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PREFACE

Part I of this volume contains three papyri (4705–7) of Hermas, all dating from the second and third centuries AD: one roll, one recycled roll, one codex. These offer a number of good new readings; and more generally contribute to the arguments about the date and compositional history of the work (4706 apparently contained Visiones III–IV as well as Mandata).

Part II offers fragments of otherwise unknown Greek poetry. 4708 contains a substantial piece of Archilochus’ Elegies, which tells the early history of Telephus, an extended exemplum rather than an independent mythological narrative; the new text represents a major advance in our knowledge of the genre. 4709–10 are scraps of verse, the first of lyric (Stesichorus?), the second with musical notation. 4711 preserves elegiacs partly at least concerned with metamorphoses (possibly Parthenius?). 4712–14 come from hexameter poems: 4712 certainly from an Argonautica, perhaps Hellenistic, perhaps later; 4714 with narratives about Lapiths and Centaurs, Cassiepeia and Andromeda, probably of imperial date.

Part III collects papyri of known prose-works. 4715–16 provide rare examples of Lysias being read at Oxyrhynchus: 4715 the end title of the lost Περὶ τῶν ἀνακαλυπτηρίων (considered spurious by some ancient critics); 4716 three columns from the transmitted Or. XXI. 4717–37 represent one of the most-read orators, Isocrates: these papyri of Ad Nicoclem, Nicocles, and De Pace offer a scatter of new readings (mostly variations of word-order) and in general confirm the modern view of the textual tradition, that the systematic divergence between the Urbanas and the ‘vulgate’ postdates the Roman period. 4738 (the back of LXVIII 4666) is the first published papyrus of one of Lucian’s authentic works (Dialogi deorum).

Part IV includes documents of the Roman period that illustrate the bases of agriculture and transport (land-leases, 4739, 4747, 4753; sales of donkeys, 4746, 4748, 4749?, 4750, 4751, 4752?); a group of customs receipts shows Oxyrhynchites doing business in the Fayum, where one imports donkeys and camels via Dionysias (4740), another exports reeds via Tebtunis (4741–4). From the sixth century come papers referring to the aristocratic landowners who give the period a (deceptively) feudal look: Flavia Maria (4754), Flavius Ioannes (4755), Flavia Anastasia (4756–8).
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NOTE ON THE METHOD OF
PUBLICATION AND ABBREVIATIONS

The basis of the method is the Leiden system of punctuation, see CE 7 (1932) 262–9. It may be summarized as follows:

\[\textit{\text{aβγ}}\] The letters are doubtful, either because of damage or because they are otherwise difficult to read

\ldots\] Approximately three letters remain unread by the editor

\[\textit{[aβγ]}\] The letters are lost, but restored from a parallel or by conjecture

\[\ldots\] Approximately three letters are lost

() Round brackets indicate the resolution of an abbreviation or a symbol, e.g. (\textit{ἀρτάβη}) represents the symbol \’\,\textit{σ}, \textit{ετρ(αηγύό)} represents the abbreviation \textit{ετρ}

\[\textit{[aβγ]}\] The letters are deleted in the papyrus

\[\textit{‘aβγ’}\] The letters are added above the line

\[\textit{⟨aβγ⟩}\] The letters are added by the editor

\[\textit{‘aβγ’}\] The letters are regarded as mistaken and rejected by the editor

Bold arabic numerals refer to papyri printed in the volumes of \textit{The Oxyrhynchus Papyri}. The abbreviations used are in the main identical with those in J. F. Oates et al., \textit{Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraca} (BASP Suppl. no. 9, 2001); for a more up-to-date version of the Checklist, see \url{http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html}. 
I. THEOLOGICAL TEXTS

4705-4707. HERMAS, PASTOR

Published below are fragments of three papyrus manuscripts of the Pastor of Hermas, an early Christian ‘extracanonical’ work, well attested among papyri; for an annotated catalogue, see K. Aland (†), H.-U. Rosenbaum, Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri, II/1: Kirchenväter-Papyri (Berlin–New York 1995) 232–311 (KV 29–43; the four parchment fragments are not included). The new items bring the total number of published papyri of Hermas to twenty-three (twenty-five with 15 = KV 59 and P. Mich. inv. 6427, which contain quotations); two of them (P. Bodmer XXXVIII and P. Mich. 129) are very extensive. As expected, the bulk are codices; only two come from rolls (P. Berol. 5513, P. Mich. 130), to which 4705 (written on the back of a roll; cf. P. Mich. 190) and 4706 are now to be added.

The three new papyri are of considerable interest: they are early in date; offer a number of good readings not found elsewhere (but also others that are plainly wrong); and two of them (4705-6) transmit portions of the Visiones, not well represented in papyri (otherwise only in P. Amh. II 190, P. Bodmer XXXVIII, and P. Berl. Sarisch. 9; P. Harr. I 128, which contains parts of Vis. V, need not come from a codex that contained Vis. I–IV).


As a basis for collation I have used the editions of M. Whittaker, Der Hirt des Hermas (GCS 48: Berlin 1967²), and (U. H. J. Körtner,) M. Leutzsch, (Papiasfragmente.) Hirt des Hermas (Darmstadt 1998). The sigla used are the following: A = Codex Athous; B = P. Bodmer XXXVIII; Fa = Lavra K 96 (ed. M. Bandini, RHT 30 (2000) 109–22); M = P. Mich. 129; S = Codex Sinaiticus; C¹ = the Achimimic Coptic translation; L¹ = the old Latin version (vulgate); L² = the Latin Palatine version; E = the Ethiopic version. (Readings from the indirect tradition and the translations are cited rather selectively.)

N. GONIS

4705. HERMAS, VISIO I 1.8–9

A fragment of a roll, broken on all sides, written across the fibres on the back of an
unidentified literary text; the latter may be assigned to the early second century. The hand responsible for the text of Hermas is an informal round one, which I would place in the earlier part of the third century. It belongs to the same paleographic environment as III 412 = GLH 23a (Iulius Africanus, Kestor), of the mid-third century; compare also GMAW² 63 (the Bodmer St John), assigned to the first half of the third century. It is generally bilinear; only i and p descend slightly below the notional baseline. a is usually formed in a looped sequence, but occasionally is wedge-shaped; e has long mid-stroke sometimes detached from the back; the stem and upper arm of k are made in a single movement.

Θεός is abbreviated in the usual away. There is punctuation in the form of a middle point written in a blank (more than one-letter) space left for it (4, 5, 7, 9), but once we find a high point within the normal spacing of letters (8; it is unclear whether this is by the first hand). These may have served as pointers for reading aloud (cf. also P. Mich. 130). Elision is signalled in the only case that can be verified. A correction in 3, making good a phonetic spelling, is probably not due to the copyist (the cancelling stroke is in a different ink).

The text overlaps with S, B, and A. Too little has survived to allow a reliable judgement on the relation of 4705 with the other witnesses, though we may note that, when the tradition is split, 4705 mostly, but not always, sides with S. There is one new reading (9), while in another case the papyrus illustrates the complexities of the tradition (7).

\[\text{avrov} \text{davarov} \text{kcll} \text{ajiyp-a} (1.8)\]

\[\text{Acoric}^{\text{pov}} \[\text{e}7\text{rta}]+\text{aIt} \text{jaia/\text{v}a} \text{rovroy} 77 \text{e}[\text{pt}770 \text{t}]
\]

\[\text{oupe} \text{tov} \text{e} [\text{jaio} \[\text{avpicovrcc cv too} \]
\]

\[\text{5-7} \text{tcov ayaOcov tcov} [\text{pteAAov} \text{tcov} \text{p-rAAovTcov} \text{ay ad cop A}. \]

\[\text{7 p-eTja/aieAiycoociv: peTfape} \text{Atjcovtcu B: pcTavoiicouav S (et debent paenitereY): noWa peTapeAicouciv A: vagan-}
\]

\[\text{tur} 1, \text{non resistent hisdem luxuriis L} 2, \text{fj,€Tafj.e\ricova.v is wrong in terms of grammar: neither NT nor documentary papyri provide any evidence for the use of the active forms of this verb with personal subject. 4705 now shows that the corruption is ancient. Carlini has argued that B preserves the original reading; see his ‘METANOEIN}
c METAMELEΣΩΝI nelle Visioni di Erma', Miscelania Papirologica Ramon Roca-Pag (Barcelona 1987) 97–102, and the commentary to P. Bodm. If this holds, S's metameleseousi could be a correction of metameleseousi. It should be noted, however, that metameletheia is not attested elsewhere in Hermas, while metameleus occurs frequently.

9 ἀλλ' with B: ἀλλά S.A.

αὐτοῦ: εἰστὸν SBA. The uncontracted form is common in Hermas. For a similar case of disagreement between the MSS, cf. 22. 9 (εἰστὶν S: αὐτὸ S: εἰστὶν A).

12 τὰ ἁμαρτήματα σὺ with S: σὺ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα Α: τὰς αἱμαρτήματα Σ[ου] B.

N. GONIS

4706. HERMAS, Visiones III 4.3, 6.6, 9.7, 13.4–IV 1.1, 7.9; Mandata II 4–5, IV 1.1–9, 3.6, 4.3–4, V 1.6–7, VI 1.3–5, VII 5, VIII 6, IX 7–8, X 1.1

fr. 13 5.1 x 10.2 cm

Second/third century

Twenty-seven fragments of a roll, blank on the back; ten of them have not been placed. A crude kollesis is visible in fr. 5. The lower margin measures 2.8 cm (frs. 1, 16); the upper margin is extant to 0.6 cm (?fr. 12); the intercolumnium is c. 1 cm wide (fr. 20). The dimensions of the original roll and of the column of writing (we know only that each line contained 22–6 letters) cannot be reconstructed.

The hand is informal with cursive tendencies, of the kind that C. H. Roberts described as 'reformed documentary' (Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt (London 1979) 14). I would assign it to the earlier part of the third century, though I would not exclude a date in the very end of the second. There is some similarity to XXXI 2611 of 192/3, and VIII 1100 = GLH 20b, of 206; cf. also L 3532 = GMAW 86, assigned to the later second century. Letter forms of note: narrowly pointed Α; the apexes of Α, Δ, Λ are leftward-facing hooks; ζ has a curved base; the stem of τ joins the crossbar at one-third length; ζ, Π, Φ, and ι when ligatured to Ε, reach well below the line.

Θέος and κόριος are not contracted; this is also the case in P. Mich. 130, another Hermas fragment. The only lectional sign in evidence is a diaeresis over initial upsilon (fr. 3.4). There is no opportunity to observe how elision was treated. Titles are preserved for Vis. IV (fr. 5.13) and Mand. VIII (fr. 14.6). There are three itacistic mistakes (frs. 1.3; 3.4; 13.2), and a morphological aberration of common type (fr. 5.1). There is one correction, probably by the original scribe (fr. 13.10).

The original roll must have contained the Visiones as well as the Mandata (it is less likely that we have fragments of two different rolls). Compare the Codex Sinaiticus, which contained all three parts of the Pastor. This is of some interest, since it has repeatedly been argued that Mandata and Similitudines circulated independently of Visiones I–IV (Vis. V serving as an introduction to Mand. and Sim.); contrast, however, Aland and Rosenbaum, Repertorium pp. lxxxvii–xciv, especially the codicological part of their argument.

The papyrus is of more than average textual interest. Frs. 1–4 + 5 (part) transmit sections of the text also extant in S, B, and A; the papyrus tallies three times with SB against A.
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(frr. 1.4, 11; 3.2), once with SA against B (fr. 3.1), and once with BA against S (fr. 1.8), while it offers one new reading (fr. 1.9). Frr. 4+5 (part)–9 overlap with S and A; they present (at least) four instances of agreement with S against A (frr. 4+5.8, 11, 14; 6.5), one case of agreement with A against S (fr. 6.3), two cases of different word-order (frr. 5.12; 7.1–2), one omission (fr. 8.4), and one new reading (frr. 4+5.11). Frr. 10–17 carry parts of the text otherwise preserved only in A (and the indirect tradition). They offer some eight textual novelties (frr. 10.4; 11.4, 5–6; 13.2–3, 11, 13; 15.2, 7), most of which seem to be superior to the readings offered by A and the translations. We may also note the small overlaps with P. Amh. II 190 (frr. 4+5) and C (frr. 10–11).

In some of the smaller fragments line-divisions are largely exempli gratia.

Fr. 1

παντων αξιωτερος ειναι

σοι αποκαλυψθη ολοι γαρ

σοι προτεροι εικι και β]εθει

ονες σον οις εδει απο[καλυ

φθηναι τα οραματα τα]αυτα

αλλα ινα δοξασθη το ονο

μα του θεου σοι απεκαλυψθη[η]

και ετι αποκαλυψθη[η]εται

δια τους διψυχους διαλο

γιομενους εν ταις] καρδι

αις αυτων ει αρα εττι]ν ταυ

foot

2 αλλοι restored with SAL'12: πολλοι Ε: [B].

3–4 β]εθει, l. βεθεισσες. The same italism in B.

4 σοι restored with SBL'12 by reason of space: om. AE.

7 ετι restored with AL'1'E: ο B. S omits σοι απεκαλυψθη[η]; its corrector (S') restored only the verb (without σοι).

8 διαλο]γιομενους: τους διαλογιομενους SBA. Spacing suggests that the papyrus did not have τους, itself not strictly necessary. Cf. also frr. 4+5. 8–9 n.

11 εττι]ν with S (om. S) BL'1'E Clem. Al.: εττα Α.

Fr. 2

ε]οι[ται τω θεω ωσπερ γαρ

ο] λαθο[ε α ευρυγυ}λος ειναι μη

π]ερι[κοπη και αποβιαλη
εξ] αυτ[ου τι ου δυναται τετρα

γ] οψι[ε γενεθαί αυτω και οι πλου
t]ουν[τε εν τον τω αιωνι ε
α]ν μη περικοσατα συνων ο

1 γαρ restored with S' BAL by reason of space: om. S1'E.
3 The line looks short as restored. Perhaps τι was written after αποθαλη, and not in 4.
5 The line seems long as restored. Could it be that και was omitted?

