὅτα τ' ὑπνος [ 
] γλύκυς θεός· ἦ δεῖν ὀνίας μ[ 
] ] ζὰ χώρις ἔχην τὰν δύναμ[ 
] ] ἐλπὶς δὲ μ' ἔχει μή πεθέχη[ν 
] ] 20 μηδὲν μακάρων ἐλ[ 
] ]ρομα[ 
] ] προσ· 
] αὖθραμα κάλ[ 
] γένοιτο δὲ μοι [ 
] τοῖς πάντα[ 

Fr. 4.

. . . . . .
[. . . . .] σιτα[ 
[. . . . .]ρομε[ 
[. . . . .]δέλασ[ 

Fr. 5.

. . . . . .
[. . . . .]ων μακ[ 
[. . . . .]κα[ 
[. . . . .]τοῦτ' ἐπικε . [ 
[. . . . .]αίμων ὅλοφ[ώιος ?
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Fr. 6.

σεμίκα
καλα... άσεγωνκεάςω
μυλοτ... ἥλεοπενθιλήαμ
δακτ... προπερμαμα
μελ... πιγλύκερον [ ]
ἀμελλιχοφων
δειληνβαίδαη[ ]
δροσ... εσσα[ ]

Fr. 8.

ἀθανα[ ]
ἐρασε[ ]
τ[ ]
εδοισι[ ]

19 [ ]χαριέντ[ ]

Fr. 9. Plate II.

δαρκεντήμοσσι[ ]
Nav/tag[ ]

ouμανεφίλησι[ ]
νυνδεννεκα[ ]
τοδ'αίτιονουτ[ ]
ουδενπόλι[ ]
[ ]νδ'φ[ ]
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Fr. 6.  5  ἤσαν θεοὶ εὖ[  ἧλιος δ[  ἦλιος Πενθιλήαν  10   
 |]σα κα[κότροπ'. ἄμμα[σ  [μέλος] τι γλύκερην . [  [α μελλιχρόφων[  α[γιντ[  5   

Fr. 7.  5  ἀν][δρομέδαν [,] [,]  10   
 |[ρ]όπον δ[  ἰσαν θεοὶ εὖ[  ἦλιος δ[  ἦλιος Πενθιλήαν  10   
 |]σα κα[κότροπ'. ἄμμα[σ  [μέλος] τι γλύκερην . [  [α μελλιχρόφων[  α[γιντ[  5   

Fr. 8.  5  ἀθάνατ[  10   
 |]αγιω[η[  [νακ[  . . . . . .

Fr. 9.  5  ὁδέρκεν ἐπώμοσα[  10   
 |]ν ἔτι τὰν παῖδα δ[  ἀβρ[δ]αν κἀν χερι[  10   
 |]ε[. . . .] παρε[  . . . . . .

D
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 10.

\[ \text{ovav} \]
\[ \text{ηνοῦδε} \]
\[ \text{ησίμερ} \]
\[ \text{ταίδάμα} \]
\[ \text{αὐθος} \]
\[ \text{μερον} \]
\[ \text{ετερπ} \]

Fr. 11.

\[ \text{εβίς} \]
\[ \text{ρα} \]
\[ \text{αὐαφροδίτ} \]
\[ \text{δυναμιɚς} \]
\[ \text{σαλλοι} \]
\[ \text{ϊσεχουσα} \]
\[ \text{εναθαας} \]
\[ \text{αλλει} \]
\[ \text{ασεερσας} \]

Fr. 12.

\[ \text{αμπ} \]
\[ \text{λέσειβ} \]
\[ \text{ηηλελά} \]
\[ \text{εθελα} \]

Fr. 13.

\[ \text{αμαλλα} \]
\[ \text{ναμ} \]
\[ \text{νοθειμ'ε} \]
\[ \text{ρωσμέν} \]
\[ \text{λικ'υπα} \]
\[ \text{βα} \]
\[ \text{σαρεπαυ} \]
\[ \text{μανκανγυς} \]
\[ \text{αρμονίαςβ} \]
\[ \text{αθηνχρον'άα} \]
\[ \text{δελγηα} \]
\[ \text{ατόνιςφι} \]
\[ \text{παντεσσι} \]
\[ \text{εη[.]} \]

Fr. 14.

\[ \text{αμμ} \]
\[ \text{καα} \]
\[ \text{ποίσαι} \]
\[ \text{κλεηδο} \]
\[ \text{πλοκαμ} \]
\[ \text{εσδάμα} \]
\[ \text{ανθρώπ} \]
\[ \text{λυμαιν} \]
\[ \text{τεκαπ} \]

Fr. 15.

\[ \text{ποςεσ[.]} \]
\[ \text{παντα} \]
\[ \text{ατέρα} \]
\[ \text{λοκα} \]

Fr. 17.

\[ \text{θή} \]
\[ \text{πάςχρ} \]

Fr. 16.

\[ \text{βροδο} \]
\[ \text{ἐνθα} \]
\[ \text{ραμ} \]

Fr. 18.

\[ \text{αμοι} \]
\[ \text{τε} \]
\[ \text{τι} \]
Fr. 10.  
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Fr. 11.

Fr. 12.

Fr. 13.

Fr. 14.

Fr. 15.

Fr. 16.

Fr. 17.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 18</th>
<th>Fr. 19</th>
<th>Fr. 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]... oυδε[</td>
<td>]... φ[</td>
<td>] . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ταυταλ[</td>
<td>] . [.] θυραμ[</td>
<td>] . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]λαισιμ[</td>
<td>] oιχαλέπ[</td>
<td>] . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]πλη[νι[</td>
<td>]δεκ[</td>
<td>] .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . σθεο . [</td>
<td>]ς[</td>
<td>]σην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]έρωσ . [</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αλ[</td>
<td>α[</td>
<td>αυ[</td>
<td>κατ[</td>
<td>[ . ] [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ευ[</td>
<td>εμ[</td>
<td>εμ[</td>
<td>μήμ[</td>
<td>κα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ[</td>
<td>σεθ[</td>
<td>μήμ[</td>
<td>τα[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δα[</td>
<td>πα[</td>
<td>δ[ δώ .</td>
<td>τα[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οπ[</td>
<td>5 τ . [</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>λα[</td>
<td>] . [</td>
<td>]αμο[</td>
<td>] . [ . ] . [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]σετα[</td>
<td>]μητε[</td>
<td>]αμμα[</td>
<td>] . σάδ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]μμαι[</td>
<td>]διασά[</td>
<td>]υπε[</td>
<td>]λα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]έτεξα [. ]ρο[</td>
<td>]εγ-αλλ[</td>
<td>]λη[</td>
<td>]νιάν[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]δενάμεσ[</td>
<td>]μονω[</td>
<td>]μεδ . [</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]συσύγα[</td>
<td>]μω[</td>
<td>]μάστε[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]άλονα[</td>
<td>] . [</td>
<td>] . k[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]δαλ[</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 18</td>
<td>Fr. 19</td>
<td>Fr. 20</td>
<td>Col. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 21 | Fr. 22 | Fr. 23 | Fr. 24 | Fr. 25 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dλ[</td>
<td>d[</td>
<td>o[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>t. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 26 | Fr. 27 | Fr. 28 | Fr. 29 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 30.</td>
<td>Fr. 31.</td>
<td>Fr. 32.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| έριμυα | ζοθν | Λια. Μ. γειμ |}
| γνυ | σ | 
| κο | | ισαλιτρα |
| άι | | |}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 33.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>απυθεοθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ισταλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μν[[π]τ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έρθεο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 ] | ]αισ |}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 34.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καίτε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μηδεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νυνδά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μηβολλε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Μορφι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 35.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]ο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάμενα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| τοννεφ | άστοπέλη | |} 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 36.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]ο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 37.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]ονκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]πάμενα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ]τοννεφ | άστοπέλη | |} 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 38.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]ο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάμενα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| τοννεφ | άστοπέλη | |} 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 39.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]ο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάμενα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| τοννεφ | άστοπέλη | |} 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 40.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]ο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάμενα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| τοννεφ | άστοπέλη | |} 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 31.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | | |}
| | | |}
| | | |}
Fr. 30.  

\[ \mu \varepsilon \rho \mu \nu \alpha [ \sigma \theta \eta \nu ] \]
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Fr. 41.  Fr. 42.  Fr. 43.
[λαισ[  ]κλα[  ]δω . [  ]τόλμ[  
]
δοσ[  ]έσ[  ]  
5  ]σμ[  ]  
}

Fr. 44 = P. Halle 2 (Dikaiomata, pp. 182 sqq.).
[(πυχοισα
[θελ'ωντάπαίσαν[  ]  .  εσοννημμα[  ]τωνκαλημ
5  ]πεδαθυμοναίψα[  ]σατυχηνθεληση[  ]ρεμοιμαχεσθα[  ]λιδάναιπίθεισα[  ]υ'συδεψψαροισθα
10  ]έτειταιλλε .  .  ]έλασ[  ]  

Fr. 45.  .  
_σαπ[  _με[  

Fr. 1 + 2. 8. The end of this line is difficult. Either ἰω or ἄω may be read, and the letter following ἰω has a rounded base which, if the line is to be scanned, seems consistent only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 41.</th>
<th>Fr. 42.</th>
<th>Fr. 43.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[άβροις ἐπίχα[</td>
<td>]δικανέ . [</td>
<td>]υπ'. Ἕ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[παθεμί[</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>]αὐταν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ναβα[</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 44 = P. Halle 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[τύχοισα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[θέλ' ὁν τ' ἀπαίσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέ]λεσον νόημα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ετον κάλημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὃς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ρ ἔμοι μάχεσθα[ι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ι. σύ δ' εὖ γὰρ οἴσθα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ελασ[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 45.

Σαπ[φούς
με[λὼν δ?}

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

11. χελώναν is gen. plur.; cf. 1231. 14. 8, n. For χελώνα cf. Orion 28. 15 (Sapph. 169) ὥς παρὰ Σάφοι χελών τινή, where χελώνα should now be restored. The doubled ν is perhaps to be recognized also in Babbrius 115. 4.

12. The words χρώτα γῆρας ἐμφευσα occurs 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 γένσθαι, the remark of Wilamowiz, Sappho und 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 recollected the original, to a displaced fibre. There is therefore no conflict with 1233. 8. 4 λάθε[σθα] ἅ, 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 (? νίξ] κατά γάνα φέρουσα: the participial clause might be applied to νίξ as symbolizing death), a of φέρουσα was probably the final letter of the line, but the surface of the papyrus is damaged.

21. Perhaps ἐφ’[α]ταν, or a superlative, e. g. καθότατον. But the reference remains in doubt.

24-5. These two verses are quoted by Athen. xv. 687 A (=Sapph. 79) καί τοῦ Σασφώ, γυνὴ μὲν πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ὀψα καὶ ποιήσα, ὁμως ἡ γένση τῷ καλῷ τῆς ἀδρότητος ἀφελεῖν λέγουσα θοδε’ ἐγὼ δὲ φιλημίμα ἀδροσίναν καὶ μοι τὸ λάμπρον ἔροι (v. l. ἔρις) ἐλλω καὶ τὸ καλὸν λέβογχεν, φανερὸν ποιούσα πάνω ὡς ἡ τοῦ ζῆν ἐπιθυμία τὸ λαμπρόν καὶ τὸ καλὸν εἶχεν (ἰ εἰληξεν) αὐτή. ταῦτα δ’ ἐστὶν νίκεια τῆς ἀρετῆς. Various attempts at restoration have been made, but, as is now seen, Blass alone was right in marking a lacuna after ἀδροσίναν and in taking τὸ λάμπρον . . . λέβογχεν as a complete verse, in which the only alteration needed is ἔρος ἀλλω (so Blass: cf. Fr. 11. 4 ἀ]δὸλογοι δ’ ἔρωτες (?) or ἔρος τῶ ἀλλω. In the preceding verse there are five syllables to be supplied after ἀδροσίναν, 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 ἀβρών, this was perhaps preceded by an adverb qualifying φιλημίμα, e. g. ἐξοχα, ἐξ μάλα, πόλι’ ἔρτη, or a predicate of τοῦτο, as ἀδό γε. The papyrus may of course have agreed with Athen. in the spelling φιλημίμα, but κάλημα 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 τολο[ 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. δάφνας: or Δάφνας?
6. A dot in front of the line seems meaningless and may be accidental.
11. It does not seem possible to read τίστα, 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.
15. e. g. μέλαινας διὰ νίκτος οἱ μελαινάς περίγεοσίν.
16. e. g. [καταχειν] Βελεφάρωι λάθων or [Βελεφάρ] ἄμμων κατὰ δὴ καλύψῃ.
18. ζι χώρις ἔχετι: the tmesis is indicated in the papyrus by the accentuation.
20. ν or χ may be read in place of λ.
21. οὐ is more suitable than εὐ or αὐ. The accent on γάρ points to κ ἔνω, not κ ἔνω.

Fr. 4. 2. Possibly Ἄνδρομέδα, whose name recurs again in Fr. 7. 5; as Lobel observes, Aristid. ii. 508 οἷς δὲ καὶ Σαπφοῦς ἀκηκοέναι . . . λεγούσης, ὅς αὐτὴν αὐ Μοῦσαι τῷ ὀψιν ὁλίβιν τε καὶ ἠγωθέντων ἐποίησαι, καὶ ὃς υὐδ' ἀποθανοῦσης ἔσται λήθη might perhaps be brought into connexion with ll. 5 sqq.

4. The vestiges of the fourth letter are consistent with ζ, ξ, 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 a 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 ἐν cf. e. g. 1233. 2. ii. 8, 1360. i. 10. μέλαβροισι, . . . δόμισιν or some synonym may be supplied.

Fr. 5. 3. ὄλοφ[ῶιος, 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 ὀλοφροῖνος.

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 Ravenas in Aristoph. Thees. 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. τ' ἱπροίδησα, 78. 1 Δικά (cf. Choerob. In Heph. c. i 4). 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'. σε can hardly be Sappho herself, with a different second person in the next line.

2. εγώνυκ is analogous to e. g. 1231. i. i. 23 εμνασθ' α[λα], 1234. i. 11 πώσλων. 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 α indicates that Πενθήλιαν is fem. gen. plur., in agreement with some such word as παϊδῶν; cf. Frs. 1 + 2. i i n., and for the adj. Πενθίλης,

1234. 6. 10.

4. κο[κό]ρροπ' seems probable, though the letters ακω must have been rather spread out to fill the lacuna. λ or χ might be read in place of α.

6. Cf. Aristaenetus i. 10 (Sapph. 129) αἱ μονοκόπτεραι τῶν παρθενῶν καὶ μελιχιφωνοι (i. μελιχιφωνοι), τούτο δή Σαπφοῦς τὸ θάνατον φήγειμα. The form μελιχιφωνοι ascribed to Sappho in the similar passage Philostr. In. ii. 1 should now disappear until otherwise attested. 1


Fr. 7. 3. Cf. Sapph. 2. i ἵσος βίοσιν.

4. ἀλτρη: a very small speck on the edge of the papyrus after the second α, if it is ink, may be a medial stop, or, possibly, a vestige of e. g. a final ν. The fem. ἀλτρη occurs in Simonides 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 τα and κα.
8. Not ἵλερον.
12. Probably μα or να. 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 επ, l. 2 πα, l. 3 καν.
1. ἑξιξεν is puzzling. ρ is more probable than γ, which is the only alternative and also difficult to interpret. If επω is right, the ω was rather smaller than usual, but εγω is not more attractive.

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. ἐρ[ωτε]: cf. Frs. 1+2, 24-5, n., and Himerius i. 4 εἰσ νευμένον δύνα (sc. Σωπφω) καὶ Ἀφροδίτην (cf. l. 3) ἐφ' ἄρματι Χαράτων καὶ χορδὸν Ἐρώτων συμπαίστορα. ἐρ[ασται οἱ ἐρ[ωτε] 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 ο or ω instead of ρ.
8. The letter before the lacuna was apparently either ε or σ, not α.
10. ἀφ' : ἀδ[ι] seems to be excluded.

Fr. 14. 4. If κλεγυρ[ι] is one word, the fragment must be from near the ends of lines; but the division κλεγυρ[ι] (δ' υπ?[ι]) is possible.
5. e.g. ]], ]μ.

Fr. 15. 1. ι, ρ, ν may be read in place of τ.
3. ἀτερος for τετερος had already occurred in 424. 9. The interlinear insertion may be by the original scribe.

Fr. 18. 2. ι 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 diastole, 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 parapraphi are sometimes rather short.

Fr. 26. 3. ι 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. jων 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 [nao] quite well, and the preceding acute accent is just in the right place if ἐρρας was written.

Fr. 34. 1. καὶ τ' ; or καὶτ' (a). 5. if rightly read, probably = Sapph. 76, from Hephaest. 64, Ἐὔμορφοτέρα Μνασίδικα τάσ αἵματα Τυριννος. 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 δηντ' is circumflex or acute, but the former is in accordance with 1231. 15. 3.

5. For ἵδε cf. 1233. 4. 2; this in conjunction with the accented ε makes τ(ε) likely.

6. έκας : or έκατ.

Fr. 38. 2. πελειος is possibly for πελειος, ' dark '; cf. πελείοια.

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

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

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

4. αύταν or ταύταν.

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, τιχοίσα 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. ἔθανταπάισαν, ἔθαν τὰ παίσαν edd.; but the facsimile shows clearly an acute accent on ε and suggests an elision mark after λ. ἔθαν then seems assured, and ὄντι can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as ὄν τ', the retracted accent replacing the circumflex, as elsewhere in papyri (cf. e. g. 223. int.). Hence the last word will be either ἄπαισαν or ἄπαίσαν, according as the accent or the mark of quantity on the final a is accepted; ἄπαισαν acc. fem. would conflict with other evidence.

3. ἱσον 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. 1. 26–7 δασα δέ μοι τελέσσαι βοῦος ἰμέρρει τέλεσον. 7. 3–4, Alc. 77 ζεὼ τελέσχ νόμα.

6. ἑστια: cf. e. g. Sapph. 1. 26 quoted in the preceding note; ἑστι edd.

7. ἐπὶ (γῆ?) ἐπὶ: ? edd., who note that ρ is possible.

8. πίθευσα: cf. 1233. 2. ii. 2ο πίθευς, 'πίθευσα edd.

9. ἀπείρωσα, ἀπείρωσα edd., suggesting that πέρωσα was meant. The facsimile indicates the expected circumflex over ευ, and hardly justifies ζεφ, the letters being too small and crowded. Apparently γαρ οὐσα is quite possible, as well as γε in front of θυ.

10. τὰ λε. edd., but α obviously cannot be correct, and the facsimile shows that the interlinear mark stood over the next letter and suggests a diaeresis rather than a circumflex. If the diaeresis is right, δελ (i. e. δελλ) seems necessary, but the termination remains in doubt; to judge from the facsimile, λε was followed by two letters or a letter and a high stop, or perhaps by a broad ν.

Fr. 45. That this fragment of a title, which was found in the immediate vicinity of 1787, belonged to the same roll is not certain; the hand is not identical, though similar in type.

1788. ALCAEUS?

Fr. 4 18.6 x 5.8 cm. Late second century.

Plate II (Fr. 15).

The following lyric fragments in Aeolic dialect proceed from the same find as 1787, and are in a script which, though smaller, is very similar in type; the formation of some letters, however, notably μ, is different, and the two MSS. cannot be taken for the work of a single scribe. A further distinguishing feature is the presence in 1788 of marginalia in a small cursive, attributable to the later decades of the second century, and presumably contemporary with the poetical text. In one of these notes reference is made to the grammarian Didymus (Fr. 15. i. 10). Accents, breathings, &c., resemble those in 1787, but a stop in the low position is here used in addition to the two other kinds. To what extent these adjuncts are original or secondary is not clear. By an inconvenient coincidence the present text, like the Sappho, was accompanied by other lyric but not Aeolic fragments in an apparently identical hand, and a correct ascription of the many smaller pieces is hardly attainable. Accordingly the procedure adopted with 1787 is followed in this case also, and only those fragments which
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. 1. 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.

[. . .]λεξάνθιδοσιπ[  
[. . .]ιθεσα'α πυλιμνασπο[  
[. . .]ανεκκοροφάνοποθεν[  
[. . .]άνκαιψχρονύδωραμπε[  

5 [. . . . .]άνκαλαμοσχλῶρ[  
[. . . . .]λάδειονρεον,ον[  
[. . . . .]ηλεφάνην'καλδ[  
[ 18 letters ]  

Fr. 2.

]μνει[  
]τιτάτε[  
]  
]πνειπη[  
5 ]αδανδρ[  
]αν'αδεκ[  
]τ'ωμε[ . . . [.]λα[  
]τώα[[ρ]]α . οτρώμμε[  
]μντογενηομελανεμ[  

10 ]μυριαπαντα αντηπατον. [  
] . [.]ελίτωσ  
]διβδωνδρ[  
]  
]τ/κα[  

Fr. 3.

]Χει[  
]. ευτω ταυταγ[  
]α ενδεωθεψ[  
]σεται  
5 ]λευθερασι[  
]μεναι[  
]γυναικε[.].ζοσ[  

Fr. 4.

].,ξτυ[  
]τασεη[  
]τεμονοη[  
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Fr. 1.

[. . . ? π]λεξάνθιδος ἵππ[
[ὁρ]νίθεσο' ἀπὸ λίμνας πολ[
[ἀκρ]αν έκ κορύφαν ὀππόθεν ἐ[ν]
[γ]λαύκαν ψιχρον υδώρ ἀμπελ[
5 [. . . . . . ]αν κάλαμος χλώρ[ος]
[. . . . . . κ]ε[λ]άδεσ ἡμινον δν . [n]
[. . . . . . τ]η[λεφάνην'] καθ[δ]. [n]
[ 18 letters ]'

Fr. 2.

[μ]ψω σι[]
[']ι τὰ τε . [n]
[. . . . . . άπ]νελπη[]
[. . . . . . ο]ν. αι δε κ[
[']τ' ο με[.]. . . [.λαι[]
] τῳ γάς (?) ἀποτρώμε[ν]
ν'ῦν τὸ γένην μέλαν ἔρμ[εναι]
10 ] μύρια πάντα αὐτή ἀπὸ τοῦ . [n]
[. . . . . . έ]λίτως
[. . . . . . τ]όβων δρ[[
[. . . . . . ]ο[.]. . ν]
[. . . . . . ]τ( ) (ιστι?) κα[.]

Fr. 4.

[. . . . . . . έτυ[]
[ ]τας ἐπη[]
[ ] ἱμερτον δρη[.]

Fr. 3.

[Ξ]ε[i[
[. . . . . . έ]υτω ταύτα σι[]
[. . . . . . ά]ν δὲ τῷ φθειν [n]
[. . . . . . έ]σται
5 ]έλευθεραις α[.]
[. . . . . . μ]εναι[
[. . . . . . γ]νωκό(ς) ἵπτε[ι] οο[.]

E
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5] δα[...]
] . αισκολοκύνταισινα[φ[φ
]στα[.]. .]εο[]σαπαλι[ξ]
] [δ] . .] αι[.].]δυτ[αναφα[ .[ ]]
10] . σάγαθοστα[ .[ ]
] δάμαπω[.]. .[ ]
] . έμε[.]. .] η[ . [ ]]
] αι[ ]
] ιοναιμ[ ]
15] . νιωκερρ[ ]
] γαρ[σ].].]αισε[. ]
] . ο[.].]ενάστω[ ]
] . τε[.].] Χ[.]. [ ]
] συναισποή[ ]
20] . πασδ'ουγαρέγω[ ]
] πόνθασκατα[ ]
] . ισκαπολλαχαρις[ ]
] δοισ.τοισδ'υπίσω[ ]
] ραι τ[.].]συναδ'όκ[ [ ]
25] ]τολίασκυμ'αλ[.].]σε[ . [ ]
] . ιστουτ'ουκοιδεν.ένοιιτ[ ]
] ιουσινομιλλειταδειν[ ]
] λάντω[.].]χρήματος[ ]
] κ[.].]τ' ωλομεί[ ]
30] . τωντευ . ηδε[ ]
] κακονεσχατ[ ]
] ηψυχάνακατ[ ]
] ν'άδ'ωυ [.].]εσσ[ [ ]
] . δ'άλλοσ[.].]δ[ ]
35] ] εραι.γα[ ]
] ψυχρ [.].[ ]
] μμεν[.].[ ] [ ]
] α[ ]
] θαδ[.].]οδοκ[ ]
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κ]ούφω δ' ὑπίης[ν

5 ]δα[...].]ες π[α]δας ἀπ[ ] . αις κολοκύνταις ὑπα[ ]’]στασὶ[.].]εο[.].]αις ἀπαλ[ ] ]... αι[...].]δ' ὑπ[ ] ]αναφα...[


15 ] s νάα ποη[σ


30 Fr. 5.
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\[\text{ατον[.\textendash.Ω[} \]
\[\text{ελιδ[} \]
\[\text{ελκεαι[} \]

Fr. 6.

Fr. 7.

Fr. 8.

\[\text{πε[} \]
\[\text{π[} \]
\[\text{δευ[\textendash.μαί[} \]
\[\text{σχοσκ[} \]
\[\text{πολλάν[} \]

Fr. 9.

\[\text{περσισυφ[} \]
\[\text{ταμ[} \]

Fr. 10.

Fr. 11.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

\[\text{καλα[} \]
\[\text{πεδιο[} \]
\[\text{πολι[} \]

\[\text{μεν[} \]
\[\text{μ[τώ[} \]
\[\text{κατα[} \]
\[\text{τουτομε[} \]
\[\text{γαράγ[} \]
\[\text{αρέκ[} \]

\[\text{κ[τ[} \]
\[\text{ε[π[} \]

\[\text{θη[} \]
\[\text{μηκο[} \]
\[\text{τουτ'εγο[} \]
1788.  *NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS*  

[...]  5.  

| 40 | 5 |  
| jατων | α[  | η ἔρραν |  
| | | |  
| jελκεα | | |  

---

**Fr. 6.**

[...]

**Fr. 7.**

[...]

**Fr. 8.**

[...]

---

**Fr. 10.**

[...]

**Fr. 11.**

[...]

**Col. i.**

[...]

**Col. ii.**

[...]

---

**Fr. 12.**

[...]

---

**Fr. 10.**

[...]

**Fr. 11.**

[...]

---

**Fr. 12.**

[...]

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 13.</th>
<th>Fr. 14.</th>
<th>Fr. 15. Col. i. Plate II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[συσταί \会选择</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[πάθης ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[εἰσομαι ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[εἰ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[εἰσουσιαζοντεσ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[εἰσουσιαζοντεσσονε ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[κεραναγεσ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[γαρ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ωγγηγο ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[λων ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[νεζεν ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[φυθίδιν ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[γεσκ : ε : ελωσηπαν ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[αντιτοπουσιοτεκε ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ν ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ανεισουσερο ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[σαι ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[τιφ ζ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[πόλλακ \] \[πόλλυμ \] \[ε\]
Fr. 13.

[iof] 

Fr. 14.

[iof]sigmai [i] 

\[\text{πόλλα κ[} \]

Fr. 15. Col. i.

[iof] 

}\]

[iof] 

}\]

[iof] 

[iof] 

\[\text{5} \]

}\]

[iof] 

\[\text{10} \]

[iof] 

[iof] 

\[\text{15} \]

[iof] 

[iof] 

\[\text{20} \]
Fr. 1. 1. The length of the initial lacuna in this and the following lines is determined by l. 4, where χακαν is evidently to be restored. Neither πλεξάνθης nor λεξάνθης (or -θης) occurs elsewhere.
Fr. 15. Col. ii.

2. The first \( \sigma \), though rubbed, is practically certain.
3. \([\alpha \rho]a\nu\) is perhaps not too much for the lacuna, \( \rho \) being a narrow letter.
4. \([\gamma a]\alpha k\nu\) is gen. plur. fem., as shown by the mark of length on \( \alpha \nu; \ldots \) in 1. 5 was
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another word of the same kind. The language here is close to that of Sapph. 4 ἀμφὶ δὲ
(ἐδωρ) ψυχρὸν κελάδες (cf. l. 6) δὲ ἐσθοὶ μαλίνω ν, but the present passage can hardly have
been the source of that fragment.

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

7. τὴν ἠθέαντο: it is unlucky that the initial letter is missing, as in 1231. 1. i. 27 [τῆς] ε (?)
1233. 4. 10 [τῇ] λοθεὶν. τῇ λυ ν rests on the evidence of grammarians.

Fr. 2. 7. Not δ Ἐλευσσι (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 ἀπορρωμῆς, and ἠγας is unknown.
9. η of γεννεῖν 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 com-
bination 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 γνωκε(ς) is a more
probable reading than αὐτοκλνο(ινθδ). The two fragments may, however, well have belonged
to the same column.

Fr. 4. 3. e.g. ὀρ[η]μ', ὀρ[η] ν.
6. The second o of κολοκυτίας 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. ]: ] is rather suggested by the remains, but seems excluded by the metre.
20. συν τασδ', θυραςδ' are possibilities, neither very satisfactory.
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', ις τοῦ, αινιν and part of α, αν 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 αδειν is well below the line.
27. ηθ[θ': γνωθι is hardly possible.
28. A mark on the edge of a hole above the doubtful o 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 to which Fr. 4 belonged.
4. ι 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 ι[ηρπ]ω ν hardly fills the lacuna.

Fr. 6. 3. The accent on a is doubtful; it might be e.g. a mark of length.
4. ια: or ]ιω.
Fr. 7. 4. κατάγρει recurs at the end of a line in 1233. I, 9; cf. Sapph. 43.
8. ν is a correction from ι. If ν 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. τηρεων: or perhaps τηρ[ι]ν.
10. Didymus is known to have written a book περι ἀρμικῶν ποιητῶν, but this seems to have been of a historico-literary nature rather than a critical ὑπόμημα 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.
ii. 3. Either διωτ[σ] or διαθ[λ] can be read.
9. As in 1787. 34. i, τ may represent either τε or τοι.
11. παρέσκευ here provides a parallel for Powell’s admissible suggestion περσκέδωσα in 1231. i. 18.
13. τι: or τι, [, .
14. ετ[ι]: or ετ[ι]. The letter following τυ may well be ο.
16. The accent on α may be taken for a mark of short quantity. Χ[ι] is possible in place of τι.
18. For the (Doric) form ις for τυ cf. 1360. i. 9, where ις is better taken as 3rd person, and 1231. 55. 4, where ις is probably to be recognized; τυ, which is read in Sapph. 106, may now well be emended. The following word as originally written was apparently σωναίσεται αυτή (αιτή is possible), which was amended in some way, perhaps by the substitution of αντρείοι or αντρείοι for αυτή, but there has been no deletion.
19. For the doubled μ in κλάμμα cf. e. g. Sapph. 1. 16 κάλημμα, 14. 1 and the Halle fragment νόημα, 1231. 13. 4 ἐποίημεν. κάλον γορπωρ. is evidently parenthetical. παλαιον which was first written = πάλαιον (adv.), πάλαιον being the Aeolic form according to Eust. 28. 33. Whether the correction is due to the original hand or to a diorthotes is not evident.
21. Vestiges above the line suggest ψ rather than τ, and e. g. δ[ψι] 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 τοιονται may be part of the preceding letter.
22. The letter after το 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 (το), with a vestige of ink close by on the edge of a hole in front of ο. Perhaps τοντας was altered to τοντος. Further on, if ο 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 η should be read instead of η. But the oval is considerably narrower, and the cross-stroke longer, than in a normal δ, and δ is, moreover, intractable metrically. Perhaps then the scribe began to write ε and converted this to η. If η is right, ημι μη would be suitable enough. The first visible letter must be either β, ο, ρ, or φ, and next to this the slight remains suit the upper part of a β better than anything else. [τα]ρβημι
would sufficiently satisfy the conditions, if that word were likely. For δρω [. . .]σιν, δρωσ[οι]σιν naturally suggests itself but is difficult in the context. Possibly δρωσ[ω]σιν or δρωσ[οι]σιν may be restored on the analogy of 1234. 2. i. 9 τρόπην, ii. 7 ὑπέτροπε. The high stop after this word seems superfluous in any case.

25. ἐπιστήμην [οι]: cf. 1789. i. i. 5 (v.l. ἐπισταμ., probably correct) and Alc. 46 ἐπώσαιν ἤμοι γέγονσαι, which has been gratuitously altered to ἤπι ὄνοσιν. There is more to be said for the correction ἤμοι γέγονσαι.

26. ἢ: or γ or ς.

27. e. g. καρτε[ί], καρτε[ρ].

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

1789. Alcaeus.

Fr. i 11·7 x 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. i. 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,
was borrowed from Alcaeus had already been suspected on the ground of Alc. 43; another (previously unknown) form of Asclepiad stanza is exemplified in 1234. 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 μοναρχία 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 diastolē 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.
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Fr. i. Col. i. Plate III.

[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]

Fr. 1. Col. i. Plate III.

[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]

Fr. 1. Col. ii.

φαρσωμεθώσωκιστ[ ]

εσθ'έχυρονλίμεναδρο[ ]

καμητινόκνοσμολθ[ ]

λαχη'προδηλουγαρμεγ[ ]

5 μνασθητωπαροιθαμ[ ]

νωτισάνηρδοκιμοσγε[ ]
Fr. 1. Col. i.

[...]

5 [....]ενέτω μηδ’ ἐπονήμενοι

[ζαμενόντο] ν ἀέικεα, ζαμενόν τον ζαμενίτωσαν.

10 [....]εκα πόλλας πα. αμη. α[ ] ταμε[ ]


Fr. 2.

[...]

Fr. 3 Col. i

[...]

Fr. 1. Col. ii.

φαρξόμεθ’ ὡς ὀκιστ[α — ξ]

eis δ’ ἔχυρον λίμενα δρόμωμεν.

καὶ μὴ των’ ὄκνοι μόλθ[α]κος ἀμμέων?

λάβῃ, πρόδηλον γάρ μέγ[α συμφέρον’.]

5 μνάσθητε τῷ πάροιθα μ[ῶμω]

νῦν τις ἀνηρ δόκιμος γε[νέσθω].
καὶ μὴ καταισχυνωμεν[
ἔσλοις τὸ κηπησγάσυπακ[
[.]τανδ[  
10 τανπο[  
ἐόντε[  
τὼνσφ[  
εσικε[  
ταί[  
οςτε[  
15 αλλ . [  
iον[
[. . ] . [  
[  
Fr. 3. Col. ii.  
π[  
μ[  
20 γ[  
]ωφ[  
α' ἱδρεῖα . [  
] . [. . ] . α'πάν[  
καίμαλ'έωνα[  
5 ]νάντ'αίδροσπολ[  
]πελάσγωναιολ[  
τ.  
]ποκ'ἐξεπει[  
]μαζυλαθύρα[  
]κίρσαντ[  
10 ]ηαἰνω[  
]σισφάλ[  
[  
Fr. 5.  
[  
Fr. 6.  
[  
Fr. 7.  
]ταδεωσ[  
]  
]ν ῥάνδα[ [  
]βαρημουρος[  
]νον[  
]απολελειμ[  
]μενον[  
]  
Fr. 8.  
[  
5 ]ωνυμον.  
]α[  
]άψετ[  
]  
]άρον[  
]τ[  
]  
]. . . . . .
καὶ μὴ κατασχύνωμεν [ἀνανδρία?
ἔσλονς τόκης γάς ὑπὰ κειμένοις,
[oï?] τάνδ[ε?]?

10 τὰν πόλιν
éontēs Fr. 4.
tōn σφ[ Fr. 5.
eἰσικει [ ]
tai[s ]ote[

15 ἀλλα [ ] ḫον[ Fr. 6.
[ . . ] ·

Fr. 3. Col. ii. π[ Fr. 6.
μ[ . . . . .
20 γε[ ] ὁ φί[λ]
i[ ]α ἱδρεία . [
. . . . α πάν[ ]
. . . 5 ]νάντ᾽ ἄιδρος πόλ[λ]
] Πελάσγων Ἀιολ[ιδ]
] ποτ᾽ ἐξ Ἑπεί[ων?
ά]ναξ γλαφύρα[
]ε Κύρσα η[σ .

10 ]ηαισιν [ Fr. 8.
]οί σφάλ[ ]μάδε . [.]ν

]ἄψετ' [ ]
]άρον 4 δ[ ]τό[ . . ]
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### THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 9</th>
<th>Fr. 10</th>
<th>Fr. 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μδετωφ</td>
<td>ρματ</td>
<td>κατ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σινποψ</td>
<td>δηνω</td>
<td>λεαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αρεσοται</td>
<td>μη</td>
<td>σκακοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 12</th>
<th>Fr. 13</th>
<th>Fr. 14</th>
<th>Fr. 15</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>θεσμο[</td>
<td>καταφ</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>ζωη</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 16</th>
<th>Fr. 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 18</th>
<th>Fr. 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 20</th>
<th>Fr. 21</th>
<th>Fr. 22</th>
<th>Fr. 23</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>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
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| | | | |
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| | | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
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| | | | |
| | | | |
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| | | | |
| | | | |
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1789. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

Fr. 9.

| ν δὲ τῷ [ | ] | ρματ[ | ] |
| σιν ποση[ | ] | δην ὁ[ | ] |
| γ]ἄρ έσσετ' ἀ[ | ] | μη[ | ] |
| ]. oσ oυδέ[ | ] | | |

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.

| | | | |
| | | | |

---

5 ?έν]δίκως[ |
| | | |

F2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 24.</th>
<th>Fr. 25.</th>
<th>Fr. 26.</th>
<th>Fr. 27.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὑπαντάδε'να</td>
<td>ἑφ[</td>
<td>ἁλι[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπολλυταίγ[</td>
<td>ὡμα[</td>
<td>ἀλαί[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. ταιπ[</td>
<td>ἅπτων[</td>
<td>ἀρετῆς[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵπ[</td>
<td>δέξεσαι[</td>
<td>ἵππα[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>5 ντακάκ[</td>
<td>5 ἐμέ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ν'ω[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 28.</td>
<td>Fr. 29.</td>
<td>Fr. 30.</td>
<td>Fr. 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰ[</td>
<td>. κατ[</td>
<td>ἀδ[</td>
<td>ἀκάρσ'[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κα[</td>
<td>. . σπάισ[</td>
<td>ἀνδρ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δομον[</td>
<td>ἑημ[</td>
<td>γαράγη[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 32.</td>
<td>ἐμόροσαίσ[</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>5 ἵσονιατον[</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 ἐγώ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰ[</td>
<td>βρομοσεν[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καγ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὦτα[</td>
<td>ἱνομὲν[</td>
<td>ἀράδ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀμη[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 35.</td>
<td>Fr. 36.</td>
<td>Fr. 37.</td>
<td>Fr. 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἴον[</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>ἐρω[</td>
<td>. αλ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐροη[</td>
<td>. ἐν[</td>
<td></td>
<td>μεγα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td>γομ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 39.</td>
<td>Fr. 40.</td>
<td>Fr. 41.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>νωκ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fr. 24.  Fr. 25.  Fr. 26.  Fr. 27.
1 ν πάντα δὲ να[ ]φρο[ ]αλι [ ]
 ] ἀπόλλυται ν[ ]ομαί [ ]αλαι [ ]λίπ[ 
 ] ται πο[ ]πτων[ ]ἀρετεσ[ ]δμφι[ 
 ]τι[ ]δὲξται δ[ ]μα πε[ ]
5 ντα κακ[ ]ε μέ[ ]

Fr. 28.  Fr. 29.  Fr. 30.  Fr. 31.
5 ες[ ]κα[ ]αδ[ ]κάκος [ ]
κα[ ]σ παιδ[αν ? ]ἐνόρ[ ]ἐ τόπον [ 
] δόμον δ[ ]τη[ ]γάρ ἀγ[ 
Fr. 32.  ]ει μόρος αἴστ[ ]
. . . 5 νόσον ἡτον [ ]
ἐξ[ ]βρομος ἐν σ[ ]
καὶ γ[ ]μαξιβδη[ ]
ὦ τα[ ]μανδομεν [ον 
. . .
Fr. 33.  Fr. 34.  Fr. 35.  Fr. 36.  Fr. 37.  Fr. 38.
[αναδ [ ]ἀμη [ ]
. . .  ]σι καὶ σ[ ]
. . .
Fr. 39.  Fr. 40.  Fr. 41.
.]  [πωκ[ ]
. . .  ]
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, τ, λ, ρ be supposed to have occurred.

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

2. εὐπομαῖς, e. g., would be consistent with the very slight vestiges preceding ρ. 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. ]τευ: or perhaps τευ.

4. The letter after θ may be either α or λ, the papyrus being damaged where the cross-bar of the α would be. The following vertical stroke is so close to α that the choice seems limited to ι or ρ. 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. [?]θαπος could be read but is unconvincing in so doubtful a context, especially as a broader letter than ι would be expected. After κ, ι or ρ is perhaps most likely.

5. μεντω, στεντω, στεντω? For ἐπονήμει[ν] cf. 1788. 15. ii. 25, n.: ‘let them not return evil for good’; the διαστόλε was wrongly placed. The interlinear variant ἐπονήμει[ν] supports the form ἐπόνωσι in A. 46.

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

8. ζωστρηφο[ρ]με[νο]: the verb was apparently not previously attested.

9. γλυκεως: if the first letter is γ, which looks probable, the second must be either α or λ, and υκ 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 ταυ and ως corresponding with the text; but there seems to have been a considerable divergence otherwise, since γλ[ ] 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 ατ γαλ[ ] ἢμοι τότα . . . γε[νοι] ὀποτα 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 πόλλας 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 αυ is represented by a mere speck, which is capable of many interpretations; that before the final α was γ, τ, ρ, or τ. 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 αἰθ] μέινω may be suggested (cf. 1787. 36. 2).
14. ε]χις or λα]χις would suit the vestiges. The first letter may be α, κ, λ, or χ, the second, η, μ, ν, π; and γόμων, -οι or -ει are equally possible.

15-18 = Λκ. 19, from Heraclid. Alleg. Homer. 5 ὁμώος δὲ τὰ ὑπὸ τούτου (sc. Μυρτίλου) αὑστόρενος ἐτέρωθη ποιν λέγει τὸ κτλ. How the end of l. 15 should be restored is still uncertain. The MSS. of Heraclides give τῷ προτέρῳ νεῶμ or (AB) τῷ προτέρῳ νέως, for which τῶν προτέρων ὁμῶς has been conjectured by Seidler, τῶν π. ὀνόμα by Bergk, τῶν π. νέων by Hermann, τῷ π. νέων by Gaisford, and τῷ π. νέως by Blass. Of these the last alone is consistent with the papyrus, though 'νέως is not of course necessarily right. Fr. 37, which possibly belongs here, does not help.

16. The v. l. παρεξηγή is abnormal.

17. ἐμαύνει Heraclid., ἐμβά Seidler, ἐμβά νή(ατα), i.e. νεῖα, Bergk, who also suggests ἐμβα[ν]ή κάτα, πετραίλικτος ἀλμα, a restoration which is now put out of court by the papyrus, though the true version of the fourth line of the stanza is not yet within reach.

19. ἐρ: ε is equally possible. That a dot further on above the line represents a stop is quite uncertain.

ii. 1. Perhaps ἄκισθά τοίχους, as Murray suggests, but the object may have stood in the preceding line and this one has ended with e.g. νάος (Lobel).

2. ες: cf. l. 13, 1234 Fr. 1. 10 (Part XI, p. 56), and Sapph. 1. 19, where the MSS. give ες. ες is normal for Aeolic, though ες is hardly to be avoided in 1232. Fr. 2. 3.

3. For μόλικος, which seems to be novel, cf. 1233 i. 2. 10 κόδαρων, &c.; the superscribed variant would eliminate the Aeolism, as in l. 5 below and Fr. 22. 2. δόκοσ μόλικος is comparable to e.g. χλωρόν δός. As an alternative to ἀμμέων or ὕμμεων a participle like ἀιεῖδων or ἀμπείων 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. μέγα χειμ' ἀρην, as Lobel suggests.

5. παρώθα is analogous to e.g. ἐπισκα. At the end of the verse μ[ὁμω seems to suit the contrast between τῶ παρώθα and the emphatic νῦν at the beginning of the next line better than e.g. μ[ὁχθω or μ[όθω; the v. l. τῶν is however perhaps rather in favour of one of the latter words.

8. ἔλοις τούκασ: cf. 1234. 2. ii. 12 ἔλοις ἔστειλε ἐκ τοθῆν. 13. ἐσίκε: or ἐλαίει[τ]. 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 (α? δ?) 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.

Fts. 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 ἵον (diastole) or λ' (elision) can be read. At the end of the line a was perhaps followed by a round letter (σ?) the ink of which has run slightly.

5. ἰδρός occurs in Ion 34, and cf. Etym. Magn. ἰδρόσινη, Pindar, Nêm. 1. 63 ἰδροδίκαις.

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

9. The remains of this line are difficult. According to the Etym. Magn. Κήρα was another form of Κήρας, the Phocian coastal town, and a geographical name is not out of keeping with the rest of this fragment, especially if γλαφώρα [in l. 8 be taken to imply νες. 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 σελίδες 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. ἐπιτραδέασ, like τὰν θα- in l. 3, is a v. l., as is indicated by the enclosing dots.

5. ἀπολειμμα[μένων] is a gloss probably referring to the last word of the verse, the termination of which corresponds. The question arises whether μένων in the second line of the scholium is part of the word σπολειμμενον 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. δ[νέκχειν, σφ]νέκχει[ν]?

5. e. g. ἄνωνυμον, ἐπ' ἄνωνυμον. 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. γ[λ'] α[σερ'] or παρ[σερ']? A small curved mark above the τ appears to be part of a sign of elision.

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

6. o[ : or o[.

7. τπο [ : or τπ']. 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 ἰδιόν, with θα[νατ ], in the previous line; but ἰχτυ 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.
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 v 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. i. ii, and the appearance of Fr. 32 is also different.

Fr. 29. 4. Possibly δτιο or -σ, as in Aesch. Eum. 565. π may be read instead of τ, but not ι or another vowel, apparently. αω cannot be Acc. Plur. Fem. unless the accent was mistaken.

7. μα]νωδη is a gloss on μ]αινωμεν[ov.

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

Fr. 32. 3. ὁ ταῖες?

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. ]λ is an interlinear v.1.

5. The variant δηυ implies δαυε in the text.

1780. 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 acceptance of a rather confused note in Suidas, also Ibycus.1 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 1361, the copyist contrary to the usual practice has not indicated the main divisions by paragraphi, the strophic respension is evident. A short strophe and antistrophe of four lines is followed by an epode of five lines, the scheme being as follows:—

Strophe.

\[ \text{\textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright}, \]

\[ \text{\textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} - \text{\textcopyright} - \text{\textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright}, \]

\[ \text{\textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright}, \]

\[ \text{\textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \text{- \textcopyright} \]

1 Suidas, s.v. Ίβυκος, says... γίνει Βηθυνός: ενθάνδε εἰς Σάμων ἠλθεν, ὥστε αὐτὴ ἄρρητες Πολυκράτης, ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ. Χρόνος δὲ εἰς τὸν Ἐφέσου, Ἀλκιμίδης ν. 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 τυραννοῦ οὗ ἡ τῶν τυράννων πρῶτος, is unconvincing.
Epode.

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
&\text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \text{-} \\
\end{align*}\]

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 Ibyc. i. 5-6, 5. 1-2, 16. 4, and cf. Stesichorus 2. For Strophe i. 3, cf. Ibyc. i. 8, 9. 2, for Epode 1-2, Ibyc. 15, 18, 27, Stesich. 10, 48, and for Ep. 3, Ibyc. 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. \(\text{εξωπαπάτας}\) (l. 10) and \(\text{Πουλυκράτης}\) (l. 47, Πολ. Pap.) are metrical Ionisms which appear also in Pindar. \(\text{ἐπθλὸς}\) is apparently written, and \(\text{ἐλέθσαν}\) (l. 18) is noteworthy. Whether \(\text{ἐγὴρατο}\) in l. 41 is more than a vagary of the papyrus is not clear. No example occurs of the \(\text{σχῆμα 'Ιβόκειον}.\) In its accentuation the papyrus follows the Doric system (e.g. l. 2 \(\text{ηγάρον},\) 18 \(\text{πολυγόμφος}, 23 \text{μώσαο, 24 εμβάδεω, 47 εξεῖς}\) 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.
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Frs. 1 + 2. Col. i.

αιδαρδανιδαπριαμοιομε
τυπερικλεεσολβιουνηνάροι[ ]
οθενορνυμενι
υοσμεγαλοιοβουλιοι
5

υβάσελευσαπερείδει
ριστολυμονέχ[.]ντεσ
λεμουκαταδακρ[.]εντα[ ]
γαμονδανε[.]αταλαπεριο[ ]
σοθειραν[.]ακυπριδα.

10

υδεμοιωτεξειναπάταντ[ ]
v
επιθυμιονουτεταν[.]υρ[ ]

υήκαςσανδραν
αμοιστεπαιδασαλλου[ ]
αισθυψιπυλοιοαλωσι[ . . ] [ ]
15

αρανώνυμονουδεπ[ ]

ϕωναρεταν
εγραφανονουστεκόιλα[ ]

ϕόλυγόμοφοιελέυσα]

άικακονηρωσεσθ[ ]
20

. ευκρειωναγαμε[ ]

Frs. 2 + 3. Col. i.

[.]ρχεπλεισθ[ . . . ]δαςβασιλ[ . . . ]σαγοσανδροι
καιταμε[ . . . ]μοίσαιεσοφ[ . . . ]εναι
ευθλικωνίδ[ . . . ]εμβαίενλογ[ . . . ]
25

θνατοσδουκ[.]νανηρ
διερηχ[ . . . . ]ταεκασταιεποι
ναών[ . . . . ]ελαιοσαπαυλίδοσ
αιγαίονδι[ . . . ]υτονάπαργεσσ
ηλύθη[ . . . . ]ν
30

[.]ποτροφο[ . . . . ]εφωτεσ
[.]αλκασπ[ . . . . ]εσαχαιων
1790. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS 77

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. i.
1 [οὐ κ]αὶ Δαρδανίδα Πριάμοιο μέ-
2 [γ’ ἀσ]τυ περικλείες ὀλβίον ἡνάρων
3 ['Αργ]οθεν ὀρνυμένοι
4 [Ζη]νὸς μεγάλου βουλαῖς
5 1 [ξα]νθάς 'Ελένας περὶ εἰδεῖ
2 (δη)μν πολύμυμον ἔχ(ο)ντες
3 πόλεμον κατὰ δακρυ[ῦ]λευτα,
4 [Πέρ]γαμον δ’ ἀνεβ[α] ταλαπείριον ἄτα
10 1 [νῦ]ν δὲ μοι ὄστε ἐξειναπάταν Π[άρ]ν
2 [η]ν ἐπιθύμουν ὄστε τανό[σφ]ω[ο]ν
3 [υμ]νὴν Κασσανδραν
4 [Πρ]άμοιο τε παιδᾶς ἀλλοὺς
1 [Τρο]ιᾶς θ’ ὑψιπυλοῖο ἀλῶσ[ν], ὥ’
αντιστρ.
15 2 [οὐκ] ἄρ’ ἀνώνυμον· οὐδ’ ἐπ[ἀνέρχομαι]
3 [ηρ]ώον ἀρετᾶν
4 [ἐπ]εράφανον ὄστε κοίλαι
1 [νάς] πολυγόμφοι ἐλεύθα[ν]
2 [Τρο]ῖα κακὸν ἣρωας ἐσθ[λούς]
20 3 [τῶν] μὲν κρείων Ἀγαμέμ[νον]

Frs. 2–3. Col. i.
4 [ἡ]ρξε Πλεισθ[εν]δας βασιλ[εῦ]ς ἀγος ἀνδρῶν
5 Ἀτρέος ἐσ[θλοῦ] παῖς ἐκ π[ατρός]
1 καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄν Ἵμισαί σεσοφ[ισμ]έναι
2 εὖ 'Ελικωνίδ[ες] ἐμβαίεν ὕλογ[ες]
25 3 θνάτος δ’ ὁ[κ]εὶν ἄν̄ρ
4 διερό[ὺς] τὰ ἐκαστα εἰποί
1 ναιν, ὥς Μει[ν]έλαος ἀπ’ Ἀυλίδος
2 Αἰγαῖον δι[ᾶ] πό[λ]υμνον ἀπ’ Ἀργεος
3 ἡλυθε [Δαρδανία]ν
30 4 [ἐπ]ποτρόφο[ν], ὡς δ’κε φώτες
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[..]ωνεντρ[..]ερεστατοσα[..]χμα[..]
[..]..[..]ποδ[..]κυσαχιλλευος
[..]..[..]γασ[..]ωνισαλκι[..]

35 [..]..[..]αγ[..]γυρος[..]
[..]..[..]οσαπαργεος[..]
[..]..[..]σεσιλιον
[..]..[..]..

40 [..]..[..]αχρυσοστροφι[..]

Frs. 2 + 3. Col. ii. Plate III.

υλλιασεγηνατοτοι[..]πατρωιων
ωσειχρυσονορει
χρικωτρισάπεφθο[..]ηδη
τρωιο[..]ναιτερα[..]σαν

45 μορφανμάλεισκομοιον
τοισμενπέδακαλλεσαιεν
καιευπολύκρατεσκλεοσαφθινεξεισ

εςκατ[..]οιδακαιεμουκλεος

[..]μαχοσεντωπεριτευκροφηςι[..]ν[..]

50[..]..[..]τουκλαβιπουουουμετατο beya][
[..]..[..]τουτηνεγενεινειν
[..]..[..]αγαπεια[..]αιως
[..]..[..]ταυιαλ[..]τουλαμεν[..]τραμε[..]εστρα
[..]..[..]μασ[..]ε[..]ε[..]ε[..]

Fr. 4.

Col. i.  Col. ii.  Fr. 5.  Fr. 6.
[..]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
]    ..    ..    ..    ..
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2 [τ]ῶν μὲν πρὸ[οφ]ερέστατος α[ι]χυφ
3 [βαίν]ε[ι] τὸδ[ας ὁ]κυς Ἀχιλλεύς

35 5 [. . . . .] . ατ[. . . . ἀρ]γυρος.
1 [ 15 letters ]ος ἀπ’ Ἀργεος
2 [ 16 ] s ες Ἰλιον
3 [ " " ]
4 [ 15 ] . [ . ]

Frs. 2 + 3. Col. ii.

2 Ταλλις ἐγήνατο, τῷ δ’ [ἄ]ρα Τρωίλον
3 ὀσεὶ χρυσῶν ὀρει-
4 χάλκῳ τρις ἀπεθάναυ[ν] ἡδη
1 Τρώως Δ[α]υαὶ τ’ ερό[θ]οσαν
45 2 μορφαν μάλ’ εἴσκον ὀρμον.
3 τοῖς μὲν πέδαι κάλλεος αἰεν’
4 καὶ σύ, Πο[ν]υλύκρατες, κλέος ἀφθιτον ἐξεῖς,
5 ὁς κατ’ [ἄ]ραιδαν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.

[!]Καλλί[μαχος ἐν τῷ περὶ Τεῦκρου φησὶν πα[. . . . ]ν

Frs. 4.

Col. i. Col. ii. Fr. 5. Fr. 6.
[ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]
[ ] σο[ δασε[ ]σι[ ]
[ ] α[ [.]ενθ[ ]]
[ ] ε . [ [?]χινα [ ]
[ ] νυσσον[ αἰθ’ οῖα[ ]δ[ ]
[ ] 5 ἀσπίδα[ 5 αἰτε λι[ 5 ]κέ[ ]
[ ] τοι δ’ αὐ χα[ πα[ ]νη[ ]
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. [οὶ κυβί (Murray) is a likely restoration. For Πράμου οὐρ' άυτον cf. e.g. Homer B 332 ἄστυ μέγα Πράμου. Other Homeric phrases are l. 7 [πολ]αμον δακρυουμεντα (E 737), 14 [Τρο]εστυφυλον (Π 698), 20 κρεισον ἀγαμεμνον (A 130 &c.), 21 ἀγος ἀνδρων (Δ 519 G)}
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&c.), 33 παθ[ες ο]κες 'Αχιλλεύς, 34 μίγας Τ[ελαμό]ώνος ἀλκι[μο]ς Αἰας (cf. e. g. M 362, 364), 47 κλέος ἀφθίτων (I 413).

4. την ... ὁδιάσις: cf. Homer Λ 5 Δίος ὤ τετελείτο ἄνθροπη.
5. The diaeresis on εἰκός is evidently mistaken; cf. ll. 18, 31, 44.
6. The letters τ[α, l. 10 ν], and the vestige at the end of l. 14 are in Fr. 2, i, which is separated from Fr. 1 by a short lacuna.
10. The term ξιναπάτης is applied to Paris in Eurip. Troad. 866.
11-12. ταυτ[σφ]ρ[σω]: so e. g. Bacchyl. iii. 60, v. 69. Cassandra occurs also in Ibyc. 9.
14-15. διενεργείται seems to be the easiest connecting link between these two lines, and the vestige, though very small and ambiguous, is consistent with γ. [οτ; γ]ωρ in l. 15 is excluded by the difficulty of completing the preceding verse; the plural διαφορ[ας] is not at all probable, especially with ἀνωμονός following. At the end of l. 15 γ is an alternative to π; a new verb seems wanted here in any case.
18. καὶ ὑπογιμφός is an epithet of ἰθέα in Hesiod, Op. 658. For ἐλεύσοντον cf. ἐπελεύσω in Cretan inscriptions, e. g. Collitz-Bechtel, Dialektisinschr. 1998. 1. 9-10 αι δὲ ... μὴ ἐπελεύσαι τοῦ πετενκός.
19. ἐσθλοῖς, which was suggested by Lobel, and makes an effective contrast to [Τροῖα] κακων, is a doubtful but quite possible reading, the papyrus at the top of the σ being defective so that there is an appearance of two strokes. The form ἐσθλοῖς is indicated also in l. 22 and recurs in Ibyc. 19. ἡρωίς is read by Ludwig and others in Homer τ. 303.
21. Πλειστερείς: cf. Sestichorus 42 βαυλεῖς Πλειστερείς. It would follow from the present passage, if Murray's π[αροδός] in l. 22 is right, that Ibycus regarded Agamemnon as the son of Atreus (cf. e. g. Eurip. Hel. 390-2) and Pleisthenes as a more remote ancestor (grandfather?). According to Apollodorus iii. 2. 2 Pleisthenes was the father of Agamemnon, and it would be possible to make our poet an exponent of that view by reading ἐκ γ[εών], which is palaeographically admissible, in place of ἐκ π[αροδός]. That, however, would be questionable on metrical grounds, since the corresponding syllable, as Housman observes, is short wherever preserved (I. 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 λόγα is incredible. ι or π can be read in place of γ, but these do not help. Murray proposes to emend to πόθα, but the pleonasm is not attractive in a metaphorical passage. ἐμπλέκεται is commonly used with the dative or a preposition, but Euripides has ἐμπλακοῦσα κλευδὼν in Suppl. 989.
25. οὐ καί is more euphonious than οὐκ [καί], with ἄνηρ following.
26. For διεροτ[ε] after βηθάνας ... ἄνηρ cf. e. g. Homer τ. 201 ἄνηρ διερότε βραγότε: the vestige of the ο is slight but suitable. Unless there was a flaw in the papyrus, something else besides διερότε must have been originally written, but sense and metre are complete as the verse stands. καίτα for καὶθ' would not nearly fill the space.
27. A slight vestige after ναόν suits a round letter and is inconsistent with ο, so that ais is excluded.
29. If ἦλθε is right, [Δαρδανίλαβ] (Murray) is the natural restoration, but the accent on ἦλθε must apparently be corrected (cf. Apollon. De Synth. iii. 7. 33 (p. 213 Bekker) and Corinna i. 18 (Betr. Klassikerleute, V. ii, p. 20) ἐμπλέχεται, and e. g. ἦλθον ἐσ τροία might be read; the plural, however, is less natural.
30. [ι]ποτρόφον (cf. the Homeric Κλον εὐσωλον &c.) suits the space better than [ι]ποτρόφον.
31. Λ fartoroπ[λες, οι] is Housman.
32. [Βατρ[i] or [Χαρτες] is unconvincing, though palaeographically possible; [Ιες] seems
objectionable on account of the hiatus, unless this could be excused by the original digamma; cf. l. 5.

36. Perhaps Τοῦδες...ος, as Lobel suggests. There should be a mention hereabouts of Teucer, to whom the note at the foot of the column refers. Line 35 would be the natural place for him, but απ’γνωρις 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. Υλλίς.

Nireus, whose parentage is stated by Homer B 672, can hardly be meant, nor is e.g. Euryphylus (cf. λ 522) suitable. In l. 40 χρυσός was originally written, and was amended by the insertion, possibly by the first hand, of an e over the line; a cursive a seems to have been subsequently added rather above the level of the e by some one who took χρυσός τροφός as separate words,—which is indeed possible, though less likely. ρ of τροφή was converted from, probably, a partially formed o. In l. 41 the spelling of the papyrus in ἐγνάτο has been retained, though whether this is a genuine form is open to doubt.

42. ὀδύτικακος was mentioned by Stesichorus according to Schol. Apoll. Rhod. iv. 973 ὄρ. ἑδος χαλκοῦ...μησονεῖκαι καὶ Στρηγίγρος καὶ Βασιλείδης. Ibycus and Stesichorus were sometimes confused by grammarians (cf. Schneidewin, Ibyc. Relig. 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 ἀπεφθον χρυσός.

46-8. In this passage much depends on the punctuation. A logical sentence would result from the removal of the stop after αἰνέω, with πέδα as the preposition (the accent in the papyrus need not imply equivalence to μετεστι, but may be accounted for by the anastrophe, in spite of the intervening μέν). On this view the κάλλος 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. τοις μέν...αἰνέω is then poetic language for 'they will always be remembered for their beauty'.

Πολύκρατες is necessary if the metre is to correspond; cf. Pindar, Νεμ. vi. 70 Πολυκράτειν.

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 [Κάλλι]μαχός appears the most likely name, and the Περί 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 ἐστι, 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 φησιν may possibly be the top of an e.

50. κ(ατα)λαβ(αν) 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. Τεύκρος in some form seems inevitable, but the termination is very doubtful.

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

Fr. 4. ii. 6. αὐχαί is possible.
8. ἐφ[; or εφ[.

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
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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. άετ... ασε apparently correspond, whether α or α is written. δυ[ can be read in l. 4.

Fr. 7. 2. κτυ|τ... δ[κτυ...?

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

1791. PINDAR, Paean.

9·9 x 4·1 cm. First century. Plate III.

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 responsion 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 Paeans is stated by Galen, who also quotes it.

The text, which is from the top of a column, is in small upright uncial 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 τοι μεν Τπερβορ[εοις ?
λυ... σε... μενησεμι[[κ[ 
ω μοισα τον δε παντεχ[ρ[οις
Αφαιστον παλαμας και Αθα[νας?

κεραυνό χθονα νο[ 
ἐκρ[.ψ. ν... [.]αντω[ 
γλυκειαί Διος αγλ[α 
οτι ξιο. φ. νον[.
1791. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

5 τις ὁ ρυθμὸς εφαινετο
χαλκεοί μὲν τοιχοί χαλκ[ε]αι δὲ
ουτω κιόνες εστα[η]ν
χρυσεῖ δ εξ υπερ αετον
αειδον Κηληδον[ές]

10 ἀλλα μιν ἦρον εἴη [ ]

1-2. Cf. Pausan. x. 5. 9 δεύτερα δὲ λέγουσιν ὅλοι Δελφοὶ γενέσθαι ἕπο μελισσῶν τῶν ναὸν, ἀπὸ τοῦ τε εἰρηνὸν τῶν μελισσῶν καὶ ἐκ πτερῶν' πεμβάθημα δὲ ἐς 'Ὑπερθορέων φασιν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. In l. 1 the papyrus strongly suggests του, but the ν is not impossible and seems essential for the construction. In l. 2 ζωμεύσις εμέ[ι] or εζαμεύσει με[ι] could be read, but the vestiges between ε and ι are extremely slight; εζαμεύσις, 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 i might have a similar effect. Υπερθορ[ε]ν ευ[ ] χρυσείς με[ι]ας would be consistent with the remains. The subject in any case is presumably Apollo.

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

4 sqq. Cf. Pausan. x. 5. 11—12 τὰ δὲ ἐς τὸν τρόπον τῶν ναῶν, ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐκ χαλκοῦ, βαθύμα ὠδέων . . . τὰ μέντοι ἄλλα μὲ νῦεν ἐπεθεὶ δ λόγος, ἡ Ἡφαίστειον τῶν ναῶν τέχνην εἶναι, ἡ τὰ ἐς τὰς φόδους τὰς χρυσὰς, ἦ δὲ Πανθεόν ἦσεν ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ τῷ ναῷ, χρυσαία κτλ. (ll. 8—9, Pindar Fr. 53). The two verses are also quoted by Galen on Hippocrr. De artic. 18. 1, p. 519 Kühn. Scholars have successfully treated the corruptions found in Pausanias and Galen, and the fragment as printed by Schröder corresponds with the text here, except that he has mistakenly preferred Bergk’s ἐξουσιά to Schneidewin’s εῖ ὑπέρ, which the papyrus now confirms. ρυθμὸς in l. 5 = σχῆμα; the word does not occur elsewhere in Pindar.

10-12. Cf. Pausan. x. 5. 12 οὔ μὴν οὐδὲ τρόπον ὄντος ἀφανισθῆναι συνέπεσε τῷ ναῷ κατὰ ταῦτα εἰρήμενα εὕρουσαν καὶ γὰρ ἐς χάριν γῆς ἐκπευνείν αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπὸ πυρὸς ταχέως λέγουσαν. Pindar’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 η than anything else, though the space is rather narrow. ι is hardly possible. σ could be read in place of ε before την. In l. 11 we may divide χθον ἄρ ω or χθονι νό, and the last letter may be either o or ω. In l. 12 the space is indecisive between εκρ[ι]ψ and εκρ[υ]ψ, and the termination can be -αρ or -εν. 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[ς] is possible; αφαντω[θ] is clearly excluded.

13. The slight vestiges are consistent with Διος, after which either αγ[ι] or αγ[λ] may be read. The latter seems the more likely here, whether written with a capital or not. For Ἀγλαία cf. Ol. xiv. 19 πότιν 'Α. φιλησάμολπε τ' Εὐφροσύνη and Fr. 199 Μούσα καὶ 'Λ.; but ἄγλ/α- may of course be another adjective, e.g. ἄγλ/αθρον (κόρα?), for which cf. Ol. xiii. 96 Μούσαις ἄγλαθρον.

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

15. τεαν aυ[ ] or τεχνα[ ] looks likely.

16. What has been taken for the upper part of a φ is possibly the base of a letter
following ν at the end of the preceding line, in which case o (τεμένοχ vs ?) 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 ρ; there seems hardly room for σ or γ, and ἀναγκη would of course be a false form. At the end of the line μαν appears inevitable, μαν being unsuitable.

18. For λυσίμβρωτος, which occurs only here, cf. δλειμβρωτος, φθισίμβρωτος, &c.; in Tryphiod. 147 λυσίμβρωτος is an epithet of οῦνος.


δαδαλ: or δ Αίδα?

1792. Pindar, Pacan?.

Fr. 1 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 diplacae in the margin and the interlinear asterisk in Fr. 47; but some, e.g. the elision-sign in Fr. 1. 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. 1.

[... . . . . .]με[
[ . . . . .]οιςινεννε[…]
[ . . . . άλαδάρτεμιδ[ . . . ]φνας[[…]
[ . . . . χοσαμφεποι[. . . .]ατδιά[]
5 [ . . . μυνησιοδρεπ[. . ]μαμαδεφ[
[ . . ]δοθενλιπαρατρωνθυσι[[…]
[ . . ]λωνχαριτεσισμυγδαν[[…]
[ . . ]θιονπαρακρημνονενθα[κελαινεφεαργιβρειτανλεγο[[…]]
10 ζηνακαθεζομευν[κορυφαιςινυπερθεφυλαξ[.. . . ]ονο [. [ανίκ' αγανόφρων]
NEW

1792.
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κοινωνική τηλεφωνία
αν
> ωδεινος·ελαμψ\\[e\\]δ' αελιονδεμασσο[15
αγλανοεφασίοντεςδίδυμοι
παιδεσπολυμοθ[.]. ἕσσαγαποστοµ[20
[.]. λειβυιακαλια[.]. οσιοτελ[.]. αιδολ[.]. τελαμβανον [.].
[.]. εφθεγξαντοδεγχώριαι
 [.]. λαοσασαγερκ[.]. ...
[.]. ....... ]τογαρακ ... ἦν . ατο[.].
[.]. ....... ] ... ρ ... γονατ[.].
[.]. ....... ] ... ]ηρασορ[.]
[.]. ....... ] ...
Fr. 2.
Fr. 3.
Fr. 4.
Fr. 5.
Fr. 6.
Fr. 7.
Fr. 8.
Fr. 9.
Fr. 10.
Fr. 11.
Fr. 12.
Fr. 13.
1792. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

\[\text{Κοίνων θυγάτηρ λύετο τερπνᾶς}
\]
\[\text{ώδινος· ἐλαμψαν ὥσ' ἀελίου δέμας ὀπότ'}
\]

15 ἀγλαδὸν ἐς φαός ἱόντες διδύμοι
παιδές, πολύν ῥόθ[ο]ν ἑσαν ἀπὸ στομ[άτων]
[Ἐ]λείθυα τε καὶ Δά[χ]εσις· τέλει[α]ῖ δ' οὐ[κ]
[κα]τελάμβανον . . .
[. . .] ἐφθέγγαντο δ' ἐγχώριαι

20 [ἀγ]λαδὸς ἂς ἂν ἔρκε[. . .]
[. . . . . . .]το γὰρ ἀκ . . . τιν . . . ατοι[]
[. . . . . . . . . . .] . . . γονατ[]
[. . . . . . . . . . .] . . . . . . . . . 

\[\text{ηρας (v.} 1 . . . \text{es) or . . .}
\]

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 2.</th>
<th>Fr. 3.</th>
<th>Fr. 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ραι[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.[.].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνευ . ει[</td>
<td>.[.].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μολοισα[</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. 5.</th>
<th>Fr. 6.</th>
<th>Fr. 7.</th>
<th>Fr. 8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γλ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πο[</td>
<td>θα[</td>
<td></td>
<td>μη φ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πο[</td>
<td></td>
<td>ηλυθο[ν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>δς ετ[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 9.</th>
<th>Fr. 10.</th>
<th>Fr. 11.</th>
<th>Fr. 12.</th>
<th>Fr. 13.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεν[</td>
<td></td>
<td>]</td>
<td>χυτα[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 14. Fr. 15. Fr. 16. Fr. 17. Fr. 18.

Fr. 19. Fr. 20. Fr. 21. Fr. 22. Fr. 23.

Fr. 24. Fr. 25. Fr. 26. Fr. 27. Fr. 28.

Fr. 29. Fr. 30. Fr. 31. Fr. 32.
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1792.

Fr. 14. Fr. 15. Fr. 16. Fr. 17. Fr. 18.

Fr. 19. Fr. 20. Fr. 21. Fr. 22. Fr. 23.

Fr. 24. Fr. 25. Fr. 26. Fr. 27. Fr. 28.

Fr. 29. Fr. 30. Fr. 31. Fr. 32.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ναρ[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ω[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ορον[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>η[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 33.</td>
<td>Fr. 34.</td>
<td>Fr. 35.</td>
<td>Fr. 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>πάτροπα[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>γο[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>πάτροπα[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>γο[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>πάτροπα[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>γο[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 37.</td>
<td>Fr. 38.</td>
<td>Fr. 39.</td>
<td>Fr. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>γο[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>μία[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>γο[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>μία[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 42.</td>
<td>Fr. 43.</td>
<td>Fr. 44.</td>
<td>Fr. 45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>γο[</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>μία[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI**

---

---
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 33. Fr. 34. Fr. 36.

\[ \text{o\v\i} \pi[ \text{a\o} \text{to}. \]
\[ 5 \text{\nu\ar\i} \]
\[ 5 \text{\o\ro\nu} \]

Fr. 35.

\[ \text{\E\nu\nu\a\l\i\o\u} \]
\[ 5 \text{\p\a\t\r\o\s\  \e\x} \]
\[ \text{\d\i\k\a \d\a\s\i} \]
\[ \text{\a\ l\a} \]
\[ \text{\e\p\i} \]
\[ \text{\a \k\e\l\e\u\s\i} \]
\[ 5 \text{\g\o\u} \]

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

\[ \text{\w\o\p\o} \]
\[ \text{\i\i\d\o\w} \]
\[ \text{\e\i\k\e\r\i} \]
\[ \text{\r\o} \]
\[ \text{\e\i\n\u\x\i\o\u} \]
\[ \text{\a \P\i\e\r\i\d\e\s\i} \]
\[ \text{\n\o} \]
\[ \text{\a\i\s} \]

Fr. 41.

\[ \text{\n\a\t\o\i \nu\i} \]
\[ \text{\e\u\f\r\o\n \g\a\r} \]
\[ \text{\e\b\o\a \m\e} \]

Fr. 42. Fr. 43. Fr. 44. Fr. 45.

\[ \text{\g\a\p} \]
\[ \text{\d\e\x\i\a} \]
\[ \text{\s \ i\o} \]
\[ \text{\o\t} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 46.</th>
<th>Fr. 47.</th>
<th>Fr. 48.</th>
<th>Fr. 49.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ν [</td>
<td>δαγ [</td>
<td>Περτατ [</td>
<td>εμ [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μος [</td>
<td>σεκ [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 50.</th>
<th>Fr. 51.</th>
<th>Fr. 52.</th>
<th>Fr. 53.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. [</td>
<td>Ριανα [</td>
<td>Ναιρ [</td>
<td>ειταν [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ωρθυποκρ [</td>
<td>Ευπτωω [</td>
<td>Αριντ [</td>
<td>Ναυλδ [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ωσομενγ [</td>
<td>Μονπ [</td>
<td>Βενά [</td>
<td>. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εκνοσαιδ [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. [</td>
<td>Εινσοφ [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 54.</th>
<th>Fr. 55.</th>
<th>Fr. 56.</th>
<th>Fr. 57.</th>
<th>Fr. 58.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ατεφ [</td>
<td>Αμ [</td>
<td>Μαλα [</td>
<td>Ανα [</td>
<td>Μ [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Οναμ [</td>
<td>Ανα [</td>
<td>Πεδε [</td>
<td>Μ [</td>
<td>Σα [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 59.</th>
<th>Fr. 60.</th>
<th>Fr. 61.</th>
<th>Fr. 62.</th>
<th>Fr. 63.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Νενθα [</td>
<td>Να [</td>
<td>Φοι [</td>
<td>Νοι [</td>
<td>Ξ [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νπεφ [</td>
<td>Κ [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 64.</th>
<th>Fr. 65.</th>
<th>Fr. 66.</th>
<th>Fr. 67.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Οεθ [</td>
<td>Θρ [</td>
<td>Ευ [</td>
<td>Προ [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
<td>. [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1792. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

| ν . [ ] | δαγ . [ ] | υπερτατ [ ] | εμ [ ] |
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Fr. 50. Fr. 51. Fr. 52. Fr. 53.
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Fr. 59. Fr. 60. Fr. 61. Fr. 62. Fr. 63.
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Fr. 64. Fr. 65. Fr. 66. Fr. 67.
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Fr. 68.

1ω[σ]ω[
]ονα[ν]ς[·]ε[τ]
]μεναίν[·]
5 κατά[
]τροπ[]

Fr. 1. 2. ἐν νε[ι] ἐνε[ὶ] σα, ἐνε[ὶ] π. . .

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

4–5. If the subject is singular, ἀμφετός/λει . . . δρέπανων or -πιονταρ] seems likely; cf. Ἀετ. viii. 10 λεκτρός . . . ἀμφετός. But the verb in l. 4 may be ἀμφέτευς, which is combined with δρέπανος in Ol. i. 19–20 ἀμφέτευς σκάπτων . . . δρέπων μὲν κορυφᾶς. Whether the word preceding δρέπανος is an adjective (Ὑμητής, ἔρυμνος) or a substantive (Ὑμητής, ἔρυμνος (?), μοῦσα) is not clear. The remains of the first letter are slight, and ε 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 travails; 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 φ might be an acute accent on the of ὑστερι, which, however, is less likely on account of the infrequency of accents in the papyrus.

9. ἀργυροβείναν: the word is novel, but cf. Ol. viii. 3 Διὸς ἀργυρειρίουν. A further confirmation is here provided of the form ἀμοιβήβεινα in Bacchyl. xvi (xvii). 66; cf. the n. ad loc. on 1081.

12. ἀγανάκτοιν, like καλανέφης in l. 9, is Homeric (ὥ 467).

13. Κοῖνον λεγόμενον at the beginning of a line occurs also in 841. 19. 22 (meaning Asteria). For ἑρπετάν ὁδίνως cf. Ol. vi. 43 ὁδίνως ἐρατός.

14. The v. l. (ἑρπετάν) ὁδίνως does not commend itself. ἑλαμψάν . . . ὀπότε is a rather awkward inversion and the corruption ἑλαμπέ is hardly surprising, though it leaves δίδυμοι παιδεῖς without a verb.

15. Cf. e.g. Ol. vi. 43–4 ἡλπιν δ’ ἐπὸ σπλάγχνον . . . ἐς φῶς, Ἀετ. i. 35–6 σπλάγχνων ὑπὸ . . . βατίτων ἐς ἀγλάν . . . μελεν.

16. 'Raised cries of joy' is evidently the sense, and if ροθ is right πολῖν ῥόθον ἵεσαν becomes inevitable, though it is difficult to reconcile the traces after ροθ[ό]ν with a ν. There are also, rather to the right of these, some vestiges above the line which are not very satisfactorily regarded as a rough breathing on . For ροθ[ό]ν cf. 841. vi. 128 ὁδίνων ῥόθαν. ῥόμοιν, which might be thought a more natural word here, cannot be read.

17–18. Either τῆλε[ί]ον or τῆλαι is possible, presumably referring to the two deities (cf. e.g. Ol. xiii. 115 ζεόν τῆλαι, Ἀετ. x. 18 ἡμῶν τελεία παρὰ ματέρω), but ἰερά] 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 *ακταλ, but the τ is joined by a ligature which is too low for the normal αι of this hand, and suggests rather α, κ, or χ. The preceding letter might well be ν or υ, besides τ.

22. γον or τον is certain, and if the ρ is right either ραγ or ρτ is likely. *ἀμφι 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. *ορ was followed by some round letter.

**FRS. 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 *οπος* in Fr. 1. 14; but Fr. 4 does not seem to join on immediately.

**Fr. 5.** 1. The *diplē* is probable but not certain.

**Fr. 6.** 1. νη[, ιλ[ would be suitable.

**Fr. 10.** 2–3. Line 3 apparently ended at ω, and ων may be the end of l. 2.

**Fr. 16.** Cf. *Fr. 841*. vi, 134–6 [ε*π] *Αυ* [ω*π]... *ινα* *δέφάρσο* παρθένον. In l. 2 here the doubtful τ can be π, but of course this may be quite fortuitous and e.g. ἔθρα*ψαρο* is an obvious alternative.

**Fr. 24.** 2. *ἀριστο*πανο... (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 *[νω Διδύς; 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 δ may be due to the first hand.

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

8. *ε*μελη[...'πλημελε[?]

**Fr. 41.** 1. e.g. *άβαρατης, ια 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 ἵστοκρι may of course be divided ἵστο κρ[.]
Fr. 47. 2. Cf. Pindar Fr. 51 b, d τρικάραναν Ἡγεων κεφαλάνα. 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. α[θεπ] or α[ηεπ] could be read.
3. πα[σαλο] is rather suggested by φθοργον in the following line; cf. Ol. i. 17 ἀπὸ φόρμυγγα πασσάλον λάμβαν', 1861. i. 1–2 ὃ βάρβατε, μηκέτι πάσσαλον φυλάσ[σων] ἔπιτάτονοι λιγυρῶν κάππαυν γάρων; but θε[σαλο] is of course possible.

51. 3. The coincidence with Ol. iii. 26 ἄρα νυξ Ἰπποσάοι θυν, 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 a may be δ.

Fr. 67. Either there is a junction of selides 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.