Fr. 3

τον κ]υριον [και εκκλειςθη
κεεθει] μετα των αγαθων ι
μην εξ]ω της [θυρας του πυργου
νυν ου]ν ἑιμι[εν λεγω τοις προ
ηγομε]νοι [ει εις της εκκλησιας
και τοις] προκοταθεδραίας

1 κυριον with SAL' L2: δε B. For a discussion of the readings, see P. Bodm. XXVIII p. 89 (n. 1. 4).
2 των αγαθων restored with SB by reason of space: των αδελφων αγαθων Λ: cum bonis vestris L1: cum omnibus divitis L2: cum divitis vestris E.
4 ἑιμι[εν. The traces on the edge suit a left-hand curve (ε) rather than an upright (i).

Frts. 4 + 5

ρα η θειες οτι τετεκα]πες [πο
dac εχει το ευμφελιον [και
ιπχυρως εστηκεν και γα[ρ o
κοιμος δια τετεκαρω [ετοι
χειων κρατειαι] οι ουν [με
ta]νοθηκαν[εκ ολο]τελ[ως νε
οι] εκονται [και τε]θεμ[ελιω
μη]νοι εξ ο[λης της κ]αιρ[αι
με]τανοθηκαν[τεκ α]πεκ[ει
ολο]τελ[η την αποκ]αλυψ[εν

1 κυριον with SAL' L2: δε B. For a discussion of the readings, see P. Bodm. XXVIII p. 89 (n. 1. 4).
2 των αγαθων restored with SB by reason of space: των αδελφων αγαθων Λ: cum bonis vestris L1: cum omnibus divitis L2: cum divitis vestris E.
4 ἑιμι[εν. The traces on the edge suit a left-hand curve (ε) rather than an upright (i).
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μηκ]ετι [μήδεν αυτή]εις εαυ [τι δε δει σοι αποκ]αλυφθη[τεται

οπασις τετ]αρτη

ην ειδον αδελφοι] μετα []

ημερας εικοσι της] προτε[]

22.1 Vis. IV 1

1 τεσσαρες, 1. τέσσαρας. The same spelling in S. See F. T. Gignac, Grammar ii 191–2.
1–2 ποθεν εχεις restored exempli gratia with S B A (L1): εχεις ποθεν P. Amh. (L2).
4–5 στοιχειων κρατεις restored exempli gratia with S(B)A: κρατεις P. Amh.
8–9 εις οθης τος καρδιας μεταφορας] τοις with S: οτι εξ οθης της καρδιας μεταφορας ΑΛ' E: [P. Amh.].
The article is not necessary. Cf. fr. 1. 9–10 n. (Contrary to editors' reports, L2 does not side with S but offers something different: et funderit in toto curo peneitnion agent.)
11 αυτηςει: αυτηςεις S': αυτηςεις Α. (The same textual variation in Mand. VIII 6.)
After αυτηςεις, ΑΛ' E adds περιπ αποκαλυφθης, apparently an interpolation (not present in SL3).
12 τι δε restored exempli gratia with S: δε τι Α.
ου αποκαλυφθης] τοις: αποκαλυφθης Α: Ανακαλυφθης S: Α. The word order of the papyrus as restored is conjectural, based on considerations of space. But this still leaves us with another difficulty; if my reconstruction is right, there would be too little space at the end of the line for τοις; and yet there does not seem to be space for a further line between 12 and 13 (even if the interlinear space is larger than the usual).
14 ην ειδον restored with S by reason of space: δρακcj ην ειδον Α (visione quam L1: visionem quam L1'; but neither reading need go back to a Greek original such as A). The tradition displays a similar split at the start of Vis. III.

Fr. 6

χεν ωσει κεραμοι και] ηρ[ξα
μην κλαιειν και ερωτ]αιν γ[ον
cμην κλαιειν και ερωτ]αιν γ[ον
κυριον ων με λυτρω][ειτα[ι
εξ αυτου και επανεμ[ησθη[ν

5 ου ρηματος ου ακτηκοει]'ν μ[η
διαφυγεις ερμα ενδυ]εαιμ[ε
νος ουν αδελφοι την] πιετ[ι]

2 κλαιειν with S' AL' L1: E: κλαιει τα γανατα S.
3 λυτρω][ειτα[ι with Α: λυτρω[κεται S.
4 επανεμ[ησθη[ν restored exempli gratia with S: οπανεμ[ησθη[ν Α.
5 ακτηκοει] with S: ακτηκοα Α.
6 διαφυγεις restored exempli gratia with S: διαφυγης Α.
Fr. 7

τον ε[δω [κα ουτω δε το θηρι 
ον] γρχ[έτο ροιξω ωστε δινα 
ε]θαι α[υτο πολιν λυμαναι 
ερ]χομαι ι εγγυς αυτου και το 
τη]λικουτ[ο κητος - - - 

Three lines appear to have been lost between frs. 6 and 7 ([τον κυριου και μνηθεις αν ε]διαξεν με μεγαλευων 
θαρενες εις το θηριον εμαυ], if the papyrus had the same text as S).
1 ε[δω [ka restored, largely exempli gratia, with S: δεδωκα Α. 
1-2 ουτω δε το θηριον] γρχ[έτο. MSS transmit ουτω δε ήρχατο το θηριον; if the identification of the fragment 
is correct, the papyrus had a different word-order. 
5 τη]λικουτ[ο κητος restored exempli gratia with S: τηλικουτου κτηριου Α. 
After κητος, S has εκις (intended for εκιςει?), while Α gives εκτεινει .

Fr. 8

ο θε]ος [διδωειν ου πας ιντε 
ρου]μενοι διδωυ απλως μη 
διερ]αξ[-components 
μη δ]ως [πας γαρ ο θεός διδο 
5 εθα]ν θελε απο των ιδιων 
δωρ]ημα των οι ουν λαμβα 
νου]τ[ε ει [ποδωσουσι]ν - - 

4 After μη δ]ως, the papyrus apparently did not continue πας διδου, transmitted by SA. This could be an 
omission due to homoiarchon. One may also consider whether πας διδου is interpolated: this phrase is not really 
necessary after the exhortation πας γνευημαντες διδου απλως; but in a text where repetition is rife such consid¬
erations may simply be too logical.
5 ατο restored exempli gratia with S: εκ Α Απτ.

Fr. 9

μη αν]αβαι[νετω ου επι την 
καρ]διαν [περι γυναικος 
αλ]λοτρια[ε η περι πορνειας 

4706. HERMAS, VISIONES, MANDATA

(Vis. IV i)
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4 \textit{τοποθετηται restored exempli gratia with S' Ath. L'L'E: πονηριας SA (influenced from πονηρως?).}

Fr. 10

\begin{align*}
\text{εαν τις εκπειραθεις υπο} & \tauο\gamma \\
\text{διαβολον αμαρτηση μιαν} & \text{ meta} \\
\text{νοιαν εχει εαν δε υπο} & \chi \text{ ειρα α} \\
\text{μαρτανη και c.2 μετα} & \text{ γοην a} \\
\text{συμφοραν επτ' τω αν} & \text{ βρω} \\
\text{πω τω τοιουτω δυσκ} & \text{ μο} \\
\end{align*}
(31.6) \quad \text{(Mand. IV 3)}

\begin{align*}
\text{και c.2 μετα} & \text{ γοη: και oυ μετανοηση Α; και μετανοηση L'L'3'E, adopted by editors. (There is a slight variation in the Latin translations: si autem subinde peccat et poenitentiam agit L'; si frequenter poenitentiam actorum suorum agit L'.) oδ ου in Α seems to stem from an attempt to make sense of a somewhat difficult passage. The space of two letters that I have posited between και and μεταγοη could be filled by a negative particle. But even if the papyrus had μη (rather than oδ), I doubt it goes back to the author; it could have been an influence from Mand. IV 1. 9 ζαι άμμενη τις και μη μετανοη (so S; έπαιμενη . . . μετανοης Α). As for μεταγοη, it may be considered superior to μετανοηση of Α, since it agrees with the verbal aspect of the preceding διαιρηση (συ μετα γοη refers to a repeated action).} \\
\text{6 τω τοιουτω restored exempli gratia with (L')L'3'Ε (Ε): το τοιουτον Α.}
\end{align*}

Fr. 11

\begin{align*}
\text{τω θεω ταυτα coi oс} & \text{ οι λαλω [32.3] \quad \text{(Mand. IV 4)}} \\
\text{η και μελλω λαλειν φιλλας[} & \\
\text{ει απο του νυν αφ ης} & \text{ μοι παρ[} \text{ e} \\
\text{δοθης και eις του οικον} & \text{ σου κα[} \\
\text{τοικης} & \text{ των} \text{ δε προτερων[} \text{ σου [} \\
\text{παραπτωματων} & \text{ αφεις[} \text{ εσται} \text{ [} \\
\text{]} & \text{ . . .} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{2 δ restored with Α; om. L'L'E: [C'].} \\
\text{4. Spacing suggests that ημερας, which follows after παρεδωσθης in Α and looks back to δφ' ης, was not present in the papyrus; ημερας is omitted in L'L'E. δφ' ης without noun is regular NT usage; see F. Blass, A. Debrunner, F.}
\end{align*}
4706. HERMAS, VISIONES, MANDATA

Rehkopf, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch (Göttingen 1979) § 241 n. 3. It occurs twice in the text transmitted by A, viz. in Sim. VIII 1.4 and 6.6, but in both cases this may well not be the original reading.

4-5 ξ[φιεσεως restored with AL'E by reason of space: habito Λ'.

5-6 των δε πρτερων ιναν [παραπτωματων: τοιε δε πρτερων ιναν παραπτωματων Λ. The new reading may be the original: elsewhere in Hermas άφεςε construes with genitive of thing (Mand. IV 3.1, 3, 4) and dative of person (Mand. IV 4.4). The reading of A may be an influence from the construction with dative in the next period (και παςι δε άφεςε εκεια).

7 Too little survives to confirm a match with the expected text.

Fr. 12

Top?

The restorations are often exempli gratia, and have been taken from modern editions; no single witness transmits the text exactly as printed above, but I see little point in citing variants when the relevant words are entirely lost.

3 ευφηρητοι[e ete: ετιν ευφηρητοι Απι.: ετιν ευφηρητοι Α (according to Lake): ευφηρητοι εται L'E. There does not seem to be enough room to restore Α's putative ετι (not accepted by editors).

5 κυριει with AL'L: om. Α.

10 All witnesses have κοινοτην after δηνεκες; if my reconstruction is correct, there does not seem to be room for κοινοτην here. It should be noted that the traces interpreted as of the γ of τγνυ do not admit any of κ, σ, or γ.

Fr. 13

ετερβληυ[ν εκαν η] γαρ[ρ
ετερβληυ[λη ωδοκ [υρετι [ρευ
κ οεκει και τραχεια εττι και α
καυνθωδος βλαβερα [ουν

5 εττι κουε εν αυτη μο[ρευ
μενοι οι δε τγνυ οδη ο[δω μο
ρευμενοι ομαιωμενοι [ε περιπα
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10 touc]i καὶ απροκοκ[πως
ουτε] γαρ τραχεια εστὶν ουτε
ακανθωδ[ες] βεληπε[ις
ομν' α]τι ευμφορωτ[ερον ες
τι ταυτ]η τη οδω π[αρεεις
θαι αρεξ]ει φημι [κυριε ταυ
τη τη] ο]δω πορευ[εθαι
πορευεη] φ[ηκι] και [ος αν

1 η] γαρ[ρ] μετ' Α: η δέ Ι. Ι.2: δει Ε.
2 τρε]βουκ, ι. τριβουκ.

Fr. 14

4]ν τολας αυτου εκει

5 νω]ν η [ξων εστι παρα τω
θε]ω των δε μη φυλακες
τω[ν τα] ει το]λας αυτου ουδε
ξω]ν] εν αντ[οις

38.1 Μανδ. VIII

7 In Α. Μανδ. VIII starts εις των κοι, φηκεων. After the break, there is one high and one low near-horizontal trace, followed by what seems to be the top of an upright adorned with a left-facing serif. These could be the remnants of e and t of εις των, themselves enlarged, as was often the case with the initial letters of a new section (cf. Roberts, Manuscript, Society and Belief 16-17). After that, too little is preserved to allow a match with the received text.
Fr. 15

λιαν πονηρα φημι τοις δουλοις του θεου τουτων ουν παντων
dei εγκρατευεσαι τον δ]ου λευντα τω θεω εγκρα]τεν
cαι ουν απο παντων του]των ινα ζηση τω θεω και εγγ]ρα

1 φημι restored with A: ταυτα L*: om. L'.E.
2 I have restored ουν, absent from A, with the Latin translations in order to fill the lacuna. Another but less likely possibility is that φημι (restored in 1) came after δουλος.
3-4 δ]ου[λευντα τω θεω restored with AL by reason of space: δουλον του Θεου Αθ' L*: τον αγνοιτην και δουλον του Θεου Αντ.
4-5 ζηση restored exempli gratia with Αθ': ζησε Α: ζεσει Αθ''.
6 The trace on the edge is probably the lower part of the tail of ς or α. A has εγγυαθ'ει μετα των εγκρατευομενων αυτα; if the papyrus offered the same text, the position of the putative a cannot be explained. We may consider whether it had a different word-order from A, i.e., αυτα εγκρατευομενων; spacing seems to suit:
   ινα ζηση τωθεουδεκαευγ]ρα
   φημετεσταναυταγκρ]ρα

Fr. 16

η παραπτ]ωμα τι ο εν αγνοεις
βραδυτερ]ον λα[μβανεις το αι
τημα σιου] εν ουν [μη διαλιπης

1 τι ο with A Αθ'' Αντ: σιου L'.E: σιου τι L*: om. Αθ'.

Fr. 17

της διψ[υχιας και της ο
ξυχο]λιας τω[θε φημι κυριε
αιδει]φη εξ]τι τουτων αλλο
γαρ μοι] δοκε[ι ειναι οξυχολια

1 [της διψ][υχιας και της ο
ξυχο]λιας τω[θε φημι κυριε
αιδει]φη εξ]τι τουτων αλλο
γαρ μοι] δοκε[ι ειναι οξυχολια

5 [ ]
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Fr. 18—27 UNPLACED

Fr. 18

Fr. 19

Fr. 20

Fr. 21

Fr. 22

Fr. 23

Fr. 24

Fr. 25

Fr. 26

Fr. 27

Fr. 18 1 ], low trace, but perhaps not ink 2 ], π or τ, less likely τ 4 ], upright with traces to left as of the diagonal of η
Fr. 19 1 ], low trace 4 ], φ?
Fr. 20 1 ], high trace 4 ], high speck ιι 1 ], upright
Fr. 22 1 ], left-hand curve 2 ], lower curve 3 ], left-hand curve?
Fr. 23 1 ], upright on edge, left-hand tip of high horizontal or upper extremity of Λ, Δ, Λ 3 ], trace at two-thirds height ]], upper left corner of η?
Fr. 24 (Apparently not Mand. XI 16: οὐ cannot be read in 1.) 1 ], lower part of ε or ι; perhaps η, though its putative left-hand upright is oblique 2 ], short upright and thin medial horizontal projecting to right (c rather than h?)
Fr. 25 1 ], left-hand curve
Fr. 26 2 ], lower part of descending oblique such as of Λ or Λ 3 ], upright
Fr. 27 2 ], top of Λ, Δ, Λ?