1793. 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.),¹ 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 c Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Κάσανθον περὶ βασιλείας (εἰ γνήσιον τὸ σύγγραμμα· τολλοί γὰρ αὐτῷ φασιν εἰναι Σωσιβίου, εἰς δὲν Καλλίμαχος δ ἑπητῆς ἐπινίκιον ἐλεγχεικὸν ἐποίησε), τοὺς Περσῶν φησὶ βασιλεῖς κτλ. and called in Schol. Lycochr. Alex. 522 (ed. Scheer) Σωσιβίου νίκη. The identification seems sufficiently established by the occurrence of the name Sosibiou 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 ἐπιλυτικός (Athen. xi. 493 c, Suid. s. vi), 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. 226) 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 ὁ λυτικός or ὁ 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 Philadephus and a courtier of some influence. Whether any relationship subsisted between that Sosibius and the ψευδεπίτρωτος of Philopator is quite problematical; it has been suggested that they were father and son, but the father of the ψευδεπίτρωτος 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 ε); 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 ζηνί τε καὶ Νεμέι τι χαρίσσαν ἐδοὺ ὄφειλομεν 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 ἀντίπρι Βερενίκης was a periphrasis for ἐμοὶ and was simplified by Catullus to mihi [(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 -ἀμεναί, which might well correspond to nudantes in Catullus (l. 81), and that if κλεῖ . . . in l. 3 is κλίνη, that too, though not translated literally, could be interpreted in a sense conforming to the Latin. A mention of the ἄντίπρι 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.

] . . . ξύν

λ . . . τ . . . [  
]

Col. ii.

] ηπρινανάξ . [ . . ] . . ματ . . [  
] πρυ . . . [ . . ] . . [  

Col. iii.

] . . . κα . . ὡ . . έ . [ . . ] . . [ ]ἀμεναί

] . . . μισκλέι . . πρυ . . [ . . ]ωβερενικής

] . . . εἰδαβού[.] . μ ' . π[.].έ . [ . . ]ν '  
] . . [ . . ]τα . . . [ . . ] . εθήσεν[  


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 Η 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.

]... ευν
Λ...τ...
[...]

Col. ii.

]η πρυν ἀναξ...[...]

Col. iii.

]... κα...ό...ἐ...[...]

[... µις κλέι...πρυν ἀστέ[ρι τ]ο Βερενίκης
[... ἰδα βου[.]. χ...[.].ε...[.].υ
[...].τα...[.].α...[.].εβήσειν
Col. iv.

\[\text{διονυσιακὸς αλλὰ γραμματέως...}
\]
\[\text{την καυσόφωνο... σ... εἰρήνη...}
\]
\[\text{νησίδησε... πρ... δακρω[...]
\]
\[\text{παντωντα[...]
\]
\[\text{ουμετ[... νου[...]
\]
\[\text{Χιστόν}
\]

Col. v.

\[\text{τοσσαμαγαθαργῆς... ἔλ...}
\]
\[\text{μμαμενειδ[...]
\]
\[\text{αυταπ...[...]
\]
\[\text{σφατονευμη[...] τευ[...]
\]
\[\text{φωκαεωμεθυρισκεμενη[...]
\]
\[\text{ριτεκηπαλλα[...]
\]
\[\text{σαειαναριστ[...]
\]

Fr. 1, to l. 6?

\[\text{γείνα[...}
\]

Col. vi.

\[\text{άγουςαρβυσ...[...]
\]
\[\text{σημερίνουδωσειπ[...]
\]
\[\text{στοτ[...]
\]
\[\text{δαιμόν,δαμφοτεροθενά[...]
\]
\[\text{τενεσσαρχαισσ[...]
\]
\[\text{γού[...]
\]
\[\text{ηνη[...]
\]
\[\text{εί[...]
\]
Col. iv.

[διον πολύπαλτον ὑπὲρ . αλ . ασον γάμος ἦτ ...]
]. τηκαομὴν εὖ ... σ ... εἰριτιαί
]. νη βασιλῆα, σὲ ... πρ ... [.]. δ' ἀκρω[. . . . . . . . . . . . .]
]. πάντων πάντων τελειότατε.
]. ου μετ[..]. νου ... [χιστον

Col. v, with Fr. i.

[.]. τ]
[.].μμα μὲν αἰδ[.]. αυτα π ... [.].[.].ια[ τόσα Μάγαν βασιλῆα τ ... εν λ ... [.].[.].
]. τόσα τὸν ἐν μη ... [.]. τεν ... [.].[.].]μναν ἔτι,
Φωκαέων μέχρις κε μένη [μέγας ε]ιν ἀλι μύδρος,
5 [μέχ]οι τέκη Παλλᾶ[ς κη γάμος] Ἀρ[τ]έμιδι,
[.].[.].[.].[.]. αἰ[πανάριστα] με[νείν α[.].[.].] Βερενίκη

Col. vi.

ἀξονος Ἀσβύστης ἱππος ἐναυλον ἔχει.
σημερινὸν δ' ὤσεὶ περ [? ἑ]μὸν περὶ χεῖλος ἄφσει
tοῦτ τ' ἐπος ἥδειη λεχθὲν ἐπ' ἀγγελίη.
Δαίμον, ὡς ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἀ[λι[ζ]ώνοι κάθη(σ)αι
5 [σ]τείνεος, ἀρχαῖος ὅρκ[ιε Σ][σ]υφίδαις,
[τῆ μὲν Κρομν[ί]την τῇ [δὲ ...].[.].
[.].[.].[.].[.].[.].].ει[.].[.].δ[.]

1793. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS 103
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Col. vii.
ofrakæswithiontisaleçanidrountepwthetαι
theutikainaiounikynphilosthefa
amofteoroparaapakekakegynitwitelearchou
kaioymrouniontwayagyaladhekomou
5 θηλυτανουκαιελωτωνεναιοινυδωρ
οδειτ[...]καλαμοι [...]γισετεισε [...]γοτ
[...]γαρποτ [...] [...]γεθλα
[ [...] ]φιοντ[ 18 letters ]

Col. viii.
calpiđesouskousumbybolonallapatoïo
anbrosotoudeisastesedokamenvnd'boai
ννουνεπιγλακησκιωμαγοντιχορω
arkiloukikaionefynuienekebedionlou
5 λαγειδήπαρασουπρωτονεθοφορείν
ειλαμεθάπθολεμ [...]έτειη [...]ρηνικεληχ [...]ρ
[ [...] ]τετισελαι [...]ουκοιη
[ [...] ]ωβασι [...] [...] [...]αχθεί

Col. ix.
amofteoronoτενυνσεπηβολοσουκετιγυναο
παιδασεσνηραιωσσεομενευρυνομη
ωσφαμενωδωσετιανηρομοφρονιοσαιδην
τουτομεκαλλωνεκλυνιερονεω
5 κεινογεμηνυνδοναυτοσοπαρποδικαθετονειλοπ
νειτατικαισνειςετικωμοσαλα
κυπροθενειδουνι [...]κατηγαγενεθαδεγα [...]ος
 [...] ωεκκε [...] [...] [...] [...]ωσα [...] φι[ 23 letters ]
[ [...] ]φι
Col. vii.

δόφρα κε Σωσίβιον τις Ἀλεξάνδρου τε πύθηται
(γ)ην ἐπὶ καὶ ναίων Κίνυφι διστεφέα
ἀμφωτέρῳ παρὰ παιδί, κασιγνήτῳ τε Δεάρχου
καὶ τὸ Μυριναιὸν τῷ γάλα θησαμένῳ,
5 θηλύτατον καὶ Νειλωτῶν ἐνιαύσιον ὕδωρ
ὡς εἰπ[...] καλάμοις (?) [...]πιστεισ[...] εισ[...] γὰρ πῶ τ[...]
[... φίων τ[18 letters ]]
[καὶ παρ’ Ἀθηναίοις γὰρ ἐπὶ στέγος ἱερὸν ἤνταν]

Col. viii.

κάλπιδες, οὐ κόσμου σύμβολον ἄλλα πά(λ)ῆς.
ἀνδρας ὅτι οὐ δείσαντες ἐδόκαμεν ἥδι βοήσαι
νῦν ἐπὶ Πλαύκης κώμον ἄγοντι χορῷ
'Αρχιλόχου νικαίον ἐφύμνιον ἐκ δὲ διάιλευ,
5 Δαγείδη, παρὰ σοὶ πρῶτον ἀεθλοφορεῖν
eιλαμεθα, Πτολεμ[α]ῖε, τεῇ, π[άτε]ρ, ἧνικ’ ἔλεγχ[. . .]
[. . .]τε τις ἥλαιή[. . . . . . . . .]ου κονίῃ
[. . . .]ω βασιλ[. . . . . . . . . .].]αχθεὶ[. . . . . . . . . .].

Col. ix.

ἀμφωτέρων ὁ ξείνος ἐπήβολος· οὐκέτι γυμνᾶς
παιδας ἐν Ἡραίῳ στήσομεν Εὐρυνύμης.
ὡς φαμένοι δώσει τις ἀνήρ ὁμόφως νο(ν?) ἀοιδῆν.
τούτῳ μὲν ἐξ ἄλλων ἔκλυν ἴρον ἔγω,
5 κεῖνο γε μὴν ἠδον αὐτός ὅ παρ ποδὶ κάθετο Νείλου
νεῖται τῷ Κασίου ἥει ἐπίκομος ἄλα·
Κύπροθε Σ[ε]δόνιοις μὲ κατηγαγεν ἐνθάδε γα[ύλ]ος
[. . .]. ω ἐκ κε[. . . . . . . . . .]ωσά θεῶν
[23 letters ]φι[. . . . . . . . . .].
Col. x.

καίτωνεφουνικαίσιναιειδομεναρμιαδημων
εἰδοταουκεπιμικρωνουκεπιληθωμενον
παυριστοντοκενανδριπαραφνωτιαείδοιτο
ωτωμικρηκ[.]σσωνησινοσευπτυχος

5 ουντονανησωτοσοναξ[.]ονουτελαθωμαι

didiaγαρδημουγλωσσανεμαμποτερος
μ. [. ]ομεωδι[.]ηνια[.] ουδεπ[.]σθολονε . εξεν
εξ [. ]α[.] δησα[.] καπ[. . . . . . . . ]

[ 35 letters ]

Fragments.

2. 3. 4. 5.

[ ]ονεσκ . [ ] . βεες [ ]
[ γεψω [ ] . εγν [ ]
[ ξ . . . . . . . . . ]

Col. i. This is a puzzling fragment. In l. 1 ξ and the circumflex are clear, and the letters υ, 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 ξυν 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 Arel. Phaen. p. 134 δηαν (sic) μένοι ο Καλλίμαχος Πρών αὕτερ τῷ Βερενίκης επὶ τοῦ πλοκάμου
φωνίν, δι ἐκ ἑπτὰ καταφθανὼν σύγκειται, (ἡμάρητη;?) erva. int. p. 100. The passage in Catullus to which Schneider supposes the fragment to correspond is (lxvi. 79–83)
nunc, vos optato quam iuuenit lumine taeda,
non prius unanimitis corpora coningibus
tradile, nudantes reiecta veste papillas,
quam iuunda mihi munera libet onyx,
vester onyx, casto colitis quae iuera cubili.

prius quam mihi is regarded as a translation of πρών αὕτερ τῷ. If that is correct, it seems
Col. x.

καὶ τὸν ἑφ’ οὖν νίκαισιν ἀειδομεν, ἀρθμια δήμῳ
eιδότα (καὶ) μικρῶν οὐκ ἐπιληθόμενον.

παύρισον τὸ κέν ἀνδρὶ παρ’ ἀφνεῖσι τις ἵδοιτο

5 οὖτε τὸν αἰνήσω τόσον ἄξ[i]ον οὖτε λάθωμαι,
deείδα γὰρ δήμου γλώσσαι ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέροις,
μὴ [τ]ὸ μὲν ὡδ’ [εἴ]πησιν, [ἐ’]Οδ’ οδδαπ[ειτ’] ἐ[σθ]λόν ἐλεξεν
er[ . . ]ψ[ε]υδῆς α[. ] καπ[. . . . . . . . ]

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 35 letters ν

Fragments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τα[</td>
<td>γέπα[</td>
<td>βόες ἐντ[</td>
<td>ἱσμεν . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 ἐπίρ. If the combination is incorrect, Col. v will become Col. vi and θ. ασον γάμος ητ’ . . . &c. will become Col. v, with a possible lacuna between it and Col. iv. The small fragment κυστον assigned to l. 5 was adhering to the back of Col. v, opposite πανωριστ[, and its position is thus indicated with probability.

1. πολέπαλτος is a novel compound; the epithet would suit e. g. [κυστ][]τιδιον.
2. Perhaps τ’ ἰκανοςμην or καλ[[καν]]σαμην, 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. τελευτάτε: 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 ἀνω 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 εὐ, which is suggested by l. 3, seems unobtainable.
Magos, 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. ἐννα, to which the insertion above the line apparently refers, remains obscure. ἅτι may be sound, though ἕτη would give a suitable substantive for the repeated τόστα.

4 = Callim. Fr. 209, from Schol. Soph. Antig. 264. Valckenaeer’s correction of Ψοκείων to Ψοκαίων 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 ἱεια (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 3-4. It will not combine readily with 5 and so has been assigned to l. 6, where it seems suitable.

Col. vi. 1. The ‘Ασβόττα belonged to the Cyrenaica (cf. Callim. Hymn. Apoll. 76 'Ασβοστιδί . . . γαί), but the word may be loosely used as an equivalent of Διβός, as in Fr. 13 Τρίτονος ἄφ’ ἔδανων ‘Ασβόττας. Libyan horses were noted for their speed (Ael. Nat. An. iii. 2. xiv. 10), and according to Hdt. iv. 189 τίσσερας ἵπποις συζητῶν υπάρχον τις Διβός οἱ ‘Ελλήνες μεμάθηκασι; cf. e. g. Soph. El. 702, 727. ἑπαλύνον ἐξει is capable of two interpretations, either ‘is in its stall’, ἑπαλύνον depending on some phrase equivalent to λεβεῖς ἄπο, or ‘has fresh in its ears’, sc. the sound of the wheels. The letters στ are derived from an impression which also gives the doubtful μ in l. 2, and the rough breathing (also doubtful) on a in l. 4.

2. At the end of the line ἀγότει seems to have been corrected to ἀισότει, the γ (or τ?) being cancelled by a dot above and below it. The letters στ are fairly clear in an impression on the back of the next column, which also makes the overwritten στi certain. Of the two accents on περ the acute is slightly the darker and larger. τάμω looks probable, but is not satisfactory after ἄστει περ (τ?); nor can ἄτω be regarded as an improvement.

3. The ἱδεῖα ἀγγέλη is presumably the news of the victory of Sosibius.

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

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

6-7. [γ]ρ[φ]γ[ντ]ς is very doubtful, but the letter before ων, if not γ, can only be ξ or τ, so that e. g. οἰκονομεῖς is excluded. τῆς μὲν Κρωμῆς ἐπην (sc. καλούσι or sim.) may be suitably restored from Schol. Lycoiph. Alex. 522 (Scheer) Κρῶμα . . . Παθαληπτὶος πόλις ἐν ἄγας Πεσειδῶν ιερών ἐστιν. ΄ετέ δὲ καὶ Κορίνθου τόπος, ὡς καὶ Καλλίμαχος ἐν Σωσιβίου νίκη, τῆς μὲν Κρ.

8. A dot slightly above the second i (?), unless accidental, is 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 τ to γ at the beginning of l. 2: ‘that even one dwelling on the Cybins may learn that Sosibius and Alexander have won a double crown’. For γη instead of πόλις cf. e. g. Eurip. Tro. 868 γῆ δορὶ πειουσα, and for the order in l. 2 Callim. Fr. 530 ἐπὶ τρίγα δ ἐξειν ἐδωδή.

3-4. For ἀμφοτέρῳ παῦκ(ί) cf. e. g. Callim. H. Del. 168 ἀμφοτέρῳ μεσόγεα. Probably ‘the brother of Learcuss’ means Melicertes, in whose honour the Isthmian games are said to have been founded (cf. Pausan. i. 44. 8, Plutarch, Theseus 25, &c.), and the other child ‘who was suckled on Myrina’s milk’ is Ophieltes-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 θηλώτατον cf. Eustath. ad Hon. θ p. 1599. 25 θῆλος ἔρηση, ἣ τοῦ ἐκκαρπέων καὶ
6. A vestige of the letter after οι would suit e.g. ι, and possibly [οις (τις είσω ...?) followed, though a rather longer supplement is desirable. Or was the Nile personified?

9. This line is given by Callim. Fr. 122; cf. the next note. The traditional order of παρ' and γάρ, which are transposed by Schneider following Meineke, is retained (P. Panaeth).

Col. viii. 1 = Callim. Fr. 122, from Schol. Pindar, ἔκθ. x. 64 διὰ τοῦτο σημαίνει τοὺς τὰ Παναθηναίων νεκρηκότας τιθεντα γὰρ ἐν Ἀθηναίων ἐν ἐπίθεσι πάθει πλῆρεις ἐλλοιο. διὸ καὶ Καλλίμαχος, καὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίων κτλ., with ἄλλα πάλην, instead of which the papyrus mistakenly gives ἄλλ' ἀπάτης, at the end of the second line. Schneider proposed to assign this fragment to Ael. i. 6; Bergk was no happier in suggesting that the source was the "Ἀργοῦσ οἰκίσμοι.

3. Μανίκη: 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 καλοῦμενον ψευδών; cf. Pausan. ii. 3. 6.

4. Ἀρχιλόχου υκαίον ἐφέμυνον: i.e. τίμηκα καλλινκε, the conventional salutation of a victor in the games; cf. Archil. Fr. 106 τίμηλα, διὰ καλλίνικε χαῖρε κτλ., Schol. Pindar, Ol. i. 1. There is a somewhat similar allusion to φροίμουν Ἀρχιλόχου in Callim. Fr. 223, ἐκ διαύλου is perhaps metaphorical. 'We have retraced our steps,' as e.g. in Aesch. Ag. 344 καρφίων διαύλοι θάτερον κάνων.

5. δεθλοφορεῖν: the verb occurs only here.

6. π[ι]ητρ[η]θος was suggested by Lobel: πιθητρος is much more probable than τοι.

7. ελαιν does not, and the right emendation is not obvious.

8. ὁ: ὁυ or ὁου are possible alternatives.

Col. ix. 1–2. The παῖδες Εὐφρύνομης are no doubt the Graces, who are commonly called her children by Zeus; cf. Callim. Fr. 471 οἱ δ' ἐνεκ' Εὐφρύνομη Τητρώις εἰστὸν ἐπικτε (sc. τῶν Χάριτων), and for γυμνὰι Callim. Fr. 266 ὀσταλέων Χάριτων λόφον. οἱ Χάριτες γυμνοι became a proverbial expression, as in Aristaeus. ii. 21 αἱ γὰρ χάριτες σου ... ἀληθῶς κατὰ τὴν παρομοία γυμναί; cf. Suidas s. v. καὶ παρομοία αἱ χάριτες γυμναί, ἦτοι οἳ δεὶ αὐθελοῦ καὶ φανεροῦ χαρίσθαι, ἢ ὅτι αἱ χάριτες τῶν έκτων κόσμον ἀφήμισθην ... χάριτας γυμναὶ ἰσορροφή, διότι δορφῶν δεὶ χάριτας τίθεθα: but the point in the present passage is not very clear. The Ἡραίοι may be that near Mycenae, which had ancient statues of the Χάριτες in its πρόσασ (Pausan. ii. 17. 4) and was not far from Nemea.

3. ομορφώμονως is evidently an error for ὀμορφωμονως or ὀμορφωμονω; Lobel's suggested correction of ἀφδον to ἀμομιθῆν διὰ Plato is also plausible, though for δῶσει ... ἀφδον cf. Callim. Fr. 310 ἀλάγαμα νόμιμον δοῦσιν.

5. κάθετο: sc. probably Sosibius, who made commemorative dedications both in Greece and in Egypt; the former were only known to the poet by hearsay (ἐκ ὀλλων ἐκλονων, l. 4), the latter lie had he. The λ of νεόλων seems to have been corrected from ο, the base of which gives the letter the appearance of a δ.

6. This verse, in which apparently the ποὺς Νεόλωρ was more closely defined, is obscured by corruption. setImage is open to suspicion on account of the hiatus. The Κάσιον ὅρος was near Pelusium and the Serbonian Lake, παρ' ἵδη τὸ Κ. ὅρος τείνει ἐς θάλασσαν (Hdt. iii. 5), and there was a temple of Zeus there. καίνωιας might conceal Κάσιος Ζεὺς, but the rest of the line is incongruous. νεϊάν τῇ Καιδία ναῦς would give a possible sense, but is far from being convincing. With regard to the concluding words, a similar collocation is noticeable in Callim. Fr. 373 (Tzetz. ad Lyco. 139) ἐδος εἰχον οἱ παλαιοί, ὡς καὶ Καλλίμαχος
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ιστορεί, μετὰ καθάρας περί τον ἄλας ἰέναι καὶ ἀνυμνεῖν καὶ ἐγκωμίαζεν. As Schneider remarks, ιστορεῖ 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 δέων is not excluded.

Col. x. 2. οὐκ ἐπὶ αἰώνας, probably an inadvertent anticipation of οὐκ ἐπιληθῶμενον is clearly corrupt, and καί, which was suggested by both Murray and Lobel, or τῶν, is an easy alteration.

7. The restoration suggested gives a suitable sense, [τ] ἔνευ referring to the first alternative, i.e. ἐὰν αἴνησω: but μή [μ] or μή δ’ ὅ μέν would also serve. At the end of the line the very slight remains are consistent with either ἐφεξέν or ἐφεξεν. A vestige in front of the base of o of αδέων is quite in keeping with a δ.

8. Ψ[ψ]δῆς or α[ψ]δῆς accords with the context, but is very doubtfully read, the ψ being represented only by the top of a stroke above the line equally consistent with φ; λ is possible in place of δ. The next word is perhaps α[ψ]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 × 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(δρα)

φηδεολασσον [. . . .] κοστεκο [. . . .] σεεοίκε
δευομενοτ [. . . .] τοσονπαρ [. . . .] αἰδανεες θαι
tωουχερο [. . . .] ερκαι [. . . .] ερμανονη
οι [. . . .] αμή [. . . .] μο [. . . .] τ [. . . .] τ[. . . .] κεδονησ
5 τορδεγε [. . . .] μ [. . . . .] ομεγθανενομμενπ [. . . .] ν
εμεοντ [. . . . . .] ἵμπρωονονδενον
αυτηδου [. . . .] θ [. . . . .] ελποραιδεαγησαν
ημετερησιοτη [. . . . .] νδεμοιουκοσαυτει
άλλοτεγαραλλ [. . . . .] ωδε [. . . . .] υλαχοςανθρωποισιν
10 ειτοπεσουιοδικη [. . . .] ηδεκαιολβον
πες [. . . . .] σαμειβομενο [, . . . . .] οτεμεντο [, . . . . .] λαστετοις [. . . . .]
ειςαγαθοντι [. . . . .] καιαφνεοναιψατ [. . . . .] θησι
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 ν. 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 τέκος. 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, λυπερφήτης, which is used of herself by the speaker here; cf. l. 17, n. 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 ἱδ' ὅλον βοῦβρωστις 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 βοῦβρωστις, and some further resemblance may be found between the following lines 105–6 χῆραι μὲν μάνθραι, κενεῖ ἐκ μου αὐλίες ἱδὴ τετραπόδων and ll. 18–19 of the papyrus: but this may be a coincidence.


10 οὐ οὗ τοῦ πεσοῦο δίκη, το[ι]ῇδε καὶ ὀλβοῦ·
eis ἀγαθὸν πίπ[τε]ι καὶ ἀφεὶν αὖ[ψα] τίθησι
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προσθεναναλβείωντεινηφενεοντ...δανολβον
toιοδειωτησιπερ...ρεθεταιπετρυγεσαιν
15 [.].βοσεταναθρωποσ[.].λονδεξαλ[.].μοβελλει
ηδαι[.].ηπολεεσιτ[.].μκαισεινορεξα
τηνοραισεινυτιλιτ[.].ηητισπαροσηα
εσκεδομευνοεσβαθυλ[.].οσεκευβ[.].ωηι
πολλαδεμομηλεσκε[,]αμενδαιαντακεδασεν
20 ηδολονβουβρωστισεγωδακομιστο[.].αντισ
[.].εποθιπληθουσανανπτολινε[,]...οπωι

1-21. '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 making rich the man who was before poor, and making poor the man who was enriched. Even so 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 uncare for wanderer, creep thus about the crowded city".'

1. Of the letter before σε there is only a very small vestige, and e.g. η could equally well be read, but ου seems required by the sense.
3. The restoration of ιροσ[γειν σιτ'], for which cf. l. 16, was suggested by Housman.
4. κε: or perhaps σε.
5. τον is possible in place of τον.
6. If σιτ is rightly read there must be some error. σιτ is an alternative, perhaps also σε though the latter is less suitable.
7. There may have been only one letter (ν?) between ου and ρ; at any rate there is no room for οσι [τι]μ'. υ, φ, or ψ may be read in place of the following doubtful ρ.
8. ανδρ... αντει: the Homeric phrase, which is used of metallic sounds, has here a rather different but quite intelligible sense. There is not room for κενεβ',
9. γάρ might be altered to τάρ', but the a is perhaps lengthened as e.g. in Homer B 39
θανείν γάρ ἐρ' ἐμελλειν, H. Dem. 57 φωνής γάρ ἢκοινα. Cf. l. 12, where καὶ ἀφενήν, as Housman observes, also has Homeric analogy (e.g. Ω 641, H. Dem. 424), though the loss of τε after πίπτει would be easy.
13. ἀναλθείν and εἰσφενείσιν are apparently unattested. The latter can of course be eliminated by writing εἰσφεενε' δι[α].
14. δευνιορσια must be corrected to διευνησι or διευεισι. The ω is broken, but η cannot be read.
17. Cf. Callim. Fr. 66 ε σιν γάρ μοι πενήν πατριών, οδο' ἀπὸ πάππων εἰμι λυπερνυτε. The verb presumably refers to the substantives of the preceding line as well as to αὐτά, to which it is more strictly suitable. Cf. Soph. Antig. 287, where Jebb's assertion that δωσκεδάν 'could not possibly be joined with γάρ' is unconvincing.
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πρόσθεν ἀνολβείοντ', εὐθυγενέοντ[α] δ' ἀνολβο'ν·
toίος διν(η)τῆς περ[ιοτ]ρέφεται πτερύγεσιν
ἡ δ' ἀὐ[τη]ν πολέσσι π[ιστο]ν καὶ σιτον ὀρέξα
生产总 ὀράσας, ἑπεὶ οὗτι λιπ[εμφήτις] πάρος ἦν,
ἐσκε δὲ μοι νείδας βαθυλ[η]νος, ἑσκεν ἀ[λ]ων, πολλὰ δὲ μοι μῆλ' ἐσκε, [γ]ὰ μὲν διὰ πάντα κέδασσεν
20 ἑδ' ὁλοὶ βούβρωταις, ἐγὼ δ' ἀκόμιστο[ς] ἀ[λ]ῆτις
[ὁ]δε ποθὶ πλήθουσαν ἀνὰ πτόλιν ε[ι...] ἐρπω

1795. ACROSTIC EPIGRAMS.

Col. ii 22·3 × 17·8 cm. First century.

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 (ἐκάμετροι μείωσοι), and, as also in 15, each is followed by the words αὐλ(ε)ὶ μοι. 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 Ξ, 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. i is distinctly smaller and neater than towards the end, where it begins to approximate

1 That αὐλεμοὶ 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, Π. 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 verso 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.

] κεφάλη στεφανω[ ]υ
]υ μετα του μελαν[ος
]κω και κλωνια [ ]υ

]. οι και σισατε το[ ]υ[. . . ]ου
]κων ανεμων ! [ ]υ[. . . ]ους
]ς περι δακτυλον [ ]υ[. . . ]ους
π]ακαμους λευκους


Fr. 2.

]υ[ ]υ[. . . ]ου
]. [ ]ςας
]υ[. . . ]ους
]. [ ]υ[. . . ]ους

Col. ii.

μηδ αδικιν ζητει μηδ αν αδικη προσερις πευγε φονους και φειγε μαχας φ[ι]σαι διαφρονε[ι]ν [ ]ς εις δ ολιγον πονεσεις και δευτερον ου μεταμελη αυ[λι μοι]

[1]δ[ι]ς εαρ χειμωνα θερος ταυτ εστι διολον
5 ηλιος αυτος [εδυ] και νυξ τα τεταγμεν απεχει μη κοπια ζητειν ποθεν ηλιος η ποθ[ε]υ νυξ[ρ]

αλλα π[ο]θεν τοι[σ] μυρον και τους στεφανους[σ] αγορασης αυλι μο[ι]
κρηνας αυτορι[το]ιος μελιτ[ο]ιος τρις ηθελον εχειν
πεντή γαλακτορυτος οινον δεκα δωδεκα μιρουν
και δυο πηγαιων υδατων και τρις χιουνων παιδα κατα κρηνην και παρθενον θηλευν εχειν αυλι μοι
Λυδιος αυλος εμοι τα δε Λυδια παγματα λυρας
κα[i] Φρυγιοις καλαμος τα δε ταυρεα τυμπανα πονει
tαυτα ξων ασαι τ ερομαι και οταν αποθαινω
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15 αυλον υπερ κεφαλης θετε μοι παρα ποσι δε λυρην αυλι μοι
μετρα τις αγι πλουτου παλι ανεφαρτο μετρα πενιας
η τις εν ανδροποις λυροσ παλιν ευρατο μετρον
νυν γαρ ο χρηματ εχων ετι πλειουνα χρηματα θελει
πλουσιος ων δ το ταλας βασανιδεται ωσπερ ο πενης αυλι μοι

20 νεκρον εαυ τοθ ιδης και μνηματα κωφα παραγης
κοινων εσπτρουν ορας ο θανων ουτω ροσεθεια
ο χρονως ετι δανος το ζην πικρος εσθ ο δανισας
και τοτ απαιτηαι σε θελη κλαιων [α]ποτειδοις αυλι μοι

Ξερπης ην βασιλευ[ν] ο λεγων Διε παντα μερισαι

25 ο δυς πηδαλιδο[λ] μονος εσχαση Αημνιων υδωρ
ολβιν ην ο Μιδας τρις δ ολβιος ην ο Κυνη[α]ς
αλλα τις εις Αιδα οβολου πλεον ηλιθειν εχων αυλι μοι

Fr. 1. 4. 1. μετ' εμωι.
6. e. g. [λοι, ]μοι.
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 l. 1 was abnormally short, some
part of αυλι μοι should be visible. The spacing of the lines is also suitable.

Col. ii.

' 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.

' 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.

' 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.

' 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.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

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. προσερησα: the remains of the termination are scanty, but seem too much for -σαι.
2. For διαφρον[ε]ν cf. Hesych. διαφρονίων διανοούμενος. καί ὁ ἐν διαφορά τυι γεγονός. The reading, however, is far from certain, a being especially doubtful; the letter after δ may well be ν.
3. μεταμέληθη as an irregular future form would balance ποιήσεις better than μεταμέλη.
4. l. ἕδωρ.
7. The first σ of στέφανον[ς] is a correction, perhaps from a partially formed τ. Cf. l. 15, where there is an unnoticed lipography.
13. ταυρεία is a drum or something of the kind in Geop. xv. 25. 3.
14. ζων provides a good antithesis, but the ζ is not altogether satisfactory and the other remains are very scanty. l. ἔραμαι.
15. l. λύραν: the correct form was written in l. 12.
16. l. τίς for πολι, which has come in from the next line. For the tmesis cf. e. g. Eurip. H. F. 1035–6 ἀπολείτι πολω, ἀπὸ δὲ πατέρα.
19. l. βασανίζειν. Perhaps βασανίζης was written.
20. l. ποτ. ἢτων is one of the words often wrongly aspirated; being influenced no doubt by ὅτω. e. g. Philipp. ii. 23 ἢτω ἢν ἀφίδω; cf. Mayser, Grammatik, p. 201.
23. l. κάν ποτ. The (Ionic) forms διδοῖς, διδοὶ occur e. g. in the LXX, Ps. xxxvi. 21, Job xxxiv. 11.
26. ο ἐλαῖος was converted from o. -ιος for -ος is a common vulgarism.
27. τίς seems inevitable here, but the remains suggest ε rather than s. This may be deceptive, but possibly ε was written twice by mistake instead of σε.

1796. HEXAMETER POEM ON EGYPTIAN BOTANY.

21 x 35 cm. Second century.

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
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at any rate the greater part of the preceding column (πολυγλαγέων κυκλάμεινων l. 9, κυκλάμεινος l. 12; the form θερμέσωτι 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.

[α]τα
εσθανετα[ι] ποταμον γαρ επηλυσιν ην δ' απολειπη
ριζησιν μεγαλησιν ατε φρονεοντι λογισμοι
λκ
πλειον υδωρ ε[[ν]]ουσα πολυπληθι τοτε καρπω
σ
αλλ ουκ εσθ οτε καρπον εφεδρευοντι λαβεσθαι
5 ανθρωποι θανοτες ε[[ν]]γραφεων κυκλαμεινων

πολυη γαρ Νειλουχ χυσις πολυη δ' επι σιτω
αφθονη τετανυσται εποιεσε δε γελουσα
ευθενην ου καρπος επι χθονα πασαν οδειν
ωγυγιος νομος ουτου απαρχαιων ετανακτων

10 θεσκαι δενδρεα κεινα παρ αληλουι κολωναις

χωματος ευ[[α]]δρ[[ν]]ο πεθην αλκηηρα τε λειμουν
ου δροιο

περση δ' ακμησιν υπο χλοερο[[ν]] πετηλιων

ευφορευι καρπω περικαλλει μηδε πεπ[[ε]]νοι

μεχρις επανυθος[[ν]]τι κλαδου προτεροι {δε} περι καρπον

15 πειπτοι μηδ' αρα νυκτος οτ' ευγυθεν ορινται υδωρ
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

περσείς απὸ καρπὸς ατέρ βαρυκέως αυρής
συμφέρεται μονὴ γαρ αδωπευτών δὲ γεγηθεὶν
αδροσίη καρπὸν γαρ ὑπ' αδροσίης πεπαίωι

σήμα καὶ ημερής ενείδε[.]ς εγγὺς {e} ἰδεσθαί
20 Νεῖλου πλήμυροντος ὑδὸρ νεόν εὐτε πιοῦσα
καρπὸν απ' οφαλμοί ν[ἐ]οι συνανήκατο βλαστῶ

ηὲρος ακρισιμὶ προσ . φι . [.]εὶ δ ἐπὶ κηπωὶ

1. There is not enough to show whether the initial ε written by a common confusion in ἐσθαυρεῖν was deleted. The subject of απολείπεται is ὁ στομάχος.
2. In the margin in front of this line is a δ or α having the third stroke protracted downwards; the meaning of this is obscure.
3. ςαπτεῖ is perhaps for ςαντεῖς.
4. σείω, if that is right word, is for σητοῦν. επ[?] in the margin looks like a correction of or variant on ἐπὶ σείω.
5. ἐπὶ ποιῆς ἐπὶ ὑμ. might be read instead of επὶ, but seems no easier.
6. ὑγείῳ was apparently written originally. To what δαλ[?] in the margin refers is not clear; the letters are slightly above l. 9, but nearer to it than to l. 8.
7. δένδρα 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, μᾶλλον δὲ ὑπὸ τὰ δένδρα, and another as having κανάζους παχῖς, γονιτωδεῖς, περιελυσσαμένους τοῖς παρακειμένοις δένδρασιν ἐλικοεῖς (ii. 193-4). The cyclamen then may have been brought in here in connexion with some tree, to which δένδρα κύστα goes back. The tree, as Housman remarks, might be the ἄκανθα, which is planted on modern embankments because the roots bind the soil.
8. περσείς κάρυα, 53. 7. The persea, which was an exclusively Egyptian tree (Strabo xvii, p. 823, includes it among the ιδαίωνκα of the country), is described at length by Theophrastus, H. P. iv. 2-5, who says that it κάρπον φέρει πολὺν καὶ πάναν ὁμοίως περικαταλαμβάνει γὰρ ὁ νέος αἰτὶ τὸν ἔνον: this illustrates the epithet ἀκριμὸς 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; χλοεροῖς, as written in the margin, must in any case be read. The first o of the marginal lection has been corrected.

13-14. According to Theophrastus, l. c., the fruit πέπτει ὑπὸ τοὺς ἐτυρσίοις. l. προτέρου?
15. l. ἐγγυθεί. σ was written over ν by mistake for γ.
17. Both this and the preceding marginal note are obscure. αδωπευτῶν = 'harsh', as
19. ημερής = ἡμερότητος, '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. ακρισιμαί = '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 Ἀληθείας, 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 this 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 Ὀρθοδοξίας, 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 ττ, 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 ὁμονοίας, this copy being more or less uniform with that of the Περὶ Ἀληθείας (1364) and belonging to the same owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . ] τον δικαίουν</td>
<td>λῃθη μαρτυρ[η]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[σπουδαίον δοκοῦν]</td>
<td>40 σας· και ου μον[ον]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[τοι το] μαρτυρεῖν</td>
<td>τω μέσει· αλλα κ[αι]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[έν αλήθειας ταλήθη]</td>
<td>οτι δει αυτον το[ν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [δικαίο]ν νομιμέται</td>
<td>αιωνα παντα φυ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[εἰναι] και χρησιμον</td>
<td>λαττεσθαι τουτόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ουδεν] ηπτον εις</td>
<td>45 δυ κατεμαρτυρ[η]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[τα των] ανθρωπων</td>
<td>σεν· ας ὑπαρχειι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[επι]τηθενματα`</td>
<td>γ αυτων εχθρος τοιο[ν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 [τουτο] τοινυν ου δι</td>
<td>τος οιος και λεγειν [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[και γα]ρ το μη αδικειν</td>
<td>και δραν ει τι δυν[αι]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[μηδε]να μη αδι</td>
<td>50 το κακον αυτον· και[ι]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[κουμε]νου αυτον</td>
<td>τοι ταυτα φαϊνεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 [δικ]αιον εστιν· αναγ</td>
<td>ου σμικρα ουτα τα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[κη] γαρ τοιν μαρτυ</td>
<td>δικηματα· ουτε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ρου]ντα και αλη</td>
<td>α αυτος αδικειται·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[θη μ]αρτυρη· ομος</td>
<td>55 ουτε α αδικει· ου γαρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[αλλ]ουν πως αδικειν·</td>
<td>ξοιον τε ταυτα τε δι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 [εικος δε?] αυτον α [</td>
<td>καια ειναι και το μη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[δι]κεισθαι [εις νυτε</td>
<td>[δ]εν αδικειν μη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ρο]ν· ενεστι γε</td>
<td>[δ]ε] αυτον αδικεισθαι·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ε]ν οι δια η[α ντ εκει</td>
<td>60 [α]λα αναγκη εστιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ν]ου μαρτυρηθεν</td>
<td>[η] τα ετερα αυτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 τα αλησκε[ται ο κα</td>
<td>[δικαια ειναι· η αμ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταμαρτυρομενος·</td>
<td>φοτερα αδικα· φαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>και απολλυσιν η</td>
<td>νεται δε και το δικα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 ξειν και το κρινειν</td>
<td>και το διαταν οπως</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
χρηματα η αυτων
[δ]μα τουτον ον ουδεν
30 [α]δικειν εν μεν ουν
tουτω των κατα
[μ]αρτυρουμενον
[α]δικει κατι ουκ αδικ
[κο]μητα εαυτων α
35 [δι]κει αυτος δ αδικει
[τα]υ ν]πο του καταμαρ
[τυρηθ]εντος οτι μι
[σειται] υπ αυτον τα [α

αν περαινηται ου
[δ]καια οντα· το γαρ
70 [λο]υς βλαπτει εν δε
[του]των οι μεν ωφελουν
[μενοι ουκ αδικουν]
[ται οι] δε βλαπτομενοι
75 [.........]μημ[.........]
[.........] ινον[.........]

Fr.

] τους νυμ[ους

.,. 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. [στουδ]ουν: αι is rather more probable than ν, but e. g. [αξιεπαι]νου, 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 l. 22 a small dot after the first ν was intended as a stop. αυτον instead of εκεινον would hardly fill the space in l. 24.

28. αυτον απολλων is an intelligible expression, but with χρηματα preceding it seems more likely than not that αυτον (των βιων) should be read.
34. εαυτον appears to have been written, not αξιονευτον (cf. εαν τον).