N. GONIS
A portion of the outer part of a page of a papyrus codex, made up of three virtually contiguous fragments. Upper margin extant to 1 cm on →; outer margin extant to 1.7 cm on ↓. On average there were about 35 letters to the line; about 800 letters, or 23 lines, are lost from the lower part of the → side. (The ↓ side is somewhat more generously spaced.) Thus there would have been about 55 lines to the page, which gives a written height of c.28.5 cm. Adding 4 cm for upper and lower margins together, we have a page c.32.5 cm high. The written width may be estimated at c.11 cm; adding 4 cm for side margins, the width of the page would be c.15 cm. Such dimensions would place this leaf among Turner’s Group 6 of papyrus codices (see The Typology of the Early Codex 18).

The hand is a mature version of the ‘Severe Style’, smallish and upright, executed rather informally. A date in the third century would suit; cf. GLH 23a–b. It is generally bilinear; φ projects above and below the line, while some descenders may dip slightly below. The contrast between narrow and broad letters, standard in this style of handwriting, is not particularly pronounced. Most uprights tend to curve gently leftwards at the foot (γ has a ‘sinuous tail’).

Sim. VI is separated from Sim. VII by a paragraphus and a short blank space, followed by a title (mostly lost). Nomina sacra are treated in the usual fashion. There are diaereses over initial iotas (↓25, →22). Elision is not effected in ↓25. There are itacisms (ei for i) in ↓9, 17, 18.

The parts extant in 4707 are also transmitted by M and Δ. 4707 and M are usually in agreement against A, except for places where M gives a shorter text. There are several new readings (→28–9, ↓5, 16, 17, 26, 27–8), but with a single exception (↓16) they may be dismissed as errors.

The supplements are generally taken from M.

4707. HERMAS, SIMILITUDINES VI 3–VII 2

34 4B. 73/H(3-5)c * 103/196(a) 6 x 17.5 cm Third century


\[\begin{align*}
\text{4707. Hermas, Similitudines VI 3–VII 2} \\
\text{A portion of the outer part of a page of a papyrus codex, made up of three virtually contiguous fragments. Upper margin extant to 1 cm on →; outer margin extant to 1.7 cm on ↓. On average there were about 35 letters to the line; about 800 letters, or 23 lines, are lost from the lower part of the → side. (The ↓ side is somewhat more generously spaced.) Thus there would have been about 55 lines to the page, which gives a written height of c.28.5 cm. Adding 4 cm for upper and lower margins together, we have a page c.32.5 cm high. The written width may be estimated at c.11 cm; adding 4 cm for side margins, the width of the page would be c.15 cm. Such dimensions would place this leaf among Turner’s Group 6 of papyrus codices (see The Typology of the Early Codex 18).}
\end{align*}\]

The hand is a mature version of the ‘Severe Style’, smallish and upright, executed rather informally. A date in the third century would suit; cf. GLH 23a–b. It is generally bilinear; φ projects above and below the line, while some descenders may dip slightly below. The contrast between narrow and broad letters, standard in this style of handwriting, is not particularly pronounced. Most uprights tend to curve gently leftwards at the foot (γ has a ‘sinuous tail’).

Sim. VI is separated from Sim. VII by a paragraphus and a short blank space, followed by a title (mostly lost). Nomina sacra are treated in the usual fashion. There are diaereses over initial iotas (↓25, →22). Elision is not effected in ↓25. There are itacisms (ei for i) in ↓9, 17, 18.

The parts extant in 4707 are also transmitted by M and Δ. 4707 and M are usually in agreement against A, except for places where M gives a shorter text. There are several new readings (→28–9, ↓5, 16, 17, 26, 27–8), but with a single exception (↓16) they may be dismissed as errors.

The supplements are generally taken from M.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{→ τα εργα τα πονηρα α επραξαι και τε δοξαζουσι}
\end{align*}\]

\]

64.1 Sim. VI 4
τρυφωσι και απατωσαί λεγει] μου τ[ον α]υτον χ[ρο

νον βασανίζονται εδει γαρ τους ουτω τ[ρυφων]

tας και επιλαιναμενον του τυ επτα]πλας[ι

ως βασανιζεθαι λεγει μοι ασφρων [ει και ου] νο

eις της βασανου την δυναμιν] ει γα[ρ ενο]ρων φη

μι κε ουκ αν εε επηρωταν ινα μοι] δηλων[η]ς ακουε

φηνων αμφοτερων την δυν]αμιν της τρυφης

και απατης ο χρονος ωρα εκτη]ν μια της δ[ε] βασα

νου η ωρα τριακοντα ημερων δυ]ναμιν εχει εαν ουν

μιαν ημεραν τως τρυφης] και ατ[α]η[θ]η μιαν

de ημεραν βασανιδη ολον εναιν]τον ιχθυ[ς] ει τη ημερα

tης βασανου οια ουν ημερα[ει τ]ρυφης τοι το

cουτους εναιαυτους βασανιζεται τ]λεπεις ουν

φημει σοι της τρυφης και απα]της ο χρονος ε

λαχυτος εστιν της δε τιμωρ[α]ς και βα[ρα]νο[υ]

πολυς επει φημι κε ου νενη]ς κα ολους τ[ο]ς ηρ

νους της απατης και τρυφης] και βασανου δ[η]

λωςον ου τηλαινετον α]ποκρι[θ]ες μοι

λεγει η αφρονυνη εου παραμονος ει]ετιν και ου

θε λεις ου την καρδιαν καθαρει]αι και δουλευ

tω τυ βλεπε φηνων μιποτε] ο χρονος πληρ[ο

ω

θη και ει αφρων ευρεθης ακοιε ινυ[ν] φησιν

64.2  64.3  64.4  64.5  65.1  65.2  65.3

↓

ουν εν τ]η πρα[ει εις αυτου αυτα]ν πας] τρυφαι βλαβε

ραι εις[ιν τ]οι[ε δουλοι του τυ δια ταυτας ουν τας

απατη]ς] τα[εις οι τιμωρουμενοι και βα

η[α]νε[ι]μενοι] εις[ιν δε και τρυφαι εις ους των ους

θρ[ω]ποιοις το]ις ανθρωπων τουτων τιοντω οι δε β[α]


65.6  65.7  65.8


θ]ανατ[ων ε]ς αυτοις περιποιουνται
4707. HERMAS, SIMILITUDINES

(vac.)

π[αραβολής ζ

μητα [ημε]μα[ε] ολυγας ειδον αυτον εις το πεδι

66.1 Sim. VII

ον τ[ε] αυτ[ο]ν και τους ποιμενας ευφα,

κειν [κ]αι λεγ[ε]ι μα τι επιζητειν παρεμι φη

μι κε [ε]περωτή[ν]η[ν] και εε εινα του αγγελου του

τεμωρησον κ[ε]λευσης εκ του οικου μου ε

ἐξεθεν [ο]τ[ε] λει[α]ν με θλιβοι δειε εε φη

ναι ουτ[ω] γαρ πι[ρ]οστεπαξεν εν ευδοξις αγγε

66.2

λος τα περιου σου θ[ε]λει γαρ σε και περαθη

ναι με τα γαρ φημι κ[ε] εποιησα αυτων πονηρον

ινα τουτο του αγγελου παραθω ακουε φη

και [μ]εν αμαρτ[αι] και σου πολλαι αλλα ου τοσανται

ας [τε] ε εινα του του αγγελου παραδοθηναι αλ

λα το οικος σου με[γ]αλας αμαρταις και ανομαις ηρ

γασατο και γαι επικραπηθη ο ευδοξις αγγε

λος επι [τ]ομει [ε]γνωσε αυτουν και δια τουτο εκε

λευ[ε]ι χρονον [τινα θλιβηναι ινα κακε

νοι μετανοη εωσι και καθαρισωσι ειαυτους

30 απο πα[ε]ι χη επι[θημαι του αιωνος τουτου

→ 2 The line is restored with M by reason of space. AthL.1'L'E add εστι και after κρητης. (The whole passage represented by 1–4 is omitted in A by mistake.)

3 auton with M: auton AthL.1'L.

4 If the papyrus had the same text as M, the line would have run δουλευοντων τω κω και καθαρα καρδια αυτων.

5 πας παρε[ι]ς with MA: παςοις τας παρε[ι]ς L.

6 παρα παρα του κυριου πατα L, restored exemplar grata with M: παρα τοι κυριου πατα Α (L.1'L).

7 οι[α] διειρται with M (οι[α] αυτων)[ι]ται Λ: δε' δεν αιτωται AL.

8 κ[ο]πρε ετι μιοι τουτο δειπ[ο]ς restored with Α; Μ adds φημι after μοι, but there does not seem to be space for this in our codex.

13 γαρ restored with AL (L.7) by reason of space: om. M.

14 ροφει. Or αυτοι.

In M, "There is room for more writing after χρόνων, perhaps και (cf. Λ1 . . .), though the single remaining trace might belong to a φ (φημι) as well as to the κ of και" (C. Bonner).

13-14 After Bacavi[on], an additional sentence is present in the two Latin translations (et dixi ei: exiguum iniquum cruciantur L1; et dixi, multum exiguum domine cruciantur L2), and in F*, a fourteenth-century patristic florilegium, which gives σοι, των, φημι, κυριε, χρόνον Bacavi[on]; In M, "There is space for at least four letters after Bacavi[on]... It is possible that M and Α agree in a common error, the omission of a sentence by
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homoiooteleuton (βασιλεύω) (Bonner); this may be confirmed if F attests the original reading. In any case, the additional sentence is necessary to explain the yap that follows.

17 ce restored with ML; om. A.

21 τις τροφής restored exempli gratia with M Ath²: τροφής τις Α. Μ and A agree in having τροφής τις in the next period, and this word-order is also attested by our papyrus.

22 ἵππη[ε] restored with MA by reason of space: ἵππη(ε)ι L¹E².

24 διάκεισθαι restored with MA by reason of space: διάκεισθαι Αθ²E.

25 φησὶ restored with MAL²: om. Ath²L²E.

27 ce restored exempli gratia with ML¹E²: ἔτη Α.

28-9 ἱδίπλωμα μοι τιμαθετησαν: τιμαθετησαν μοι δήλωκοι Μ (δήλωγετε[ρον] Α): the word-order of the papyrus as restored is inferior to that of MA; but it may also be considered whether the papyrus had the same text as M, sharing with it the corrupt διαθετησαν, itself an influence from δήλωκοι.

33 νε[ρ] | λου M; νῖν Α: νῦν (ναύς) L²E: νῦν νῦν (εὖρα ναύς) L².

1 ce restored exempli gratia with M: εἰς Α.

πασι τροφὶ restored exempli gratia with M: πάσι ἄι τροφὶ Α: δὲ αἱ πρόξειει Αθ²; add. καὶ ἀπάται L¹L².

5 ce restored exempli gratia with M: γαρ Αθ²L²E² (edd.): om. A.

αὐξᾶν restored with M (αὐξᾶ[θο]] ΑΕ: αὐξᾶθα ΑΘ² (ὄφερα ὑπόθεται L¹L²).

After ἐραγάζομεν, MAL¹L² continue τροφῆς τῇ έαυτών ὕδωρι φερόμενοι; this is not present in the papyrus, possibly a case of σατ ὅμως τοῦ τέκνου (ἐραγάζομεν - - φερόμενοι) But τῇ έαυτών ὕδωρι φερόμενοι is omitted in Ath¹E: a mere coincidence?

7-8 τωι τοιούτῳ with AL¹L²E: om. M.

9 αὐτῶι restored with A(E) by reason of space: om. ML¹L².

10 επιτομ[είν] restored exempli gratia with M: ἐπιτομέως Α. After that, there is no space for the equivalent to in illis, transmitted by L¹L² (τις E).

12 θ[αραβολή] restored with L¹L²: θαραβολή Α: θαραβολή ϊς ΑE.

15 παρείμα restored with ML¹L²E: παρα ἐφώι Α, a patent corruption.

16 [ἐ]περωτήσει restored with ΑΕ: ἐπερωτήσει: M. The new reading is transmitted by all witnesses twice (§§ 29.4, 31.1), while in a passage similar to ours (§ 18.2) the witnesses split (ἐπερωτήσεις ΣΒ: ἐπερωτήσεις Α) ίνα σοι ἀποκαλήθηση. Generally, in Hermas ἐπερωτήσεις is more common than ἐρωτήσῃ.

ce restored exempli gratia with L¹ (spacing does not decide): om. L² (and AE, which omit the infinitive too): [M] (Bonner restores it, but it is doubtful that there was room for it in the papyrus).

ἀγγέλοι restored exempli gratia with Μ²E: παραμένω Μ²AL¹L².

17 τιμωρηται (L. τις): τιμωρηται Α: τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς τιμωρίας L¹L²: τῆς τιμωρίας Ε: [M]. The New reading is corrupt: a reference to an 'angel who ought to be punished' (τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν τιμωρητῶν) is out of place.

18 με restored exempli gratia with AL¹L²E (spacing does not decide): om. M.

19 γὰρ προσεταξεν with ML¹L²E: γὰρ φηκε προσεταξεν Α.

20 και restored with M: om. AL¹L²E.

22 τοντω τω λαγέλωι with M: τῷ ἄγγελῳ τούτῳ Α.

23 ce with M: om. A.

τοντωι with AL¹L²E: om. M.

24 = αλλα: [αλλα] M: διλλ' Α.

25 αμαρτιας και ανομιας restored exempli gratia with ML¹L²E: αμαρτειας και αμαρτειας Α.
25-6. ἔργα γακατο restored exempli gratia with M; εἰργάκατο A.

26. γαρ ἐπικρασθῇ: παραπικρασθῇ M (π[αρεπικρασθῇ] M—space permits). The new reading may be due to a graphic confusion; that γαρ turns up several times in neighbouring passages may also have played a role. The compound occurs in 66.3 ἡ παραπικρασθῇ ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ ἐνδοξος, which would speak in favour of its presence here.


N. GONIS
II. NEW LITERARY TEXTS

4708. Archilochus, Elegies (more of VI 854 and XXX 2507)

One large fragment and seven small tattered scraps from a papyrus roll written across the fibres. Two of the scraps bear a coronis each, and one of these the probable traces of a third. On the front of all fragments (except fr. 5) and along the fibres the same way up are written extensive accounts (perhaps of sales of confiscated land) in a mid-second century cursive.

Elegiacs are shown, wherever we can tell (frr. 1—5). In the largest fragment (fr. 1) a battle is narrated. The ‘fate of the gods’ (7 μοῖρα θεῶν) is involved. A river is mentioned, clogged with corpses (8–9). These, together with references to Telephus (5, 24), Argives (6), Ilios (15), and Trojans (20), but also Mysia (21) and Teuthras (17), point to the middle stage of Telephus’ story (reign in Mysia and opposition to the landing of the Greek army there), rather than the earliest (birth and childhood) or latest (wandering and cure; survey of treatments, including the mythographic hypotheses, in C. Preiser, Euripides: Telephos. Einleitung, Text, Kommentar, Spudasmata 78 (Hildesheim 2000) 41–115). Frr. 2–8, insofar as they offer anything of substance, are susceptible to interpretation in other contexts, but are also consistent with the narration of this episode.

The hand is a smallish ‘round capital’, almost always upright, written moderately rapidly, at first sight spindly but with some mannered traits: slight, deftly placed feet and decorative hooks on bottoms and tops of uprights. Largely (but not strictly) bilinear (top and bottom-lines bound all letters except ι, γ, ϕ, ι, which occasionally violate the latter). γ is written in two forms: V-shape and the champagne-glass variety with a bowl balanced on a stem. Δ with a hook left over the apex, but ο at full size, ύ with rounded saddle but deep, and ω rising to full height in its centre. Less formal comparable hands may be found in Roberts, GLH 20b (VIII 1100, Edict of prefect, AD 200), Schubart, PGB 22b (M. Chr. 86, excerpts from proceedings of archidicast, AD 135), and Norsa, SLG 12b (BGU V 1210, Gnomon of the Idios Logos, the recto document of which carries a date of 149; the Gnomon itself refers to Antoninus Pius without adding θεός, which implies, if the copyist was conscientious, that it was copied before Antoninus’ death in 161). These suggest a date in the second half of the second century, probably late in the second half, which seems consistent with the mid-second century documentary hand of the accounts on the front.1 The text is equipped with the occasional acute and circumflex accent, apostrophe, diaeresis (initial),

1 The ‘seventh year of an emperor (Antoninus?)’ to which Grenfell and Hunt found a reference in the same accounts on the documentary front of VI 854 is due to a misinterpretation of a sequence of abbreviations that could in another context have had that sense but here means ‘seven’ of something.
4708. ARCHILOCHUS, ELEGIES

and correction, all apparently by the original hand. Paragraphus, combined with coronis, presumably marks end of poem. Occasionally (and not by design) a space has crept in between words; no other form of punctuation is in evidence. Iota adscript is written wherever we expect it (fr. 1.23, 2 i 7). The pentameter is not inset.

Written in the same hand, line-spacing, and format are VI 854 containing line-beginnings overlapping (at vv. 6–9) a passage ascribed by Athenaeus 11.483d to Ἄρχιλοχος ἐν ἔλεγείοις (fr. 4 W. on the κόσμων, connected by some with Archil. fr. 2 W.) and XXX 2507 (Adesp. eleg. 61 W.), elegiacs hesitantly ascribed by Lobel to Archilochus (line 10 could be restored as Archil. fr. 1.2 καὶ Μουσῶν ἐρατῶν δόρων ἐπειτὶ ἄμενος, but the preceding line is different from that quoted by Athenaeus 14.627c). The hand was identified by W. B. Henry, ZPE 121 (1998) 94, with further refinements on published readings and supplements. All the fragments originally belonged to one and the same roll containing on the back literary texts, arguably a book of poems by a single author. Assignment of 4708 to Archilochus rests on this identification. Similarities of diction, style, and handling of the elegiac metre corroborate up to a point. There are close parallels in phrasing with known fragments of Archilochus, with the versions of the battle in the Hesiodic Catalogue (fr. 165 M.–W.) and the Cypria (arg. Procl. Chrest. 80, fr. 20 Bernabe), and with the language of the Homeric poems, especially Od. (cf. D. Page in Archilochus, Entretiens Fond. Hardt x (Geneva 1963) 117–63, at 125–62; M. L. West, Hesiod: Works and Days (Oxford 1978) 61 n. 1). In the hexameter the ‘féminine’ caesura predominates over the ‘masculine’ (7 out of the 10 hexameters where preserved in fr. 1), as it does in early Ionian elegy and Tyrtaeus (2:1); it predominates in the next group of poets (at Homeric level 4:3), then in Ion of Chios and Critias the masculine caesura predominates; see the statistics (to some degree outdated) of M. L. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (Berlin 1974) 112; id. Greek Metre (Oxford 1982) 45. On this basis the hexameters of fr. 1 would belong to the earliest group. The pentameters in fr. 1 regularly have a syllable before the caesura that is long by nature (rather than by position), a trait often associated with the Hellenistic epigrammatists and elegiac poets after Callimachus (West, GME 158, cf. 281–2; Maas, Gr. Metre § 22; Gow–Page, HE xli). Archilochus’ few previously known pentameters in elegiacs exhibit variation in this respect: nine are long by nature, and eight by position (frs. 1.2, 3–7, 8.1, 13.8, 10). But the statistics of the available studies are now badly outdated by more recent accessions of elegiacs. It may be noted that Tyrtaeus has several such runs (ten successive pentameters in elegiacs in fr. 10 with naturally long syllables just before the caesura), while exhibiting variation in this respect overall. Cf. XXX 2507 = Adesp. eleg. 61 — from the same roll as 4708 — in which the syllables in 4 and 14 are long by position at the caesura, while 6 and 8 are long by nature.

The length of the passage contained in fr. 1 would seem to rule out a collection of excerpts or a gnomic anthology like P. Hibeh II 173, which pairs verses of Archilochus (frs. 219–21 W.) with their Homeric counterparts in εὐγνώμενοι (cf. J. Barns, CQ 44 (1950) 132–7 and 45 = n.s. 1 (1951) 1–19 on gnomic anthologies). The copy was an extensive, critical edition: 4708, VI 854, XXX 2507 together show remains of 112+ lines (56+ distichs). It contained short poems (4708 fr. 8, six verses) together with long ones (fr. 1, at least 24 verses).
fr. 3 ii and fr. 5 show coronides; the same marginal graphic can be discerned in VI 854 2 (plate I). 4708 fr. 1.7, 10 show acute accents; fr. 2.6 and XXX 2507 3 (plate I) show circumflex accents. 4708 fr. 6.10 shows an interlinear variant. A paragraphus marking end of poem (and associated with the coronis) occurs in fr. 3 ii 7 and 5.2, as well as in VI 854 i together with at least one other critical sign, a ‘dash’ (Hunt) opposite v. 5.

Archilochus’ elegiacs are well known (testimonia in W. Crönert, *Archilochi elegiae* (Göttingen 1911) 3): frs. 1–14 and (less certainly) 15–17 W., parts of seventy-some verses of elegy. Only half of these are complete verses or nearly so. Three previously known papyri, deriving from two different rolls, contain them: XXIII 2356 (a) and (b) (frs. 9, 10 W. respectively); from the same roll as 4708; VI 854 (fr. 4 W.) and XXX 2507 (Adesp. eleg. 61. W., cf. XXX 2508 = Adesp. eleg. 62 W.). 4708 fr. 1 is now the longest consecutive run.

Elegiacs of a narrative sort on mythological subjects are rare before the Hellenistic period, even more so in early elegy (‘not used, so far as we can tell, for the straightforward telling of myths and legends’: West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* 18). How far did the battle-narrative in fr. 1 extend? It may have been introduced in fr. 1.5 (see 4–5 nn. and 16–21 n.); it has not certainly been concluded when the fragment breaks off. It thus extended to at least 20 lines and probably more. Even at this length (as in the case of the Deianeira narrative fr. 286–8 W.) its narration as a mythical exemplum as part of a larger poem cannot be ruled out. The story of Telephus (and in particular the stage narrated here) might well have recommended itself as a comparison to a poet who sang about defending (not always successfully) his own country’s soil, or occupying another’s. There is no clear direct address nor hortatory locution. For a possible first person verb (-/u,]e θa?) see fr. 1.4 n.

The events narrated in fr. 1 are discernible in broad outline; what happens at the beginning and end of the column is anything but clear: (i) mentions of cowardice and flight, leading to the mention of: (ii) Arcadian Telephus, who routed the Argive warriors when they landed on Myssian soil (5–7), (iii) slaying them to such a degree that the river was filled with corpses (8–9); (iv) Telephus has a fierce aristeia: the Argives are worsted and the Myssians drive them back to their ships (10–15); (v) the Argives, having lost their way to Troy, had arrived at the Myssian shore, and approached the city of Teuthras in search of Troy (16–21); (vi) someone encounters Telephus; there is a shout, and a fierce battle (22–4); (vii) mention of a father, and death (or an immortal) (25, 28).

It is not certain that fr. 1.1–4 tell the story of Telephus or, rather, (as Professor Parsons suggests) introduce it as a comparison to the poet’s own concerns in a larger poem, perhaps along the lines of, or even continuing, Archil. fr. 5 W. on the loss of the poet’s shield (see 4–5 nn.). In the standard version, e.g. as told in the *Cypria* (arg. Procl. *Chrest.* 80, fr. 20 Bernabé; F. G. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus* ii (Bonn 1865) 136–41; A. Kiesling, U. v. Wilamowitz, *Isylos von Epidaurus* (Berlin 1886) 48), the Greeks lose their way en route to Troy and land on the Myssian coast. The Myssians drive the Greeks back to their ships; Telephus slays Thersander

Earlier mistaken for the stichometric letter Θ (whence it has found its way into the existing studies on stichometry and on Archilochus as ‘line 800’), it may now be seen to be the central portion of the same form of coronis as in 4708 frs. 3 and 5.
son of Polynices. Then Telephus is caused by a vine-shoot (= epiphany of Dionysus) to stumble, and is wounded in the thigh by Achilles; then the Greeks put to sea and are scattered by a storm. On this outline, 16–21 seem to take a step back in the narrative (or, rather, form a narrative frame with what precedes), and tell the story over again: ‘The Achaeans were driven back with great slaughter to their ships: the background to this is that they had lost their way, and had approached the city of Teuthras with warlike ardour, since they were anxious to attack Troy, though in fact they were in Mysia.’ 22 ff. seem to continue with a crucial part of the battle.

The essential point, then, seems to be Telephus’ (and/or the Argives’?) heroism amidst varying fortunes. If so, the mythological narration in fr. 1 may not have existed for its own sake, but as an exemplum. Thus (i) the story might illustrate the supremacy of Moira (7), continuing from the gnome in Archil. fr. 16 W. πάντα τόχη καὶ μοῖρα, Περίκλεες, ἀνδρὶ δίδωσιν (cf. below, fr. 6.11 n.); (ii) the story might illustrate the horrors of a real battle (fr. 1.3–6: ‘it is not possible to express the [rout] and misery [of our situation], [no less dreadful than] the carnage once inflicted by Telephus even on the mighty army of Agamemnon’); (iii) Archilochus and his friends have suffered some setback in the Thasian campaign, which is here being portrayed as temporary: the (hortatory) message would be ‘the Greeks en route to Troy had a false start but ultimately prevailed and so will we’; (iv) the story might illustrate the vicissitudes of the poet, continuing (or introducing?) fr. 5 W.: ‘So I lost my shield by a bush? So what? Who would dare to call this cowardice (3), when even Telephus, who routed the great army of Agamemnon, came to grief on a bush (vine-shoot) and lost his shield — and survived’. The loss of Telephus’ shield appears explicitly only in the narrative of Philostratus’ Heroicus (13.4–14.1, 23.1, 23.24; see, however, fr. 1.22 n.). But the presence of the motif here would explain why Archilochus fr. 5.1 W. makes a point of παρὰ δάμων.

References to the text and numeration of the fragments of the elegiac and iambic poets (including Archilochus) are to the edition of M. L. West, Iambi et Elegi Graeci i–ii, ed. alt. (Oxford 1989–92) (= W).

Fr. 1

[...]

. [...][...].[...].[...].[...].θεοκρατερ,[
. [...][...].[...].[...].αικακοττηταλεγε,[
. [...][...].[...].[...].θελα, [.1–2]αφυγειιφενυ[...

5. [...].ou.[...].ou.[...].τηλεφοε.ρκ.[
. arg. νωνεφι, ης. π. λυτρα. [.'][
. λκ.[...].δανηνωραθενω.φοβ. [.]
. αιχμητ. πε. εοντε[.].ευφρετηθεθεκ[
. [...].τωνεκυνων ετεινε.σκαι[...].
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1]... , two descenders, (i) beneath the line of writing, (ii) lower than the first, which suggests Ψ Υ; the second
Φ Τ ... , end of horizontal connecting to an upright as of ει, ι; foot of an upright
negligible traces until diagonal connecting to upright at base-line as Α Χ Χ Ν before θεω [, tiny speck at
base-line close-in to ρ 3 ], [, right and left arms balancing on a vertical stem descending below the line, γ
suggested; ink at top line and bottom line as of round letter: ε ο ο ς [, [, top of upright with diagonal descend¬
ing from top, followed by another upright: Ν?] ... a9, traces of 'upper and lower-right arms: Κ or Χ? on edge of
hole, foot of upright in right part of letter-space as of ζ θ η χ ιον [, [. .] ... ζη [.,] θεω, τα [, .] καρδιον [
... ] ρον [, .] [. .] [. .] δηϊόμεν [, [. .] [. .] [. .] . ηλεφνο , . . . . οις και η [, .] [
.