56. ταυτα: i. e. ταυτα, but ταυτα is wanted; cf. 194, 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 x 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 ψ, 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 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
Quellenverhaltnisse 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 (1) 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. ὅτι 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 ἄποιναντίζεω may be due to copyists, but the form ἀνελεί (Fr. 44. i. 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.

[... ] τοὺς μ[.] [...]
[... ] θείατ[ρ]ωι κα[.]
[... ] οὺς απε[...]
[... ] ε περὶ θρο[ν]ον
5 [... ] εν τοῖς μ[.]
[... ] π]αρεδωκε [ [... ] απετυπα[ι]
[σαν αυτο]ν το δε σωμ[α]
10 [... ] ερι την [...]
[... ] ηκλ[.]

Fr. 3.

[... ] [...]

γομ[ [... ] ? Θη
εισιν [...]
βαιων [...]
ω [...]

Fr. 2.

[... ] [...]
[... ] σου[.]
[. ] δακρυο [...]
[Κα]δμου [...]
5 [... ] σου [...]
[... ] άκρυο [...]
[κ]αι δη Θηβα[ις]
[θροποισιν αοικοι [...]
[... ] [...]

Fr. 4.

[... ] [...]
[... ] η[ [... ] 
[μην τε [...]
[δημος [...]
[τουργο [...]
5 [... ] μον [...]
[ [... ] δι [...]

Fis. 5-6.

Col. i.

κατα τη[ [... ]
ης εβας[λευ [...]
ου και [...]
στ [...]
5 δ [... ] [... ] [...]

Col. ii.

kata την [...]
ης εβασκ[λευ [...]
ου και [...]
στ[ [...]
5 δ [... ] [... [...][ [...] [ [... ] [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... [... ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 7.</th>
<th>Fr. 8.</th>
<th>Fr. 9.</th>
<th>Fr. 10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>επος ε[πειν ?</td>
<td>αυ[</td>
<td>πι[</td>
<td>ἀλη[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εξελιπ[ε</td>
<td>θη[</td>
<td>οι[</td>
<td>περιο[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>του επ[πουν ?</td>
<td>κλ[</td>
<td>μουμ[</td>
<td>πε[πωκ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρωτο[</td>
<td>νη[</td>
<td></td>
<td>του αλ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 η αυτο[</td>
<td>5 του[</td>
<td>5 μνουν ου[</td>
<td>5 θερον τ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . .]η[</td>
<td>[. . .]ε[</td>
<td>[. . .]μολα[</td>
<td>[. . .]ει[ γλυκ[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 11.</th>
<th>Fr. 12.</th>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[.]ντι[</td>
<td>αν[</td>
<td>λον</td>
<td>4 . [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χον μ[</td>
<td>μεγα[</td>
<td>μαχης</td>
<td>παρθε[ν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περιδ[</td>
<td>αι κναι[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. ]ρον[</td>
<td>αληθινου[</td>
<td>πη</td>
<td>η εκα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . .]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[. . .]ν[</td>
<td>[. . .]ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 14.</td>
<td>Fr. 15.</td>
<td>Fr. 16.</td>
<td>Fr. 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ. μ[</td>
<td>] ρω[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>ντα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δείη[</td>
<td>με]γαλη[</td>
<td>]μ[</td>
<td>σκέ]ναζ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν]ουρ[</td>
<td>Αλε]ξανδρ[</td>
<td>]χει[</td>
<td>]ις δε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ραν [</td>
<td>]ρα[</td>
<td>]ταδ[</td>
<td>]ν ελατι</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>ολ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]Περσι[</td>
<td>] . [</td>
<td>Αλε]ξαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεικρ[</td>
<td>]αι [</td>
<td>δρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολ]λακις λ[</td>
<td>] . [</td>
<td>] παρω[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . αλε[</td>
<td>]τε[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? δι]καιω[</td>
<td>]οσ λε[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] επει κ[</td>
<td>]ταισυ [</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]αμιον [</td>
<td>]]σα[</td>
<td>Fr. 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]αραμε[</td>
<td>]ον [</td>
<td>]ευστ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ομε[</td>
<td>]ον [</td>
<td>]γει[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . εδι[</td>
<td>]ημ[</td>
<td>]ναιω[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . μεντ[</td>
<td>]λιν π][</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>]ορ[</td>
<td>]ειδ[</td>
<td>]γου ] [</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . ο[</td>
<td>]οι τ[</td>
<td>]μ[</td>
<td>]τας[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . το γε[</td>
<td>]ν ολη[</td>
<td>]δο[</td>
<td>]δο[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]οδη[</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 27.</td>
<td>Fr. 28.</td>
<td>Fr. 29.</td>
<td>Fr. 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λιπ[</td>
<td>]ησ[</td>
<td>]εις σ[</td>
<td>]αιδ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τομ[</td>
<td>] . ντ[</td>
<td>]ε εστ[</td>
<td>]μεν[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]η[</td>
<td>]νε . [</td>
<td>]ειτ[</td>
<td>]νθ . [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 32.</td>
<td>Fr. 33.</td>
<td>Fr. 34.</td>
<td>Fr. 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]ου[</td>
<td>] . α[</td>
<td>]οντ[</td>
<td>]ναι[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]α[</td>
<td>]ευη[</td>
<td>]αμ . [</td>
<td>]τρια[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[][</td>
<td>]πο[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 37.</td>
<td>Fr. 38.</td>
<td>Fr. 39.</td>
<td>Fr. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]ου ως[</td>
<td>]υςα[</td>
<td>]θ[</td>
<td>] . στ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] . και[</td>
<td>]εντ[</td>
<td>]ε[X[</td>
<td>]βε[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 42.</td>
<td>Fr. 43.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]ρ[</td>
<td>]δε[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]δεια[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 44.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. i.</td>
<td>Col. ii.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[? επιχειρ]ησειν αυτον φαρ</td>
<td>ειχε τους Μακεδονας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[μα]κωι μελλοντος δ</td>
<td>εξηκοντα γαρ των βαρ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[αυτ]ου διδοναι Παρμε</td>
<td>βαρων μυριαδε[ς] ησαν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[νι]ων διαφορος αν τωι</td>
<td>οι δε Περσαι των Μακε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [Φι]λιππωι γραφει προσ</td>
<td>5 δουνω κατεφρονουν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Αθ]εξανδρον κελευνω</td>
<td>Αλεξανδρος δε πλησι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φυλαξαθαι τουτον α</td>
<td>ον ορον την κρισιν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κουειν γαρ χειλια τα</td>
<td>εν αγωνι[α] την και προς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαντα Δαρειον αυτωi</td>
<td>ευχας ετραπη Θετιν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 διδοναι καὶ την αδελφὴν γυναῖκα εφ' οί αυτοὶ αυτῷ ἀληθεῖς Ἀλέξαν
δρος δὲ λαβὼν τὴν εἰ πιστολὴν καὶ οὐδεὶς
15 προσποιησμένος πειν[εῖ . . . . . . .] τι[δὲ

Col. iii.
σαν οἱ Περσαὶ εἶτα τὸ λοιπὸν τῶν βαρβαρῶν
πλῆθος μεθ' οὓς οἱ ξένοι
οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀλέξαν
5 δρον ὑπείρας μὲν ὑπένθυν
σιν πεῖοι δὲ πεῖοις
ἐπηκολουθοῦν καὶ τὸ
πεδίον πληρεῖ τὴν νε
κρών πολὺ δὲ μερος
10 τῶν Μακεδονῶν επὶ
tας σκηνὰς τῶν βαρβά
[ρ]ῶν ὁμιλησάμεν εἰς δι
[α]ρπαγήν τῶν εὐ αὐτοῖς
[πω]ρεῖς δὲ ἡ σαν ποικί
15 [Α]λῆς γαζής Ἀλεξάνδρος
[δ]ὲ επιθυμοῦν λαβέων
[Δαρ]είων εἰδωκεν μὲ
[τὰ δρῖ]μον πυθομε
[νος δὲ ηδῆ α]μίτον α[.] [ ]

Col. iv.
ἐχόντι νυπ αθεραπ[ε]ῦν
σιάς την ἐξῆς προσ[η]
νεγκε τοι τῶν ἡπαστ[ι]
στῶν λαβὼν παρὰ [βου]
5 κολοῦ ἀρτοῦ τρυφῶν [ο]
δὲ διὰ τὴν ἐνδε[ία]ν
φαγὼν αυτομενῶς παν
τες ἀρα εἰπεν ἀνθρω
ποι ἧσων ἡδεως α
10 πεθανοῦν δὲ τῶν μεν
Μακεδονῶν πεῖοι
χειλίᾳ καὶ ὑπείρας δια
κοστοὶ τῶν δὲ βαρβά
ρων πεῖοι μὲν ὠκ η
15 λαττοῦν πεντε μυρία
δῶν ὑπείρας δὲ τρισχι
λιο[ι] τῶν δὲ ξ[ε]ρῶν πε
[πι . . . . . . . . . . .] ε . η

Col. v.

λα[ι]
ο[ι] . [ ? Ἀλέξαν
δρο[ι]

15 ρα καὶ [ κοι.]α [ ]
κυ[ι.]α [ ]
ερο[ι]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 λού[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 παῖδ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αλλ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επε[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 διαβ[ τ[ν Ευφρ[[ατ[ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>και μα[χ[ν αυτ[ω[; συν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>απτ[ε[ δευτερ[αν [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[... θα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τεμ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τν[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρμ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fr. 1. The mention of a theatre in l. 2, in conjunction with the burial of Ἀμφιπόλεις in ll. 8–10, leaves little room for doubt that this fragment refers to the death of Philip, but the details are unfamiliar. Philip's assassin was Pausanias (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 οἱ τερπ ὁ Περδικκαῖος συγκεκτήσατε ἀνείπου. Apparently, then, the object of ἀπετυπαθέως is some other person, whose identity is obscure; cf. Justin xi. 2. 1 Prima illi cura paternaria exsequiarum fuit; in quibus ante omnia caedis conscios ad tumulum patris occidi iussuit.

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 τοις μ[περ] | [ἐν τοι ὑπαρχεῖσ] | καὶ[θημεν] | ο[ὔς ἄρεσ] | [στότοις] (or τοις) δ[ι] may be suggested.

5. |μ: |λον is not possible, and |λον 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. 6 ended with -κε, it was rather shorter than its neighbours.

7. The spelling ἀπετυπαθέω seems to be novel; τύμανον 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; κυλων[ι] 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; Θ[νις] would be quite suitable.


9. The first letter is more probably δ than θ. τ αρνᾶς is recommended by the apparent repetition of τ, but whether αρνᾶς or Αρνᾶς should be written is not clear; cf. Homer B 507 (Τάρηνα ἀφ', Strabo 413).

10. No compound -ουμόρος (e. g. κυλωμόδας) is known.

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

Fr. 3. 3. If βαίον is right, Θ[νις]βαίον is the natural restoration, but θαί ων is possible. This fragment differs in appearance from Fr. 2, but is very similar to Fr. 4.

Fr. 4. These fragments were combined after the text was in type, and the numeration was therefore retained.
ii. 6. Σιθαραβαταρ . . . this is evidently the son-in-law of Darius and satrap of Lydia (or Ionia) whose name is spelled Σιθροβαρθυς by Diodor. xvii. 19, 20, Σιθροβαρθυς 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 υπτεφυον: 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 εις, but εις is by no means clear, nor is it certain that the i is by another hand.

Fr. 12. 4. αληθεινον is suggested by κυν[ in the preceding line, but λειθνον would also be suitable.

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

Fr. 18. There was a junction between two selides 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. Αληθεινον . . . is one of many possibilities.

Fr. 21. Like Fr. 18, this piece shows a junction between selides 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 Ελκμευκαλα, either as the mother of Alexander or a date.

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

Fr. 36. 1. πανορα: or possibly Πανορα[νας; 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 [επιχειρ]σειν cf. Plutarch, l. c. επιχειρησεις φαρμακεία, but ιππον may mean Alexander (cf. Arrian, l. c. καθηρα ιππον άλεξανδρον φαρμακών) in which case another infinitive may have preceded, e.g. επιχειρησεις θεραπευσαι επιχειρησεις, or ιππον may be differently restored, e.g. οφελησεις.

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

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

8-10. χειλα ταλανα . . . και τον αδελφην: so Curt. mille talentis . . . et spe nuptiarum sororis eius. Plutarch says δωρεάς μεγάλας και γάμων θυγατρός, Arrian χρήσασθαι only.

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

14-15. οὐδεν seems to be an error for οὐδεν, the meaning being similar to e. g. that in Polyb. v. 25. 7 σαφος εἰδος . . ., οὐ προσποιηθείς δέ. A use of προσποιηθείς with the dative in the sense of κοινωνία 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. εἰς: sc. φόβος or some synonym. For the confidence of the Persians cf. Arrian ii. 6. 8 καταπαθήσεως τε τῇ ἐποχῇ τῶν Μακεδόνων τῆς στρατιάς ἄλος ἅλλοθεν αὐτῷ (sc. Δαρείῳ) ἐπαίροντες ἔλεγον, Plutarch, Alex. 20 ἀποκριμαζόν τε Δαρείῳ δεδεικα μὴ φθαίσαντο αὐτῶν ἀδιδώσας οἱ πολέμιοι. Diodorus. xvii. 32 describes the effect of the disparity in numbers on the local population, τῆς μὲν τῶν Μακεδ. ὁλιγήκτους καταφρονήσαντες, τὸ τε πλῆθος τῆς τῶν Περσ. στρατιάς καταπεταμένοι. 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 παρεκάλει διαρρέων, though it may be hinted at by Diodorus. xvii. 33. 1 τῶν δὲ κατασκότων ἀπαγελιάτων . . . τὸν ΔαρείΟν . . . τῇ δυνάμει προσέναι καταπληκτικός: cf. Justin xi. 9. 3 periculosius differe bellum ratus, ne desperatio suis cresceret.

2-3. εἴσκοτα . . . μυριά[ς]: so Arrian ii. 8. 9, Plutarch, Alex. 18. Diodorus. 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 solet fieri cum ultimi discriminis tempus adventat, in sollicitudinem versa fiducia est. Iam ipsam fortunam, qua aspirante res tam prospere gesserat, verebatur . . . ipsa in iugum editi montis escendi multisque conuentibus facilis patrio more sacrificium dis praesidibus loci fecit. Kaerst, l.c., pronounces the statement of Curtius to be worthless, and that of Diodorus. xvii. 33. 1 that Alexander regarded the approach of the enemy as a heaven-sent opportunity to be an szech 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 sollicitudo nor phobia, 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 θείους, θαλασσίους φησιν, ἐπευχόμενος . . . ἀμώνιε. 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 praesidibus 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. 10, where he is said to have made libations to Poseidon and the Nereids when crossing the Hellespont.

15. εὐφα[γα]κτε ψευδε και νυκτε: 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 φόρησαν, 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 πάς ὁ συνεχής τόπος νεκρῶν ἐπιληφθῆ, but this was a conventional phrase which reappears e.g. xvii. 61. 2.

9-15. Cf. Diodor. xvii. 35. 1-2 οἱ δὲ Μακεδόνες παυσάμενοι τῷ διωγμῷ πρὸς ἀρπαγήν ἀφμησαν καὶ μάλωσαν περὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν σκηνῶν διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς πολυτελείας ἰσχυοῦσα, κτλ., Plutarch, Alex. 20 κατέλαβε τοὺς Μακεδόνας τὸν μὲν ἄλλον πλοῦτον ἐκ τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ στρατόπεδου φέροντας καὶ ἀγοντας ἑπεβάλλοντα πλῆθος, Curtius iii. 11. 20.

18. ἐπιραμὼν: the vestiges do not suggest o, but are not inconsistent with the irregular formation of that letter as sometimes found in this text. μιχρ[.] λον 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 non adpetaet et consequendi spes non erat. At the end of l. 19 the broken letter might be e, o, p, 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. βαρεως is to be supplied before εκοιντι.

5. τρυφος: the straightness of base in the final letter suggests ν rather than σ, 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 εξφυκοστα 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 εν [1]σω 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 ἀνω.

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. 5. o of ro has apparently been converted from e.

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

1799. Oratorical Fragment.

9·9 x 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. ν 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . .]ει[. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>[. . . . . . .]νησε[. . . . . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . .]γα[. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>[. . . . . . .]αετα τον [. . . . . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . .]τι [. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>[. . . . . . .]να [. . . . . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . .]πρ [. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>[. . . . . . .]ασ [. . . . . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . .]νυ [. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>[. . . . . . .]ν [. . . . . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . Αμυσθενης τι δει καθ εκα [. . . . . . .]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 [. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>10 στου λεγειν των νυ [. . . . . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>προειρημενων η [. . . . . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>τετολμημενων [επειδη?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>τα μεν παρ αυτον Λ[εχθεν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . . . . .]</td>
<td>τα αληθη και συμφεροντα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1798. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS
10] τον 
\[ \epsilonπει \]
\[ \epsilonιμι . \]
\[ παντ \] αν εσωξετο ει δ \ ανα 
\[ \epsilonι \] 
15 
\[ ιο \]
\[ ιυ \]
\[ ια \]
\[ \epsilonι \]
\[ ουτ[ο]\epsilonι ου γαρ .. [. . ] \παλιν \ Φι
\[ [λι]ππος ουδ οι \ το\[\muα]\[ Μακε
\[ \epsilonι \] 
20 \[ \epsilonι \]
\[ \epsilonιο \]
\[ \epsilonι \]
\[ \epsilonι \] 
25 δ \ η \ των \ \eta\[\muετερον \ \ολιγωρι 
\[ \epsilonι \] 
30 \[ σην \ \epsilonξελεσασα \ \βασιλεα 
\[ γης και \ \ταλαττης \ \αλλ \ ει \ δει 
\[ [ιο \ \alpha]\[\lambdaηθες] \ \epsilonιπειν \ \το \ \παν \ \tau[ον 
\[ [τ \ \epsilonι\[γειν\[ετ\]ο \ \δη \ \μονον \ \tau . [. . ]
\[ [. . ]\[γε . [. . ]\[αχ[. . .] . . ] . . ] . . ] 
35 [. . ] \[ [ ...] 

9–10. \[\alphaθ \ \epsilonκα\[\sigmaτον is very uncertain, but seems to suit the construction. \[ might be e.g. \[\epsilonου.

11. Not \[ τ\[\oν nor, apparently, \[ κ\[α. 

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 \[ουτ[ο]\epsilonι ου 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 ο of \[ουτ[ο]\[μι, 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 \[Φλι]\[πος would be contrary to rule). But \[εκεινουν 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; \[ου is perhaps more suitable than \[υ but neither is convincing.

27. \[ at the end of the line has been corrected from \[ου, whether by the original or a subsequent hand is difficult to say.
1800. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

1800. **MISCELLANEOUS BIOGRAPHIES.**

Fr. 3 27.1 x 15.4 cm.  Late second or early third century.

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 (Fr. 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 Thucydides 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.

Col. i.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \pi e r i \ \Sigma a p f o u s )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( [\Sigma a p f o w \ \tau o \ \mu e n \ \gamma e n o s] \ \eta n \ \Delta e )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\sigma b i a \ \pi o l e w o s \ \delta e \ \ Μ i t \varphi \lambda \nu \η \nu s] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ( [\pi a t r o s \ \delta e \ \Sigma a k a m a n d r o u \ \kappa a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\tau a \ \delta e \ \tau i w o s \ \Sigma a k a m a n d r o w n u] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\mu o n \ \alpha d e l \phi o u s \ \delta] \ \epsilon \varsigma \chi e \ \tau r e i s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [E r] [\gamma u w o n \ \kappa a i \ \Lambda a r i c h o n \ \pi r e )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma b a [\tau r a t o n \ \delta e \ \X a r a b a o u \ \o s \ \pi l e v )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ( \sigma a s \ [e i s \ \Lambda i \gamma u t o p o n] \ \Delta o r i c h a i \ \tau i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu i \ \pi r o s [\mu i l \eta]\varsigma \ \k a t e d a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \pi a n \eta s e n \ \epsilon i s \ \tau a u t \eta \ \pi l e i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma t a \ \tau o n \ \delta e \ \Lambda a r i c h o n \ \langle \gamma e o u \rangle \ \o n t a \ \mu a l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda o n \ \eta g a p \eta s e n \ \theta u n g a t e r a \ \delta \ \epsilon )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 ( \varsigma \chi e \ \K l e i n \ \o m o w i m o n \ \tau h i \ \epsilon )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha u t \eta s \ \mu \eta \tau r i \ \k[a]\tau \eta \gamma o r r t a i )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Col. ii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \pi e r i \ \Sigma a m a i l e w o u )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 letters ( \omega \varsigma ? )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \pi e r \ \X a m a i l e w o u )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 ( \tau i o s \ e p l a n \eta \eta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha t \ \alpha \tau u o n \ \lambda e g e i \ [\ldots] \ \Lambda i o l \iota \delta i ? )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta i a l e k t \omega i \ \k e \chi r \eta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \gamma a f e n \ \delta e \ \beta u b \lambda i a \ e i n e a \ \mu e n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda u r i k a \ \epsilon l e g e i o w )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta e \ \k a i \ \alpha l l o w )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 ( \epsilon v )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( > \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \pi e r i \ \Sigma i m [\omega n i d o u] )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Sigma i m o n i d o s \ \tau o \ \mu e n \ [\gamma e n o s \ \eta n] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \K e i o s \ \pi o l e w o s \ \delta e \ \I o u \lambda i d o s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \pi a t r o s \ \delta e \ \Lambda e o p r e p o i o w s \ \gamma e o )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 40 \ \nu e n \ \delta e \ \phi i l a r g y r o s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau i \varsigma e s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta \ \alpha u t o i \ \tau h i \ \tau o n \ \mu \nu \eta \mu o )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \nu i k o w \ \epsilon u r e s i w \ \pi r o s [\tau i b e a )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
δ υπ ει[ι]ω[ν] ὡς ατακτὸς οὐν 
[σα] τὸν τρόπον καὶ γυναίκε 
[ρα]ς τριά τὴν δὲ μορφὴν

20 [εν][καταφρονητὸς δοκεὶ γε 
[τ]ὴν μὲν γαρ οὕν φαινότης 
[ν]ῆ πέρχεν τὸ δὲ μεγέθος >

μειχρά παντελῶς τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ

25 [συ]μβεβήκε καὶ περὶ τοῦν 
[. . . .]ν ελαττῶ [.] γεγονα 
[ 15 letters ] , ἦν

Fr. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
<th>Col. iii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 [. . . .] τῶν Δελ[φον . . . .]</td>
<td>[. . . .] εὐωνυμ . [. . . .]</td>
<td>[. . . .] εὐωνυμ . [. . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . .] εὐωνυμ . [. . . .]</td>
<td>[. . . .] εὐωνυμ . [. . . .]</td>
<td>[. . . .] εὐωνυμ . [. . . .]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>. . . .</th>
<th>. . . .</th>
<th>. . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 ν μένου δὲ τοῦ ἱέρειου καὶ</td>
<td>[ο] μέν [υ] εαυτοὶς μαχαιρὰς</td>
<td>[. . .oned . . .]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 [ν]ορ καστὸς ην αν ἰαχυσθη</td>
<td>[. . . .] ὑπασαυτα αὐτὸν αμοι</td>
<td>[. . . .] ὑπασαυτα αὐτὸν αμοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . . .] λείρ</td>
<td>[. . . .] ἐπεσκαψεν εφ οἰς διοργι</td>
<td>[. . . .] ἐπεσκαψεν εφ οἰς διοργι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
σθεντες οἱ πολλοὶ λίθοις
50 αὐτὸν βαλλοῦτες κατὰ
κρημνοῦ εωσάν μετ' οὖν
πολὺ δὲ λοιμικὸν πάθος
ἐπεσκηγῷ τῇ πολεί χρῆ
στηριαζόμενοι δ' αὐτοῖς
55 ο θεὸς ανείπεν οὐ προτεῖν
.downcase

η

ρου [Ἀνὴρ] εἰν τὸν νοσ[ον μὲ
χρισ [αὐτὰ] εἰσὶ ἱεράς
[κονταί οἱ δὲ περίτεις [γ
[χιο]αντες τὸν τόπον [ἐν

60 [ο θ]αστέπασεν βωμῶν δὲ [θ]ι
δ[ρωσα]μενοι λυτηρίων
τῆς νοσοῦ οὐκ ἤρωθ τ[ῦσιας
πρὸ[ς]ηνεγκαν

peror Θουκυδίδου

65 Θουκυδίδης τὸ μεν γε[νοι]
ἣν Ἀθηναίων παῖ[σ] δ Ὀ[λοὲ
ρου διαβαλλοῦσι δὲ τον πα
τέρα αὐτοῦ Θραίκα οὖντα
eis Ἀθηνᾶς μετοικισθῆ
c

70 ναὶ δυνατοὶ δὲ εὖ λογοῖς α

γ[ε με]νοις ἀνεγρα

ψευ τὸ[ν] γενομένον Ἀθη
nοις [και] Πελοπονη
c σιοὶ πολέμουν

Fr. 3.

Col. i. [ ]

Col. ii. 25 [γε]νομενοις τοῦ φ[αρμα]

[κ]ου συντομῶς εξε[πνευ

[σε] μεχρὶ τελ[ο]ν το τῆς [ε
[ει]θεριας [αξ]ωμα δια
[φυλαξει Αθηναιοι δε πα]

30 [λι]ν την ελευθεριαν α
νακτησαμενοι ετιμη
σαι αυτου εικονα χαλκην
αναστησαντες εν Κερα []
μικου επιγραμμα τε [εν]
ςτηλη ενεκολαψαν τοι
ουδε ειπερ ισαι γνωμαι
ρωμαν Δημοσθενες εσχες
ουποτ αν Ελληνων ηρ-
ξεν Αρης Μακεδων

>——

40 περι Αισιχυνου
Αισιχυνης ο ρητωρ το μεν γε
νος ην [Αθηναιοι παις δε]
Ατρομητου και μητρος
Πλαυκοθεας πρεσβυτατος

45 των αδελφων Φιλοχαρους
και Δαοφβοιου κατ αρχας δε
ετριταγωνισθει τραγωδοις
υποκριμωνου ευφυς
δε εν λογοις γενομενος

50 αντι της σκηνης το των
Αθηναιων βημα διεδε
ξατο γραφομενος δε Κτη
σιφωντα παρανομων
οτι μη δεοντως εστεφα

55 νωςε Δημοσθενη χρυ
σωι στεφανωι καινωι
τραγωδοις ου μεταλα
βων δε το πεμπτον με
ρος των ψηφων φυγας

60 εξηε των Αθηνων
Δημοσθενης δε ου μνη
σικακησας επι τοις γεγε

ημενοις το δε ασατον

της τυχης ευλαβηθηεις ε

65 [φοδ]ουν αυτωι αργυριουν

[τα]λ]αυτον προσεπεμψεν

[ο δε] ου δεξαμενος εδα

[kρυ]σεν πυθανομενου

[δε τ]ίνος επι τινι δακρυν

70 [ειπ]ε οτι τοιαυτης πολεως

[απα]λαττομαι εν ηι και

[εχθροι] συνπαθε[σ]περοι

[φιλω]ν ευρισκοντα]μι γενο

[μενος δε εν] P[οδα]ι σχολην

75 [.............] Αττικον

[.............] Ροδο[ios]

---

Frs. 4 + 5.

ναιοι[...

μητ[...

dε τ[...

κτο[...

5 λει[...

οπε[...]. α[...

> [περι] Θρασυβουλου

Θρασυβουλου παι[σ μεν ην Λυκου

[to δε γ]εν[ο]ς Αθη[ναιοιο Στει

10 [ριευς] Δε των δημουω .......

[.........]. λε πατ[...

---

Frs. 6 + 7.

Col. i. ..

Col. ii.

[.. . .. .] ρα[..]. [.. .] [.. .]

[.. . ? συ]ι [αυτωι απο Φυλης

[.. . ? καταγο]ου ι του δημου ως

[δε κατε]λυθηναι του τρια

5 [κοντα] εγραψεν ψηφισμα

[Θρασυβου]λους μεταδιδους

[αυτοις?] της πολιτειας α

[προκυ]λευν του ψη

[φισματος] γεναμενου ου

10 [κ ετυχου] ης τιμης ο δε παν

[.. . . . .]. νας αγαπη...

[σαις ελη..]εν τοις δικα> δ[...

[στ]ηριο[ισ i]ς κινδυνευ α[...

[.. . . . .]. ως δ εκουλ

15 [θη ? .........] κψηφ[....]
1800. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 8.

Col. i.

\[ \mu \eta \\
\eta \delta e \\
\sigma \theta e ta \\
\omicron \upsilon \nu \\
\] apo \\
\omicron \sigma \chi a \\
\omicron \mu ou \\
\] \sigma per a un \\
tov\nu A\theta\nu a i

5

Col. ii.

\[ 20 \ \alpha \theta e o s \ [ \]
\] \varepsilon u g e n e i a [ \]
\] e p e i \delta e ? \\
\] \eta A\theta\nu a i [\omicron \sigma \tau r a t e i a ? \pi e r i \\
\] \Lambda \alpha m i a n t h s (\Theta e s s a l i a s \\
\] s u n n t u x h e s [e n \ \omicron \ \omicron s w n e r \\
\] 25 \ \gamma o s t o i \ \Delta h m o [\sigma \theta e n e i \ \omicron \nu \\
\] \upsilon p \alpha \nu A n t i p a t r o u \ e n t o i s \\
\] \delta e k a \ r h \tau o r s i [ \eta \tau \theta i \kappa a i \ p a n ? \\
\] t o n a t u x h e s [a s \ldots \ldots \\
\] a u t o s e n \ M a k e d o n i a i a \\
\] 30 \ \pi \omega l e t o A\theta \nu n a i o i \ d e \ p a \\
\] [\lambda] \nu t h n \ e l e u \theta [e r i a n a n a k o \\
\] m i s a m e n o i \ \kappa a [\ldots \ldots \ a v \\
\] [\tau] \nu n a n d r i a s i n \ e [\tau i m h s a n \\
\] ______ [\pi e r i] \ L e u k o k o m a \\
\] 35 \ L e u k o k o m a s t o \ g e [\nu o s \ m e n \\
\] \eta \ K r h [s] p o l e o [s] \ d e \ K i o \\
\] s o u m i r [a k i a] k o s [d e \ \omicron \nu e n \\
\] p r e p h [s]

Fr. 9.

\[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \]
\[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \omega y o s \ a g [\ldots \ldots \\
\] \[ \ldots \ldots \ .] p o l i t e u s [a \\
\] \[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \] v t i k a i \ \omicron \ i d [o w \\
\] [t o n \ \omicron \ \omicron \ \omicron \ d e i n \ t h s e l e u \theta e \\
\] 5 [\rho i a s \ldots \ldots ] s t h w s \ \delta e \ t o t e \\
\] [ \] a n a \\
\] [ \]

Fr. 10.

\[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \]
\[ ] [ \ldots \ldots \\
\] [ ] e d i d o u \\
\] [a n o n t h s \\
\] [ \] \theta a n o n \\
\] 5 [ \] \pi a r a \\
\] [ \] v s \ \nu \ [.]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 11.

[. . .] νόθ
[περὶ Αβώθρου

Αβώθρου εὖ Θώρα?

καὶ π
5 εὖ Ἡῴ[νια]

καὶ . [ αν
τὴ[φ[ γῆς α[]

Fr. 12.

οι [ . . .
τω [. .] [αθει[ [τω[ [τρο[τ]ς χρησα[ [η[ μαρτεν σεο[ [θο[ [. . . . . . . .[
[γαρ θεασαμ[εν [. . . . . . . .[
[. . . Προβατ[ 5 ]αρτ[ . [
[ε[μαμε[ [σιασ[ [οι[ [Χρον καθ[ [λον[ [ομενο[ . [
[ν[ . [ γα[ . . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[

Fr. 13.

[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[

Fr. 14.

[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[

Fr. 15.

5 εσων [ . . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[

Fr. 16.

5 δημ[ . . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[
[. . . . . . . .[

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. Μετ' ἀληφης: 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. Σκαυμανθρον: this is known as a Lesbian name (cf. Dion. Hal. ix. 18, Lebas, L
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

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. [Eρ]ίγυνος: in Suidas s. v. Σαπφώ, where alone this brother is mentioned, the name is spelled Εὐρίγυνος, and [Ε]ρίγυνος could equally well be read here, but cf. Arrian iii. 6. 8 Ερίγυνος ὁ Λαρίχων, Diod. xvii. 81, 83; moreover in Suidas, l. c., the name of Sappho’s father was according to some authorities Ἱερίγυνος, which is no doubt a corruption of Ερίγυ.

Δαριχων : 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, Erygyius.

10. Αργυρτος suits the space better than Ναυκρατιν (Strab. xvii. 808, Athen. 596 b). Δωρίκα occurs in 1231. i. ii; cf. Strab. l. c. τῆς ἑταῖρας... ἤν Σαπφώ μὲν... καλεῖ Δωρίκαν... ἄλλου δ’ ὁμομιμοῦσι τριβοῦσιν (ἄλλου include Hdt. ii. 135; cf. Athen. 596 c).

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

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

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


26. Perhaps [Αλκαυνο], 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 γεγονότα, since there is not room for ελαστων γαρ γεγον(ε). Perhaps τε stood in the lacuna.

27. η is preceded by the top of a vertical stroke, which would suit υ or ν; λι 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 Παυσιός, since Chamaeleon was a native of Heraclea, but Ποιήτες would rather be expected, as e. g. Athen. 273 c Χαμ. ὁ Ποιήτες. 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 τριγράμματα καὶ ἐλεγεία καὶ ἀμφίβος καὶ μονοδίας. The suggested restoration assumes what is quite uncertain, that the non-lyrical poems were included in a single book. ο ελεγείαν is very doubtful, only a very small vestige remaining which would also suit α, but ελεγείακον δὲ would not fill the line, and the epigrams &c. ought not to have been ignored.

II. 36–46. ‘Concerning Simonides. Simonides was a Cean 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. Λεωπρ.

40. φιλοκέρδης: cf. Pindar, Isthm. ii. 6 ὁ Μούσα γὰρ ὃς φιλοκέρδης κτλ., and Schol. νιν,
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. prosoxeirē dē kai tā makρα τῶν στοιχείων καὶ διπλά, but the statement in the papyrus does not coincide and a suitable restoration remains to be found. At the beginning of l. 47 either κ[ or χ[ may be read, and στω[κ[ε[ suggests itself, but δ[πλα στο[ιε[ would be too long and does not well accord with the rest of the line. The letter before στ is either o or ω, and α[ may be αῦ[.

48. εὐ: or σε; σου[ρ]ησα is possible.

Fr. 2. i–29. That the remains of these lines relate, like ll. 30 sqq., to Aesop is uncertain, but is suggested by l. 18 μυ[θ[ . . . (?); ασκρίμ[ασ[ has been restored in l. 21 on this hypothesis.

31. ενωμ[ . . . is apparently meant, in spite of the unusual diaeresis; the letter after α may be either o or ω, and the vestige at the end of the line is consistent with i 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. 1. ε[ρ[ω[ : ερ[ω[ 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. Respūb. Magn. 2. Plutarch in De sera numinis vind. 556 has a different version which represents Aesop as coming to Delphi with offerings from Cretus and brings in Iadmon, as in Hdt. ii. 134.

51. κρημ[ν[ο[ : the πέρια 'Υάμπε[ia 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 malign 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 Θράκιον δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ γένος' καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῷ "Ολορος ἐκ Θράκιας εἶχε τοῦμα.
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 ἰκρινον γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ τάφου κεῖσθαι, τοῦ κενοτάφιον δὲ τοῦτο γνώρισμα εἶναι. But according to the same authority, 17 (cf. 32 and 55), the tomb was among the Κυμώνια μνήματα πρὸς τὰς Μελετίας πῦλας ἐν Κοιλη, which does not suit the demo-name in ll. 8—9, and the reference of this passage to Thucydides is therefore very questionable. The letter after α in l. 8 seems to be μ or λ, pointing to Ἀμαζωντεύσι, Ἀλαμεύσι or Ἀλωπεκεύσι: Ἀλμουντί (Thucydides' deme) can certainly not be read. In l. 6 αὐτοῦ εἰπὶ τῆς Ἀρτικῆς suggests itself, and Ἀρτικῆς is not inconsistent with the scanty remains. In l. 7 αὐς or λοι is more suitable than νοι.

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. ὁμήροι: 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. Onct.).

22. εἰνοπφίσαντο: cf. Plutarch, Dem. 4 τὰ μὲν νοσήματα, τὰ δὲ ἀμελησάντων.
24. παρέλθωσι συντομίας καὶ αὐστικότητας.

32—3. Cf. Plutarch, Dem. 30 α τῶν Ἀθ. δήμος . . . εἰκών τε χαλκῆς ἀνάστησε. According to Plutarch, X Oral. VI. 847 καὶ, the statue was πλησίον τοῦ περικεισμάτως καὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν: Suidas says ἐν ἀγορᾷ. αὐτὸν rather than αὐτὸν is expected.
34—9. The epigram is quoted also by Plutarch, ll. cc., and Suidas, who rightly give ἵσην ῥώμην γνώµην. Plutarch, Dem. 39, and Suidas say that it was on the base of the statue.
49—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 Philocharis 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.
56–7. κανον πραγματικον: 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:—πειρατος δ’ Ἀισχύλου μετὰ τὴν καταδίκην, ἐπεὶ κατεδώξεν αὐτὸν (SC. Δημοσθένης) τοῦ δ’ ὦμβλητος αὐτῶν συλλαμβάνοντα καὶ προσπεσόντα καὶ συγκαλυφαίμενον, ἀναστήσως αὐτὸν παρεμβῆσαι καὶ τάλαυντον έδώκες ὁργήριον.

76. Ῥόδους: 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 doubtful; the dissimilarity of the versos rather favours the latter alternative.

1. Possibly Πιττρο[μ] . . . , but the doubtful ρ may be any long letter—ν, φ, ψ.
2. συβ: the doubtful ν may equally be λ.

5 sqq. Cf. Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 40. 2 καὶ δοκεὶ τοῦτο τε πολιτεύσαται καλῶς Ἀρχίνος καὶ μετὰ ταύτα γραφόμενο το ψήφισμα το Θρασυβοῦλου παραμόρφω, εν δ’ μετέδοθον τής πολιτείας πασι τοῖς ἐκ Πειραιῶς συγκατεδυόται, ὥν ἐνα ναοὺς ἠσαν δούλων. A comparison of that passage suggests that δοῦλα were mentioned in the lacuna preceding l. 2 autou απο Φυλῆς, and that autou or πασιν should be restored in l. 7; but ll. 11–15 are more difficult.

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

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

12–14. The position of the small detached fragment containing the letters )κ ελ[ and ]ρω[ with vestiges of a third line is made practically certain by the similarity of the fibres of the papyrus. In l. 12 the γ is quite uncertain, and e.g. ελγ[εν] would be possible. In l. 14 the vestige of the first letter suits ρ and the following have rounded tops like σ, σ, or εσ.

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 f, Phocion 23), was one of the orators whose surrender was demanded by Antipater after the battle of Cnonon (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 αὐτῶν γνωστομαθήματι εἰς Μικαδονίων ἔδωκτο).

22–3. For the loose reference to Lamia cf. e.g. Pausan. vii. 10. 4 ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ ἐν Δαμή πταίμα εὖνέτο.

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.

34–8. 'Concerning Leucocomas. Leucocomas was a Cretan by birth, of the city of Cnosos. Being a comely youth (he was beloved by Promachus ...).'

34 sqq. The story of Leucocomas and Promachus is known only from Conon 16. The passage is: τα περὶ Προμάχου καὶ Λευκοκόμα τῶν γνωστῶν ... διεξευσώ ὡς ἦρα Πρόμαχος νεανίου καλοῦ τοῦ Λευκοκόματ' ὡς ἄδικα αὐτῷ μεγάλα πρότεινε καὶ κανόνων μεστά' ὡς πάντα ὑπόστη Πρόμαχος ἐλπίδι τοῦ τυχεῖν ὡς δὲ οὐκ ὑστὸν τυχάνει, καὶ ἀντιλυπτεί Λευκοκόμαν τὸ τελευταῖον τῶν ἅβλων (κραίνος δ' ἦν περιβότην) ἐν ἐτέρῳ καλῷ νεανίᾳ ὁράντων περιβεῖς τοῦ Λευκοκόματ' καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἐνεγκὼν τὴν ἑλπισπιάν ξίφει ιαυτὸν διεχρόκατο.