1]... , two descenders, (i) beneath the line of writing, (ii) lower than the first, which suggests Ψ Υ; the second
Φ Τ ... , end of horizontal connecting to an upright as of ει, ι; foot of an upright
negligible traces until diagonal connecting to upright at base-line as Α Χ Χ Ν before θεω [, tiny speck at
base-line close-in to ρ 3 ], [, right and left arms balancing on a vertical stem descending below the line, γ
suggested; ink at top line and bottom line as of round letter: ε ο ο ς [, [, top of upright with diagonal descend¬
ing from top, followed by another upright: Ν?] ... a9, traces of 'upper and lower-right arms: Κ or Χ? on edge of
hole, foot of upright in right part of letter-space as of ζ θ η χ ιον [, [. .] ... ζη [.,] θεω, τα [, .] καρδιον [
... ] ρον [, .] [. .] [. .] δηϊόμεν [, [. .] [. .] [. .] . ηλεφνο , . . . . οις και η [, .] [
.
upright at bottom-line as N of α, lower-left part of round letter as θ o c ϑ, top and bottom of round letter not closed at right with horizontal protruding left at mid-level, θ strongly suggested; bottom of upright followed by top of upright, could combine in η n π; top right quadrant and bottom of round letter as ε c; top and bottom of upright before hole; after hole, diagonal crossing from base-line, not quite connecting to upright apparently looped at top as Α or possibly Λ with right part more upright than elsewhere; apex of diagonals converging at top line; trace in centre of letter-space at top line and another to right at bottom line, diagonal as of Α Α Α o o; after o foot of upright, upper part of diagonal, and top of second upright as of N (or Ν ?); less likely Μ; lower part of diagonal inclining to upper-right as of Α Α Α; two splayed legs at base-line as of Α o Α or Χ; connecting stroke into letter with round bottom, o or Μ ?; upright with horizontal protruding right from it at mid-level, η upright; upright, these last two possibly connected by a diagonal as γ; upper-right part of round letter as θ o c; indistinct trace as of top of upright at top-line in far right of letter-space if a wide letter, after the gap of a letter if a narrow letter; upright cocked at a slightly oblique angle and descending just below base-line in centre of letter-space with beginning of ι round bowl at top: ι distinctly suggested; vertical with looped top and bottom with arm connecting at upper right suggesting Κ (better than Χ); two horizontal traces at top-line, perhaps (but not certainly) to be connected as a horizontal or top of round letter; two indistinct traces one above the other but both below the bottom line as of a descender; i or P ?; after break, trace on edge at top line as of vertical with horizontal extending to the right: η; trace at bottom-line as foot of upright close-in to η, thus η η, π?; trace of upright at about mid-level, indistinct ink-streaks; horizontal ink at base-line with diagonals leaning inward from either end, Α suggested; bottom of upright with upper and lower arms connecting at right as of Κ; indistinct trace in lower left quadrant; diagonals crossing as of Α o Ο, indistinct trace at top line, upper-left part of round letter as θ o c ϑ; indistinct trace at top-line, a succession of 4 uprights; top of round letter as Α Α Α Α; possibly triangular letter as Α Α Α Α; indistinct traces; cap as of ι c; diagonal and upright as of Α ?; diagonals bowed inward converging in tight loop at apex as Α; near horizontal at base-line as Α Α Α or bottom of lunate as ε c; indistinct trace; horizontal at mid-level in right part of letter-space as middle stroke of ο or η connecting to following letter; foot (?) as of upright but with ink continuing to right: nose of α or left end of Α ?; diagonal connecting to upright at bottom as η or bowl of γ; upper-right quadrant of round letter; trace at mid-level, compatible with diagonal as of right side of Α Α Α;
Fr. 2, col. i

1 ξ, tiny round centre (too low for ι) with detached lower horizontal cocked at an angle, but too high for an accent over vowel in line below — a different formation from the more cursive (line-initial) form with bars connected in VI 834 3 , bottom of round bowl broken at top and abraded at right as of ο ω 2 , slight trace at upper left as of upright or κ Χ 3 , horizontal as of i π or top of ι, descender below the line with top missing, ι suggested, as ι elsewhere does not descend in this way, followed by slight trace below the line as of ι γ 4 , horizontal connecting stroke at mid-level as of ε out of abraded letter-space into following ν, round letter not closed at right with horizontal trace at mid-level at right side of bowl as of e or ι, then horizontal connecting stroke at mid-level, then vertical trace in upper register 6 , stroke of upright, then stroke ascending diagonally from base-line as of ι Δ τ, then right side of tiny bowl high in the line as of ι, then upper left quadrant of round letter as of ι ο ι ι 7 , vertical trace at level of top-line dangling on a fibre, stroke curving from mid-level to the base-line as of ι, less good for ι ι ι τ, then lower left quadrant of smallish round letter as ι ο ι 9 , trace at uncertain level

Fr. 2, col. ii

10–11 ostensibly line beginnings: traces of initial letters (left leg and apex as of ι ι ?) visible presumably due to column drift on an otherwise straight vertical edge. But it is not impossible that these are parts of a coronis or critical signs of uncertain import. 12 dot on the line, dot on the line, vertical, diagonal, left end of high horizontal (?) in alignment beneath the (line-initial?) traces in 10–11, with the preceding traces protruding even further left in the margin as though part of a gloss or critical sign. 13 prima facie diagonal connecting to upright at bottom as η, situated at left in the margin relative to the (line-initial?) traces in 10–11. But it seems to be ranged too far right to be the end of a hexameter at this level in col. i. Thus διπλε or abbreviation crediting the source of an alternative reading, e.g. Ν(αναπο?)

Fr. 3

col. i

\[ \] 5 asio, [ ]
\[ \] 5 \[ \] 6 \[ \] 5 \[ \] 5 \[ \] ενναρφ 5 [ ]

col. ii

\[ \] 7 [ ] 7 5 a \[ \] 5 [ ] 5 [ ]
Fr. 3 col. i

1], end of high horizontal with no trace of ink on surface below, thus τ excluded: τ? after o (not closed at bottom) connecting stroke to diagonal descending from top to mid-level as left arm of γ 2], slanting upright with horizontal ink at top right as of η p τ or right leg of π (but spacing suggest the first), then left leg as of Λ λ λ ..., upright with diagonal descending from top as n, then two uprights (the second with foot curving right) as of τ 3], foot of upright centred as of i, with circumflex accent above clearly preserved 8 upper right arm of κ x or acute accent

Fr. 3 col. ii

6-8 coronis; to its right: traces of initial letters of three successive lines visible due to column drift on an otherwise straight vertical edge 6], slanting diagonal as of i τ; trace just beneath it possibly left end of paragraphos (corresponds with centre and mid-level of the coronis at left) 7], diagonal on edge as of left leg of λ x or nose of λ 8 left side of round letter as of Ω ω

Fr. 4

...], ἐν...]
], [, φρεττάκα[...
],...

Fr. 4

1], upright as ι η ι 2], dot on the line 4], large round dot high in the line, possibly a blob on the bottom of the cross-stroke of φ descending from the line above 5], diagonal descending from top of upright or diagonal as λ ι, apex of diagonals connecting at top as of Λ Α Λ

Fr. 5

...], [...
], δω[...
],...

Fr. 5

1 dot on vertical fibre 3 ], two points of ink above the line compatible with round letter or horizontal of τ ι 5 ], two short horizontals one above the other as top and mid-stroke of ε ...], vertical rising high in the line as of τ, wavering horizontal ink at level of the line curving upward at each end: ι Ω?, round letter not closed at top, possibly forming ω with following vertical, then stroke connecting diagonally downward from top of vertical or of ι
Fr. 6

1–6 have been stripped of their horizontal fibres underneath. 1 short horizontal stroke at level of line 2 dot below the line, bottoms of two uprights, the second with diagonal sloping down from top as of η 3, horizontal line below η (as of paragraphus or grave accent on letter in line below?) 4, [left side of round letter as of θ ο ο possibly followed by right side of round letter on a separate fibre, then two successive vertical strokes 5, upright as of 1 5,] dot at mid-level, then ο or ε with near horizontal stroke (acute accent?) above 6 small straight-backed letter not closed at right as c, splayed legs open at top and converging at line, γ suggested, trace below line as of descender and another at the top line as of Π γ, diagonal with bowl attached at lower left as of λ 7, right side of round letter ο ο,] diagonal curving from upper left to lower right with ink attached at middle left, ι suggested, trace of vertical 8, left side of round letter followed by upright, the two possibly connecting to form ω 10, upright as of ι or right side of round letter ο ο,] to (more likely) or τ 11,]... top of upright with diagonal descending, ι suggested, three successive dots at level of the top line 12, bottom of vertical followed by dot on the line 13, dot at left at level of top-line, upright followed by dot at mid-level 14, top of round letter with dot at mid-level underneath as of ε ι, upright in left part of letter-space, triangular letter as Λ Λ Χ,] upper arm as of Κ γ Χ,] two horizontal strokes one above the other on a dangling fibre
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Fr. 7

1. bottom of upright 2. foot of diagonal as of ΜΜΜΜ, round letter as οοοο 3. top of vertical 4. left end of horizontal and foot of upright, π suggested 5. two uprights 6. diagonal trace near line 7. curving diagonal as left side of ΜΜΜΜ 8. vertical 9. curving diagonal as right side of Μ followed by ε or θ left side of round letter as of οοοο on a dangling fibre

Fr. 8

ε. [  
ω[  
τ[  
ε. [  
ο.[

Fr. 8

1–4 coronis; large dot in margin at level between lines 3 and 4, not connected by ink to curving tail of coronis, but possibly part of it, if its tail curved up and around to left where the surface is now lost 1. diagonal stroke high in the line from upper left to mid-level at right as of arm of ΧΥ, not connected to mid-stroke of ε, apparently not paragraphus not connected to coronis 3. dot on line as bottom of vertical of Τ 5. arm as of ΥΧ 5–6 hook in margin (top of coronis?) curving over left and back down 6. upright curving back left with shallow bowl balanced on top as of Υ or sagging top of Τ

Fr. 1

.... [  
θεον κρατερή[ε οπ' ανάγκης  
ai κακότηταλει[
'Αργείων ἐφοβήσε πολὺν στρατ[.].[

ἀλκήθεϊοι] ἡ τῶν δὴ μοῦρα θεῶν ἐφόβησι,

αἰχμηταὶ περ ἐόντες[.].] εὐρρεῖτης δὲ Κ[άικος

π]ιπτόντων νεκρῶν ετείνετο καὶ[

Μύδιον, οἱ δὲ ἑπὶ θῖνα πολυφλοῖσβοι[ο θαλάσσῃς

χέρσ'] ὧπ' ἀμελέκτον φωτὸς ἐναρό[μενοι

προτροπᾶν ἀπέκλινον ἐνκρήμ[ιδες Ἀχαιοί.

ἄ[παροι δ'] ἐκ νέας ὡ[κ]υπόρ[ο]ς [ἐκέβαν

ταῖδες τ' ἀθανάτων καὶ ἀδελφοί', [οὐ' Ἀγαμέμνων

"Τλιον εἰς ἱερὴν ἤγε μαχησομένο[υς.

ο]ι δὲ τότε βλαφθέντες ὅδοι παραβ[.].[

Τε[ὑ}θραυστός δ'] ἐραθήν πρὸς πόλιν [.].[

ἐ]νθ[ε] [μ]έφος πνείοντες ὡμος αὐτό[.].[

1-2][.].] [.].] η μεγάλως θυμὸν ἀκη[.].[

..] ν ἢ ἀρ ὑψίτυλον Τρώων πόλιν εἰς[.].

....] [.].] ην δ' ἐπάτευν Μυκίδα πυροφόρο[ν

....] [.].] [.].] [.].] βοῶν τα[λ]άκάρδιον [νὸν

....] [.].] [.].] [.].] δήλω ἐν [πολ]έμ[ω

Τ]ήλεφον ο......... οἰς κακη[.].[.]
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Fr. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>col. i</th>
<th>col. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>φορ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζέκο[</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,ε[</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πατήρ</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ομεν[ους</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άρητ[η[</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ[α]κότητος[</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>col. i</th>
<th>col. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?ένοςε[ι[χαιον[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεν[δρ[φυ[[</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε[ιν[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fr. 4

\[ \nu \delta \phi \rho \' \xi \tau \iota \pi aca[ \]
\[ \]. [ \]
\[ \]. [ \]
5
\[ \]. [ \]

Fr. 5

\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
5
\[ ]\[ \]

Fr. 6

\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
5
\[ ]\[ \]

\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
10
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
\[ ]\[ \]
Fr. 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ἰπ | ἔλλοβα |... because of mighty necessity... cowardice... to flee... Telephus routed the great army of Argives. The brave men fled—indeed, so greatly was the fate of the gods routing them—spear-men though they were. And fair-flowing Kaĩkos and the Mysian (plain?) were stuffed with corpses as they fell. And being slain at the hands of the relentless man (Telephus), the well-greaved Achaean turned-off with headlong speed to the shore of the much-resounding sea. Gladly did the sons of the immortals and brothers, whom Agamemnon was leading to holy Ilion to wage war, embark on their swift ships. On that occasion, because they had lost their way... toward the lovely city of Teuthras, where, despite their valorous ardour... in distress of spirit. For to the high-gated city of Troy... but they had their feet on wheat-bearing Mysia... shouting to his brave-hearted son... Telephus... in fierce battle... evil... gratifying his father...
Fr. 1

Elegiacs; the hexameter precedes. Placement relative to VI 854, XXX 2507 and priority to fr. 2–8 is not certain (see fr. 6–8 n.).

1 The traces cannot be reconciled with Archil. fr. 5–4.

2 καταστήρις ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης (W. B. Henry); Archil. fr. 13.6 ἐπί καταστήρις τὴν πλημμογῆν ἐθέκα; Il. 6.458 καταστήρις δ’ ἐπισκείτετ’ ἀνάγκης; Od. 10.273 καταστήρις δὲ μοι ἐπίλετ’ ἀνάγκης; 2.110 οὐκ ἔθελον ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης; Thgn. 109–5 ἐπεὶ καταστήρι μὲν ἀνάγκη / ἐντόκοις; 389 ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης / ξυλίζουσιες / καταστήρις μὲν ἀνάγκης; Bacchyl. fr. 11.46, 20.1; PMG Adesp. 1017.2.

3. οἵ. Either γαϊ or γαϊ (Thgn. 1045, but unlikely here) would suit the trace; a monosyllable after the caesura is required. At the beginning M. L. West suggests οἴδας ηδ[ι] [αδείας].

κακοτῆτα: a favourite word in the elegists (16x Thgn., 1x Eumen, Solon, Tyrt.), in keeping with the concern for moral criteria (e.g. see on 4 φησίν φεύγω). Cf. fr. 2.1–7 κακοτῆτα (context uncertain, but see 6 φεύγω), Tyrt. fr. 10.10 πᾶσα δ’ ἐντύλη καὶ κακοτῆτα ἑπίστα (of the coward in battle); Thgn. 1082 πάλλετε κακοτῆτα σε κεκαθ’ (of the city’s bad leaders); West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus 15–18. The sense of κακοτῆτα here could be either ‘disaster’ or ‘cowardice’. If κακοτῆτα is the object of 4 φησίν φεύγω, it would mean simply ‘avoid trouble’, as it does at Od. 3.175 δόρα τάχητα ὑπὲκ κακοτῆτα φάγωμεν, 5.414 ἐφησίεσθ᾽ κακοτῆτα. Either sense would be suited to a martial context, though hardly entails it, or even a specific κακοτῆτα, like Telephus’ wounding or suffering as a result of it; at any rate, he cannot have received this when he routs the Argives in 6, and it is not in fact certain he is already concerned here: we get a separate mention (introduction?) of him in 5.

κακοτῆτακεγεί(.): Division uncertain: (ι) κακοτῆται followed by ἄλγεις(ψ), ‘to have a care for’ (cf. Archil. fr. 5.3 τί μοι μέλει αἷς ἐκεῖνον, ‘mind’, ‘heed’ (often negated, but the beginning of 4 will not accommodate e.g. ωδήδω), more frequently with a genitive (e.g. Od. 9.15, 275) than an accusative, but the accusative is well-exampled: Il. 16.388 ἐν Ἑσ. Ὀμ. 251 θεῶν ὑπὸν οὐκ ἄλγοντες; Od. 6.688 ὡνὰ τολομῶν ἄλγοντες; Simonides PMG 38.15 ἄρχων . . . κύματος οὐκ ἄλγος, ἀδὴν ἀνέμου φθόργων; (ii) perhaps more likely, κακοτῆτα καὶ λέγεις(ψ) in the sense ‘tell’, ‘enumerate’. Thus perhaps δ[ίνων] α[τα] κακοτῆταρ’ ἄλγες(ψ), it was ‘impossible even to have a care for cowardice’, or κακοτῆτα λέγεις(ψ), ‘to call (this) cowardice’ or ‘to tell of the disaster’ (note also ἀλγόν with ἔν + dat. in the sense of ‘count/regard (something) as among (something else)’, Alcman PMG fr. 1.2, Pr. 2.78).

4 θεᾶ. If –θα, we would have an internal speaker (exhortation?), whether part of the narrative of the Mysonian battle, or in the poet’s own voice, or an interlocutor’s (e.g. νῦν ἔριπωμαι ἡθά (M. L. West).)

[1–2]a. The trace suggests α., α., or λ.: thus δ[ίνων] α[τα] (M. L. West) or δ[ίνων] α[τα]. If so, e.g. πείρωμαι ἡθά δ[ίνων] α[τα] φησίν[ψ] φεύγω(ψ) ὑπὲκ ἄλγεις(ψ) / ἀφέως, might be tried: ‘let us attempt to escape destruction and by fleeing to contend tomorrow’, along the lines of Men. Monast. 56 jakel ἀνὴρ δ’ φῆσινων καὶ πᾶλα μαχήσεται; cf. Il. 2.140 φησινώμενων οὖν νεκρῶν. For contracted ὦς see e.g. Tyrt. fr. 12.12, Minn. fr. 14.9, Thgn. 532, West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus 81; the uncontracted form below in 23. For ἀφέως cf. Simonides PMG 521 ἀνθρώπος ἑνῶ μὴ ποτή φάσις δό τίνετε αἴρως.

φησίν φεύγω. Accusations of cowardice? φησίν[ψ] φεύγω[ψ] ὑπὲκ τε ὀφρή (M. L. West). φησίν[ψ] ὑπὲκ καὶ ἐκέλθω(ς). (D. J. Mastronarde), φησίν[ψ] ὑπὲκ καὶ αἵτω(ς). (C. Murtagh); cf. Tyr. 5.8. Flight is not explicitly mentioned in Archil. fr. 5, which rather speaks of ‘saving himself’, αὐτῶν δ’ ἐξεκάσαθα (if that is indeed the right reading, as seems likely, against Sextus’ αὐτῶς δ’ ἐξεκάσαθα), G. I. C. Robertson, Evaluative Language in Greek Lyric and Elegiac Poetry and Inscribed Epigram to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.E., DPhil thesis (Oxford 1999) ch. 2.5 ‘Fight or Flight’ pp. 64–71, notes (p. 65) that funerary epigram mentions the idea only to reject it, citing CEC 118 (Thessaly, c.475–450?) in which it is said of the fallen warrior that οὐκ ἐπισκέπτομαι φησίν. So also Tyrt. fr. 11.14; 9 μέτα φησινών τε διοικώντων τ’ ἐγένεθα. For the repetition of the verb: Hdt. 5.95 of Alcaeus (fr. 428b) φησίνων ἐφησίες; Callin. fr. 1.12–15, of the man who thinks that by escaping the destruction of battle he can escape the fate of death: 12/14 θάνατον τε φησίνων . . . δρούσῃ φησίνων (concluding at 15 ἐν δ’ ὕκων μοῦρα κίχει δανίσαν). Such repetition seems to have been a stylistic feature of the poem (6 7 ἐβάλλετε . . . ἐβάλλετε, 10/16 ἔποιησα . . . παρα . . . διόκατα; 22/4 τη . . . ἔθεσαν), as it is of Archilochus elsewhere: e.g. frr. 2 ἐν δορί / ἐν δορί / / ἐν δορί / / ἐν δορί; 23.14–15 ἐπισκέπτεται τοῦ τοῖς φιλ[ε]ρ[τα] μὲν ἄλλων ἐκείς ἐλείον; 26.6 πήματε καὶ εἴπας ἄλλων ὀψίν ὀψίν.
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

5 |o|, o, [ | Tήλεφος. Before Τήλεφος, |οικεός[ | or |οικεός[ | seem the likeliest reading (less plausibly
|οικεός[ | ?). Thus |ός | φίλος, ‘as’ or ‘when’ (cf. Hes. fr. 105.19 |, ὥς δ’ ἔστων), introducing the narrative that follows as
an exemplum? (But I would have much preferred ὥςτε = ὅπερ: Archil. fr. 21.1, 41.1(?), 43.2(?), 125.1, 1968.47,
216, 224; in elegy: Thgn. 56, Solon fr. 15, and often, or ὥς ὅτε or ὅποτε, or ὅτε καλὸς or τοῦτο ὅποτε. M. L. West sug-
gests καί ποτε μὲν ὃτεν ἔστω (cf. Il. 4:388, 17:94).

|Ἀρκαλ[εὐς? (not in LS) | or Rev. Suppl.), So Hes. fr. 165.8 M.-W. ἐπέκεισε Τήλεφον |Ἀρκαλ[εὐς Μυσίων βασιλέα |ὡς ὁ. |Ἀρκα[εὐς see Archil. fr. 112.4(?), Tyrt. fr. 23a.15(?), Simonides FGE V Πάνη
τῶν Ἀρκάια: uncontracted ὡς: Archil. fr. 91.5, 171.1, 205; at end of pentameter, Thgn. 148, 794 δίποκαι ὡς: 866
ἐποῦν ὡς. Metre does not decide between Ἀρκα[εὐς | and Ἀρκα[εὐς ὡς: according to West, Greek Metre p. 159,
only 13% of pentameters in Tyrtaeus have an accented syllable at the end (24.4% in Mimnermus, etc.; no statistics
given for Archilochus). There is a very marked decline in Hellenistic elegics. (West speaks of a ‘gradually increas-
ing tendency’ to avoid an accented final syllable in the pentameter, with Archilochus standing at the upper end.)
Archilochus’ preserved pentameters, too small a sample to be statistically significant, show no such instance. (Al-
lowance must also be made for the expected percentage taken at random, i.e. the percentage of Greek words alone
or in combination with the right metrical shape that have the last syllable accented.) Ἀρκαλ[εὐς (prose, Menander,
Callim. h. 3.88, epigrammatists in AP) is not attested earlier than the Hellenistic period.

Ἀρκα[εὐς seems to presuppose that Telephus and his story are here introduced in the poem (otherwise, we
would already know who he is); and from this it would follow that 1–4 does not refer specifically to the Myśian
battle, but to some situation external to the Mysian narrative, such as another mythical battle or Archilochus’
own contemporary military exploits, to which the Myśian experience is compared. With Ἀρκα[εὐς ὡς, however,
the participle could be concessive (with Telephus already part of the narrative); although he was Arcadian, and
therefore Greek, he was killing/routing Greeks (who ought to have been allies).

6 πολῶν στρατ[...] |. Presumably πολῶν στρατ[...] | |; | if Π. Archil. fr. 88 ἀνάλογος ἀναρχεῖται στρατός | Il.
8.472 ἀλλ' Ἀρκα[εὐς πολῶν στρατόν αἱματάτου. At end: στρατ[...] | if (ἄν ἄνθρωπος | or (ἄν ὃν ἔγινεν | (M. L.
West).

7 ἄδεξεν |. Cf. Il. 11.489: ἀπὸ ἔτους πολλοῖς τε καὶ ἄδεξεν; Archil. fr. 95 ἄδεξεν (but the context is lost);
148 ἀδεξαμενόν; Adesp. iamb. 38.10 ἄδεξαμενόν; Callim. fr. 1.1 ἄδεξαμεν ἐξητε βημαίον, 10–11 ὥς ἀπίστα ἄδεξαμεν
ὦτρ + ὦκας; Tyrt. fr. 10.17, 24 ἄδεξαμεν . . . βημαίον; Ἀναχ. iamb. fr. 2.1 ἄδεξαμεν . . . φίλοι; Timoc. iamb. fr. 7
ἄδεξαμεν Ἁδεσίοιο.

7 ἄδεξεν (R. Janko) may refer to the comparison with Telephus in 5–6 (assuming ὥς in 5): ‘so greatly as this’ (i.e.
as Telephus routed/slew them). Or the reference may be to a situation (Archilochus?) outside the narrative: ‘so
great a fate as this (i.e. our present predicament).’ On the other hand, ἄδεξεν could have limiting force: ‘only as far
as this,’ ‘to this extent’ (since the Myśian victory will be for Telephus short-lived, as 18ff. tells); the latter sense at
Archil. fr. 15 Γάλαξ, ἐπίκουροι ἀνὴρ τῶν γόνων φίλοι ἔκει μάχηται.

μοῖρα θεῶν. Cf. Od. 3.269 ἀλλ’ ὥς ὅτι δὴ μὲν μοῖρα θεῶν ἐπέδοκε δαμόνια; Solon fr. 13.30 (cf. 63) μοῖρὴ θεῶν μοῖρ
ἐπικύριος κύριος: A. R. 1.1440 μὲν μὲν δὴ μοῖρα θεῶν χρεὶα τε περίχει; Archil. fr. 10 πάντα τόγη καὶ μοίρα, Περικλέη,
ἀδρί διδῶσε (see on 5); Steich. PMGF Stg.5–10 (of Heracles killing Geryones) διὰ δ’ ἔκες πάρκα [καὶ ὃ]τ’ ἐδά
δαμονος αἰτεί. Cf. 2 θεὸς κρατῆτις ὡς ἄνάγκης. The reference need not be a specific one. But in the background
could be: (i) the oracle that the Argives could only reach Troy ‘with a Greek leading them’ (= Arcadian-born Tele-
phus); (ii) the oracle according to which Telephus could only be cured by ‘the one wounding’ (= Achilles’ spear);
or (iii) a point of comparison to a situation (Archilochus?) outside the narrative? Where Telephus is concerned,
μοῖρα θεῶν might allude to his later reversal of fortune (for having offended Dionysus) and his wounding by Achil-
es, illustrating e.g. a principle like that of ἔτοι ἔλλος ἐξεὶ τόδε: νῦν μὲν ἐκ ἡμέρας ἐτράπετθ’ ἀἵματεσ δ’ ἔλλο
ἀνακτήσωμεν, θέτοι τις δ’ ἔτερον ἐπαράγεται | Archil. fr. 13.7–9.

ἐδράσει (R. Janko); ‘routed’ (the Homeric sense), with ‘Argives’ understood. Telephus put the entire brave
company of the Argives to rout under the fate of the gods.

8 ἀἵματαν περ ὅπερ (C. P. Parsons). Archil. fr. 93.5 αἵματαν ἔλλο; 24.13 χρόνον ἀἵματις ὠσ’ | fr. spur.
324.3 of Heracles and Aiolaos αἵματα δῦο; Tyrt. fr. 5.6 αἵματα πατέρων ἷματαρῶν πατέρων; 19.13 ἀἵματες
ἀἵμαται.
But $e + \text{short}$ is regularly contracted in iambus (West, Iambus a Elegy Studies in Greek and 9.283 Od. scanned as a monosyllable in synizesis; cf. via, 161).  

9 πιθητητων νεκρων στεινετο. The images are familiar, both the falling corpses (same unexpected present tense of πασσο as in Homer II. 10.199–200 νεκρων διεβαίνετο χώρος / πασσοτων), and the river stuffed with them (QS. 7.100 νεκρων δ’ έκτεινετο γαία; id. 9.160 πέδων δ’ έκτεινετο νεκρών). Differently at Ovid Met. 12.111–12 βαρμαξιστας popularis adeo Caicus / fluxit et Philosoph. He. 23.24 ψήφ’ ἄν ἠμιστημένον μεθύνη τὸν Κάικουν, on which basis an Alexandrian or Pergamene version has been postulated as a common source (but cf. II. 21.21).  

καὶ[ιν έ] + [ι] όγχοι? [hiatus blocked by digamma]; [ξιφόν] [expansion of the simpler image at B. 10.199–200; Archil. fr. 3.3 ξιφόν δὲ πολύτον ἐετετα ἔργον}. Or (preferably) καὶ [πέδων? (schema Alcaenicum/Pindaricum): cf. Pl. O. 9.71 Τεθειασα με πέδων; I. 8.50–1 Αμοίλας: δ καὶ Μύειον ἀμοίλας / αυμάθεις Τηλέφου μέλαινα βαλοντιά φίλου πέδων; Archil. fr. 3.2–3 εῦχτ’ ἄν δὴ μαλῶν Ἀργης ευάγγει / ἐν πέδων; so Pausanias 8.45.7 describes the subject of the west pediment of the Temple of Athena Alea at Tegea as τὰ δὴ ὅπως πετυχημένον ἐν τοίν πέδων Τηλέφου μετ’ Ἀμοίλλα δεῖν ἐν Κάικουν πέδων μάχῃ; at 14.5 he refers to the battle site as τὸ Μύειον πέδων. If καὶ is not assumed: καὶ[ν έ]περ (adverbial)?  