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 Ἀμάθρης seems at all likely, especially as it is clear from Fr. 8. ii. 34 sqq. that this collection of biographies included mythical persons. For Abdera cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀμάθρης, Apollodor. ii. 5, 8, 341. 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. κπι: or λπι, but ἢρκακπί 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. 2. ἦμενεσ 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 ἱν in l. 4.

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

1801. Glossary.

13 × 10.6 cm. First century.

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 y-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 [Δρ]ακόνος Δρακων (cf. Choerob. In Theod. Can. p. 79, Gaisf.), a new section begins 12 Περὶ δὲ τοῦ αὐτήρ βατηρ καὶ τῶν ὀμοί 13 ὠν επιλαμβανεται ἑκάτερον... 14 λέγων μὴ εσταίαι [τὸν τούτων ἀριθμὸν 15 μον μηδε δινασθαι τι.]... 16 τις (ἡ corr.) ἀναλογικά Εὐλαμβάνεται ὧν ὡς ἔπειδη ὁ Γενναδίου τὰ ὀμοία ὀντα... 18 μοιχώς σχηματιζεται [οὐτω γαρ αὐ] 19 λέγωντε πρῶτον μεν ὃτι...
Col. i.

[... ... ... ... ... ......] με [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] αν ε[ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] υτον λ[ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] τετταρα[... ... ... ... ... ...] τα ι 5 [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] ωλιβαμ [...] κευ[ ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] γειρακες [...] γειρακες αι γλαυκε(ς) παρα [ ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] εις και στρατον η[ ... ... ] 10 [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] Σοφοκ[ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] λης δε εν Σαλ[ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] μ[ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] προστασιμον της [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] συμμ ... ... ν πα[ ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] ον λο [ ... ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] [ ... ] 15 [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] και Ευπολις εν [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] μας ουτι ποιν πολ [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] λ[ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] εν Σαμυριως αλλ οταν [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] γας σαφ ιστε και σοφοις [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] εκανον αρσεμονον 20 [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] αι [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] βελεκος Αριστοφανης εν Πολυδωι και [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] των βελεκων λεγει δε περι αυτων [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] λογον τουτον εστιν [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] εις παρα τοις την 25 [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] [. ως] περ ο πισος και λα [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] θυρος ομοιος ι κριωνοι το μεγε [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] θος 15 letters βελεκους καλουσιν [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] 30 [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] ν η [ ... ... ... ... ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ]
1801. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

[...]. γελω[...
[...].] μτος ε[...]: τὴν γνω[θον]. [...].
[...]. τα. [.] μνου[...]. εχο [.]. [...].
[...].] αι και τὸν Κρατ[...]. νον εν Θρα[...].

35 [...]. διλογχον θεον η[...]. [...].
[...].] μηνα[...]. [.] ιπερ [.]. [...].
[...]. ον ποδηρη. ομικα [.]. [...].
epsilon [.]. [.] ορατον ει και φ[...]. [...].
α[...].] ο βελτιστε πειστε[...]. [...].

40 β[εμβιξ] ] περιστρ[οφη] Αρ[ιστοφανης]? [...]. [...].] θων ενι[...]. δε σχημ[...]. [...].

Βελ[βιν]α κομη τ[...]. Ασκονι[κης]. [...].
[...].] στις ακριβος[...].] ατρ[...]. [...].
και Φυλαρχος εν τη δ [.]. [...].

45 [Β]ερεσχετοι ανοητο[ι] πεπλασται παρ Αριστοφ[ανει]
βέλος Αριστοφανης] εν Αχαρ[νεισι]. [...].

αν παρην λεγεω εγχος δι [.]. [...].

βεβυςμεν]ενον πληρες τη [.]. [...].

gη βεβυςμενη Αριστοφ[ανης] εν [...].

50 Βεργαιος Αλεξ[ισ] εν Ησιογ[ηι]. [...].
εστι και κομπασματα [.]. [...].

Βεργαίον αποδειξενυ ιθλον [.].
αυτοι σκοπετε νυν εγω δ [.]. [...].

νος γαρ ως πεπακεν εις τ [.]. [...].

55 εστιν δ η Βεργη της Θρα[ικης]
Βελλερον τον Βελλεροπο[ν]. [...].
βερβινων Ερμιπης εν Στρατιωταίς?

ων τας ληνθους κατη[...]. [...].

βηρχηκες Αριστοφανης] [εν [...].

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

7. Cf. Hesych. Βελέκκος έραξες. It is not possible to read η or και before γλαυκες, though one of those words should perhaps be restored. o could well be read in place of αι but would be unintelligible. The similar gloss of Hesychius βάραξ’ έραξες παρά Λίβσοι suggests that Λίβσοι may be the name in the lacuna after παρα; but the name may also have been that of the author who used the form.

10. Σαλ[μ]οψ[ε]ι is consistent with the remains, which do not suit Σατυρος (cf. l. 17).

11. προστασιον is apparently novel.

13. or: perhaps σω.

16. μασ ουτε: or μα σου τι.

19. The first letter may be e.g. β, δ, ρ. Neither αροε for αρατι nor αρ σε is attractive in this context.

21-7. Cf. Elym. Magn. Βελέκκος δαστρια και των Βελέκκων, 'Αριστοφάνης. Hesych. Βελέκκος δαστριας τι εμφαρει λαθυρω μεγεθος ερεμιδου εξου. The papyrus, besides giving the name of the play of Aristophanes, confirms the view of earlier editors that και των was part of the citation; Kock prints Βελέκκων only (Fr. 755). Lines 23 sqq. are an excerpt from a prose writer who described the Βελέκκος. κριοτος from κριος (vetch) is unattested.

34 sqq. Cf. Hesych. s. v. δίδοιχυρ, την Βενον αυτω Κρατινον εν Θράττας εκάλεσεν, ήτοι δι των τιμας εκληρωσατο, οδηγαν τε και χλωνιαν . . . η ου διο λόγχας φερει κτιλ. From this it is plain that ll. 34-5 are not at any rate part of a note on Βενον, of whom Hesych. says s. v., η 'Αρτεμις. Θρακιστι' παρα δε 'Αδηναίας ἑορτή Βενόθεα. 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. Μυην in l. 36 is possibly τήμυν (cf. Hesych. διο τιμας). In l. 37 κωμικαὶ is apparently not to be read, unless ο was here written differently from those elsewhere. In l. 38 τιμοσ[σ]ε is not impossible.

40. Cf. Hesych. βεθβίσ . . . δινη. If, however, αρ[ is 'Αριστοφάνης, as is natural to suppose, the name of the play seems to have been omitted, contrary to the compiler’s usual practice. βεθβίσες εγγενεστερων (Vesp. 1530) suggests itself, and might not be too long if Αριστοφ(ανος) were written; πε[ρ]ι αρκρ]δων (Ltr. 1461) is a not very satisfactory alternative.

42. Cf. Hesych. Βελησινα τώ γε Λακωνική.

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 Βεργαώος acquired a similar connotation; cf. e. g. Strabo ii. 100 τὸ δὲ Βεργαώον διήγημα τοῦτο ἐν πίστεις μέρει τιθεί. Steph. Byz. says that a verb Βεργαώειν was also coined.


57-8. Cf. Hesych. βεργαῖα ξίλα καθηλομένα, εἴ δὲ τὰς ηρκύδους ἐκρίμων. The Στρατιώτα 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. βεργαῖων τας λ. κατιγαγον) or as explanatory (e. g. ξίλα εἴ | ὡν, on the lines of Hesych).

59-60. Cf. Hesych. βήρηκες μάζα ὅρθαί. οἱ δὲ ἀπλῶς μάζας. ἄλλα μάζας ἀνωθέν κέρατα ἐχοῦσας, καὶ βάρακτ... καὶ φύραμα στρογγύλων ὅφει ὡν αἱ μάζες, Eustath. 1414. 29.

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

1802. Glossary.

Fr. 3 14·3 X 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 (Frs. 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 (ll. 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 Ζίθη 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. 26–35 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 1</th>
<th>Fr. 2</th>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κ[</td>
<td>λα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v [</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>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>[</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1802. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 3. Col. i.

Μαργιανοι; en] Ὑ Σκυ[θικ]ων

|νοι αρχη[... ητρ[...]
|α ποιουντε[ς ε]φθουσια
| en τω περι του κατα Ασι

παρ ετεροις Μαρδοι κ[α]λουνται

avan

Ασκληπιαδής en [.] επιγ[ρ]α

κα[τα Ασιαν α

]σω ευρυχωρια [....

]ο Ιτυκαιος

? Πα[ρθοι πρ[...]

καθη[-

Col. ii.

[με[λισσα[ ] άι της Δημη[τ]ρος ερει[α]ί η αυτη Απολλ[ωνια ?] en τη α επ[αγον ]

σαν δε τον καλαθον τας Νυφαις συν τω ιστω και τοις εργοις της Περ

σεφωνης α μεν παραγενεσθαι εις Παρον και ξεινατεσθαι παρα

to βασιλει Μελισσον χαρισασθαι ταις τουτου θυγατρασι ουσις εξη

κοντα του της Φερσεφωνης ιστον και πρωται αυταις αναδοναι

tα περι αυτην παθη te και μυστηρια οθεν και μελισσας εκτοτε

κληθηναι τας θεσμοφοριαξουσας {κληθηναι} γυναικας

μελυγιον ποματιον τι Συντικον Γλαυκος en έξηγησεως τοπων των κει [][μενων ετ άριστερα του Ποντου μερη συνκαταθεμ[ε]νων δε των ελα

tων ελυσε του συλλογον και απολυθεντες εκαστός] επι τα ιδια παρ

εσκενάξον το μελυγιον τουτο δε το πομα μεθυσκει μαλλον του

οινου γεινεται δε εφομενον του μελιτος μεθ υδατος και βοτα

νη[ς] τινος εμβαλλομενης φερει γαρ αυτων η χωρα πολν το με
λι ετι δε και το ζυτος ο ποιουσιν εκ της κεγχρου 
μελωδια η τραγωδια το παλαιον ελεγετο ως Χαλλιμακος εν υπο 
μνημασιν 
45 μενεμαι το υδωρ παρα τος Περσαις Ζευνων ε[ν .......]. ον 
μερμαδαι οι πριορχια παρα Ανδοις Ανδρων ε[ν], του Πολε 
μου του προς τους βαρβαρους 
μεροπες οι αφροες υπο Ευβοεων Διονυσιος εν [.........] 
μερου ειδος οριεων υπερ ανυκεκτρεφει τους κ[.........] 
50 Αριστοτελης εν η περι των εν τοις ζωοις μοριων 
μεσοτελεστον το ημιτελεστον Διτωλους [.........] 
[.........]μασιν 
[.........]μασιν[......]μασιν[......]κοισα [ ] 

Col. iii. 

55 ουν εστι μεικρον Αθηναδιον και επιγε[γραφθαι φασιν αυτω ]? 
την Μητιν 
μητραι ειδος μελισσων Αριστοτελης εν η περι των εν τοις ζωοις μοριω 
μητραι εν Ταρσω και Σόλοις τας δελτους εν αις αγ[αγραφουι ? τας 
οικιας μητρας προσαγορευεθαι α. και δημ[.........] Άριστοτε 
60 λης εν τη Σολεων πολειτεια 
μισθηρ ο ειδος εαυτου μη καθαρον αιματος και ελθων ανα μη 
δει και μιαινων Αγοκλειδης εν τω επιγραφ[ματι ]? 
μιθοργ γενος τι αρχονιας παρα Χαλδαιοις περ[.........] 
Μιθρας ο Προμηθεως κατα δι αλλος ο νης παρα Περσαις [.........] 
65 μιληχ γενειον υπο Αλβαιων των ομοροντων[.............] 
ωσ Ηρακλείδης εν α Ξεινης φωνης 
μινοδολουσα αριθμων συνταξις παρα Χαλδαιο[ισ] η εν τω 
κατα Βαβυλωνα 
Μινως ου μονον Ορχομενιοι αλλα και οι Μαγνητε[σ] εν τω πε 
70 δι ποταμων 
μινωδες αμπελιοι τινες ουτω λεγονται παρα Ροδ[ιου]ς [.........] 
μισαι ο παρα Χαλδαιοις η των μελλουτων προγνωσι[ς] εν τω 
κατα Βαβυλωνα 
Μιτυληναιοι καπηλου απ[.........] ως Ηγιανδρος [εν υπομνημασι ]?
Fr. 2. 5. Antenor may be the historian of Crete referred to e. g. by Plutarch, Mal. Herod. 22.

8. Aristotelēs ev? Cf. Fr. 3. 59. Aristotle’s treatise on the Thessalian constitution is cited by Harpocrate s. v. τετραρχία as ἡ κοινή θεττ. πολ. ; Athen. xi. 499 b omits κοινή.
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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 Μαργανοί; cf. Strabo xi. 510–1, where the Ἀμαρδοί, Μαργανοί, and Σκάθαι are mentioned in close connexion; possibly Μαργανοί is to be restored in l. 2. εὐθυσμαθιὰν;

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

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

8. ἡμικλείδης: perhaps the author of the Ξένη φωνή mentioned in l. 66, or e.g. Heraclides Lembus, 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 Ἀσίαν: cf. l. 17; but the division τὰ Ἀσίαν is of course possible.

13. Possibly διαμένοντος ὁ Ἰτυκαῖος, the writer of a Πιθοτομικά who is mentioned by Steph. Byz. s.v. Ιτύκη.

19. ὡς ἔργασιοι may well be part of the title of some treatise.

27. Πάρος more probably than ὁμοθέτων, perhaps.

29–35. μελισσαί: 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; whereas the women who took part in the Thesmophoria were thereafter called Melissae.”

l. 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. μελισσαί: ait τῆς Δήμητρος μυστικὰς, Porphyry. De antr. Nymph. 18 τὸς Δήμητρος ἑρείας ὡς τῆς χρονίας θιάς μυστικδας μελισσαί τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἔκλαου, Schol. Pind. Pyth. iv. 106. Though the letters at the beginning of the line are mostly broken, the remains well suit the reading adopted, with which Αὐτοκλέων or Αὐτοκλεῖαν seems unavoidable.

30. For the καλάβως cf. e.g. Callim. H. Cer. 1 sqq., 121 sqq., and Schol. H. Cer. i 6 ὁ Φιλαδέλφος Πτολεμαῖος κατὰ μίσην τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔθη τινα ἵθες ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρεια, ἐν οἷς καὶ τῆς τοῦ καλάβου πρόσωπον. ἢθος γὰρ ἦν ἐν Ἀθηναῖς ἐν ὄρμαιε ἢμέρα ἐπὶ ὀχήματον φέρεσθαι καλάβως ἐς τιμὴν τῆς Δημήτρου. The καλάβως worn on the head is a common emblem both of Demeter and Persephone. References to the ιστός of the latter do not seem to occur.

ταῖς Νυμφαίς: cf. Schol. Pindar, Pyth. iv. 106 ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὰς περὶ τὰ ἱερὰ νυμφᾶς μελίσσας ἕλεγον Μνασίας ὁ Παταρηκές ὑφηγείται λέγων... ἀνεν γὰρ Νυμφῶν οὐτε Δήμητρος ἱερῶ τιμᾶται... οὔτε γάρος οἰδέτις ἀνεν Νυμφῶν συνελείται.

31–2. α = πρώτων: l. ξενοθείσαν. Melissus king of Paros and his 60 daughters are apparently not elsewhere mentioned. Paros, however, was prominent in the worship of Demeter; cf. e.g. Homer, H. Demet. 401, where Paros is mentioned next to Eleusis, Nicanor, ap. Steph. Byz. s.v. Πάρος, who says that the name Δημήτριος was applied to the island, and the statement in Schol. Aristoph. ΑΤ. 1764 that Archilochus wrote a hymn to Demeter at Paros. According to Pausan. x. 28. 3 the ὄργα τῆς Δημήτρος were said to have been brought to Thasos from Paros; other references are collected in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencycl. iv. 2722–3.
34-5. Cf. Pindar, Pyth. iv. 106 μελίσσας Δαλφίδος, of the prophetess, and Callim. H. Apoll. 110 Δηνίδες δέ οὖν ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέοντο μέλισσα. κληθηναι has been inadvertently repeated.

36-42. 'Μελίγυαν: a Scythian beverage. Glauclus 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 he prepared the μελίγυαν. 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 millet."

Cf. Etym. Magn. μελίγυαιν, πομάτιον Σκυθικών, γενόμενον ἐκ μύου μέλιτος μεθ’ ὕδατος, βοσάνης τινώς ἐμβαλλόμενης (similarly Zonar. μελίγυαιν' πάμα τι Σκ. κτλ.), Hesych. μελίτον πάμα τι Σκυθικών μελίτος ἐφομένον στὸν ὕδατι καὶ πόρι τινί. The Etym. Magn. is especially close to the papyrus, and the spelling μελίγυαιν is confirmed as well as πομάτιον, which Dindorf wished to emend to πάμα τι from Hesych.; a more probable alteration would be to write ἐφομένον for ἐκ μύου. In l. 36 l. Σκυθικών. The treatise of Glauclus 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. οὖν (l. 37) = ἐλατήρ in Eurip. Fr. 773. 28 ποιμένας ἔλαται; Ελατήριων is hardly likely in this context.

43-4. This is a new piece of information, apparently. The term μελίφθια may have been applied to tragedy in its germinal dithyrambic stage.

45. l. Ζηνον, i.e. not improbably the grammarian of Myndus, who is cited e.g. in Etym. Magn. 590. 44 s. ν. μοριάν. The vestiges before οὖν are consistent with e.g. δ', λ, μ, but Δέξεως is unsuitable. As for μεμεμα, Mr. R. Levy tells us that μαγα, 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 ἀμνις.

46. Cf. Hesych. μέροπες τρίφωνος. The family name of Gyges was Μερμάδαι according to Herodotus i. 7. 14. Ανδρων is perhaps more likely to be the historian from Halicarnassus than the Alexandrian who wrote Χροικά (Athen. iv. 184 b), 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 prolic Διονύσιος ο Ερδά, Διονύσιος ο Τρίφωνος, whose extensive treatise περί ὕδατον is cited by Athenaeus, Harpocratio, and Steph. Byz.

49-50. l. μεροψ. ε of opep has been corrected from a or o. The word beginning with κ should mean 'parents' or something analogous; κἡδεμανα is hardly satisfactory. The μέροψ is mentioned by Aristotle in An. Hist. ix. 13, p. 615 b 25 φασι δὲ τινὲς τῶν μ. . . ἄποτετρέφεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἑκόνων: cf. Hesych. μέροπες . . . καὶ ὄρεα τινὰ, ὡς 'Αριστοτέλεις. 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 θετ. άνιμ.); cf. l. 57 n.

51. μεσοταλεστον; so 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- = ἡμι- cf. Hesych. μεσόφημον ἡμιζημόν. A few Aetolian forms are given in Hesych., e.g. κίβα, ἄρα, παγάνια.

54. Χαλκίωτον was restored by Lobel, no doubt rightly. The identification of Μήτις and Athena is apparently novel; Apollodor. i. 3. 6 puts them in the relation of mother and daughter. Cf. Hesych. Μήττης σύνετες . . . καὶ ἡ θεός.

57. του was originally written after en, i.e. the writer began to write τουB owing to the repetition of en. μήτρα σφηκῶν and ἄνθρωπων 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. μὴτρά eidos σφηκός.

58–60. Cf. Hesych. μὴτρα ... καὶ ὁ κλήρος ὑπὸ Σωλέων, ὡς Κλείταρχος. In l. 58 σὺγγραφοῦσι would also be possible, or the letter after τ is might well be ι. In l. 59 neither ας καὶ nor ας καὶ suits the remains; perhaps there was a correction and αι καὶ was intended. That Σώλος was included among Aristotle’s collection of constitutions was unknown.

61. μεστήρ is presumably a copyist’s error for μιστήρ; cf. Photius μίστηρ᾽ σταν τις αὐτὸν μὴ καθάρων εἰδός παρέχεται ἵνα μὴ δεί, μεμασμένος, whence the supplement in the latter part of the line has been derived. The identity of Αὐτοκλείδης is doubtful; he is not likely to be the writer of ἐξηγητικά mentioned by Plutarch, Nic. 23.

63. 1. ἄρμονας. Hesych. gives several Chaldaean words, but μιθρύς 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. μιθρας ὁ ἱλιος παρὰ Πέρσας, and the similar but longer notes in Suidas and Photius.

65–6. At the end of the line e. g. τους Ἐθνος or Ἀρμένοιος would be suitable; cf. Strabo xi, p. 501. The work on Ζήτη φωνή 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. μυμαλλεόςας ἄρμιστος καὶ τὰ πέρι οἱράνα σύνταξις. Βαμβλώνοι. In consideration of this compiler’s fondness for giving authority it is preferable to treat κατὰ Βαμβλῶνα as part of a title rather than to read e. g. Χάλδαιοις τους ουσί; cf. ll. 72–3, where των κατὰ Βαμ. 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. Μυνίων οἱ Ὑφραντέοις, καὶ Μάγριπτες. 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.


72. Either 6 before παρά is superfluous or something has dropped out. For the citation cf. n. on ll. 66–7. μυμαία according to Sayce = Sumerian me-zu, ‘to divine’.

74. The lexica throw no light on this entry, which seems to have no connexion with Hesych. μυμπλανδοις ἄπόλυτος, the latter word being too long for συμφ[...]. . . .], as well as otherwise incongruous. Ἡγομνηδρος is presumably Hegesandros of Delphi, the author of a collection of anecdotes called ᾿Υπομηματα, in several books, cited by Hesych. s. v. ἀπόφασις and Suidas s. v. άλκευνής as well as by Athenaeus.

Fr. 4. The blank spaces in ll. 7 and 9 indicate that the preceding words were γλώσσαι, 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. Βασιλεὺς: or βασιν ὡς? Βασιλικοὶ or -κος is less suitable.

6. παρά Χαλδαιοῖς: 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 ρ.

Fr. 11. Either the beginning of a line or of the explanation of a word.
1803. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**
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1803. **GLOSSARY.**

*Sixth century.*

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 σ, 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 Χρυσοῦν Δένος, Aristophanes Γῆρας, Menander Συναριστάωσα, 'Εγχειρίδιον, Φιλάδελφος, 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.

Fol. 1 verso.

στιφρόν ως πολλοὶ στριφὼν
20 συναγαγεῖν τον συναθροί

ος Αριστοφάνης Γῆραι καὶ τας χρηματισμούς
σαὶ καὶ συλλέξαι δὲ το αυτο

μη ὑποστήριξε 
τοῦτο ὡς ἐν Φιλαδέλφῃοις

φωνὴν εἶχεν καὶ Μενᾶ
χωρίδιον πρὸς συνα
gαγὼν πᾶν ὅποι ὡς ἐκεῖς

δρος εἰς Συναριστάωσαί σως
τὸ δ' εὐω δῶσῳ σχολή

[α] εἰ στεφρᾶς εἰσομενᾶς
τοῦ ἐκεῖς εἴναι καὶ ταλανταῖς
μοι συλλέγει

Σαραπιν διὰ τοῦ ἂ ως ἐν Εγγ

Fol. 1 recto.

πολλακεῖς.

5 συναγαγεῖν τον συναθροί

σαὶ καὶ συλλέξαι δὲ το αυτο

tοῦτο ὡς ἐν Φιλαδέλφῃοις

χωρίδιον πρὸς συνα
gαγὼν πᾶν ὅποι ὡς ἐκεῖς

τοῦ δ' εὐω δῶσῳ σχολή

μοι συλλέγει
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> χιριδιω ως σεμνος ο Σαρα

10 > πις θεως'

συγγίγγεινται λεγεται κατ' ε'

πενθεσιν του ἵ και γίγνω'

σκειν μαλ[λων] στα οι παλαι'

οι αξίωσιν δε και χωρις'

15 αυτον

σημιον γην σφραγιδα και'

σημηνσαθαι το σφραγισαι'

ως [']


Fol. 2 recto.

οργων ως σκολη πορευ'

εται αυτοςι'

σιτου και την τροφην απλων'

ως Ξενοφων εν β' Ανα'

40 βασεως το δε στρατευ'

μα εποριζετο σιτου οπως'

ε[ ].] δυνατο εκ των ὑ'

ποζύγιων κοπτοντες'

βους και ονους και τον'

45 καρπον ομοιως ως Δη'

μοσθενης εν τω κατα'

Διονυσιοδωρου παλιν'

καπηλευον και συνι'

στας [τ]ας τιμα[ς] του σιτου'

και τον αρτον αυτον σιτο'

καλουσιν ως Ξενοφων'

εν τη Αγ[α]σι [']


Fol. 2 verso.

των επιτηδεων ως ταχι'

στα βουλομενους διακιν'

δυνευειν

σαβυττους κουρας ειδος τι'

Ευπολις εν Χρυσω Γενει'

και καρα . ἃς ως μ' ἡλθες'

ε[ ].] τρημενος σαβυττους'

60 σιωπησομαι αντι του σιω'

πησω και σιωπησει και'

σιωπησεται ως εν τω πε'

ρι του στεφανου καγω στερ'

και ε[ ].] και σιωπησ[ε][ ]μαι και'

65 Μενανδρος εν Φανιω'

σιωπησε παλιν εν τω με'

ρει κατα τα[ν]τα δε και α'

κουσομαι και ακουσει και'

ακουσται και πηδησομαι'


2-4. The line from the Γῆρας cannot be correct as quoted, but is easily emended, e. g.
kaĩ μῆ (v) ὑπόστιφρον σῦ ... οὗ ὑπόστιφρον σῆ ... ἵχειν. In place of ὑποστίφρον (ἁπαξ. εἰρημ.), which is obviously to be read, the copyist lapsed into the non-Attic ὑποστίφρων, but after noticing the error unintelligently made only a partial correction; there is no form στιφρός.

5-7. 1. στιφρας. If the a at the beginning of l. 6 has been correctly cancelled by the copyist, something has dropped out either before or after στιφρας. The final σ of εισομενας was converted to ι.

8. Instances of the shortening of the second a in Σάραπις are found only in Latin (e. g. Prudent. Adv. Symm. ii. 531). The Ἐγγεβριδιος is no doubt that of Manender, who was the last author to be mentioned.

11-15. Cf. e. g. Heraclid. ap. Eustath. 1722. 55 οἰ μὲν παλαιοὶ ἐν δυσὶ γάμμα ἱχρόμωτο, γίνομαι λέγουσι.

12. l. ἦ for τ: the converse error occurs in l. 16.

13. ι of μαλλοτα is written through λ, i.e. μαλλων was first written.

16-18. l. την. Cf. Photius σημείων τὴν σφραγίδα καὶ σημαίνουσα τὸ σφραγίζεσθαι, Hesych. σημείων τέμας. η σφραγίς, and σημαίνουσα σφραγίσεσθαι, Harpocrat. σημεία οὗτω λέγουσι τὰ σφραγίδας. Δημοσθένης οὐ τῷ πρῶτο Φαίνετον. In l. 18 ος is followed by what seems to be the top of a vertical stroke, so that neither Αξιστοφανίς (cf. Εἰ. 952) nor Δημοσθένεσ i s probable.

19. πολλακες: ei has been converted from ιο.

22. Φιλαδελφοί: of Menander presumably.

23-6. Two iambic verses apparently, but the first i of χορίδον should be short and ο is likely to have preceded.


31-4 = Εἰ. 655-6. The papyrus supports the usual reading εἰσηγγελμέαν. Ρ omits χως, whence Cobet proposed ἀγαθαί ταῖς ἥγεθε.

35. Perhaps καὶ ταῖς εὐρισ καίντοι, as in ll. 14-15. διὰ τοῦ i presumably refers to the spelling εἰδίκεων, which is used metri graitia, e. g. in Pythag. Καρμ. ιουρ. 35, but there seems to be no instance of συνεδ, apart from augmented forms.

36-7. This is no doubt part of a note on σοδικὶ in the sense of βραβίως or αὐθαίως. Cf. Suidas σανηλη ἵνα ἀντί τοῦ οὐδ' δοκεῖ, βραβίως, αὐθαίως. Ι. Γε' ωργιν, i.e. most probably the play of Menander; cf. ll. 8, 22, nn.

38 sqq. Cf. Harpocrat, and Suid. ιτος: πᾶς ὁ σωτικὸς καρπὸς, ἐνέ ό πυρὸς μόνον καὶ αὐτὸ τὰ σωτικά, Hesych. ιτος: ὑποψία. The references in ll. 39 and 45-7 are to Ξεν. Αναβ. ii. 1. 6 and Dem. In Diomed. 7. In l. 41 the papyrus correctly agrees with the 'deteriores' against CBAE in omitting καὶ πότον after σωτιν. In l. 52 the reference may be to Anab. v. 4. 29 and σιτω can be read; but ἄναβατις is not very satisfactory, though τη, which seems to be right, points to the work or the Κυροφ, which is irreconcilable with the remains, τη αὐτῇ being also unsuitable.

53-5 = Θουκυδ. vii. 60 διὰ τὴν τῶν ἑπταθείων σπαίνων ὡς τάχυτα κτλ., cited no doubt in illustration of the word σπάνως. Cf. Photius and Suidas σπάνως ἑνδεία. Either σπάνως preceded τῶν ἑπταθ, in the papyrus, or it was omitted.

56-9. Cf. Hesych. σάβιντος: εἶδος ἐξηρεσίων εἰς καλλωπισμῶν πότερον δὲ τοῦ πάγων ἢ τῆς κεφαλῆς, ἀδήλων: τῖν ἢ τὸ γνακείον. Photius gives the latter meaning only to σάβιντος and spells the equivalent of ἐξηρεσίων εἶδος, σάβιντης, but Hesych. is confirmed by the papyrus. ll. 58-9 look like a pair of trochaic catalectic dimeters (cf. e. g. Aristoph. Αὐ. 1478-80), but if so, there is apparently some corruption in l. 58, where, though it would be easy to write ος (ε)µ, the preceding word remains a difficulty. The doubtful κ after καὶ can be
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\( \chi \) or \( \xi \); \( \eta \sigma \) is probable, but \( \omega \) is very uncertain. There is a reference to a \( \kappaουρεύος \) in an already extant fragment of the \( \chiρ. \) \( \gammaέν. \) (Kock 278).

61. \( \sigmaιωπησεί : \epsilon \) has been converted from \( \iota \).

62–4. \( \Delta e \) \( \text{Cor.} \) 112. 1. \( \sigmaιωπησομαι \), as originally written.

65. \( \phiαυνω \): the papyrus confirms the spelling of this title, as to which there has been some doubt.

66. \( \epsilonν \ \tauω \) is very uncertain, but consistent with the meagre vestiges.

1804. \( \Lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilonις \ 'Ρητορικαί. \)

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 \( \Pi, \ \Pi, \ \Sigma \). They are written in well-formed sloping uncial letters 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 \( \Lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilonις \ 'Ρητορικαί \) Seguerianae edited by Bekker in \( \text{Anecd.} \) 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 \( \Piυθαίος \) (?), \( \proστρόπαιος, \ \περίστατοι \) and \( \πορεύον \) follow the same sequence in \( \text{Anecd.} \) pp. 295–6, though separated there by a few additional words; similarly in \( \text{Anecd.} \) pp. 299, 300, \( \ρητορική \ \gammaραφή, \ \ρώπος, \ \ρυτήρ, \) and \( \σκευαφεία, \ \συμμορία, \ \συμμοριτής, \ \σύμβολον \) are successive, corresponding to Frs. 3 and 4 of 1804 with one additional word in each fragment (Frs. 3. 5–8 [?], Fr. 4. 4–6 \( \sigmaτρατηγολ \)). Material similarities are pointed out in the commentary, and though such matter is often common to e.g. Photius and the Etymologicum Magnus, the verbal correspondence is generally greatest with the Seguerian \( \Lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilonις \); 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 \( \Lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilonις \) 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.

[Πυθαῖος? ὄνομα ε]ρ[τ]ῆς Ἀθήνη

[σιν αγομενης του Α]πολ[λωνος . . .
[. . . . . . . . . . σας εν τοις εἰς ις . [
[. . . . . . . . . .] στι Πυθαῖος Ἀθη

5 [ν . . . [. . . . . .] αρματος αστρα [-
[π]τοοτοι [. . . ] κομιοντας Πυθα
ει τας τ[. . . . . .]ημ[ε]ιαν καλουσιν
. α[.]παισ . [. . . . . .]
προστροπ[αιοις Ἀι]σχινης εν τωι πε
10 ρι της πα[ραπρεσβείας δαιμων της ει
τι των α[ληθηρων?] ὁνομασθησαν δε
οι μετα το [σταθηναι τροπαιοιν] πολεμι
ους λαβοντες προστροπαιοι]
[π]εριστατοι [ οι περιβλεπτοι]
15 [πορ]ειοιν [το διδομενον τοις πρε[σβυ

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. ii.

[. . . . . . . . . . [. . [
Παμβ[…]καθα[η] δήμος της Ερεχθθείδους?
Παι[…]μιδα[η] δήμος της Λεοντίδους?
20 Πα[…]φες?
Πα[…]λ […]κεις δήμος της Αντιοχίδος?
Πε[…]ρ[…]γ[…]κή δήμος τῆς Ερεχθθείδος?
Πε[…]ρ[…]φ[…]κεις λιμ[…]ν Ἀθηνήσιν?
[Π]ε[…]ρ[…]φ[…]κ[…]δα[η] δήμος της Οινηδίους?
25 [. . . . . . [. . . . . .]
Fr. 3.

[ποσ πραξάντος τι η γραψαντ]ος η ε[ι
[ποντος τι φαυλον η νη] ηγ[ω]νιζον []
[το οι ρητορες ....... εγρ]αψαντο<
[...........................]
5 [ρ ......... ? σημαινει] μεν τον της πα
[.................................]δας σημαινει
[δε?] [..............................]κον Δειναρχος
[εν τωι κατα Πολυευκτ]ου [δ]ωροδοκιας
[ρωτος ο παντοδαπος φ]ορτος Δημο<
10 [σθενης εν τωι προς την] Φορμιωνος
[παραγραφην ]
[ρυθρ ο μας κυριως δ]ε αι ηνιαι

Fr. 4.

....... ........

σκε[ραφιου οικημα τι? κυβευτικον παρ[α
[ιε[ρον Αθηνας εξω πολε]ως ενθα οι
κυβε[νται επαι[ον ]
στρατ[ηγοι] η[σαμη] ηρ[η]μενοι φυλ[ης
5 εκαστης α Θπερείδης εν τω κα[τα
Αυτοκλεους
συμπορια συμπορια ηςαν κῃ ξ []
ανδρον εξ ους ηςαν οι τριηρ[α]ι [αι
συμπορειτης δε ο της συμποριας κ[οι
10 νως και φυλη]της και δημοτης [ηςαν
δε τουτων και ηγεμονες οι παρ αυτω[ν]
tα αναλοματα ποιουμενοι υποτερον [δε
παρα των αυτων κοιμισμενοι
συμβολα σημ[αι]νει και τον λογον του
15 δια της φημης γεινομενον επισημα
νει και τα συμβολαια Δημοσθενης εν
Frs. 1 + 2. i, 1–8. Apparently a note on Πυθαία or an analogous form. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 295. Πυθαίος' ὄνομα ἐστὶς 'Ἄθηναν ἄγωμένης τοῦ 'Ἀπώλλωνος, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πυθαίου, Ετυμ. Magn. 696. 22 Πυθεία καὶ Πυθαίος' ὄνομα ἐστὶς ἄγωμένης τοῦ 'Ἀπώλλωνος. Harpocrat. gives a reference for Πυθαία to Hyperides πρὸς Ἀπελλαίον. In l. 1 o of εὐφρής 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 ἀρματος was εἰς, part of the π should be visible. In l. 7 the ε is blotted and seems to be have been cancelled. The first letter of l. 8 was either κ or χ.

9–13. Cf. Harpocrat. προστρόπαιον. Λαθήνης περὶ τῆς προσβείαις κτλ., Photius προστρόπαιος. δαίμων τις ἐπὶ τῶν ἐναγών (so too Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 296, and Etym. Magn. 700. 10), ἐπὶ οἱ μετὰ τὸ σταθήναι ἦδη τὸ τρόπαιον {οἱ} ἀναφερόντες τινα τῶν πολεμίων πρόστροποι καὶ ἐναγινεῖ εἰσιν. 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 ἀληθρίων or ἀκαθάρτων. In l. 13 προστρόπαιον 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 οἱ before ἀναφερόντες rather than to emend ἐπὶ οἱ to ἐπείδη with Naber.


15–16. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 296, and Etym. Magn. 684. 8 πορεῖν τὸ δαδόμενον τοῖς προσβεταις ὑπὲρ (περὶ Etym. Magn.) τοῦ πορευθήσασθαι εἰς τὴν προσβείαις δισπερ ἐφόδων. The papyrus apparently had practically the same note, but the vestige of a letter or two at the end of the line is too slight to indicate what stood after ἐφόδων.

18. Cf. Harpocrat. Παμμαθάνης ἄρμασθέσης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Νικόστρατον. Παμμαθάδας τῆς Ἐρεχθίδος δημος. Either δῆμος τῆς Ἐρεχθ. or δημ. τῶν Ἀθηναίων will suitably fill the line.

19. Cf. Harpocrat. Παιανεῖς καὶ Παιινίαδα. . . . διαφέροντι δὲ οὗτοι (sc. οἱ Παιανεῖς) τῶν Παιινίδων, ὡς ἰστρο ἐν Ἀτάκτῳ ὑποστηματεί. μηνονεύοντι δὲ καὶ τούτοις οἱ ῥήτορες, δισπερ καὶ Δείναρχος . . . δήμου δὲ εἰσιν οὗτος τῆς Δεινίδος . . .
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20. παιωνίασ occurs in Dem. De Cor. 287, but in this series of proper names, a misspelling of Παιωνίασ is perhaps more likely than a derivative of Παιώνια. The form Παιωνίασ occurs in Hesych. s.v. Δίαλασ.


22. Cf. Harpocrat. Περασαθένε. Ἰσαῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Θουτίμων. Περασαθ δήμος τῆς τῆς 'Ερεξθηδος τῶν μεντών δημάτων διχῶς λέγεσθαι φασι, Περασαθεὶς τα καὶ Περασαθένε.

23. Περασαθένες λιμὴν Ἀθηναίων is a gloss in Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 288.


Fr. 3. 1–4. These lines are evidently part of a note on ῥητορική γραφή, beginning probably in the last line of the preceding column (ῥητορική γραφή ... καί κατὰ) for which cf. e.g. Harpocrat., who after referring to Isaieus' speech against Euclides says: ἐσχε ῥητορικὴ γραφὴ καλεῖσθαι καί κατὰ δρᾶτος γράφαντος τι ὡς ἐπίστος ἡ ἀπόδειξιν ῥητορικήν γράψατο πρὸς τούτῳ πρὸς τὸ παλαιον ῥήτορα, ἀλλ' ἐθείας ἀλλ' ἑντὸς ἡ ῥητορική γραφὴ ἐπάργοντο τῇ τῆς ῥήτορος γινόμενα, γράφαντο τὶ ἐπίστος εἰς ἀπόδειξιν παράδοτος, Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 299 Ῥητ. γραφήν καὶ ῥητορικήν γραφῆμαν τὸν ῥήτορα ἡγούμενον γραφήμοις ἐπειτέ πρὸς τῇ ῥήτορας φαιλίων. 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 Πολυκλῆαν δωροδοκίας is cited e.g. by Harpocrat. s.v. δώρῳ γράφῃ. It is identified with the κατὰ Π. ἐκφιλλοφορηθέντος ἐνδείξεις.

9. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 299 ῥόπος ἐν τῷ παντοδαπός φίλος, Photius ῥόπος μίγματα ... τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν παντοδαπῶν φίλος ῥόπον ἑὑρίκαν, Etym. Magn. 377. 30 s.v. ἑὑρήκαμεν, ῥόπον γὰρ ὁ ποικίλος καὶ λεπτὸς φίλος (ποικίλος also Ael. Dionys. ap. Eustath. 927, but this would not fill the lacuna so well). For ll. 10–11 cf. e.g. Harpocrat. s.v. ἐπιθέσεων ἑστάτας, ἡμι. ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Χρυσίττου πρὸς τὴν Φ. π.; the reference is to the C. Phorm. 9.

12. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 299 ῥυτήρ τι ἐστὶν ὁ ἰμάς. κυρίως δὲ τῇ ἱνὰ κτλ., Photius ῥυτήρᾳ ἀπὸ μὲν ὁ ἰμᾶς, κυρίος δὲ ἱνὰ κτλ. The supplement printed hardly fills the lacuna, but there is not room for ἀπὸ μὲν: perhaps ῥυτήρες ὁ μανᾶς was written.

Fr. 4. 1–3. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 300 σχειραφεῖα: σχειραφεῖα ἐστὶ τὰ κυβεῖα, ἦτο τι ἐπει σκείρασι τὶς ἐστὶν ὅραν κυβερνικὸν, ... ὡς ἐν τῷ τῆς Σκιαρίδος Αθηνᾶς ἱπτρόν ὁ μανᾶς ἐταῖον, ἐξω τῆς πόλεως ὄντως. Photius and Etym. Magn. 717. 27 have similar notes but omit ἐξω ὁμι ... ὀντι. Harpocrat. citing Dinarchus, In Proxeni. says σκειράφια ἔλεγχω τὰ κυβερνήματα, ἐπειδὴ διετρίβον ἐν Σκιρῳ ὁ κυβερνήτης, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ ντὶ ἐποσημηνία. The gloss in the papyrus seems to have lost in clearness owing to compression.

4–6. Cf. Harpocrat. στρατηγοὶ ... ὁι καθ' ἐκατὸν ἐναντὸν χειροτονοῦμενοι στρατηγοὶ ἐστὶν, ὡς μαθῶν ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν ὁμερεῖν ἀντίπλοκεσ. ... The vestiges in the middle of 1. 4 are very scanty but so far as they go suit the letters suggested.

7–13. Cf. Harpocrat. συμμορία ... ὡς ἔστω Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν συμμορίων φησι, περὶ τῶν χιλιῶν καὶ διακοσίων ἀνθρώπων λέγων τῶν πλουσιώτατων, "ἐκ τούτων τοῖνυν οἷαν δὲν ποιήσα τη συμμορίας κ', δότερ νῦν εἰσι, σύμμα ντὶ ἐκατόν ἐνσώματα" ἡμερείδης δὲ ἐν τῷ πρὸς Πολυεκτήντος φήσιν "ἔτη ἐν τῇ συμμορίᾳ ἐκκαστὶ τῇ ἀνδρᾷ ... συμμορίατα δὲ εἰσιν οἱ τῆς αὐτοῖς αὐτοῖς μετέχουσε συμμορίας, ὡς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ ὁμερεῖν δεικνύονπα, Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 300 συμμορία τῇ ἐστὶ περὶ τοῦ συνάγωμα τῶν πλουσίων τῶν ἐπιτρέπτων πρὸς τριμμαχίας. μετι ὁ μανᾶς διακόσιος, συμμορίτης σημαίνει (....). The ἱγμῶν συμμορίας (II. 11–13) is treated separately by Harpocrat. and defined as ὁ πρὸς τῷ πλούτῳ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῶν ἄλλων ἱγμανευέντω ἐπεικημένων,
The financial responsibility described by the papyrus is apparently not elsewhere stated. At the end of l. 7 κς, which is clear, is an error for κ (cf. e.g. Dem. De Symm. 17), perhaps arising from the ambiguity of an original εικοσι εξ εφεκτου, where εξ should have been read as εξ not εξ. The εξ is very uncertain, but the scanty remains are sufficiently suitable. In l. 11 παρ αυτων may be interpreted παρ αυτων, but more probably παρ is a mistake for υπερ, or υπερ by a common misspelling became ωτερ and then οι παρ.

14. Cf. Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 300 συμβουλον‘ σημαίνει μεν τά σημεία, σημαίνει δε καί τα συμβολαί καί τά γραμματεία. ειδικώς δε το σύμβολον δηλοι γραμματειόν τι, δ' ελάμβανε των δικαστῶν ἕκαστον εἰς τό δικαστήριον, δ' εστι πινάκων. Photius, Etym. Magn., and Suidas give the second sentence in the form σύμβολον δ' ἑλάμβανοι δ' δικασταί εἰς τό δικαστήριον εἰσίωντες, εἰτα τούτο δόντες τό δικαστικὸν ἐκομίζοντο. Harpocratio agrees with the papyrus in referring to the seventh Philippic but is otherwise dissimilar.

Fr. 5. πλυθειον in l. 2 suggests that this may be part of a note on πλυθειον, a word which occurs a little above Πυθαδως (cf. Frs. i + 2. i. 1-8 n.) in Bekker, Anecd. i, p. 295 πλυθειον το πλυθωργειον, δηπο πλυθειο γίνοντα; cf. Harpocrat. πλυθειον· δ' τόπος εν ψ' πλυθειο πλάττεται· Λυσιάς εν τῳ κατὰ Λυσιδεων. If so, the fragment would probably belong to the upper part of Frs. i + 2. i.

Fr. 6. 4. There is an appearance of a colon just in front of ε of απηει, but this may be due to a correction, e.g. perhaps the scribe began to write απηε(δε).

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.

[δρακων ελικτος αλλοτ ανδρειω τυ]πιων
[βουκρανος εκ δε δασκιου γενειαδιος
[κρουνι διεραιμωντο κρηναιον πο]του
15 [τοιω γεω μυστηρα προσδεδεμν]υνη
[δυστηνος αει καθανειν επευχομην [
1805. **EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS**

37 [εν]ταυθα δη μαλιστα ταρβησασ εχω
[εξ ου γαρ εκτα κεινος Ιφιτου βιαν
[ημε]ες μεν εν Τραχινι την αναστατοι

Fr. 2.

37 [ο των απαντων Ζευς πατηρ Ολυμπιων
[πρατον νιν εξεπεμψεν' ουδ ηνεοχετο
[οθουνεκ αυτον μουνου] ανδρωπων δολω
[εκτεινει ει γαρ εμφαν]οις] ημυνατο
[Ζευς ταν συνεγνω ειν] δικη χειρωνενω [

275 [ο των απαντων Ζευς πατηρ Ολυμπιων
[πρατον νιν εξεπεμψεν' ουδ ηνεοχετο
[οθουνεκ αυτον μουνου] ανδρωπων δολω
[εκτεινει ει γαρ εμφαν]οις] ημυνατο
[Ζευς ταν συνεγνω ειν] δικη χειρωνενω [

280 [υβων γαρ ου στεργησιν ουδε δ]αιμονες
[κεινοι δι υπερχλιοντες ε]κ [γ]λωσσης κα]κησ
[αυτοι μεν Αιων παντες] εισι οικητορες
[πολις δη δουλη τασδε δ ασπε]ξ εισορας

Fr. 3.

290 [φρονει νιν ως ηδοντα τουτο] γαρ λο[γ]ου
[πολλων καλων λεχθεντος ηδιστο]ν κλυειν
[ανασσα νυν σοι τερψις εμφανης κυρε[ι]
[των μεν παροντων τα δε π]επυσμενη λογο

Fr. 4.
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Fr. 5.

301 [αι προν με]|ν ησα|ν εξ ελευθερων ἵσως
[ανδρον τα]μεν δ[ε δουλον ἵσχουσιν βιον]
[ο] Ζευ τροπαίει μηποτ εἰσιδοιμι σε

Frs. 6–10.

αγορα συνεξη[ηκουν]
λειμψης ταυτ[α]
αγοραν νοησαι [δει το επι λ]ημμουν [αθρουσμα;
[εγκ]λημα [μικρον] αιτιαν θ' ετο[ιμασας]
[επι]στρατευει πατριδα την ταιτης εν η
[το]ν Ευρυτο[ν τον ειπε] δεσποζειν θρονων
[κτε]νει[[ν]] τ [ανακτα πατερα τηςδε και πολιν
365 [επε]ργει και νυν ως ορασ ηκει δομους
5 lines lost

370 [δεσποζε]ιν' α τονδε τυγχανο μαθων παρα
[και ταυτα πολλοι προς μεση Τραχιων]
[αγορα] συνεξη[κου]οιν ωσα[υτως εμοι]
[οστ ε]ξελεγχειν [ει δε] μη λεγω φιλα
[ουχ ηδο]μαι: το δ [ορθον εξειρχη ομω]
375 [ου]ιοι τ[αλαιω] [πο]υ ποτ' ειμι[ι πραγματος
[τιν εισ]δεδεγμα[ι] πημονη[ν υποστεγον
[λαθραι]οιν' δ διοστηνος α]|ρ α[ινονυμος]
[πε]φυ[κε]ν ωσπερ ουπαγ[ω]ον διωμινυτο
[η καρτ]α λαμπρ[α και κατ ονομα και φυσιν
380 [πατρος] μεν ουσα [γενεσιν Ευρυτου ποτε
[Ιολη κα]λετο της εκειν[οι ουδαμα]
[βλαστα]ι εφωνει δηθεν [ουδεν ιστορον
[ολοιντο] μη τι παντες οι κακοι τα δε
385 [τι χρη ποε]ιν γνυ̃αικες ω[ις εγω λογοις
1805. **EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS**

[τοίς νῦν π]ᾶ[ρους]ν εκπεπληγμένη κυρω
[πευθοὺ ὠτοὺς τα]ῦ[ρος ὦς τα]χ ἀν σαφῆ

Fr. 11.

532 [ταῖς αἰχμαλω]τοῖς [παίσιν ὡς ἐπ ἔξοδῳ
[τήμος θυραιός ηλι[θὸν ὡς ὑμᾶς λάθρα
[τα μεν φρασο]ῦσα χ[ερσιν ατεχνησάμην
535 [τα δ οἰα πασχ]ῶ [συνκατοικτιομενη

Fr. 12, 13.

576 [τῆς Ηρακλειας ωστε μ]ητὶν εἰςιδὼν
[στερθεὶ γυναίκα κεί]νος αἱμὶ σου πλεον
[τουτ εννοησασ ὡ φιλ]αί δομοὶ γαρ ἡν

[κε]υνον θανοντος εγκεκλημε[νον κα]λως
[ζων κε]υνος εἰς καὶ] πεπειρα[νται τα]δε

Fr. 14.

602 [σ]ως φερ[ης μοι το]ύδε ταναφη πεπλο[ν
δώρημ' εκε]ινω ταυδρι τῆς ἐμῆς χερος
δίδουσ δε πονδε φρα[ξ] σως μηδεις βροτωι
605 κεινου παρο[ιθε [μ]φειδουσαι χροι
μη[δ]' ο[ψεται μιν μ]ήτε φεγγος ἡλιου

Fr. 15 Col. i.

[...]
[...]

174 [πως εἶπας ὃ παί τού παρ ἀνθρώπων] [παρὼν ἀνθρώπων] [Ἀπ(ιστοφανής) μ. 
θ]

Fr. 16.

763 [καὶ πρῶτα] μὲν [δειλαῖος ἱερὸς φρενί

[κόσμῳ τῇ] χαϊδρῶν καὶ στολή κατηχεῖτο

Fr. 15 Col. ii.

[κ]όμη δὲ λευκὸν μυθὸν εκραίνει μεσοῦ
[k]ράτος διασπαρεντὸς [αἰματὸς θ ὄμοι:

ἀπὸς ἀνευφημησεν οἰμωγῆ λεοὺς

τοῦ μὲν νοσοῦντος· τούν δὲ διαπεπραγμένον

785 κουδεὶς ετολμᾶ τάνδρος αὐτῶν μολεῖν

[ἑσπάτατο γαρ πεδοῦδ[ε] καὶ μεταρροῖς

[β[ο]υν ἵπ[ζ]ων· ἀμφὶ [δ ἐ]κτυποῦν πετραί

Λοκρῶν ὀρειοὶ προὶ[ν]ες Εὐβοίας τ ἀκραὶ

ἐπεὶ δ ἀπειπε πολλὰ μὲν τάλας χθονὶ

790 ἐπτῶν εἰς τὸν πολλὰ δ ὧν ὁμογή βοῶν

τό δυσπάρευν ξηκτὸν [ἐνδατομένον

ποὺ τῆς τάλαινης καὶ τὸν [Οἰνεῶς γαμὸν

καὶ τὸν καταστήσατο λυμ[αντήν βίον

τότε] ἐκ προσεδρῶν ἱλιγγὺς διαστροφὸν

795 ὀφθαλμὸν ἀπὸς εἰδέ μ' εὖ [πολλῷ στρατῷ

dιάκρισσιν ὁ καὶ μὲ πρὸς βλεψας καλεῖ

ὁ παῖ προσελ[θε]· μὴ φυγῆς τούμον κακον
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Fr. 17.

851 [μοίρα προβα[νει δουλιαν
[kαι μεγα]λαν [αταν
[ερρογεν] παγα [δακρων κεχυται;?
[νοσος?] ο ποη[οι οιον αναρσιων
[ουπω αγα]κλει[τον

Fr. 18.

[τι δ ο γεραια κ]αινο[ποιθεν λεγεις
[βεβηκε Δη]αιερ[α την πανυστατην
875 [οδον απασω]ν εξ ακίνητου ποδος
[ου δη ποθ ως θα]νού[σα
[pαντ ακηκοας]
[τεθνηκεν η τα]λαι[να

Fr. 19.

[ω παι γενου μοι παις ετ]ητυ[μος γεγως
1065 [και μη το μητρος ονο]μα πρε[ςβευσης πλευν
[δος μοι χερων σαιν αυ]ντος εξ ο[ικου λαβων
[ει χειρα την τεκουσα]ν ως ειδω [σαφα
[ει τουμον αλγεις μαλλοιν η κεινης ορων
[λωβητον ειδος εν δικη] κακουμενου
1070 [θω ω τεκνου τολμησον οικ]τει[ρον τε με
[πολλοισι ωκτρον οστι]σ ωστε [παρθενος
[βεβρυχα κλαιοι και τοδ ου]δ αν [εις ποτε
[τουδ ανδρα φαιη προσθ ιδειν δεδρακοτα

Frs. 20, 21.

[προς του τερας τοι δια κακων εθεστι[ος

N
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[αυτη ςρω αυτης ωυδενος προς εκτο[πον
[οιμοι πριν ως χρην σφ ε]ς εμης θανειν χερος
[καν σου στραφειν θυμος ? ει]ς το παν μαθοις
1135 [δεινου λογου κατηρβας]ς ειπε δ η νοεις
[απαν το χρημα ημαρτε] χρηστα μωμενη
[χρηστ ο κακιστε πατερα] σον κτινασα δρα
[στεργημα γαρ δοκουσα π]ροσβαλενς σε[θεν
[απημπλαξ ος προσειδε τους ενδιον γαμους
1140 [και τις τοσουτος φ]αρμακευς Τραχυ[λω]
[e
[Nεσσος παλαι Κεν]ταυρ[ος] [ε]επεισε νιν
[τοιωδε φιλτρω τον σου εκμηναι ποθον]
[ιου ιου δυστηνος οιχουαι τα]λας.
[ολωλ ολωλα φεγγος ουκετ ε]στι μοι
1145 [οιμοι φρονω δη συμφορας] ιν' εστα]μεν
[θω ω τεκνον πατηρ γαρ ου[κε]τ εστι σοι
[καλει το παν μοι ςπερμα σ]ων [ομαιμονων

Fr. 22.

[ταχειαν ω παι προσθες ως π]ριν εμ[πεσειν
[σταραγμον η τιν οιστρον ε]ς πυρα[ν] με θης
1255 [αγ εγκονει[τ αιρεσθε παυλα τ]οι κακ[ων
[αυτη τελευτη τουδε τανδρος] υσται[τη
[αλλ ουδεν ειργει σοι τελειουσθα]ι ταδε

Fr. 23.

[τω τηνδ ατην υπεχον]τι
1275 [λειπου μηδε συ] παρθενεν επ οικων
[μεγαλους μεν iδ]υσα [νεους θανατους


Fr. 24.

Σφ[οκλεους]

[Πραχινιαί]

12. Unfortunately it is not clear whether the papyrus agreed with the MSS, in having τυπω(τ) βούκρανος, or supported Strabo’s κυτεί βανπναρος, which is generally preferred. On the whole τυπω(τ) seems a more satisfactory reading than κυτεί.

17. Bergk wished to reject this line.

225. Apparently Ορυμπιως was originally written, but a dot between i and o and a vestige of ink above the line point to the insertion of -ος as an alternative. The genitive would spoil the line.

278. ημίνατο: so L &c.; ημίνατο B.

281. ι of εκι is directly above the first ι of εκι in l. 282, so that with υπερχιλιντες (L first hand and lemma of Schol.) the number of letters in the respective lacunae coincides. But υπερχιλιντες (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 δε.

Frs. 6–10. The cursive note at the top of this column refers to l. 372, and evidently explains the apparent inconsistency of άγορα here with έν βουλευει λειμών in l. 188, the inconsistency vanishing if άγορα is taken in the sense of assembly or gathering; cf. Schol. άγοραν αποθείοται. The reading suggested in the latter part of the third line is, however, highly doubtful, the μ being rather cramped and the ι very insecure. λων or των is possible.

360. εχθροι: so edd. with Α; εχµι (from εκεί) L.

362–4. These verses have been much suspected, some critics bracketing ll. 362–3, others l. 362 την ταύτης—l. 364 παρερα.

364. The superfluous ν (due to the preceding infin. no doubt) has been crossed through, perhaps by a later hand.

370. α: δ MSS., which is required by the preceding τδ παν.

372. Cf. n. on Frs. 6–10 above.

379. Whether the papyrus had καρτις or και τα cannot be determined.

534. So far as considerations of space are concerned, there is nothing to choose between φραζόντα (L) and φραζόντα (Α).

576. ρητον: η suits the remains, which are inconsistent with ον.

579. εγκληματον: a better spelling than that of L (-κλευμ-) or Α (-κλεινμ-), and already restored by Dindorf. The ι was probably added by a corrector, but the colour of the ink is indistinguishable.

602. Opposite this line on the edge of the papyrus, at a distance of 6 cm., are the tips of two horizontal strokes, one 3 cm. above the other. They may either come from a marginal note referring to the previous column, or perhaps be the remains of a stichometrical figure, i.e. ζ, standing for 600; such figures are not always quite accurately placed.

744. παρου, which was inadvertently written originally, has been amended to μαθων by a later hand, which also inserted in the margin the (unknown) v. 1. ανδραστον, attributing it to Αρπ( ), who is more probably Aristophanes than Aristarchus; cf. 1174. vi. 5, where Αρπ( ) seems to be used side by side with Αρν( ) as an abbreviation of 'Αριστοφάνης. Subsequently the pen was drawn through this marginal note and also, rather unaccountably,
through the final word of the line. Possibly ἀνθρώπων was similarly cancelled and ἀνθρώπου μηθῶν rewritten above.

764. Why a was written again above the line is not evident, the original letter being sufficiently well formed.

781. [κώμη: κώμης MSS.], a reading retained by Jebb but often suspected. κόρης, κόγχης, κοπή, βολή have been conjectured in its place. κώμη is unacceptable, but the papyrus reading might be used as an argument in favour of a dative like Hense's κομή.

784. ανευφημήσεν: this reading had been restored by Brunck from Hesych. s. v. ανευφημήσει and is also in Schol. Eurip. Tro. 573. ἀνευ φωνῆς εἰν Λ, ἀνευφημήσει or ἀνευφώνησεν other MSS.

788. Jebb following Porson accepts τ after Λακράων from Diog. Laert. x. 137, where ll. 787–8 are quoted with several other variations from the MSS. reading, which the papyrus supports.

790. μετάνω: cf. l. 780; μέτανω MSS.

793. The alternative reading ἄνω implies the corresponding v. l. λυμαντη later in the verse; ἄνω ... λυμαντή only MSS.

796. δικρυμωντά: analogous spellings are not infrequent in the papyri.

852–4. Unfortunately the papyrus brings no light here. In l. 854 the MSS. reading οὐκ ἄγαλματον suits the space. What stood in the lacuna at the beginning of l. 853 is more doubtful. κεκυτα νοσός, if that was read, must have been divided between ll. 852–3, and κεκυτα would fill the space better than νοσος, but there is no evidence for that order.

1071. ὀστή: L mistakenly has ὀστίς.

1134. τό is preceded by something that looks like σ surmounted by a rather thick dot; perhaps εις was inadvertently written and the superfluous s subsequently cancelled; or the dot might be explained as a high stop after θυμο]έ, ει may be omitted.

1135. A spot of ink on the edge of a hole above η may represent a rough breathing or circumflex accent, but since there are other ink-marks above νο, they are all best regarded as accidental.

1136. μοι[ε]μ confirms the correction of Heath, which according to Subkoff was the reading of L; μοιμένη ΛΑ &c.

1138. The stop after προσβάλεω shows that σέθεν was constructed with ἀπήμαικε instead of with ἀπήργημα.

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. πῦρον: the accent is a probable indication that μεθης was regarded as one word, as in L, since otherwise an acute on the ι would be the normal accent. It is however possible that both accents were inserted, that on the ι 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
1806. **EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS**

1375. 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. i. 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 τεθραμένος for τεθλασμένος, l. 60 ἀπέλθοις for ικάνοις, l. 77 κόψον for κόψλον; cf. 694. 34, where σφυν παρέκειτο replaces γάρ σφυν ἐκείτο. 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 Μαγνήσσης ἀπὸ νησός.

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.

**Col. i.**

8 [νηον θ αι δυνοντα χαι ουρανον εἰσ]αιοντα

**Col. ii.**

38 [ν]δατι πεπληθυναν ακ]ηπατω αι ὦ λευκερθεν
[λαλαι κρυσταλλω η]δι λογοι νυδάλλοντο

**Col. iii.**

40 [εκ βυθου] υψηλα[ι] δε πεφυκασκ τα εγχοθί πευκαι
[ανθεα τ ευωδη λασιας φιλ]α εργα μελισσαι
[οσ τερος ληγουντο επιβ]ρυει αν λειμωνα
[en]θ[α δ ανρ υπεροπλος ε]νημενος ενδιασκεν

[δεινοι ιδειν σκληρησα τε]βραμµενος ουατα πυγµαις
[στηθεα δ εσφαιρωτο πελορια και πλατυ νο[τον]
[σαρκι σιδηρειν σφυρηλατο]ς οια κολοσσος
[εν δε µυες στηρεοισι βραχιο]σιν ακρον υπ οµον []
[εστασαν ηυτε πετροι ολοιτρο]|χοι ουστε κυλινδε[ων

[χειµαρρους ποταµος µεγαλαις περ]|εζεσε διν[α]ις
[αυταρ υπερ νωτοι και αυχενος] γιορειτο
[ακρων δερµα λεοντος αφηµµε]νων εκ ποδεω[νων
[τον προτερος προσεειπεν αεθλ]οφορος Πολυ[ευκης]
[Χαιρε ξειν οτις εσει τινε βροτοι ο]ν οδε χω[ρος

[χαιρω πως οτε τα ανδρας ορω τους µ]η πριν οποια[α]
[θαρσει µητ αδικους µητ εξ αδικων φ]αθι λειυσειν
[θαρσεω κουκ εκ σειν µε διδασκεσθαι] τοδ [ειουεν]
[αγριοσ ει προσ παντα παλιγκοτο]ς η[δ υπερστης]
[toio δ οιον ορας σης σης γε µεν] ουκ ε[πιθαινω

[ελθοις και ξεινων κε τυχων παλιν] οικαδ απε[λ]θοις
[µητε συ µε ξεινιζε τα δ εξ εµευ ουκ] εν ετοιµο

[δαιµοι ουδ αν τουδε πιευν υδατο]ς συγε δοις

[γνωσεαι ει σειν βιψοσ ανειµ]ενα χειλεα τερσει

[αργυρος η τις ο µισθος ερεις ο κ]εν σε πιθοιμεν

[εις ειν χειρας αειρον εναντιος ανδι]ς καταστας
[πυγµاخος η και ποσι θενων σκελ]µατα δ ορθοι
[πυξ διατεναµενος σφετερης µη φειδεο τεχνης]
[tις γαρ οτω χειρας και εµος συνερεισ]ω [ι]µαντας,
[εγγυς ορας ου γυνις εων (?) κεκλησε]θ ο πυκτας

Col. iv. Plate IV.

70 / η και α[εθ]λον ετο[ιµον εφ ο] δηρισοµεθ αµφω
σος µεν εγω συ δ [εµος κεκλησει αι κε κρατησω
ορνιθον φοινικο[λοφον τοιοιε κυδοιµοι
eιτ ουν ορνιθεσι[σιν εοικοτε ειτε λεουσι

Plate IV.
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γινομεθ ουκ αλλω [κε μαχεσχαιμεσθ επ αεθλω

75 η ρ Αμικος και κοχλουν ελων μυκηςατο κοιλην

ο[[ν]] δε θωσ συναγερθεν υπο σκιερας πλατανιστους
κονχου φυσηθευτος αει Βεβρυκες κομωντες
ος δ αυτως ηρως ιων εκαλεσατο παντας
Μαγνησσης απο νησον [υπειροχος εν δαι Καστωρ

80 οι δ επι ουν σπειραιασιν εκαρτυναντο βοειαις
χειρας και περι γινα [μακρους ειλιξαν ιμαντας

[ες μεσσον [σ]νυαγευν φονον αλληλουι πνεοντες
[ευθα πολυ(ς)] σφισι μο[χθος επειγομενουσιν ετυχθη
[σποτετερος] κατα [νωτα λαβοι φασ ηλιοιο

Unidentified Fragment.

[...]

[επικυρευ[κω
[ει τ[
[κρι τ]
[...]

8. The fact that this small fragment is from the bottom of a column makes its identification with l. 8 probable; Col. ii will then have been one line longer than Col. iii.

39. That the papyrus had Ruhnken's αλλας in place of the αλλα of the MSS. is of course quite uncertain, but there would apparently be plenty of room for it.

40. πεφυκεσαν: so Stephanus; πεφυκεσων MTr.

41. πλατανοι τε is required, but cannot be read. The supposed τε (which is not o) 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 και immediately after πλατανοι 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 λεικαι, which was taken for λευκαι.

43. λεικαι: λειμωνας MSS.

45. τεβραγμονος: τεβλασμένος (τεβλαγμ. M) MSS.

49. κυλιδι[ων] κυλιδων MSS.

60. απελθοις (Ην from απεθανοι): ικάνος MSS.

62. δους, as originally written, is correct.

63. ει συν . . . τέρσει MSS.; the occurrence of τέρσει with v. 1.-σοι at the end of the line points to ει σου or σευ preceding. εντε τε . . . τέρση Wilamowitz.
64. ε of πιθομεν was converted from a vertical stroke.
66. θενω ... ὡρθον: βλεν ... ὡρθος M, βενων ... ὡρθά Tr. ὡρθον for ὡρθος 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. βενω σκέλος; ... ὡρθα 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 πικτας, which Wilamowitz obelizes, is at any rate something. ου συ με ἀμος Tr., ου γίνης (γίνης M) ε'ων MD, ου γίνης ε'κων Meineke, ου γίνης ἀμος Haupt. The spelling πικτας is that of D (a corr.).
70. A short oblique dash in front of this verse has no evident significance. Cf. 694. 21.
77. κοκχον: κόχλον MSS.
82. συναγον is the spelling of the MSS, as originally written here. Whether the termination is rightly read as γανυ 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 ε in the remains of the supposed o. παναρετ would however be meaningless.
83. Consistency with the ordinary reading seems only to be obtained by the supposition of an original lipography of ε, 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, Διοσκεία.

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. 1) 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. l.

For the accompanying collation the edition of E. Maass has been utilized.

Col. i.

895 ἄφαργης

897 νοτώ δ ἐπικεκλιται

901 εὔγνος ἀληθῶν φαίν[ο]υ[ται]

Col. ii.

[εξ αλος] ἐρχήσατι φωνὴ περιπολλα λεληκως

915 [κε]νυμένου κε] θαλασ[σαν υπέρ φορειτ ανεμοίο
και ποτε κ[αί κε]πφοι οπο[τ] ενδιο ποτε(ω)νται
ἀντία μελ[λοντ]ων ἀνεμ[ί]ων εἰληδα φερονται
πολλακι δ [αγριαδ]ιες νησσα[ι] η ειναλιδιναι
αιθυαι χερσ[αια] τμασα[ω]νται πτ[εργεσσιν]

920 η νεφελη ορε[ος] μηκυνται εν κορ[υφησιν]
ηδη και παμποι λευκης γνήρειον ακ[ανθῆς]
σημ εγενοντ ανεμοι κωφη[π] αλος o[πποτε πολλοι
ακραν επιπλώσαι τα μεν παρος αλ[α δ οπποσω
και ϑερεος βρονται τε και αστραται [ε]ρ[θεν (ε)ωσιν

925 ενθεν επερχομενοι περισκοπε[ειν ανεμοιο]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

καὶ διὰ νυκτὰ μελαινών ὁστὴρες αἰσθωσίν
tαρφέα· τοῖς δ ὁπιθεν ρυμοὶ ἐπιλευκαίνονται
dειδεῖται κεῖνοις αὐτὴν ὀδον ἐπὶ χομενοῖ
πνευματος· ἥν δὲ κεῖν ἂλλοι εναντίων αἰσθωσίν

930 ἂλλοι τ[5] ἡ ἂλλοι μερεῖν τοῦ δη πευφαζο
παινοιῶν ἁνεμοι οἱ τ ακριτοὶ εἰσὶ μαλιστα
ἀκριτα δὲ πνειουσίν ἐπὶ ἀνδράζοι τεκμηρασθᾶι
ἀντα ὅτι ἐξ εὐροίου καὶ εἰς νοτον [αστραπτησιν

895. Perhaps τῆς φατῆς was added in explanation of ἐγγὺς, or the word may be part of a longer note on a previous line; cf. Schol. 892 εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ταρπ ἐκάτερα τῆς φάτης δύο ἀστέρες, κτλ. But e.g. ἄνης or ἦνης is also possible.

897. The marginal v., νότο δ ἐπικεκληταί, is the reading of A and Maass (cf. l. 486); presumably ἐπικεκληταί stood in the text, as in CM.


915. ἰκῦνομεν [νοῦν]: κινομο. AC.

921. 1. παπποῦ.

923. επικλωσότι: so Maass with several later MSS. (cf. Homer ε 284); -ῶσι AM, -είσι C.

924. τε: om. C.

927. τοί δ: so ACM and (M) Schol.; τοὶ δ' Philoponus, in Aristot. Meteor., p. 100 (l. 926–31), τοῖς Maass.

928. κεῖνος A.

929. ἦν: so CM ( iov): el Maass with A Philop.

930. allou, as originally written here, is read by Maass with C &c., and Avienus; ἂλλοι δ', the corrector's reading, is that of AM and Schol.

1808. PLATO, Republic viii.

Width of column 4·5–5 cm. Late second century.
Plate IV (Cols. i–iii).

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 uncials of the sloping oval type, in which the smallness of ε, θ, ω, 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 ἡπτηνυ. 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.

| οντος ραίδας | 546 b | [μηκη με]ν τη|ι | 546 c |
| [ποτε ου δεον ε]τ | πρ[ομηκη] [δε] | οκατ[ον με]ν αρι |

γενιμη
[σονι ραίδας]
[ποτε ου δεον ε]τ
ομοιοιοι

Col. iii. Plate IV.

[λ]ειν [φυλακες ον] 546’d
tes π[αρ ελαττον]
tou de[ιοντος ηγη]
samenv[r] ta mou
5 σικης δ[ευερον]
de ta γνυμναστι
c[ης οθεν [αμου]

σοτερο[ν] γ[μιν γε]
νησου[θαι οι νε]
10 oi ek de τοντων αρ

Col. iv.

πλουσιω[ν] tais ψυ
χαση epι την αρε
την και την ar
κατα
χαιαν αποστα
5 σιν ηγετην ςι

θημων α[πο δια]
µη αριθµε ο πλευ
6 µετρων [ρη]των [ραν έκ]
πεµπταδ[ος] δεο
µενων [ενο]ς εκα
τη ι πλευρ ηή
ου
στον arρη[τ]ουν
ει σι πι
δε δυειν [εκα]ταν 'Ζφ ι
10 τριαδος
10 de κυβω[ν] έδυμ
πα[β] de ου[τ]ος ο αρι
θμος γ[ε]ωμετρ
κος τουντου κυ
ριος [αμεινονων]
15 те και χειρονων

Χοιτες ου πανυ
φυλακικοι κα
ταστησονται
προς το δοκιμα
15 ζειν [τα Ησιοδον
τε και παρ υμιν
gειν [χρυσουν τε
cαι [αργυρουν και
χαλκουν και σιδη

Col. v.

νυ μεν ο[ιν]: με
ταβησεται[ι] μεν
δη ουτως [µετα]
βασα de πος [οι]
5 κησει: η φανε
ρου οτι τα µι[εν]
Col. i, marg. 1. Perhaps κατηγορ, the word in any case being explanatory of θειων 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 = μεν or -μεν, and the next word may be a form of αίτως, perhaps αίτων: tachygraphic τ becomes a vertical stroke, and υ = 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 altgr. Tachygraphie, Plate II. 9. 5. Further on, ν is surmounted by a small semicircle (perhaps incomplete), which may represent τ or ω.

4. The collocation of figures after ερή is peculiar. If μ = μεράς, 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 μ α 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 τέλειος ἀριθμός, but are not easy to interpret. Perhaps τελ(είων) ὀρ(ίον) ἐ(ν) [α]υτ(ι) χά(τα) τρ(άπηγ) ὀ (θείων) ὀρ(ίων) ὀ (τις) π(αραστ) παντ(ής) ὁ (ποι(κάρ)οι) στη(ρού) may approximate to the sense, though there are several points here which are unsatisfactory. At the end of l. 5 a short vertical stroke, which might be read as 1, remains unaccounted for. Can ἐ(ν) [α]υτ(ι) ω be meant? But the order is not in favour of this. In l. 7 σ' is a recognized abbreviation of σῶν, and σ(ῶν)π(αραστ) would be unobjectionable but for the occurrence in l. 14 of a similar curved symbol which remains unexplained. In l. 8 ἀποκαθίστημαν is the compound expected, but this will presuppose considerable irregularity at the beginnings of the lines. Taylor suggests that or 'ε may stand for ὀ τ(έλειος) ἐ(ναρτός), followed by ἐ(ν) ϕ: such drastic abbreviation, however, seems hardly possible, especially as the word ἐ(ναρτός) does not actually occur in the text.

9–10. διναμεν(αι) (ταίς) ὑποτεινούσας? : 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 ταίς is not a serious objection, since there are analogies for this in tachygraphy, and the alternative δυνάμεν(αι) (αι) not only necessitates the alteration of ὑποτεινούσας but also involves a similar incongruity in ll. 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 ἐπὶ τοῖνος ἥ υποτεινοῦσα ἴσον δύων ἀμφοτέρας ἀμα, διά τοῦτο ἡ μὲν δυναμεῖ καλεῖται, ἀλὲ δὲ δυναμεῖμενα, and Dercylides ap. Proclus, In Repr. ii, p. 25 (Kroll) τῶν μὲν περιεχομένων τῶν πρώτων ἐν συμβολὴς λόγον ἐξουσίων (i. e. 4 : 3), τῆς δ’ ὑποτεινοῦσας ἦ τις : εὑρετὰς διπλάσιον, Kroll; but what is expected is surely ἴσον δυναμεῖ ἀμφοῖν.

11–12. τὰς ἀλλὰς πλευρὰς, referring to δυναμεῖμενα; cf. the passage from Alex. Aphrod. quoted in the preceding note. In the next line the ἀλλαὶ πλευραί are more closely defined as the ὀρθὴ and the βάσις, the perpendicular and the base of the triangle. For the symbol interpreted as ας or τάς cf. n. on ll. 9–10 above. The sign \ ordinary means εἶναι, and also represents \, but these would be out of place here, where \ is desirable. Cf. ii, marg. 4.

13–16. δ’ ὁροὶ(α) ἦ ἄποστάσεις ἐξουσία... δ’ κ(ε)νες τὸ ὁρο[ν(α)] ἐπιφέρ[αν(ες)\?]. For the high dot at the end of the first word of the note cf. Col. ii, marg. 8, where a similar mark occurs above λείπ(ει). Possibly there was a corresponding mark in the text. The latter part of the note is obscure. In l. 14 the symbol before \ is like that in l. 7 above, which may represent \. \ seems to be a termination rather than the relative, which would lack an antecedent, and also a governing verb, if \, is the object of \. With regard to this verb, the plural termination is demanded by \, and the symbol at the end has a smaller and more rounded top than that standing for \. The introduction of \, as a synonym apparently of \, is hardly helpful.

Col. ii. 3. εκατ[ου] : so ΑΜ Proclus; ἐκαστον AFD.
7. The v. l. ἐκαστον superscribed by a second hand is unrecorded.
9. δευν: so AD; δευν with others Burnet.
11. 0 after \ has been cancelled by a dot placed above; \ is \. MSS.
13. v, which was originally written in place of \, was presumably cancelled, but only the top is preserved; the correction may be by the original hand or the corrector.

Col. ii, marg. 1–5. This mutilated note refers to ll. 4–8 of the text, the value of \ 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 \ (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 (δειμένων εώς ll. 6–7, λεῖπ(ει) μνάδι marg. 8) from the square of 7 (ἀριθμῶν ἀπὸ διαμέτρων ll. 3–4). In marg. 2 perhaps \ should be restored, and τὸ before λ(ει)πθ(αι)· for μολαδι cf. marg. 8. In marg. 4 something like \ in τὸ \ seems required, and the symbol for \, which recurs in marg. 12–13, no doubt represents \; cf. e. g. Wessely, \, cit. Plate II. 7. 2, where the sign for \ 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 \ is doubtful; at any rate the previous group is not in the least like the tachygraphic symbol for \. The passage of the Μένο referred to is 85 b ἀπὸ τῆς διαμέτρου... γίγνοι\ ἐν τὸ διπλάσιον χωρίον. In l. 5 l. ἀπὸ \ is \. 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 \ ἄρθρῳ ἄρθρῳ ὁ πλευρῶν ἐξω(ν), but as this is an obviously incorrect definition of a finite number, Taylor suggests that \ is meant, ‘the square of a “rational diameter,” is a square number’, which is less tautologous in Greek than in English, but might have been more clearly expressed as \ ἀριθμὸς ἀπὸ \ ὁ πλευρῶν ἐξω(ν). Cf. marg. 10–11.

8–9. λειπ(ει) μονάδι, \ μη. These words seem intelligible only if \ here
is taken as referring to the side of the oblong; 'it is less by a unit, if the side = 148 (x 100)'.
This is certainly not very satisfactory, and there is something to be said for Taylor's proposal to insert e before μ: 'it is less by a unit; i.e. if the side is 5, the number will be (149 - 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. ἀρνητ(όν ι') (δὲ?) 'ν, οὖ (οὔκ) ἐστιν πλ(ευρα). It seems simplest on the whole to regard the first two words of this note as a lemma from the Platonic text; cf. ὑπτ(ὀν ι') in marg. 6. The curved symbol is rather like that in marg. 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 (οὔκ), the usual tachygraphic equivalent of οὔ 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) κ' γί(νονταί) ἡμέρ(αι) 'Ζφ, ἀκ(ολούθως ι') (τῷ) γν(ακείω). In this note the number 27 appears to have been connected with the female μηναι. For the symbol for τοι cf. marg. 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 ἀκ(ολούθως) 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 δρομοί by Dercylides ap. Proclus, In Remp. ii. 25 (Kroll) ο μὲν εὐστὶν ὑμοίποτε φίλος, οὶ μι, δ ἐν ἀνομοίποτε, δ οἱ, καὶ ο μὲν (γεινή) τοιοῦτον ἄλλον τῶν μέρη, δ δὲ ἀνάδμαον μετ' εκείου τῶν 'Ζφ. Proclus obtains the number 10 by the addition of κ' and μ' (ii. 36 sqq.), but whether he is here following Dercylides he does not say.

Col. iii. 8. υ[μν] γε[πεσμ]ται: the vestige before the lacuna and the arrangement of the lines makes the reading practically certain; γε[πεσμ]ται ιμι (FDM, Burnet) or ημι MSS.
10. εκ: or perhaps ευ.

Col. iv. 2. αρχηρ was first written (no doubt owing to the following αρχηρ) the e having been inserted at the same time as the τ over Χ, which has not been deleted.
4. καταστασι-, as amended, is the ordinary reading.
12. To which hand the insertion of the missing syllable is due is uncertain.

Col. V. 1. με[ταβαθήσεται: so AM; μεταβαθήσεται D, μεταβαθήσεται F.
14. The superfluous i adscript has been crossed through and a dot was also placed above it.
15. τοι: so A, Burnet; το FD. The vestige of the i is very slight, but the reading is confirmed by the spacing.