10–13 The Argives, having been met and worsted, are driven back willy-nilly to the sea shore. In the Cypria (arg. Procl. Chrest. 80, fr. 20 Bernabé, Apollod. Bibl. Epit. 3.17) Telephus slew Thersander son of Polynices, but there is no separate mention of that here. Pausanias 9.5.14 refers to the episode as ἡ πλαγγά 'reverse' or 'setback' I. 21.607 ἀπετέκενεν.  

10 πολυδόνιοι θαλάσσες: Archil. fr. 13.3–4 κάπη καμια πολυθόνιοι θαλάσσες / ἐκέλευον (contrast the description of the sea in fr. 8.1 πολύς ἄλος ἐν πελάγεσσ). In Homer the epithet is always so completed, e.g. II. 23.59 Πηλείδης δ’ ἐπί τινι πολυθόνιοι θαλάσσες. Nicander and Nonnus have πολυθόνιοι μερίμνας, μελαθνη, κόμβυμη, τραργηές. 

11 φως: presumably Telephus.}


12 προτροπάδην. Line-initial at B. 16.304 προτροπάδην φιλάνθροπον; cf. Pl. 4.94, SH 946.5; Nonn. Dion. 34.257. A. R. 2.143 has περιτροπάδην; Oppian has ὁπο- and ἄπο-.  

ἀνέκλεινον. Hes. fr. 165.14–15 M. – W. αὐτάρ Τῆλεφος | έτραπ’ Άργιοι γυναικοτριών | ... . . . μελανειάς ἐπ’ αγαμὰ; Pl. O. 9.72–3 δὴ ἀλλέκαστα Δαυακός τρίσας ἄλανον / πρόμαχας Τῆλεφου ἐμβολεῖ; Apollod. Bibl. Epit. 3.17 τοις Μύσοις καθόπλεξας ἐπ’ τὰς ναύς κυνέων τοῖς Εὐλαμεῖ. Taken alone, the traces would allow either ἀνέκλεινοι or ἀνέκλεινον. The former would mean 'turn off' or 'aside' (Od. 19.539), or 'turn back' (A. 1.68). At Xen. Aned. 2.2.16 and Theocr. 7.130 ἀποκλάειν means 'turn aside' or 'off the road'; differently, Stesich. PMGF 21.14 ἀπείκεν δ’ ἄρ’ αὐτήν Γαμβρίδος. In Homer ἀνεκλάλκον never means 'lay low', i.e. 'kill', as καλά does (cf. II. 3.57 Τρίσας δ’ ἐκέλευον Δαυακό; Od. 9.99 Κόλπος κλών σαμακάλετε Άργιοι), though some at least of the ancient commentators think it means 'turn aside' i.e. 'put to flight'. At Od. 11.525 (ἀνεκλάλκον πυκνῶν λόγων) it means 'suspend or delay an action'. If that were the sense here, then the point would be that the Myrians did not annihilate the Argives, but only hindered them from attaining their goal, Troy (cf. 16).

ἐννυχνίασθαι Άργιοι: so typically in B. (2.17, etc.) and Od. (2.72, etc.); the latter (but not the former) also has the completion ἐπέρα (2.402, etc.).  

13 ἀπερχόμεν. They were glad to reach shelter, finding welcome relief and conveyance in their ships; accord-
similar phenomenon in -ec stems (West, Studies 96), while the neuter plural in -ea could equally be taken as monosyllabic in Thgn. 179 and Sol. 4.34 (cf. West, Studies 97), as it is in XXX 2507 = Adesp. eleg. 61 (but see intro. above) 12 δακρούντας β' ἔπες (West, CQ 80 (1996) 22). For contracted e + a (whether long or short) see Archil. fr. 10.2 επ' ἐπέας; fr. 13.7 ἡμέρας (cf. short -ae in non-contracted ἡμέρα etc. transmitted sometimes in the Homeric text: Chanthr. I 269). Emending to de {c} νεάς at the caesura is ruled out by metre; reading επέας is ruled out by the traces. The scribe’s acute accent over e shows that eac is not to be read.


[ἐκκέμφαν. Or [ἐφιγομ (M. L. West). The Argives reach their ships after the retreat, the conclusion of the action on Myssian soil and of this stage of the story.

14 παῖδες τ' ἀδανάτων καὶ ἄδελφοις: ‘sons of immortals and brothers’, a striking collocation. Cf. II. 15.9.177 τρεῖς γὰρ τ' ἐν Κρόνων εἶμι καὶ ἄδελφοι oúκ τέκετο Τία; A. R. 3.652 ἄδελφοι ήθε τοιής. Agamemnon and Menelaus (who were alternately leaders: see 15) could hardly be called ‘sons of immortals’, in the way that, say, the Dioscuri or Achilles could. But Homer frequently adverts to Greek heroes as ἐνεκ' Ἀχιλλῶν (II. 1.162, 2.72, 4.114, 6.255; Od. 2.115, 3.104, 4.285, 8.514), to specific warriors as ἐνεκ' Ἀργο (II. 2.512, 9.82), and once to the Τρώων καὶ Ἀχιλλῶν ἐνεκ' (Od. 24.36), of which the present expression may be an analogous expansion based on cases like Achilles. Cf. West on Hes. Thgn. 240 τέκνα θεῶν.


15 ὅδοι ἐπ' ἑλεθήντων ἄδελφοι παραθέλει. Completion depends on whether para is taken alone or as part of a compound, and in the former case, with what follows or as postpositive: ε. g. ὅδοι πάρα θ' μονάδων δέλεων. But it is equally attractive to take ὅδοι with βλαβοθέτει in the sense ‘hindered, blocked from/on their journey’ (i.e. to Troy) as at Od. 1.195 πολ' ἄρνετοι κελεύουσα (cf. II. 15.489 βλαβοθέτατο βέλεων, 657 τιν' δ' γ' ἐν βλαβθείς πένθ' ὑπότειν, then para... + verb in tmesis. Alternatively we could have para with τι'ν (a), e.g. τι'ν (R. Janko) ἀδίκιόντων or ἐπέβασων or ἀδίκειαν. Likewise: τι'ν ἄλληντο ('wander, roam about like a beggar’ (LSJ s.v.; plpf- Eur. And. 306 in lyrics, of the army around Troy), and τι'ν ἐπαλαυτόν (Od. 4.81, 15.401, ‘wander about or over’) seem worthy of consideration. In any case, a verb is essential (thus not [τι'ν ἐπάλαγσε].

16—21 The Argives, we are told, had in fact lost their way en route to Troy. At first they wandered by the sea shore, then sallied forth, ‘breathing fury’ across Mysian land in search of Troy. We seem to have a recapitulation of the story from the beginning, this time stressing the military ambitions of the Argives, presumably leading to the reversal subsequently suffered by Telephus.

According to the standard version (e.g. Σφιξ fr. 20 Bernábé, Apollod. Βιβλ. Epit. 3.17), Telephus, when he faced Achilles, did not stand his ground, but turned and fled. Can Archilochus have deviated? Of all versions, only Dictys does not represent Telephus as fleeing from Achilles when he is wounded: e.g. Σφιξ fr. 20 (l. cf. ΠΙ) Bernábé ὁμοφαντός δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ Ἀχιλλῶν καὶ μείνας ἔδωκεν ἐν δ' τῶν τριῶν εμπλακείς ἀμφότερος κήλουσεν τὸν μηρὸν τιτροκράτητος, νεμέσκετος αὐτῶν Διονύσου, ὅτι ἁρά ἐπὶ τοῦτον τῶν τιμῶν ἄφηρεν: schol. Λυκοφρ. 206, 211; Apollod. Βιβλ. Epit. 3.17 ὁμοφαντός δ' Ἀχιλλῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἀμφότερος κήλουσεν; and implied by Philostor. Ἀτ. 23.24; cf. Dictys 2.3. II 214: (Powell, Collectanea Alexandrina, Epica Adespota 3 ‘Telephi epyllium’ pp. 76—8) advert to the vine-shoot over which Dionysus made Telephus stumble while fleeing from Achilles (λέβη ποιημένη ἔποιης ἀμφότερος, cf. κήλουσεν), a familiar Dionysiac motif (epiphany and wine-miracle), also mentioned or alluded to by the other versions (cited above, cf. ΠΙ L 8.49 Μύκων ἀμπελόν). Apollod. Βιβλ. Epit. 3.17, Philostor. Ἀτ. and Dictys rationalistically omit explicit mention of Dionysus; Philostoratus does not mention the vine-shoot, but his narrator is a vine-dresser, ἀμπελουργός, named Μέιρας. No reference to the vine-shoot (variously called κήλος, Λίζα ἀμφότερος, τρωόν νάι) is preserved here. Was it mentioned in 24 ff, or may it simply have been assumed in the description at 18—21 as part of the event, just as there is no mention of ‘Telephus’ slaying of Thersander in 5—12? An Attic red-figure calyx crater (St. Petersburg, Hermitage B 1843 = St. 1275 = ARV² 23.5, 6510 bc) shows that Dionysus was present at the scene of the battle from early times (C. Bauchhenss-
The narrator of Philostratus’ Heroicus says (13.4-14.1, 23.1, 23.24) that Telephus lost his shield in the battle (to Protesilaus); it also figures in the account of Dares Phrygius (16; given up to protect Teuthras). If this were due (as in the other accounts above) to a theophany of Dionysus in the form of a vine-shoot, it would have an obvious parallel with Archil. fr. 5, in which the poet says he lost his shield by a bush, not of his own volition (2-3 παρά θείμοι κάλλεπτον πάντες δέθλουσ). Cf. Paus. 4.16.4-5 (Aristomenes). That Archilochus had narrated the losing of a shield in more than one poem was suggested by A. Kerkhecker, Archilochus fr. 139 West: Another ‘dōmēstik Poem’, ἹΡΕ 111 (1996) 26. Cf. also Adesp. iamb. 38.8-9.

17 ἒκποιότοι ... πόλις: i.e. the Mysian capital.

17 ἐπανί τε πόλις. In the Homeric poems ἐπανί only at II. 3.64 (διόρτ’ ἐπανί πρώτερ χρονεύς Ἀχροδίητος); otherwise they have ἐπανίνον in this sense (cf. Hes. Thes. 970 ἐπανί παλάτης; h. Mec. 153, 426; h. Apollo. 477).

In Archil.: fr. 1.2 καὶ Μουσικῷ ἐπανί δόρου ἐπιστάμενος (cf. X.XX 2507 10) and (of a place, as here) in fr. 22.2 (of Thasos) χώρος ... οὐδ’ ἐπανί; Minn. fr. 9.3 ἐπανί Κολοφώνα; Simonides HeG 11.40 Ἑλεκτρίω τῆς ἐπανί πεδίου; PMG Adesp. 922.14 ὑπ’ ἐπανί; cf. Od. 11.275 ὑπερ’ πολιορκήτου, Solon fr. 4.21 πολιορκήτου ἄστε; ὑπερκύκλους in lyric (Sappho fr. 16.17 of her beloved’s δῆμος) and in elegy: Thgn. 242, 569, 778, 1044, 1131, 1348; Minn. fr. 9.3, Solon fr. 25.1; Τυρ. fr. 10.28, 29; Simonides HeG 27.5 ἐπανί ἔρατον.

18 ἐξῆβα (R. Janko). Line-initial at Od. 22.203; i.e. they arrived at the city of Teuthras (17), where, despite (18 δήμος) their valourous ardour, they ended up in great distress of spirit (19 ἀκήξεις).

18 βελός (R. Janko). Line-initial at Od. 22.203; i.e. they arrived at the city of Teuthras (17), where, despite (18 δήμος) their valourous ardour, they ended up in great distress of spirit (19 ἀκήξεις).

μέγας πνεύματος. In the Homeric poems with μέγας singular only at Od. 22.203 (also Q. S. 13.80; Rhianus C4 36.1 μέγας πνεύματεν Ἀμύνατα) but in the Iliad the plural (μέγες πνεύματες) exclusively appears, and the continuation Ἀμύνατοι is preferred (3.8, 11.508, 24.364, cf. 2.596, all at line-end). Cf. Τυρ. fr. 10.24 θεῶν ἀποσύνεντον ἄλκμαν ἐν κοίτῃ; still different is Archil. fr. 196a.32 δήμος μέγας; cf. in tetrameters fr. 98.16 ἄλλων δήμῳ ἀράμει.

δημος. δήμος? (‘nevertheless’, with 18 πνεύματος, i.e. in spite of their valourous spirit’; Archil. fr. 89.16 ἄλλο δήμῳ θανὼν), or ἄλλος? (‘equally’, with a following verb).

αὐτὴ ἀκήξεις. Their names were not well accommodated. Unless we assume αὑτής ἐπανί (‘against them’), the Argeives, the Argives πνεύματος μέγας could never take an indirect object in this way), we will be left with αὑτής (‘the Argeives themselves’, i.e. in addition to and as a match for the defending Mysians in 5-12?) and supplying an additional object completing the line, e.g. καὶ Ἀργα (a difficult double conception: cf. Aesch. Agam. 376 Ἀργα πνεύματος, pardoned by Aristoph. Aa. 1016 πνεύματεν δόρῳ καὶ λόγχης) or an additional subject (αὑτής πε[τ] ἑπί καὶ ἱππο; cf. Aesch. Sept. 393). Professor Parsons attractively suggests αὑτης ἐκείνου (of hand to hand fighting), after which we would need a verb (of motion? ἐλθαν; cf. Τυρ. fr. 11.12 αὐτοκελεῖθη ... ἔπεσα) governing the ἐπί clause.

19 ἔπεσα ... ἐπεσα (R. Janko). Thgn. 204, 386, 404, 546, 690, 6237, 810; P. Q. 7.24, P. 2.30, L. 6.29; cf. P. 11.26. The orthography of Archil. fr. 127 θηλακόσ (cf. E. 9.116 with Clem. Alex.) could be held against this, but genre might determine the difference. However, the descender below the line requires φ rather than θ thus δήφι αὐτής (Hes. Qb. 144).