1809. PLATO, Phaedo.
11.3 x 11.7 cm. Early second century.

This fragment contains parts of three columns, of which the second, so far as it goes, is in fair preservation, but rather more than half the lines are missing at the foot. The hand is a small upright uncial of neat appearance, suggestive of the Trajan-Hadrian period. Vertical strokes are often finished at the base with a small hook or flourish which sometimes curves back to the perpendicular, e.g. in l. 13 the τ of ἐναυτίων has the peculiar form τ. Besides stops in the high and middle positions a colon, as in 1808, is used for punctuation, this latter and perhaps the others also being apparently by the original hand. Paragraphi
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, ὥς Κέβης for ὥς Κέβης, ἐφη) may be right; on the other hand, in ii. 14 it agrees with B² in καθὼς οὔτε against the inferior καὶ τοιοῦτον τί of BTW, and in ii. 12 has the preferable οὔδε of BT against οὔτε of B²W.

Col. i. Col. ii.

1] ην[ ]αι εκ των εναντ[ιων

2)...

3].. [μ]ενεθο[. . . . . . . .]ιν αλλα

4]...... αλλα τα . . [. . ηλια] τα εκ εκ

5]..ιων μεσος τις ει : τ . . . . . . μεζων

6] ηυ ει μικρον τοι τε/]

7]τητα μικρο[ν] αν ειναι και παλιν μεγε

8] θος αυτου εως αν μ. [. .]...

9] ειναι μικρον

10 εως δ αυτως και το σμικρον [το

102 ε

και δεξαμενον την σμικρο

τητα. ουκ εθελει ειναι ετε

ρον η η διπερ ην : ωςπερ εγω. δε

5] 5 δεξαμενος και υπομεινας την

σμικροτητα. και ετι ὁν ὅσπ[ερ]

ειμι ουτος δ αυτος· σμικρος

ειμι· εκεινο δε ου τετολμ[η]

κευ μεγα ὁν σμικρον ειναι

10] 10 εως δ αυτως και το σμικρον [το

εν ημιν· ουκ εθελει ποτε μ[ε

γα γιγνεσθαι ουδε ειναι. ουδε
Marginal note. 1. The letters ἵν are on a small detached fragment which seems to belong to this line, though whether it precedes or follows ἵν ὑπὲρ ην ἀρα τον Ἕλλην is doubtful.

4. It is not clear whether the interlinear η signifies an abbreviation (ἐλλη(λ . .)?) or was added by way of correction; possibly there is a second letter (ς ?) ; and perhaps a double dot should be recognized between the ἀλά (or λα) and τ, as apparently also in l. 5.

5. ἐναυτιον is possible, though the vertical stroke before i is rather long for τ and Ῥ.
would better suit e. g. ρ; but εκ [των εναγερτων] is unlikely, since ll. 6–7 indicate a longer line. 
ει: τ cannot be ει� apparently.

6. τουτω is crossed through and ἂι μικρων του 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]. os, followed by η (or ηλ) in l. 7. φαίνων [τοις [δε ελαστω λεγεις ταυτα] (T for τιτς(ς)) could here be read, but the vestiges of ll. 1–4 do not seem to bear out this identification. b 6 μεγεθός and b 8 πος are unsuitable, and though c 4 πος is possible, ἄληθεν would give too short a line. The double dot in l. 11 is not of much assistance, since this may represent either a stop or a change of speaker; cf. int.

ii. 6. οσπ[ερ] : ὁσπερ W.
8. εκεῖνο : so B²TW; εκεῖνο B.
o: so B²TW; om. B.
oe: so B⁴TW; om. B.
o: so B⁴TW. T.
12. γενέθαι W.
o: so BT; om. B²Wl.
13. ε[τ]ι + o: so TW; α[τίον B, and W v. B.
14. ἀμα: the μ has been altered, whether by the original or a later hand is not clear; αλλα was apparently first written.
19. The first i of φα[κέρ]αι is under i of [παντα[π]αι] in the line above and τ of τωι in l. 17, so that [ο[τε φα] is hardly enough for the lacuna, which may, however, be sufficiently filled by writing οντως or οντωι.

iii. 9. Whether the papyrus had πος or εις is of course not determinable; the same remark applies to ωιδ or εις in l. 12.
10. The meaning of the marginal symbol, consisting of three heavy dots in the form of a pyramid, is unknown; it may refer to a lost marginal note.
13. In the margin opposite this line there is a small circular mark like the sign for short quantity.
14. κατοικτι: so B²; και το[ιοτό] τι BTW.
16. The marginal sign is on the broken edge of the papyrus and may be incomplete; here, too, the meaning is obscure.

1810. Demosthenes, Olynth. i–III, Phil. i, De Pacc.

Width of column 6–6.5 cm. Early second century. Plate IV (Phil. i, Fr. 15).

These fragments, covering the first five speeches of Demosthenes, are written in a graceful round hand similar in type to that of the British Museum Hyperides (cf. also e. g. 220), though more ornate and regular; it may go back to the end of the first century, but more probably is to be assigned, like the Hyperides, to the earlier decades of the second. None of the columns is complete, but they consisted of about 33 lines apiece, with a broad margin both at the top and bottom,
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. 1, 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, 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.

[τ]e [πουτων ενι τω προτων] § 9
προθυμως και ως προση
κον [εβοηθησαμεν αυτοι ραι
οηι και πολυ ταπεινοτερω
5 ννν [αν εξομεθα των Φιλιπ

Frs. 3–4.

[λιππον λαμβα[γεν] ει ει το[ν
7 lines lost
[μους ηδιον αν και ελευθε§ 23
10 [ρους η δουλους ειναι και] γαρ

Fr. 2.

[βουλου εγω] δ ουκ αγν[ων § 16
[μεν εν ανδρεσ] Αθηναιοι τουτο
[οτι πολλακις] μμεις ου τ[ους
[αιτιον αλλα τους υ[στατος

10 [την αδεωσ καρ]ποιμενιοι
[αν δ εκεινα Φιλι]ππος λα[βην
τίς αυτον κωλυσει δευρό βαδί
ζει[ν]. Θηβαι[οι μη] λει[αν πι § 26
[α]θέεις κατάκοινειν τινὸς

Frs. 5-7.

ναιν μῆδε το[θ] υμας λανθα § 25
νετω οτι νων αιρ[ε]ις ε[σ]τιν
υμιν ποτ]ερ υμας ε[κει χρη
πολεμε[ν] η παρ υμ[ιν] εκει
5 [νον]· εα[ν] μὲν γαρ α[υ]ντεχη
[τα των Ολυ]νθων υ[μεις εκει
[πολεμησετε] και την [εκεινον
[κακως ποιησετε την υπαρ]

Frs. 3-4.

11. ]ο is only a shade to the right of ]γ and ]θ in the preceding lines, and the omission of του before κατακοινευ (so Bl(ass) with Liban.) seems probable.

13-14. The papyrus seems to have had the ordinary reading. Dindorf read οι (so Bailer) οι (so two MSS.) μη, omitting γ with Rh. Gr. ii. 679 &c. Bl. similarly omits γ, inserting a sign of interrogation after εστιν.
15. Bl. brackets ετοιμως following Rh. Gr. v. 36, vii. 941.
17. δότες is bracketed by Bl. following Rh. Gr. iv. 739.
24. γ seems to have been omitted after ηλικα, as in u (Coisl. 324).

Frs. 8.

1. The identification of this fragment is made with hesitation, since the reading προσήκων in place of προσήκεν, though intelligible, is unattested, and it is not clear that any letter preceded ε in line 1; on the other hand, the fact that line 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.

3-4. Frs. 5-7. 12. The length of line 2 appears to suit this passage better than § 15 πολάων φανώμεν ἐρραθυμηκότες, but the identification is not certain.
1810. Extant Classical Authors

Olynth. ii.

Fr. 1.

[epi] πολλῶν μ[εν αν τις ιδειν § 1
[ω ανδρείς Αθηναίοι

Fr. 4.

...§13

[tant elēλης[ηθ]ως π[ροσικεί
[καὶ δὴ περαιν]ειν ου μ[ονον
[ω ανδρείς Αθηναίοι §[a

Fr. 5-6.

[σκεψαίον χαλεπ[ω]ς οι δε[ § 17
[δὴ περι αυτον οντε]ς ξενοι
[καὶ πεζεται]ρο[ι] δοξαν μεν
[του] πολεμον ως δ εγω των
4 lines lost
λεμ[ου και αγωνον τουτους § 18
μεν [φιλοτιμαι παντας απω
15 θειν [αυτον εφη βουλομε
νον [ταυθ αυτου δοκειν ει
ναι τα[ργα προς γαρ αν τοις
αλλοις [και την φιλοτιμιαν

Frs. 2, 3.

[kapio]ρκουντα και ψευδο § 10
[μενον] δυναμιν βεβαιαν
7 lines lost
10 [και πλοιον και των αλλων
[των τοι]ουτων [τα κατωθεν ισ
[χυροτε]ρα ειναι δει ουτω
[kαι τω]ς πραξεων τας αρχας
[kαι τας ποθεσεις

Frs. 7-8.

[αυτοπροβλητ]ου ειναι ει
[δε τις σωφρ]ων η δικαιος
[αλλως την καθ ημεραν ακρα
[σιαν του βιου και μ]εθην και
5 [κορδακισμοι]ς ου δυναμε
[νος φερειν π]αρωσθαι και
[εν ουδενος ει]ναι μερει
[του τοιουτου]υ λοιπους δη § 19
[περι αυτου ειναι ληιστας]
10 [και κολακας κα]λει τοιουτους
[ανθρωπους ου]πος μεθυσθεν
[tas ορχειοθα τοι]αυτα οια
[εγω νυν οκν]ω προς μεας
[ονομασαι δη]λου δ οτι ταυ
15 [τ εστιν αληθη] και γαρ ους
[ενθενδε παντες απηλλαυ
7 lines lost
ποιου[σιν ενεκα του γελασθη
25 και τοιους

...
Frs. 9-11. Col. i.

τοὶς σωμασιν § 21

[ημὼν τεω]ς μεν αν ερρώ[με]
[nos ηι τις] ουδεν επαισθα
[νεται επα]ν δ ἀρρωστήμα

5 [τι συμβη τι]αντα κενεται:
[kαν ρηγμα κ]αν στρεμμα [καν
[αλλο τι των υπ]αρχοντων>
[σαθρων ηι ου]τω και των πο
[λεων και των] τυραννων

10 [εως μεν αν εξω] πόλεμω>

7 lines lost § 22

νομ[ι]ζει σοφρονος μεν
ανθρωπον λογισ]μωι Χρη

20 ται'; μ[εγάλη γαρ ρο]πη μαλ
λον [δ ολον η τυχη] παρα παν
τ ε[στι τα των ανθρ]οπων

Frs. 12-13.

[ει μνθεις υμω]ν ο [ανδρε]ς Α § 25
[θηναιοι] δυναται λο[γ]υσασθαι
[ποσον π]ολεμετε χρό]νον Φι
[ληπω] και τι ποιο[ντων

5 [υμων] ο χρονος δι[ε]ληλυθεν ou
[τος ισ]τε γαρ δηπο[ν του οτι
[μελλο]ντων υμων [ετερους
[τινας] ελπιζοντων πραξειν
[αιτωμ]ενωι αλ[ληλους

10 [κρινοντων παλιν ε]λπιζ]ον
[τον σχεδου ταυθ απερ] [μυ]ι
[ποιοντων απας ω Χ]ρονος
[διε]ληλυθεν ειδ ουτοις αγνω § 26
[μονως εχετ ω ανδρε]ς Αθη

Frs. 11. Col. ii.

δ[ικαιων αντηρατε και πολ § 24
λ [διαi

Frs. 14-18.

[γεγον]ευ δ[ια των αυτων του
[των ελ]πιζετε πραξεων
[εκ φαυλ]ον [απο τα χρηστα γε
[νησε]σθαι] αλλ ου[τ ευλογον

5 ου[τ εκο]ν εστιν [φυσιν τουτο
γε] π[ολυ γαρ] ραζι[ον εχοντας
φυλαττεν η κτησασθαι παν
τα π[ερικεν νυν δ ο τι μεν
φυλαξομ]σιν ουδεν εστι

10 [υπο] του πολεμο]υ λοιπον
tων προτερου κτ]ησασθαι
dε δει αυτων ωυ]ν ημων ερ
γον τουτ η δη φημι δη δειν § 27
ειο[φερε]ιν χρηματα αυτους

3 lines lost
[ναιοι ωστε δί ον εκ χρηστὼν
[φαυλα τα πραγματα της] πολεως
[καυτα] δε απ αυτ[ων των ερ
[γων κρινοντας τους [μεν
20 [αξιους ε]παινου τιμαιν τους
[δοικουν]τας κολαζειν τας
[προφασεις αφελειν και τα
[καθ' υμας] ελλειμματα' ου γ[αρ
[ε]στι πι[κρ]ος εξετασαι τι πε
25 [πρα]κται [τους αλλοις αν μη [πα
[ρ μοιων αυτων] πρωτον ν[παρ
[ε]ν τα δεον]τα' τι[ν]ος γαρ ει

Fr. 19.

[μηδε] στινον [συμπονειν ου § 30
[χι γενη]σεται[ι των δεοντων
[ημιν] ουδ[εν εν καιρω το γαρ
[ηδικ]ημεν[ον αει μερος ελ
5 [λειψε]'] ειθ ν[μιν

Frs. 2-3. i. ισχυρότερα: so YOF corr.; ισχυρότερα other MSS., Bl., Butcher.

Fr. 4. This fragment is not very certainly identified.

Frs. 5-6. i. A stop may be lost before αε.

Frs. 7-8. ι. τυνδρός, which is omitted by Bl. and Butcher with SFB, was clearly not in the papyrus.
6. παρεσομαι: so SAFBY: παρεσομαι vulg.
16. In estimating the number of lines lost below this one it has been assumed that the papyrus had καθ' τιμαινας ἀνθρώπων, which Bl. brackets.

Frs. 9-11. i. ημων: so FOPQ; om. SY, Bl., Butcher.
3. The papyrus agrees with S¹ (so Bl., Butcher) in omitting των καθ' ἐκαστα σαβρῶν which is commonly added after ἐπαισθανεται.
8. Whether the papyrus had σαβρῶν (S¹ &c., Bl.) or σαβρῶν (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 ὅλων with S and Dion. Hal. 1089 is therefore probable. Bl. follows S, Butcher the vulg.

Fr. 11. ii. The identification is doubtful; [δ[ηθ ... πολ]κας is another possibility.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Frs. 12–13. 5. χρόνος: so S, Bl., Butcher; χρόνος ἀπάς vulg.
7. ὑμών: so S; αὐτῶν other MSS., Butcher, om. Bl. with Schaefer and Cobet.
12. ἀπάς ο χρόνος: so S, Bl., Butcher; ὃ χρόνος ἀπάς vulg.

Frs. 14–18. 1. τῶν αὐτῶν ... ἑπτάζων: so most MSS.; τούτων ἑπτάζετε τῶν αὐτῶν ἑπτάζων S, Butcher, and Bl. with [ἑπτάζων]. Cobet bracketed τῶν αὐτῶν ἑπτάζων, Gebauer ἑπτάζων only.
12. A high stop may be lost after ἰες.
19. κρίνοντα: κρίνοντας MSS.
22. προφάσεις: προφάσεις δ' MSS. If δ were similarly omitted after τοῦς (l. 20), which is quite possible, the asyndeton would balance those earlier in the sentence.

Olynth. iii.

Frs. 2–3.


5 lines lost

5 [γ]ονοι υπομενειν τοντο θε
[ωρ]ουν] τας ει ταληθη λε
[γυ] και δια τοντο κα] δια 
15 [πα βε]λτιω []

Frs. 1.

5 [σαι] χαλεποτατον [ηνουμαι α]λλ [§ 3
[εκ]ει]τυν απορο τυνα χρη τρο
[πον ο οι]δ]ρες Αθηναι[οι προσ
[υμα]ς περι αυτων ειπ[ε]ιν

Frs. 4.

5 [τε]ς δη]που αι[λ ο]τε μεν δη δει § 10
[βοηθ]ειν ειπο τις αν παντες
[εγκοκαρ]ειν και [βοηθησορ]ειν
[το δ οπως] το] τε λεγε μη
[τουνω ο νο]ιδρε]ς Αθηναιοι
10 [θαυμασητε αν π]αραδοξον
Col. i.  
3 lines lost

Fr. 5.

Col. ii.  

Fr. 6.

Fr. 7.
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Col. i.  

Fr. 5.

Col. ii.  

Fr. 1. 5. Either πεινωμέθ or πεινημέθ could be read.

Fr. 2-3. 4-5. Bl. brackets peri aitón and inserts kai before παρών 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 ὁ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι.
15. τα: τα γε MSS.
16. υμᾶς is bracketed by Bl. and Butcher with Cobet.
19. αν γραφήν: so A suppl.; γραφεῖν corr. to γραφῇ S, with ἄν γραφῇ in a late hand, γράφει vulg. γραφεῖν Bl., Butcher.

Fr. 6. i. Either μικρῶν (S corr. h. i B corr. AO, Butcher), or μικρῶν S'B can be read; μικρά Bl. with Dionys.
7. Bl. brackets τάξιν πούσας.

Fr. 7. 2–3. ἀπασιν ὑμ[ιν] συνοισεῖν: ἀπασι συνοισεῖν ὑμῖν MSS.

Phil. i.

Fr. 1.

] κακώς τ[α] πρα[γματα] § 2
Fr. 2.

[σκοπον το τε] πλῆθος τ[ηθος υπαρ § 4
[χονσης αυτ]οι δυναμεως []
[kαι το τα χωρια παντα απο []
[λαλεναι τη τοιε ορθως] μεν []

Frs. 5–6.

tοσο[υτον επειδαν απαντ] α § 14
κουσητε κρινατε μη προτερον
προλαμ[βανετε μηδ αν εξ αρ]
[χης]δοκ[ιω τινι καινην παρα
5 lines lost

10 μενα τη τινι βοηθειαι
κωμυσαι δι[νηθειμεν αλ § 15
Fr. 3.

§ 2 [δρες Αθην]α[ιοι και υμεις
epi της τοιαυτης εθελησθε
geneσαι γνωμης μυ]ν ε[πε]
[δηπερ ου προτε]ρον και []

Fr. 4.

dοκιουντων οικειως εχειν § 8
και π[ανθ οσα περ κα]ν αλλοις
tisiv [anθρωποις εν]

Fr. 7. Col. i. Fr. 7. Col. ii.

§ 14 [νητον εστιν κ η δια τ]οιν φο § 18 . .
[βον ειδος ευτρεπει]ς υμας
[εισεται γαρ ακριβως] εισιν
[γαρ εισιν οι παντ εξ]αγγελα
5 [λοιτες εκεινω παρ ημ]α[ν]
[αυτων πλειον] του δ]εοντως 5 §
[ησυχιαν εχη] η παριδ]ον ταυ
7[
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λ οὐς αὖ δείξην τις πορισθεὶ
σα παράφοσει καὶ ποσῆ καὶ
ποσθὲν διαμειναι δυνησκαται

15 τεως ἃν η ἐξαλυσεθεὶ πεὶ
σθεντες τὸν πολεμὸν ἡ πε
ριγενωμέθα τῶν εὐθρῶν
οὐτω γαρ οὐκετὶ του λοι

Fr. 8.

[μακρον τουτον ἀλλ] οσον § 21
[ἀν δοκη καλως εχ]ειν εκ δια
[δοχης αληθοις το]υς δ ἀλ
[λοις ἐξενοι ειναι κε]λευω
5 [και μετα τουτων ἐπε]ας δια
[kοσιους και τουτων πε]ντη
[kοντα Αθηναιους του]αχι[σ]

Fr. 9.

... § 23 [π]αντελω[σ]
[ταπεινη] ειναι δει πολιτα[σ]

Fr. 10.

... § 32 [να]ιμεθ [εκειν αφικεσθαι δει]
[τ]οινν

Frs. 11–13.

Col. i.

εμποριων στομασιν ραιδι
ως [ε]σται α μεν ουν χρησε § 33
[ται κα]ὶ ποτε τη δυνα]μει πα
[ρα το]υ καιρον ο τουτων [κυ
5 [ριο]ς καταστας υφ υμ[ω]ν βου
[λευ]σεται: ἀ δ υπαρξ]αι δ]ει πα
[ρ υ]μων [τα]υτ εστιν α εγω γε []
[θηναιοι πορισε]τε [τα] χρη[μα
10 [τα πρ]ωτον α λεγω: [ειτ]α κα
[ταλ]λα, παρασκευασα[ντε]ς τους
[σ]τρατιωτας τας τριπεις του[ς]

Col. ii.

θοντα χρονον εις Δημι[ουν] § 34
και Ιμβρον εμβ]αλων αιχμα
λωτως πολιτας [υμετερους
ωιχετ εξων και προς τωι []
5 Γερα[α]ι]στοι τα πλοια συλλαβαων
αμθητα χρηματα εξελεξε
τα τελευτα[ια] εις Μαραθωνα
απεβη και [την] ιεραν απο
της χωρας ωιχετ εξων τρι
10 ηρη: υμεις δ ουτε ταυτα δυ
νασθε κοιλυειν ουτ εις
τους χροινους ους αν προ
[ippe]ias ευνελη πασαν την
[δυναμιν νομιν κατακλεισθ]

15 [τε επτ] των πολεμω[ι] μενειν
[των] μεν χρηματω[ν] αυτοι;
τρ[αμιαι και ποριστα[ι] γιγν[ο]μες:
[ν]οι· τον δε πραξ[ε]ων παρα τον
[στρατηγου τον λ]ο[γον ζητουν]

20 [τες παυσεσθε αει περι]
[των α]ιτ[ων Βολευομενοι

7 lines lost § 34 [οσ ουδ εις εύα [των αποστο

μα]χων αγων και φερων τους

30 πλεον[τας την θαλατταν ε
[π]ειτα τι προς τουτω τον

Fr. 14.

[ατακτα α]ριστα· α[διορθω § 36 [του ιππη]ερως εληλυθεν ωσ
[τα απαντα] τοιγαρομιν αμα
[ακηκοαμεν] τι και τρη[ηραρ
[χοιι παθησαμεν] και το|υτοισ

5 [αντιδοσεις ποιουμεθα και
[περι χρηματω] ποροι σκο
[πομμεν και με]τα ταυτα εμ
[βαινει τους με]τοικους
[εδοε και τους χω]ρις οικουν

10 [τας ειτ αυτους παλ]μου αντεμ
[βιβαγειν ειτ εν οσι ι ταυ[τα

§ 37

Fr. 16.

] ι [ § 40

[γης εξετα]ι· και ε[γερωσε πατα
[εν τις] εκεισε εισ[ιν αι χει

θησθε βοηθειν καιοι τι δη § 35
ποτε ω ανδρες Αθηναιοι νο

15 μιζετε την [μεν των Παν
αθηναιων ε[ορτην και τη
των Διουνσι[ω]ν αει το καθη
κουτος χρ[ο]υ[ον γιγνεθαι
αν τε δει]νοι λαχσιν αν τε

20 ιδιωται

3 lines lost

25 [λων και] τουστ[ον

Fr. 15. Plate IV.

[τουθ υβρεως εληλυθεν ωσ
[τ επιστ]ελλειν Ευβοευσιν
[ηδη το]ιαυτας επιστολας>
[επιστολης α]γανονισιν

5 [τουτων αν ανδρες] Αθηναιοι § 38 [των ανεγνωσμενω]ν αληθη
[μεν εστι τα πολλα ο]ικ εδει ου
[μην αλ]λ ισω ο]υχ ηδη ακ[ου
[ειν αλ]λ ει μεν] οσα αν τις ν

10 [περβη τω λογω] να μη λυ
[πησι και τα πρ]αγματα υπερ
[βησται] δει προς ηδονν
[δημη]γορειν· ει δ η των λο
[γω]ν χαρις αν τη μη προσηκου

15 [σα εργωι] ζημια γιγνεταιι
[αισχρον ει]στι φεναικιζειν [εαι
[τους και] απαντ' αναβαλ[λ]
[μενους α] αν τη δυσ[η]ε ρη παν
[των υπερ]ιειν των εργων
1810. **EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS**

3 lines lost

§ 39

[λουθεῖν τοῖς πραγμασίν [αλ]

[λ αυτοῦς εμπροσθέν] εἶναι

25 [τοὺς πραγμάτων καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν αὐτὸν

[τὸν τρόπον ὡσπερ τὸν στρατηγὸν] ἄξιος αὐτῷ
tίς αὐτὸν

Frs. 18–20.

[δεῖς νῦν μητ ἐνθύμεται] § 43

[μητ ὤργιζεται ὄργων ω αἴν

[δρέας Αθηναίοι τὴν μὲν αἴρ

3 lines lost

[σαν ἡδὴ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μη παθεῖν

[κακῶς ὑπὸ Φιλιπποῦ] τάλα

[μην οτι γ νῦν στησάται δὴλον

10 [εἰ μη τίς αὐτὸν] καὶ λευκὸς[ἰ ἔται

[τοῦτ αὐτοῖς ἡμῶν καὶ τρί

[ηρεῖς καὶ] ἔνας καὶ τὰς παρὰ τοῦ

[δεῖνας ἐλπίδας αὐτὸν ἀποστείλῃ

Fr. 22.

[πράξεις] πρὸς νῦν] § 46

[ψέυδομε]ροὶ παιδίως

Fr. 23.

[γιματ αἰσχρὴς ωστε τῶν στρατηγοὺς] § 47

[την ὡστε ἑκατὸν δίς καὶ τρίς

[κρεῶν] ταῖς παρὰ τῆς περι θέα

[νατοῦ] πρὸς δὲ [τοὺς εὐθέους

5 [οὐδεῖς] οὐδ' εὔπαχτος αὐτῶν α

Fr. 24.

[τον προσήκοντος] κακο[υργοῦ] § 47

[μεν γαρ εστὶ κρι[θέντα αἰτο

[θανεῖν στρατηγῶν] δὲ μ[αχο

[μενον τοις πολ]εμίοις [
[γωνισασ']θαι περὶ θανατου
[τολμαὶ] ἀλλα τον τῶν ανδραπο
[δηστων] και λωπο[δυτων] θα
[νατον μαλ]λον [αιρουνται

Fr. 25. Fr. 26.

[βεις πεπομφε]ν ως βασιλε] § 48 [πραγµενων [και πολλα τοι § 49
[α οι δε εν Ιλλυριοις π[ολεις

Fr. 27. Fr. 28.

[ουντε]ς αλλα αν αφεντες § 50 [σθαι λεγειν] αιρουµαι νι
[ταυτ εκειν ειδωµεν οτι § 51
[εχθρον αν[θρωπος και τα η
[μετερα ηµ[ας αποστερει
5 και χρονον[πολυν υβρικε κατα ] Ψηλιππο
]

Fr. 4. i. The addition of αυτων after εξεω would make the line too long; om. S, Bl., Butcher.
2. π[αιθ: so Y; ἀπαιθ others, Bl., Butcher.
Fr. 5-6. i1. Bl. and Butcher write δυτθειµεν.
15. τεως: so FB Proem. 21, Bl.; ἢως 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. i. 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 -ναι[μεθ or -νω]μεθ was written cannot in any case be determined.
Fr. 11-13. i. 1-2. The papyrus seems to have had the ordinary reading, which is retained by Bl. Butcher obelises ραδιως ἐσται, for which Dindorf reads ραδιως εἰσεσθε with Wolf.
10. a λεγω: so vulg., Butcher; om. a S, Bl.
ii. 4. εξω: so SAY, Butcher; ἀγων vulg., Bl.

5. The deletion of the first ι of ἑραυστών seems to have been intended. There is a dot just above and slightly to the left of the ι, and on the line between σ and ι something like a comma, both marks being in rather lighter ink. ἑραυστῷ SBO, Bl.; ἑραυστῷ vulg., Butcher.

12. Either προβοηθεῖ (SBF, Bl., Butcher) or προποθήθε (A) might have been written; προσκήθε vulg.

Fr. 14. 1. ἀφροτα ἀπαρετωρ: so vulg.; ἀπαρέτωρ ἀφροστ' SAY, Bl., Butcher.

Fr. 15. 18. σ: so S; other MSS. have σα, but for this there is not room unless ἀναβάλλομεν was differently divided, which is improbable.
19. ντρ[π]ίον (S, Bl., Butcher) is possible as a reading, but considerations of space favour ντρεπίειν.
27. τις σν: so SY, Bl., Butcher; ἂν τις others.

Fr. 16. 2–3. πατα[θν] τις: or πατα[θε], with S.

Fr. 17. 3–4. γεγενήσε[σθα]ν τι ἡ γ'γεγενόμενον: γεγ. ἔ γεγυ. τι most MSS., Bl., Butcher; Y transposes γεγ. and γεγυ., and the same order is equally possible in the papyrus, to which the position given to τι is apparently peculiar.
6. ην: ἐνιν SA, Bl., Butcher, ἐνιν ποιεῖν YO, ἐν ποιεῖν FB. The loss of the syllable en- would be very easy after μεν.

Frs. 18–20. 2. Either ὄργησται (SAY) or λογήσται (vulg.) is possible.

Fr. 21. 1. τοὺς, which Bl. omits with Schol. Aristid. p. 196, was evidently in the papyrus.

3–5. There is apparently no authority for the insertion of ὡ ἄνδρες Ἄθ. after ἐστιν here, but this seems the easiest explanation of the clear [να] in l. 5, which cannot be δείκτα unless there was a considerable omission; moreover if [δυνά]βηθαι be read in l. 4, the supplement at the end of l. 3 becomes rather long. Cf. Ol. 2. 10, where ὡ ἄνδ., Ἄθ. follows οὐ γάρ ἐστιν, οὐκ ἐστιν. The similarity of ἄνδρα δυνηθηρεῖν and ἄνδρες Ἀθραίναι might help to account for either the dropping or insertion of ὡ ἄνδ., Ἄθ.

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. πα[ν]: so S (πᾶσιν), Bl., Butcher; πᾶσιν ὑμῖν other MSS.

De Pace.

Fr. 1.

... 0]ν συν  § 16
[ἐπιστρατευεῖν οὐδὲ]τεροῖς.
Fr. 1. 2. *epwstrateiv* (O) suits the length of the line better than *-sein*, but remains of course uncertain.

Fr. 2. i. 2. Either *auton* or *eauton* can be read.

6. *dein *ημας* : so S, Bl., Butcher; *φημι *dein *ημας* (*ημα*), *διπως*, for which there is evidently not room, vulg.

ii. 7-8. *ημα*] *πολε*μ*ας* : so MSS.; Bl. and Butcher bracket, following the indications of Schol. p. 164.

22. *περακτα* *τι* : so S Bl., Butcher; *καλλιστα περακτα* other MSS., Isidor.
1811. DEMOSTHENES, C. 'Timocratem'.

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.

\[ \text{... ... ... ... ... ...} \]
\[ \text{ṣῆμ[ε]ὶ \ § 183} \]
\[ \text{ο[ν φιλα[ι] δε και τα τοι[α]υν τα πλο[υτ]ον και σ[τεφα]νοσ μεν απας καν μικρος η την [ι]} \]
\[ \text{5 σην φιλοτιμιαν εχει τω[ι με} \]
\[ \text{γαλων εκτωματα δε η θυμ} \]
\[ \text{μιανηρα η τα τοιαυτα κι[η]} \]
\[ \text{ματα εαν μεν υπερβαλ λη τω πληθει πλουτου τι} \]
\[ \text{10 να δοξαν προσετρησατο} \]
\[ \text{τοις κεκτη[μ]ενοις εαν δ ε} \]

Col. ii.

\[ \text{των τ[ω]υ επ εκεινοις} \]
\[ \text{σταθεντων το καλλος προ} \]
\[ \text{πυλαια ταυτα ο παρθενων} \]
\[ \text{στοι[σ] νεωσοικοι ουκ αρμο} \]
\[ \text{5 ρισκοι δυο ουδε χρυσι[δ]ε} \]
\[ \text{φιαλ[αι]} \]
\[ \text{τετ[τ]αρες η τρεις αγουσα ε} \]
\[ \text{καστη μναιν υν γαρ εαντον ζ} \]
\[ \text{δεκατενοντες ουδε α κα} \]
\[ \text{ταρασαιν αν οι εχθρоι ποι} \]
\[ \text{10 ουντες διπλας πραττον} \]
\[ \text{τες τας εισφορας ταυτα α} \]
\[ \text{νεθεσαν ουδ οιωσπερ συν} \]
\[ \text{χρωμενοι συμβουλοις} \]
\[ \text{επο} \]
\[ \text{λιτενοντο αλλα τους εχθρου[ι]ς} \]
\[ \text{15 κρατοντες και α πας [τις} \]
\[ \text{[α]ν ευ φρονων ευδαι[ι]} \]
\[ \text{ο} \]
15 [ω]στ [απειροκαλος προ[ς] εδο
ξεν [μοι υπος τοι[ν]ν
ανκλ[ων τα] τη[ς δοξ[η]ς κτη
[ματα του πλο[ντο[ν] πεποιη
[ται μικρα κ]αι ωυχ υμον a
[οτι προς μευ χημα]των
... ... ...

Col. iii.

ναι τοιουτων επιτη[δεν
ματων οια τοιου τεθ[ω
ται] και περι μεν τουτ[ον
§ 187 15 [και] Γλαυκ[η] και Μελα[νω
κατα ζχολνν] α Ḍε Διμ[οκρα
5] τεi συνερεi πολλα λεγειν ε
τι προς τουτοις εχων παιν[αισο
μαι υιδα δ [οτι ωσ μεν [ουκ
ασυμφορος υμευ εσθ ο ιο
μοι και παι]ρα παντας τ[ους
10 νουμον ει[σενην]νεγμειος
και κατα παντα αδικος [ε
χων υυχ εζει λεγειν [ακου

i. 7. Bl(ass) brackets η . . . κτήματα, 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. ουκ υμον αξια: so F and c. Androt. 75.
20. ειδεν: so Bl. and Butcher with SLFYO; οiδεν vulg.
ii. 6. αγωνα: αγωναι F.
7. After μεν most MSS. insert δη, δην σωi δοκη, παλιν γραφεις καταχωνειν, which is read
in c. Androt. 76 (γραφεις); om. SAV\(^\ast\); Bl. brackets.
8–9. α καταμασας αν: so MSS.; διν καταμασας Bl., Butcher with c. Androt. 77.
12. οἰωστήρ : so MSS., Butcher; ὀϊτήστηρ Reiske with c. Androt. 77, Bl.
18—19. άυτ[ά]ν κλέως : so F; κλέως άυτῶν other MSS., edd.; ΑΥΟ have ἀγαφότες for ἀγαφεῖς.
epιτηδευοντας : -σαντας F corr., c. Androt. 77, Bl.
22. τοῦτο : so F and c. Androt. 78; ταντοῦτον(v) other MSS. and v. l. F, Bl., Butcher.
23. προικῆθηντε : so vulg. and c. Androt. 78; προϊκῆθε S, προϊκῆθε Weil, Bl., Butcher.
iii. 3. Whether the papyrus had τοῦτον (S) or τοῦτων is of course quite uncertain.
4—5. Ταξικρατεῖς συνερεῖ : so MSS.; Ταξικρατῆς νῦν ἐρεί Dobree, Butcher.
13—16. αὐτὸν ... Μέλος[νω]ποι λεγεῖν : so A; other MSS. place λεγεῖν after αὐτὸν.
19. εὐωδων : τοῦτων F.
20. Bl. and Butcher bracket αὐτόν, following Rh. Gr. v. 581. 16.
23. τοῦτον ἡγούμεν F.

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 δ, 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 l. 400. Survivals of the application of stichometry to the speeches of Isocrates are to be found in the Codex Urbinas (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 Δημόνικον, at any rate, that number is usually exceeded.

The fact that the Πρὸς Δημόνικον stood at the beginning of the codex suggests at the outset an affinity with the so-called vulgate (ΔΠ), 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.

\[ i \]

\( \mu \alpha t i \) \( \pi e i r o \) \( \tau o \) \( m e \nu \) \( \sigma o m a \) \( e i n \) \( \phi i l o p o n o s \)
\( \tau h n \) \( \delta e \) \( \psi i v h n \) \( e i n \) \( \phi i l o s o f o s \) \( i n a \) \( t o \) \( m e n \)
\( e p i t e l e i n \) \( \delta v n h \) \( t a \) \( \delta o i a n t a \) \( t h \) \( \delta e \) \( p r o o r a n \)
\( e p e s t h \) \( t a \) \( s u m \phi e r o u n t a \) \( p a n \) \( o \) \( t i \) \( a n \) \( m e l l h s \) § 41

5 \( e r e i n \) \( p r o t e r o n \) \( e p i s k o p e i \) \( t h \) \( g i n h m h \) \( p o l l o i s \)
\( \gamma a r \) \( \h n l o s t a \) \( p r o t r e x e i \) \( t h i s \) \( d i a n o i a s \) \( n o m i \)
\( \zeta \) \( m h d e n \) \( e i n \) \( t o n \) \( a n h r o s p i n o n \) \( b e b a i o n \) \( o u t o s \)
\( \gamma a r \) \( o u t e \) \( \epsilon u t u c h o n \) \( e s h \) \( p e r i k a r h e s \) \( o u t e \) \( d u s t n \)
\( \chi o n \) \( p e r i l u p o s \) \( d u o \) \( p o i o u n \) \( k a i r o u s \) \( t o u \) \( l e g e i \) \( [\nu] \) § 42

10 \( \eta \) \( p e r i \) \( o n \) \( o i s \h h a \) \( s a f h o s \) \( \eta \) \( p e r i \) \( o n \) \( a n a g a i o n \) \( e i p e i n \)
\( e v \) \( t o u t o i s \) \( \gamma a r \) \( m u n o [\nu] \) \( o \) \( l o g o s \) \( t h i s \) \( s i w h h s \) \( k r e i t \)
\( t o w h \) \( e v \) \( d e \) \( t o i s \) \( a l l h o i s \) \( a m e i n o n \) \( s i g a n \) \( \h n \) \( l e g e i h \)
\( x h a i r e \) \( m e n \) \( e p i \) \( t o i s \) \( s u m b a i n o u s i n \) \( t o w h \) \( a g a d h o n \)
\( k a \) \( l u o u \) \( m e t r i o s \) \( e p i \) \( t o i s \) \( \gamma i n h n e [\nu o n s] \) \( t o w h \)

15 \( k a k h o w \) \( g i n o n \) \( d e \) \( t o i s \) \( a l l h o i s \) \( m h d e \) \( e v \) \( e t e r o i s \)
\( o w h \) \( k a t a d h h l o s \) \( a t o p o n [\nu] \) \( \gamma a r \) \( t h h n \) \( m e n \) \( o u s i a n \)
\( e v \) \( t o i s \) \( o i k e i a i s \) \( a p o k r u p t e i n \) \( t h h n \) \( d e \) \( d i a n o i a n \)
\( f a n e r a n \) \( e c h o n t a \) \( p e r i p a t e i n \) \( m a l l o n \) \( e n l a b o n \) \[ \]
\( \psi h g o n \) \( \h n \) \( k i n d h u n o n \) \( d e i \) \( \gamma a r \) \( e i n a i \) \( f o b h e r a n \) \( t o i s \) \( m e [\nu] \)

20 \( f a u l o i s \) \( t h h n \) \( t o n \) \( b i o u \) \( t e l e u t h h n \) \( t o i s \) \( d e \) \( s p o u d a i \)
ois \( t h h n \) \( e v \) \( t o w \) \( \zeta h h n \) \( a d o i a i n \) \( m a l i s t a \) \( m e n \) \( p e i r h o \)
\( \zeta h h n \) \( k a t a \) \( t h h n \) \( a s f a l e i a n \) \( e a n \) \( d e \) \( p o t e \) \( s o i \) \( s u m b h \)
\( k i n d h u n e i n \) \( \h h t e i \) \( t h h n \) \( e k \) \( t o u \) \[ [p o l]e m o u \) \( s o t h \)
1812. **EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS**

ριαν μετὰ καλὸς δοξῆς αλλὰ μ[η με]τα αἰσχρ[ας]

25 φημῆς τὸ μεν τελευτησαι παϊ[τω]ν η [π]επρω

Recto,

η

δ

μεν η κατεκρινεν τὸ δὲ καλώς αποθα

νειν. ἵδιον τοις σπούδαιοις ἡ φύσις απενε

μεν. καὶ μη βανμασης εἰ πολλα των ειρη

μενων· ου πρεπει σοι προς την νυν παρον

30 σαν ἡλικιαν. ουδε γαρ εμε τουτο διελαθεν

αλλα προειλομην δια της αυτης πραγμα
tias αμα του τε παροντος βιον συμβουλιαν

gεκν

εξευ[ε.... ε.]] και τον μελλοντος χρονου

παραγγελμα την μεν γαρ του

35 των χρειαν ραδειων ειδηςεις τον δε μετ ευ

νοιας συμβουλευσοντα χαλεπος ευρησεις. οπως

ουν μη παρ ετερου τα λοιπα ζητης. αλλ εν

tε[υθεν α]σπερ εκ ταμ[ειου] προφερης οηθην δειν

μηδεν παραλειπειν α[ν] γνα εχω σοι συμβουλευειν

dεν

40 πολλην δ α[ν] τοις θεοις χα]ριν σχοινην ει μη διαμαρ

ν
tοιμι της δοξης ης [εχ]ων περι σου τυγχανο[ν]

των γαρ αλλων τους πλειστους ευρησομεν

ωσπερ των σιτιων τοις ηδιστοις μαλλον η τοις

ιν[ν]ιαινονται χαιρονται ουτω και των φιλων

45 [τ]ους συνεξαμαρτανοις πλησιαζοντας αλλ ου

tοις νο[φετουσι] σε δε νομι[ζω] τουναντιον του

tων εγώ[κεκα] τεκμηριω χρωμενος τη περι την

αλλην σοι pal]διαν φιλοσοφια του γαρ αυτω

1. το μεν σωμα : so P. Berl. ΑΠΣΥ ; τω σωματι μεν ΓΘ, Dr(erup).
2. την δε ψυχην : so ΠΣΥ (om. P. Berl.); τη δε ψυχη others, Dr.
3. ειναι : om. MSS.
4. 1. ἐπιστη : ΣΥ have ἐπιστήση.
5. ἐρειν : λεγειν P. Berl. ΆΠ.
8. εση : so P. Berl. and most MSS.; ἐσεi γ pr., Dr.
11. μαρων as originally written here is also in P. Berl., but this is probably a chance coincidence.
14. και λυπου: so Δ; λυπού δὲ 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 φορις: so ΡΣΥ; om. Γ, Dr.
29. πυν: om. P. Berl. ΣΥ.
32. αμα: om. ΣΥ, which have συμβουλήν.
34. l. καταλεπτων. The spelling of the papyrus is no doubt merely an instance of the common confusion of i and ei; cf. e.g. l. 35 παδειως.
36. συμβουλευσωστα: so P. Berl., though placing this word before μετ ευνοιας, which is also the order of ΛΠ. ΣΥ insert σοι before συμβ. l. χαλεπος.
37. τα λ. μη παρ ετ. P. Berl. (ετερων) ΛΠ.
39. παραλεπεινε: so P. Berl., but cf. n. on l. 34. αν is added also in ΛΠΣΥ.
40. ΛΠ read το δεω.
μη, v.l. μηδεν: μη, as first written, is the reading of the MSS.
41. The superscribed reading ην is that of ΛΠ.
42. γαρ: so P. Berl.; μεν γαρ others, including P. Arg., Dr.
45. ἐξαμαρτ. ΣΥ.
48. σων: so ΛΠΣΥ; om. P. Berl. P. Arg. Γ, Dr.

1813. Codex Theodosianus vii.

18·1 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 1813 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.

Recto. Plate I.

Recto. Plate I.

Recto. Plate I. 
[idem aa. Probo c-s-l. post] alia: de hospitalitate indicum et om

5 [ninum personarum quid si] bi etiam ipse possessor pr[ae

[sumere debeat quare censura] omnia quae ad su[i] dispendium

[pertinebunt subnota sint ia]m missa super hac re auctoritas

[declaravit: praelata litteris] ad Entychiann[m p. urb]

die iiiid. Ian. Constantio et Constante cons.

10 [idem aa. Hadriano ppo: Afric hoc prospectum est ut infansta hospi

talitias pratitio tolleret nec privatum quisque a

domino aedum postulet et cetera: dat. v. non. Mart. Ravennae

[Constantio et Constante co]nss.

[idem aa. Enstathio ppo: devotissimos milites ex procinctu]

15 [redentes vel proficiscentes] ad vela muri novi sac[ritas

[sinae urbis singulac turres in] pedeplanis suis suscipiant

[ nec aliquis possessor graviter ferat quasi [ill[a dis

[positione quae super publicis acedificijis processerat [vio

[lata cum privatae quoque donum tertiam partem talis rei


[Honorio xiii. et Theod. x: aa. conss-]

[impp: Theodosius et Valentiannus] aa. Haeciioni patricio et

[magistro officiorum: universi e[n] us]bet

... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ...

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. ip]si[qu]e; cf. l. 18, where quae 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. co]nss: this is also the spelling of R.


8. etychiarum praef. R. Some reduction in the number of letters is required and is most easily obtained by writing p. for praef.

9. Constante [v]v cc R.


15. vela: so R; bella Cod. Iust.

20. Cons[antinop(oli)] R.

22. Haclioni is also the spelling of R (l. Hel.).
1814. INDEX TO CODEX IUSTINIANUS, FIRST EDITION.

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 Zuluetta, 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’ Istituto 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. 42–5. 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
(constitutiones) similis vel contrariae invenirentur, circumducere et a prioris codicis congregatio in separare.

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.), Iulio in l. 48, and apparently M(arco) before Palladio in l. 13; it adds v prov(inciarum) (again with Cod. Theod.) after vic(ario) in l. 8, but omits et 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 Iulio can now be added in 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. 11. 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 uncialis 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 Iustiniani codicis editione aliquid recitare. 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 impp. and imp-p. but the latter is probably due to inadvertence. bo = -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 R 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 \( \text{R} \) 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 \( [\kappa \varepsilon \text{ or } \kappa \theta] \), which are higher figures than would be expected unless the index was preceded by other matter.

Recto.

\[ \text{R} \ [1a] \ \text{d[e } \pi \text{agan[is] sacrifciis} \]
\[ \text{[et]} \ \text{temp[is]} \]
\[ \text{=} \ \text{R} \]

\[ \text{[imp. Const. ? D} \text{iodoto} \]
\[ \text{[imp. Const} \text{antin. a] ad Taurum } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]
\[ \text{[imp. Gratian]} \text{et Theod.} \]
\[ \text{[aaa. Cyne} \text{gio } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]
\[ i \text{[mp. Arcadius et H} \text{onorius aa. Ma} \]
\[ \text{[c]rovio [et Pr]} \text{oelian. vic. v prop.} \]
\[ \text{id. aa. Apollodoro procons. Africac} \]
\[ \text{imp. Honor[ et Theodosius aa} \]
\[ \text{populo [Carta} \text{gen[i]usi} \]
\[ \text{id. aa. Asclepiodoto p} \text{p.} \]
\[ \text{imp. Valentin[ et Marcian. aa] M} \]
\[ \text{Pallad[i]o } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]
\[ \text{imp. Leo et An} \text{ished. aa Dioscoro } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]
\[ \text{avto} \text{kr(at)op} \text{A} \text{vast[aos a} \]
\[ \text{[ep[ar} \text{x(w) } \text{pr(a[torpi]o} \text{v)} [14.} \]

\[ \text{R} \ [13] \ \text{de legibo [e} \text{t constitut[ionibus} \]
\[ \text{principum et [edictis} \]
\[ \text{20 [imp. Const} \text{antin. a] Basso } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]
\[ \text{[imp. Theod} \text{odosius et} \text{ Valentinian. aa} \]
\[ \text{[a]d se[natum} \]
\[ \text{id. aa ad senatum} \]
\[ \text{id. aa ad Volusianum } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]
\[ \text{25 [id. aa Florentio } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]
\[ \text{id. aa Florentio } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]
\[ \text{[id. aa Cyro } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]
\[ \text{[id. aa ad senatum] \]
\[ \text{[imp. Valentinian. et] Marchian[ aa ad Pal} \]
\[ \text{[ladium } \overline{\text{pp}}. \]

Cod. Iust. i. 11.
Autokraton Δ(ων κ.κ.) Ἀνθ(εμιος αα ...)

impp. Leo et Zηπον αα

impp. Gratian. Valer[inian. et Theodo

sius αα ad Eυ'signium pp

β η δια τον τον δεσποτον Ιουστινον και Ιουσ

tiniouν [αα


i ad S[enatun]

impp. Theodosius et V[alent. a ad se

[i ad se[natum]

imp. Justinianus [M]ena et

[de inuis et facti ignora//ia]

imp. Philipp. [a Iul. ? Marcus[.]

imp. Dioc. et M[aximian. aa Iulianae

[imp. Anton. a Iulio Max. mil-

[ad. S[ext. Iuvelial]

imp. P[hibin. f[lo]us [a Iul. ? Marc[el]l. [

imp. Dio[. et M][aximin. aα Iulianae

[imp. Const. a [Valer]ιανο νικ.

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 Const[.], it is perhaps better to suppose that Const[. here = Constantius; cf. l. 5, where Theodosius is shortened to Theod. Di/odo is preferred to The/odo as the shorter.

4. Constantin(us): i. Constantius. The same error is found in SCR.
7. 1. Ma(c)robio.

8. 2 prov(iniciarum): so Cod. Theod. xvi. 10. 15 quinque provinciarum; om Cod. Iust.

11. 1. Carthaginienst; that the h was omitted (so SCRM) is hardly certain.

13. M, representing the praenomen of Palladius, is a more suitable reading than ]·(p 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 ecclesiæ consuciunt vel ibi exclamant, and 13 De his qui in ecclesiæ manumittuntur, are here omitted.

20. Basso: so MSS. and {Summa Per.}; the nomen Septimio is supplied from Cod. Theod. In the abbreviation of praefecto urbì the horizontal stroke passes through the letters.

27. Cyro pp. et consuli designato Cod. Iust. There would not be room for et...design. even if shortened to et cons. d.

29. 1. Marciān.

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 1\°.

33. The Greek η in Žymo was an oversight. Const. 12 is omitted.


37-8. The inscription of this constitution is deficient in the MSS. of Cod. Iust., but is restored from Nov. 124. 4 as Αὐτοκράτωρ Ιουστίνος καὶ Ιουστίνιανός αα. 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 διεσπερών 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 vēteri 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 prudentium, 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 l. 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. 1 § 6 ea, quae ante in notis Aemili Papiniāri ex Κύπριo et Paulō nec non Marciano adscripta sunt...non statim respuerē, &c. On the other hand Cod. Theod. i. 4. 3, the law of citations, is retained pending the enunciation 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. Imp. Theod. et Valentin. aa. ad senatum urbīs Rom. Cod. Theod. In l. 44 the scribe wrote Valenti and then inserted the dot between t 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.

49. L. Sext(io); 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 ] . II . [ or perhaps as ] . II. This constitution is apparently to be connected with iii. 44. 8, issued on the same date and addressed to Iuliae, 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 χωομενος corr. from o. 45 εχων added above the line. φαρετρης 65 ov was written for o γ, but the third stroke of the ν is blurred and o γ may be intended. 67 αντιπασ 71 ρηπος γηασατ. 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 uncials of about the middle of the third century. A mark of elision in l. 340. 338 om. 340 δ’ διος 344 ενεπη-ξαντες 345 τειες 348 νεων εθελοντα 386 In place of this line να[ stands in the papyrus, l. 389, which is omitted in its proper place, apparently having been inserted here. The papyrus is broken above να[. 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 contemporary, are quite distinct.

Fol. 1 4½ × 2.5 cm. Verso ends of P 379–84, recto beginnings of 418–24.

Fol. 2 1.5 × 2 cm. Verso a few letters from Σ 412–14, recto do. from 455–6.

Fol. 3 14.4 × 13.8 cm. Verso Σ 564–81 (end of col.). 571 ομαβτη


603–17 (end of col.). 604 δω 612 [αύθαλ]ἐνυ. The scribe perhaps began l. 614, being misled by the homoioarchon of 611 and 613. επ[[ε]]. 615 Αχιλλή[γ]ος. 617 Below this line is a row of angular marks, followed by the title Ιαίων ἀς 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 1618. 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 × 14.7 cm. Verso X 109–37 (ends of lines). 111 κατά-

174 άγε 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 Δαρδανιών

195 ευμήτους 196 αλάλκωνεν. βελεεστίπ[π] 200 οὐδ ὤ 283 ει τοι ηειευς
converted from η 290 οὐδε. Verso 216-43. 220 πολα 222 ἀμμης
ε ε 224 ἑφατ' 226 λιπε[π] 228 ἵσταμένη πτερεοντ? 233 Δηίφοβο[β'][ε] 238 προσ-
ε επε 239 πολα.

Fol. 3 Verso X 255-78. 260 Αχιλλέαν 264 αλλήλους 265 οὔτε
φαιδίμος Ε’κτωρ

ασπανδ[ε]ικ[η], corr. H² 305 τ[μάλα] μεγα 307 λαπάρης 310 ι[α][μ] αλήν
312 Αχ[ι][λ][λ]εας, corr. H².


Fol. 5 Verso Ψ 345-70. 348 ἑτρεφον 350 πιταρ[α] 351 ἔετεν 351 ωπλασαθ,
ε α corr. 353 κλήρο 354 τόνδ'[ε] ἔλαχε, a converted from ε. 355 δουρικλουσ,
but a straight stroke was begun after λ. 356 ελανεμεν ὑπους 359 είσαν
388 ελ’αφηραμενοις 392 αζε ... οι δε 393 δδ’ ουν 395 αγκώιας δε 396 θρυλάθη
397 δακρυότων 401 Ατρείδος (ε from ι?) δουρι κ’λυτος 405 ἱπους.

1819. Fragments of a roll containing κ, λ, μ, well written in small upright
uncials 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 1·4·2 cm., Col. i ends of
λ 244-83, Col. ii 284-323. 259 Ἀμνθαον' ἄτ’ 285 βασιλε'π[ε] corr. H²
287 ρ of Πηρω retouched by H² 292 κατ[ε] 297 θεσφαρ' ἄπαυτ' 298 κα
for κα. Τυνδάρεω 301 αμφω ουν 302 πα[ρ] Ζηνο[ς] 303 In the margin
opposite this line is υ (= 300). 306 Ποσίδα[ων] 308 Ὄτων 309 θρέψεν
corr. H². Frs. 3–5 beginnings of λ 414–26, 428–32. 418 κεϊνα 429 κα-
κε[ίμ]. Fr. 6 2·2 × 1·5 cm., a few letters from μ 1–4. Some small fragments
remain unidentified.

1820. 17·8 × 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 × 19 cm.

Fol. 1 Verso σ 55–80. 63 πλεονεσα]ν 64 βασιλει. In marg. ανον[σι
H² 65 Ευρυμαξάς τε και Αντέφος. Marg. καταειρω[ H² 67 marg. 1περι
ε. [. 2τ. . . ] H² 70 ἑλδανε 73 επίσπατον. Marg. αξ[ε]ι H² 78 ἐφαθ' ἐκ τ'
ονόμη[ν]ε 80 In left marg. a diagonal dash. Recto 95–121. 96 ἱπ[που]'
101 εἶλκε 102 αὐθοῶσι 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 αορην an
acute substituted for a grave accent. 110 [α]ψ' δ' αρ' 111 εδ[ε]'κα
αὐσωτ', the ε cancelled by a dot placed above it (H²?). 111α om. 118 ετι
γαστέρα.

Fol. 2 Recto σ 137–63. 142 marg. ετε κ[α]λψ' (not κ'αλουν or -λα
apparently) | ετε κακ'ως H² 146 Against this line and ll. 148–51 there are
oblique dashes in the left margin. 149 διακρίνοντο 152 δ of δέτας corr.
153 κατα δο[μα]α 163 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 γηνε 190 marg. το [τ]'η
κα[ν]τρα H².
IV. MINOR LITERARY FRAGMENTS

1821. 6.8 × 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.

καὶ τοξῳ μνη[παντα δ’ επιστα[μεν
ειν ατρεκεως [ος σε παλιν μ[]

1822. 35.3 × 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[κροβη νυκτος 18 ειδεσαι ειδος

(marginal adscript μυγησι] 33] ν ηλιω[ν] ελθει ii. 30 αστασα γαρ στοιχει[ι 33] 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 × 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.

[. . . . . .]ετερχ[15 . . . .] μ[ε]λαυ[ηι ι]
[. . . . . .]το λυπ[παθερα φονευσας τοτε []
[. . . . . .]σις πα[ηι]υπ την[]
[. . . . . .]ο[α]μα ημων ε . []
1824. 9.9 x 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 Δάχης and Μιξ', a name which does not occur in comedy but may stand e.g. for Μιξίδημος, Μιξίας, Μίξων, or Μιξιωνίδης, 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 uncialis, 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.

Δαχ

? βαζ'νεις εἰς μὲ: εμοὶ δει[...
ε]γω δὲ σοι Δαχης· οὐκ εστ'[...

Μιξ'

]ν οιδα δηπουθεν: γεν[

]μη ποτ ειπης φωμη[ν

Lambda

5 ε]πιδωσειν : ποθεν λαβων ?

] .. ομολογω σοι λαμ[βανειν?

] αμι: πανθ εξει . [

]ς διδωμι Παμ[φιλην ?

παιδω]ν επ αροτω γνησιων[

10 ]' αρεστα [ταυ]τα σο[ι]μ [...

λαμ[βαν[.]..]χομ . [...

]υε . [. . . . ]β[

...

Q 2
In l. 3 there is a small mark after Μι suited 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.

[\(\nu\) πορνον γαρ αλλα που τυχη\] eγω πολυ μαλλον ενεος [ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

Ψ δει δε πειραν λαμβανειν [ τι ουν εν[.φα[.]νει: τα το τρ [ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

5 \(\gamma\) ολομεί προαιπολο ταυτην εγω [ μαλακων εχει[\(T]\) γαρ α ... [ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

διατρόπη γινεται μου τουσ γάμους [ και παρελθοχ' ώχε ο εξω [ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

.. \(\lambda\)νυ κ' αι [ και τυγχανοι[ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

.. \(\tau\) ̣[ ... [ πορισω παιδιω τιθδας π ... λε [ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

10 ε[ [ ... [ opερ επεκλωσαν του[ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

Verso. 2. \(\epsilon\)ν \(\dot{\alpha}\) ψανει 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.

.. [ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

[\(\nu\) η ... [ Σεσογχωσις . [ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

] περικρατη [ και τυγχανοι[ [ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

[του παιδα ι\(\sigma\)ουν . [ παιντωσ αλλ εχουσι [ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

] Σεσογχωσις ανηλθε [ ] opερ επεκλωσαν του[ 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.]

}
MINOR LITERARY FRAGMENTS

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 τα ἐνωβοτα is required. In verso 10 the final υ of εὐδαιμονίαν is corrected.

1827. Fr. 1 10-7 x 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 uncialis; a high stop in l. 11.

Fr. 1.

[... ][ερο[. ]] τουτοις
[μεν εὐ[κ]τον ον εν
[τῇ] της πολεως α
[ξ]οματι και αγω
[ν]εσθαι και κη
[ρ]υτεσθαι της δε
[π]ολει τον τουτων
[στ]εφανον ου δο
[ξ]ης γεγονοτα αλ

10 [λ] αισχυνης αιτι
[ου]: αμα γ εκηρυτ
[τε]το Φορμιων .

In l. 2 there seems to be barely room for [κ], but εὐτονος is not attractive, still less εὐγονον.
1828.  4·9 x 2·9 cm.  Fragment of a vellum leaf, inscribed in well-formed rather small sloping uncialis 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.

] καὶ γαρ ὃνυχολ[ο]ς . [  
] ο ἰκανὸν ποιῶν τρυφ[η]  
καὶ ὁ μεθυσος καὶ ὁ καταλα[λος  
kαὶ ὁ ψε[υ]στης καὶ ὁ πλεονεκτης [καὶ  
5 ὁ αποστερητὴς καὶ ὁ τοιοντος τα [παρα  

Verso.

] . ν . . . . . . . . . [  
] μ[ρ]ι[ον] επιλανθανε[ι] [  
] πραξιν ἡ γαρ τρυφη κα[ί] . [  
] ημ[ας] ο[υ]κ] εχει δια την α[ . ]  
5 ὁ ἦ[ν] ενδεδυται η δε τειμ[ωρια] ?  
## INDICES

(1700 is to be supplied before 78–99, 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αλαυνη</th>
<th>87.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ακρ]αν</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αλικ επι</td>
<td>87.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αλιδραπο</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αλλα</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αλλος</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αλλος</td>
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a 3. 8. = eis 4. 1; 5; 8. i. sch.

'̄Αβδόρος O. 11 [2], 3.
'̄Αγαδός 86. 5; 94. 12; 3. 29.
'̄Αγαμέμνων 90. 20.
'̄Αγάνάφρων 92. 1. 12.
'̄Αγασάν O. 1. 4; 647. 11.
'̄Αγεληή 93. vi. 3.
'̄Αγευ 92. 65; 93. viii. 3; [4. 14 2]; 20. 73 sch.
'̄Αγώς 86. 4.
'̄Αγλάδος 92. 1. 15, 20. 91. 13.
'̄Αγή 27. 17.
'̄Αγενία 94. 7.
'̄Αγοράζειν 95. ii. 7.
'̄Αγός 90. 21.
'̄Αγών 98. 5-6 ii. 16?
'̄Αγώνια 98. 44. ii. 8.
'̄Αγωισθεύναι 4. 3 2; 27. 4.
'̄Αδεία 95. ii. 14.
'̄Αδελφή 98. 44. i. 10.
'̄Αδελφός O. [1.7]. 3. 45.
'̄Αδείκνυ 95. ii. 1; 97. 12 et sqfr.
'̄Αδίκημα 97. 52.
'̄Αδίκος 97. 63.
'̄Αδροσίη 96. 18.

άεθλον 93. vii. 7.

άεθλοφφείν 93. viii. 15.

'̄Αεί 93. v. 6.
'̄Αείδειν 91. 9; 93. x. I.
'̄Αέλιος 92. 1. 14.
'̄Αετός 91. 8.
'̄Αέδος 26. recto 12.
'̄Αέδαντος 92. 65. 3.
'̄Αέδος 85. 1. recto 5. '̄Αέδος 0. 8 20.

'̄Αερατεύμα μία 98. 44. iv. 1.

'̄Αθβαί 2. 3. 54; [4. 4 2]. '̄Αθβάμα 91. 4.

'̄Αθβαμάδιον 2. 3. 55.

'̄Αθβανάον O. 2. 69; 60; 4. 142. 1.

'̄Αθβαναον O. 2. 66. 72; 3. 7; 11. 29. 42. 51. 143 1. 9. 8. 9.

22. 30; 4. 142 4. 1? [23]; 27. 13?

'̄Αδροσίμα [5. 372 sch. ?].

'̄Αδρόστενος 96. 17.

Αίας [90. 34].

Αλγοίος 90. 28.

Αλγοντος [0. 1. 10].

'̄Αληθής 95. ii. 27.

'̄Αλήθης 95. ii. 1.

'̄Αλειν 90. 46.

'̄Αλμα 2. 3. 61.

'̄Αλειν 93. x. 5; 20. 64 sch.

Αίλως 86. 4.

Αλούς [0. 1. 31].

'̄Αρείν 91. 10.

'̄Αρείν 4. 4. 4. Αρείσθαι 93.

v. 6 (είλεμβα). Αρείσθαι 96. 1.

Αίρθεσιν 93. vi. 2.

Αλχίνος O. 3. 40. 41; 4. 142. 9.

αλχίνη 27. 10.

Αλώνια 0. 2. 46. 57.

'̄Αίτη 90. 5. 4. 5.

'̄Αίτειν [0. 8. 27].

'̄Αίτια Ξ. 2. 32.

'̄Αίτιος 27. 10.

Αλλάδος 2. 3. 51.

'̄Αλμα 90. 3. 2.

'̄Αμά 94. 12.

'̄Αμών 97. 43.

'̄Ακεράτως 91. 19.

'̄Ακμός 96. 12.

'̄Ακολούθως 8. ii. sch. 13?

'̄Ακόμματος 94. 20.

'̄Ακόνως 82. 8; 98. 44. iv. 7; 3; 67-9.

'̄Ακρί 1. 43.

'̄Ακρατία 96. 21.

'̄Ακράθη 22. i. 17.

'̄Ακρώ [93. iv. 3].
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The image contains a page from a text, possibly a historical or religious document, written in Greek. The page includes a long list of names, numbers, and some text in Greek script. The content is not completely legible due to the quality of the image, but it appears to be a record or a catalog of entries, possibly related to a list of names, places, or items. The page features a mix of Greek script and Latin script, with numbers and words written in various styles, indicating a detailed record or inventory.
INDICES

καταμαρτυρεῖν 85. 2-4 recto 4; 97. 25, 32, 36, 45. 
καταπίπτειν 0. 2 60. 
καταπίπτειν 93. ix. 5. 
καταφθονεῖν 85. 1 recto 6; 98. 44 ii. 5. 
καταψεύδεσθαι 85. 2-4 recto 2? 
κατηγορεῖν 0. 1 16. 
κε(ν) 90. 25; 93. v. 4, vii. 1; x. 3; 94. 4. 
κέχροι 2. 3 42. 
κείνος 93. ix. 5; 96. 10. 
Κέιος 0. 1 38. 
κείσθαι 2. 3 36. 
κέλανεφίς 92. 1 9. 
κέλευθ 98. 44 i. 6, ii. 13. 
κελευθι 92. 34 7. 
κενοτάφιον 0. 3 7. 
Κεραμεικὸς 0. 3 34. 
κεραυνός 91. 11. 
κεφαλή 95. i. 1; ii. 15. 
Κηληδόνης 91. 9. 
κήπος 96. 21. 
κηρύττειν 27. 5. 11. 
κινδυνεῖν 0. 647 13. 

κόσμος 93. viii. 1; 8. i. sch. 1. 
κούρα 3. 56. 
Κρατίως 1. 34. 
κράτος 86. 4. 
κραίσσων 93. x. 4. 
κραίεω 90. 20. 
κρημνός 92. 18; 0. 2 51. 
κρήνη 95. ii. 8, 11. 
Κρύς 0. 8 36. 
κρίειν 97. 65; 0. 3 21. 
κρίεις 98. 44 ii. 7. 
κρισμός 1. 26. 
κρύσος 22. ii. 33. 
κρύστεις 91. 12 (?): 23. 7. 
Κρυμνίτης 93. vii. 7. 
Κτησίφων 0. 3 52. 
Κτιστις π. 90. 7 2? 
κυανός 98. 12 3. 
κυβερνήτηρ 90. 7 3? 
κυβερνήτης 4. 4 3. 
κυβερνητικός 4. 4 1. 
κυκλάμωμος 96. int., 5. 
κυλίνδρος 98. 2 6. 
Κύθάρα 92. 1 8. 
Κυμηρία 90. 9. 
Κυμπραθε 93. ix. 7. 
κύρος 85. 2-4 verso 7, 9. 
κύριος | 4. 3 12. | 
κυλίνδρον 0. 647 14. 
κόρη 1. 42. 
κόρος 93. viii. 3. 
κόφος 95. ii. 20. 
λαγείδας 93. viii. 5. 
λάγρυφος 1. 25. 
λακεδαιμόνια 2. 3 54? 
λακωνική 1. 42. 
λαμβάνειν 96. 4; 98. 44 i. 13, iii. 16, iv. 4; 0. 21 4; 4. 14 5 14; 24. 5 2? 
λάμπα 6 (?): 11; 25. recto 2. 
λαμψή 0. 8 23. 
λαμπρεῖν 92. 1 14. 
λαμπαδεύσαντας 93. x. 5. 
λαμπεδόνα 90. 52 sch. 
λαφάδος 0. 3 46 (‘Αφάδος Ράρπ). 
λάμχος 0. 1 18. 13. 
λάμχαις 92. 1 17. 
λάχης 24. 1, 2, 5. 
λάχος 94. 9. 
λέαρχος 98. vii. 3. 
λέγειν 92. 1 9; 93. vi. 3, x. 7; 95. ii. 24; 97. 48; 99. 
λέοντες 4. 14 19?]. 
λέοντς 0. 1 3. 
λευκός 95. i. 9. 
λέιος 92. 1 4. 
λεωτρέπτης 0. 1 39. 
λήγμα 78. 14; 0. 2 56. 
λέκκαθος 1. 58. 
λήμνος 95. ii. 25. 
λίθος 0. 2 49. 
λυμή 4. 14 23. 
λυμής 96. 1 11. 
λπαρόδρομος 92. 1 6. 
λπερφύτης 94. 17. 
λογικός 2. 6 2. 
λόγιμος 96. 2. 
λογιμός 96. 2. 
λόγος 85. 1 verso 5; 90. 24 (?): 0. 2 20, 70. 3 20, 49. 3 1; [1. 23]; 4. 4 14. 
λομικός 0. 2 52. 
λοιπός 78. 35; 98. 44 ii. 2; 99. 1 26. recto 5. 
λοιπός 90. 5 5. 
λόξιος 95. ii. 12. 
λυδία 2. 3 46. 
λέυξ 92. 1 13; 98. 45 3; 2. 3 38. 
λύδος 0. 44 8. 
λυμαίνειν 99. ii. 20. 
λυπ[23. 2. 
λύρα 95. ii. 12, 15. 
λυρικός 0. 1 34. 
λυσιμβροτος 91. 18. 
λυθήρος 0. 2 61. 
μ δ. 8. ii. sch. 1, 9. 
Μάγες 93. v. 2. 
Μάγνητες 2. 3 69. 
μαί 92. 36 1. 
Μακεδονία 0. 5 29.
INDICES

νόστος 21. 1.
νοσφίεμ όν 0. 3 22.
νοῦς 85. 1 verso 5; (93. x. 4);
26. recto 3.
Νῦμφα 2. 3 30.
νῦν 90. 10; 95. ii. 18; 1. 53.
νῦς 95. ii. 5; 96. 15; 98.
44 ii. 16; 22. i. 17.
νῦσσευν 90. 4 ii. 4;

χ. 4. 4 7.
ζεισθὼ 90. 5.
ζειναπίτατα 90. 10.
ζείνει 2. 3 31.
ζεῖνος 91. 14 (¿); 93. viii. 1
(Σείν); 98. 44 iii. 3, iv. 17;
2. 3 66.
ζεῖνόφων 2. 9 2 (?); 3. 39, 51.
ζέρεψ ους 95. ii. 24.
ζερεύν 3. 59.

ο (dem.) 93. x. i, 3. 5; 94. 11.
ο' μὲν 90. 20, 23, 32, 46;
93. x. 7. ο' μὲν ... ο' δὲ
91. i-2; 93. vi. 7. ο' μὲν...
... ο' δὲ 94. 5. ο' δὲ 90. 41;
4 ii. 6 (τοι δὲ); 94. 5; 0. 2
58, 3 67, 67 10.
ο' (rel.) 94. 3, 17, 19.
ο'ρας 98. 2 16?
ο'ξόλος 95. ii. 27.
ο'γος (ο'γ) 2. 3 59, 57.
ο'δέ 85. 1 verso 5; 93. x. 7(¿);
94. 20; 3. 25.
οδεύειν 94. 6; 98. 8.
ο'δός 85. 1 recto 7.
ο'δὴν 2. 3 34.
ο'πειται 24. 4.
ο'ποκίν 2. 3 8.
ο'ποκίμαι [4. 4 1].
ο'πείκα 2. 3 59.
ο'τός 94. 8.
οτάς 23. 10.
Οτογία [4. 112 24].
οτομος 95. ii. 9; 2. 3 40.
οτός 90. 5. 4; 94. 10; 97. 48.
οτὼς τε 97. 56.
ο'τενθαί 25. verso 6.
οτενθεύν 92. 20 2.
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πάθος ο. 2 52; 2. 3 34.
Παιανεύς ο. 3 13.
παίγμα 95. ii. 12.
παίδων 25. verso 8.
παίζειν 1. 54; [4. 4 3].
Παιάνες 4. 1+2 20?
Παιμήν 4. 1+2 19?
πᾶς 90. 13; 22; 92. 1 16,
38 6; 93. vii. 3; 94.
2; 95. ii. 11; Ο. 2 66, 3 13,
42; 4+5 8; 24. 9; 26.
recto 3.
παλαίως 2. 3 43; 3. 13.
παλάμψ 91. 4.
πάλη 93. viii. i. (απαθή Παρ.).
πάλη {95. ii. 16}. παλώ 95.
ii. 17; 98. 50 3; 99. ii.
21; Ο. 3 29; 8 30; 3. 66;
9. sch. 7; 21. 9.
Παλλάς 93. v. 5.
Παλληνικός 4. 1+2 21.
Παμβοτάδης 4. 1+2 18.
Παιμήν 24. 8?
παναρίτιος 93. v. 6.
παντελός 0. 1 24.
παντεκνός 91. 3.
παντοδάπεδος {4. 3 9}.
παρά 92. 1 18; 93. vii. 3; viii.
5; ix. 5 (πάρ), x. 3; 94. 2;
95. ii. 15; 96. 10; 98.
44 iv. 4; 99. ii. 13; 1. 7;
24. [45]; 2. 3 [4]; 31, 45-6;
63, 67, 71-2; 8 6, 13; 4. 4 1,
11 (l. ἕπερ)?, 13.
παράγων 95. ii. 20.
παράγωνθαι 2. 3 31.
παραγραφή 4. 3 11.
παραδόδανα 98. 1 6, 10.
παρακολουθεῖν 25. recto 3.
παραλλέλω 23. 12.
παράστασις 0. 3 53.
παραπλάνητος [28. recto 5?
παραπρεψεία 4. 1+2 10.
παρασκευάζειν 2. 3 38.
παρείναι 4. 47.
παρελθεῖν [0. 3 24? ]; 25.
verso 6.
παρθένος 95. ii. 11; 98. 13 ii.
2 (?); 23. 13.
Πάρις 2. 3 27.
Πάρις 90. 10.
Παρμενίων 98. 44 i. 3.
Πάρος 2. 3 31.
πάρος 94. 17.
πᾶς 82. 12; 85. 2-4 verso
2 (?); 86. 1, 3-5; 93. iv.
4; 94. 19; 95. ii. 24; 96.
8; 97. 43; 98. 44 iv.
7; 99. ii. 18, 32; Ο. 6+7
10 (?); 8 27 (?); 3. 24; 21. 7;
24. 7. πῶς 26. verso 3.
πᾶσας 92. 30 3?
Πατήρ 86. 4. πατήρ 90. 22;
92. 34 5; 93. viii. 6 (?);
Ο. [5]; 39, 2 67, 3 16; 23,
16; 28. recto 9.
πατρόφος 26. recto 10.
pατρίστος 93. x. 3.
pαυσο[ς]. 98. 36 i.
pόδα (= μέτοχη)? 90. 46.
pόδη 96. 11.
pελιδός 98. 44 iii. 8.
pεξός 98. 44 iii. 16, iv. 11, 14.
pεπέθει 1. 39 (πεστίον).
pέφα 25. recto 2.
Περιφρέτας 4. 1+2 23.
pλάγος 98. 44 i. 4.
Pελοπώνος 93. vi. 6.
Pελοπωνονομάτα 0. 2 73.
pέμπτος 85. verso 8; 92. 37 6.
pέμπτος 0. 3 58.
pένθος 95. ii. 19.
pένθις 95. ii. 16.
pέντε 95. ii. 9; 98. 14 iv. 15.
pεπαίνεις 96. 13, 18.
περ 93. vi. 2.
περαινεῖν 97. 67.
Πέργαμον 90. 8.
Pεργασία 4. 1+2 22.
περί 90. 5, 49 sch.; 93. vi. 2;
95. i. 8; 96. 14; 98. 14,
11, 44 iii. 4, iv. 17; Ο. 1 24,
25, 36, 2 64, 3 10, 40, [4+3]
7, 8 22, 34, 11 2]; 1. int.,
22; 2. 3 17, 34, 50, 57,
60; 3. 62; 4. 1+2 9; 20.
67 sch.
περιβλεπτος [4. 1+2 14].
περιεξαιρεῖται ο. 2 40.
Περιδύνθος 4. 1+2 24.
περιστάνα 0. 2 35, 41.
περικαλλής 96. 13.
περικελής 90. 2.
περικρατή 28. recto 2.
περιστάτος 4. 1+2 14.
περιτρέφεσθαι 94. 14.
περιτροφή 1. 40.
περιχεῖν 93. int.
περιτειχίζειν 0. 2 58.
περσαί 96. 1 16.
Περσεφόνη 2. 3 30. Φερσ. 2.
3 33.
Πέρσης 98. 44 ii. 4, iii. 1; 99.
ii. 29; 2. 3 45; 64, 6 13.
Περακικός 98. 18 2.
πεσσός 94. 10, 11.
πεττηλοί 96. 12.
πηγάδων 95. ii. 10.
πηδάλιον 95. ii. 25.
πηδαν 3. 68.
Περιδίδες 92. 33 3.
πικρός 95. ii. 22.
πίνειν 96. 20; 98. 44 i. 16.
pίστειν 94. 12; 96. 15; 98.
10 3.
pίσος 1. 25.
pλανάσανθα 78. 10; 0. 1 30.
pλανήτης 8. i. sch. 7.
pλάνασαν 1. 45.
pλείων 0. 1 9.
Pλειθυσμός 90. 21.
pλειδίων 95. ii. 18; 96. 3.
πλείων 95. ii. 27. πλείστος
0. 1 12.
πλευρέτης 28. recto 4.
INDEXES

πλευτ 8. i. sch. 11, ii. sch. 6, 9, 11.
πληθον 94. 21.
πλήθος 98. 5-6 ii. 12, 44 iii. 3.
πληθυμα 96. 20.
πλήρεις 98. 44 ii. 8, 14; 1. 48.
πληροεφ 83. int.
πλησια 98. 44 ii. 6.
πλίνθος 4. 5 2.
πλόκαμος 95. i. 9.
πλούσιος 95. ii. 19.
πλάτος 95. ii. 16.
πνεύμα 82. 11. ἄγιον Πν. 86. 4.
πνημα 78. 9.
ποδήρη 1. 37.
πόδεα 95. ii. 6, 7; 25 recto 1.
ποδί 94. 21.
ποιεῖν 82. 9; 96. 7 (?) 97. 11; 2. 3 3, 42; 4. 4 12; 28. recto 2, 6.
ποικίλος 98. 44 iii. 14.
πολέμος 4. 142 12.
πόλεμος 90. 7; [0. 2 74]; 2. 3 46.
πόλεις 99. ii. 16, 28; 0. 1 [4], 38, 2 53; 3 70, 8 36; 4. 4 2 (?) 27. 3, 7. πτόλεις 94. 21.
πολειτε 0. 6 7; 2. 3 21, 60.
pολειτεύσαι 0. 9 2.
pολλακίς 92. 4 1; 98. 18 4; 0. 2 44; 3. 19.
pολυασάμης 96. int.
pολυγύμνος 90. 18.
pολυένθος 4. 3 8.
pολύδιος 1. 21.
pολύπαθος 93. iv. 1.
pολυπληθής 96. 3.
pολύς 78. 38; 92. 16; 94. 16 (πολέσσην), 19; 96. 6; 98. 44 iii. 9; 0. 2 49, 52; 1. 16; 2. 3 41; 3. 1; 25. verso 1; 28. verso 6.
pολύτομον 90. 6.
pόμα 2. 3 39.
pομάτων 2. 3 36.
pοιεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
pάνος 25. recto 1.
pάντος 90. 28.
Πάντως 2. 3 37.
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σαψύμβαίνειν 0.1 25.
σαψύλαοιν 4.4 16, 17.
σαψύλαοιν 0.1, 3, 18, 19.
σαψυρήν 3.17.
αποσύνδετος 0.1 14.
αποσύνδετος 4.4, 9.
αποσύνδετος 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.1.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
σύμπαθατέρων 0.3 72.
σύμπαθατέρων 8.1.4.
σύμπαθατέρων 3.0.7.
### 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>46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus ed. Bellermann 3, 85</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristides ii. 508</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes, <em>Eq.</em> 655</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Them.</em> 760</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 755</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus xv. 687 a</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babrius 115. 4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchylides xvi (xvii). 66</td>
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<td>Josephus, <em>Ant.</em> xii. 2. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philostratus, <em>Im.</em> ii.</td>
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