ἀκήξεις ... ἐπανί (R. Janko). δημοκτησία; with v.l. δημοκτησία; After αἰσθήσεως the writing shifts slightly to the right at a rough patch on the kollesis (compare the spacing below in 22 κατάθεν), then a trace compatible with κ, followed by the lower left corner of a round letter. The verb here seems to reiterate the idea of 10 μιχρόμενοι, and then the action continues from that point. A framing device?

20 φαντασμα. (M. L. West), in the sense ‘thought’ (LSJ 1b). Particles are not listed among conjunctions by West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (cf. pp. 102-3, 112). τε occurs in Archilochus’ elegies in fr. 17 (πῶνες τεχνίης θετοὶς μελητῆ τε βροτηίς). δέκτε τε is conjectured for Archilochus by West in the iambic fr. 43.2 (index s.v. τε
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'epicum'). yap occurs no less than six times in Archilochus' elegiacs (and even more frequently in his other metres): frs. 3.4, 4.8, 10.4, 11.1 (στέ τε γάρ), 13.3 (τοίχες γάρ), 5 (ἀλλά θεοί γάρ). Cf. γάρ τε (Thgn. 288).

ὡκίσουν Τρώων πόλιν. Of Troy: B. 16.638 = 21.544 ὡκίσουν Τρώων; Ibycus PMGF S151.14 Τρωίας θ' ὡπίσθιον; of Thebes: II. 6.416. As in the Iliad, the Argives labour under the mistaken impression that Myssia is Troy. Pausanias 1.4.6: among the great achievements of the Pergamenes is το ἐς τοὺς κόν Άγαμέμνον Τηλέμον τόλμημα (Telemus' 'exploit') δε 'Ελληνες ἀμαρτώντες Άγαμόν τὸ πεδίον ελεφάστων τὸ Μήδον ὡς γῆν Τρωάδα.

eic[++] -- : eliaμακέθαι (II. 22.17 Τηλων εἰκασικέθαι), eliανβαϊνειν lacks the hostile sense required here (though cf. II. 10.493 of trampling on corpses).

21 καὶλιμ[φ]ηγ' δ' (Nomn. D. 5.198, 15.171, 16.76)?


On this basis a reconstruction such as the following for 16–21 might be hazarded:

οἶ δὲ τότε βλασφήμεντες δοῦν παρὰ θ[ιν' ἀφίκοντο.

Τε ὁμοραίοι δ' ἐρατὴν πρὸς πόλιν [ὁ]ρ[υ]μένοι,

ἐλθ' ἵνα μέγεντες δόμοι αὐτοῖ[ι] τε καὶ ἵππου


20 φ].usermodel[φ]ηγ' δ' ἐπάτευν Μυσίδα πυροφόρον γ.'

'On that occasion, because they had lost their way, they arrived at the sea shore. And they rushed toward the lovely city of Teuthras, where, snorting fury along with their horses, they themselves had to retreat in great distress of spirit. For they thought they were approaching the high-gated city of Troy, but they had their feet on the wheat-bearing soil of Myssia, land of fair growth.'

22 Someone shouts (something?) out: Achilles' war-cry? Heracles' exhortation to his son? Telephus crying out in pain or prayer? Then suddenly mention of a father in 25, where πατρὶ χαριζόμενος might describe e.g. Telephus having or endeavouring to live up to his divine ancestry.

βοῶν: the subject must be the person (or god?) who encounters the 'brave [son]' in or before the pitched battle in 23 (δορίων ἐν πολέμου). In theory this could be any of the heroes: cf. II. 13.123 Ἑκτόρ . . . βοῶν ἄγαθος ('of the great war-cry'), but also often e.g. of Nestor. But one suspects the presence of Heracles or Achilles here. The first preserved trace suggests e: thus perhaps 22:

'Ηρακλῆς ἄνα τῆλες ἐν στῆρι ταῦτα καβοδίν [σινω'...
6. A name is expected at the beginning of 22 or 23. Those of Dionysus or Achilles cannot be made to fit the traces in 22 (and Dionysus, in the standard account; makes his appearance in the form of the vine-shoot).

βοῶν: Achilles’ war-cry? He might have shouted out when he encountered Telephus in battle: so Achilles, in concert with Athena, shouts as he returns to battle after the death of Patroclus at ii. 8.217–18 ἐδόθα ἐκά ἔρωτι, ἀπέτρεθε δὲ Παυλίσος Ἀθηρή / φθόγγον; cf. Odysseus before the house of Circe at Od. 10.311 ἐδόθα ἔρωτι ἐβόνα; Aristophanes’ Lamachus (who returns without his shield, a comic stand-in for both Achilles and Telephus) says he heard a βοῶν πολεμιστρατηγὸς (Αἰσχρ. 572). Or an auditory epiphany of a god? cf. Heracles’ voice at the end of Philoctetes (1449 φθόγγον): Eur. Bacch. 1197 διόνυσος ἄφθονος: "οὐ ναόνδες," etc.Appearances of divinities occur elsewhere in Archilochus, at least twice on the battle-field: frr. 94 (epiphany of Athena fighting διὸς παραπτωματικῆς, "propitiously by their side"); 93.4 (Sosethes inscription) πὴ μ᾽ ἐκέκοι Ἐρμῆς (T. Zielinski, Raccolta . . . Ramonio (Milano 1927) 605, comparing Hor. C. 2.7.13). According to the sculptural remains, both Heracles and Dionysus appeared in the battle between Achilles and Telephus which Paus. 8.45.7 says formed the centre-piece of the west pediment of the Temple of Athena Alea at Tegae (395–404); see Bauchhans-Thüräcl 37–8; according to J. Boardman et al., Griechische Kiinst (Munich 1966) 177, the two deities were ranged behind Achilles and Telephus respectively.

τῇ [...] βοῶν τὰλα[κ]άρδιον. For the alliteration see on 4 φυγεῖν φευγέοι. The articulation is hardly certain: τοῦ βοῶν would not be an impossible compound, although there is no lack of compounds with τοῦ- in epic (cf. LS) s.v. τοῦ βοῶν). Τῇ[ε] βοῶν could be tried (cf. Apollod. Bibli. 2.3.5), but the mythical ‘Teleboeans’ have no relevance here. τῇ = τοῦτος, τοῦθεν, τοῦθα is common enough. If τῇ[ε] βοῶν is correct, we would have a play, underscored by alliteration, on Telephus’ name of the φίγον ετησιακά variety. According to Dichtys 2.3, Achilles wounded Telephus with his spear-throw after spying him, tangled in the vine-shoot, from a distance (προκλητικῶς), which could be related to τῇ[ε] βοῶν here. This might lend support for the editors of SH against J. Lightfoot (Parthenicius of Nicæa (Oxford 1999) 197–8) in seeing a figura etymologica in Parthenius’ reference (fr. 98 Lightfou = SH 650) to Telephus by the epithet ἀργεδόπτης, deriving it (following Aristarchus) from (ἐ)γιγαρής, and Τήλεφος < τῆλεφανής, ‘seen from a distance’ (either by Teuthras in Mycia, or by the Argives when they mistook Mycia for the Troads, or because of T.’s good looks), in contrast to the far more widely-known derivation of T.’s name from θηλή and οἰνός. For etymological elements in Archilochus, see fr. 26: Ἀπολλων < ἄπολλομα (an etymology cited by Archilochus already by Apollod. Athen. FGrHist 244 F 95.10; Pfeiffer, Hist. Class. Schol. i 62 n. 1, cf. 14). However, Philostratus (Hist. 23.24) implies that Achilles jumped on him as Proteuslaus seized his shield: τῶν δὲ Ἀχιλλείας γυμνῶν προστεκότα τρόμοι αὐτῶν εὐθὺ τοῦ μονος; cf. Ovid Met. 13.171–2 Telephus hasta / pugnantem domum, which suggests close combat; still different is ιππότης γενόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀχι lle τοῦ αυτοῦ ἐπτελέος ἐν κυπροσδιδότης αὐτῶν τοῦ ἔτει κατὰ Διονύσου πρόσωποι καὶ πεπώντος εἰς γης.

ταλα[κ]άρδιον: ‘of enduring heart.’ Of Heracles at line-end: Stat. 424 (quoted below), ταλακάρδιος is not Homeric: Bacchyl. fr. 62 (a. 3 (context mostly lost); of Oedipus: Soph. OC 540 (‘minerable’); FGE ‘Simonides’ XI (b. 1 ἦν ἄρα κακαίου ταλακάρδιος. The compound is very rare’ (Page).}

[σιλα, Stat. 424 Δίως ταλακάρδιος ποῦς (= Heracles). For accusative with βοῶν see LS s.v. II.2; Pl. P. 6.32–6 of Nestor, his chariot entangled with his horse (32 ἄριστον ἐπεθανατο) calling out to his son Antilochus (36): / ὡς 

φαύνα 

όφρα (H. Pellicia). The completion [ῆον might be considered (but we expect the uncontracted accusative ἔρως as in epic).

23 ... βοῶν: A summary or direct quotation of what is shouted out in 22 e.g χειρονοι oδιβον (M. L. West). Or ἄρα λαβει (W. Burket)? Then ἄρα λαβει, as in 11 (M. L. West).

δηλου ἐν [ταλακάρδ]ον. II. 5.117: at end of pentameter: Tyrt. fr. 11.18 ἄρα θώραχον φιάγοντος δήλου ἐν πολέμων. For δῆλου cf. 4 n.; Archil. fr. 58.3, 69.3 δῆλους; 139. δήλουςα ἐμῇ].

24 δηλοῦσι. Perhaps δηλοῦσι (R. Janko). Reading δηλοῦσι τούτω, ‘with/for oaths against them’ (the additional letter i allowed by space, but just) would be a violation of Hilberg’s law, having word-end after a contracted second biceps (so also Archil. fr. 2.1, but there it is a monosyllabic appositive: cf. West, GAI 26). Dr Hollond-Strevens suggests ὄρκοντοκείοι, which is palaeographically attractive, though an addendum lexicon, and of irregular formation, since the idiom is ὄρκον τέμνον ὄρκοντοκείοι (Schol. ll. 19,197), with presumed adjustment to fit the metre (cf. Timoc. PAM 729.2 ὄρκισταιμ; Poll. i.39 ὄρκισταιμ) — leaving the choice between the awkward rhythm
or the malformed word. \( \delta \phi \gamma \) - is strongly suggested by the traces. Could the reference be to Agamemnon's oaths (accompanying his sacrifices to Dionysus described by Lycophr. 206–15 with schol.), now rewarded by the god? Or did Telephus utter oaths that would prevent the Argives from sailing successfully to Troy without Telephus as a guide? Neither of these is attested, but the theme of the breaking of oaths and oaths against one's enemies resonates elsewhere in Archilochus' verses.


25. ταξιν: Telephus' father Heracles (rather than his adoptive father Teuthras).

χιλακτικευτικα - suits the traces and seems very likely, perhaps χαριζόμενον or, if Telephus is now the subject, χαριζόμενος; Archil. fr. 6 ξένων διαμεῖν ὑπογ. χαριζόμενον; Hes. Theog. 580 χαριζόμενος Δίος πατρί.

28. φίλων, φίλων, φίλων - and much else could be thought of in the context. An immortal parent? One of the immortals: Dionysus?

Fr. 2–8

Placement relative to fr. 1, VI 854, and XXX 2507 is uncertain, being dependent on the extent (unknown) of the accounts on the front. Fr. 3 could be ranged vertically beneath fr. 2, both containing line-ends and line-beginnings of two successive columns; fr. 4 could be ranged beneath these as line-ends of col. i of fr. 2–3 (fr. 3 and 4 have distinctly smaller writing at line-ends than does fr. 2). This much is consistent with the fibre-patterns and remains of the accounts on the fronts, although not proven by them. Fr. 8 and fr. 6–7 could be ranged horizontally as line-beginnings and middle parts of the same lines, or of the line-ends in fr. 2, though neither of these two possibilities is particularly supported by the accounts and horizontal fibres on the fronts.

Regular alternation of long and short lines points to elegiacs. This seems likely for fr. 2, possible for fr. 3, but frs. 4 or 5 are hardly a large enough sample to establish regularity. In careful copies (like the Hawara Homer, more regular than the present hand) consecutive hexameters may show final variation of at least six letters, so due caution is in order.

Recoverable here and there are elements that concern sea-faring. Assuming relative proximity of frs. 2–8 to each other (arguable for frs. 2–5, less certain in 6–8), a narrative could be constructed around the fantasy of a shipwreck: references to 'running aground', 'shelter', 'courage' (or 'strength' or 'virtue'), 'cowardice' (or 'disaster'), together with mentions of Poseidon, 'darkness' (of death or the unknown), and 'bleached bones'. Among other contexts, these might fit Archilochus' elegy on the drowned Parians (frs. 8–12, cf. 13 — possibly the poem alluded to by Longinus 10.7 οὐκ ἄλλος ὁ Ἀρχιλόχος ἐπὶ τοῦ ναυσιδίου, though this is not certain; the iambic frs. 21 ὅψασθε ἔριτρον ἑαυτῶν ἐν ἀγνάκασιν, 212 ἴτην κατ’ ἥνη κύκλωμα τὸ κάκαμον, and Tzetzes Alleg. 125f in quoting fr. 215 show that Archilochus treated such disasters at sea, and this particular disaster, in more than one poem and genre). However that may be, the story of the Mysian battle recounted in fr. 1 is also framed at the beginning and end by misadventures at sea (Cypria arg. Procl. Chrest. 80, fr. 20 Bernabé), so it cannot be excluded that frs. 2–8 belong to the same narrative context as fr. 1 (cf. fr. 2 i 3).

Fr. 2, col. i

Elegiacs (alternating uneven line-ends).

1. ἐξόφλησιν ἔσχαλα γίνεται at home in the elegy on the drowned Parians (Archil. fr. 10–12), but could also be metaphorical: see e.g. Aesch. Suppl. 43B, Ag. 666. Either sense would suit an account of the Mysian battle. ὅ suits the trace somewhat better than ὅ, but unaugmented forms are impossible in elegiacs. Perhaps thus ἐξισομεῖναι or ἐξιλαμεῖν, producing a spondaic fifth foot. In this case ἐξίω, ἐξί, ἐςκα τελέσσαι are other possibilities.

2. ἐς: compatible with pentameter-end at Adesp. eleg. 21. Ζείην πάντων αὐτὸς ὀρφανός μούνος ἔχει. ἔχει.

3. σκέπασα τόν ἄνδρον (M. L. West; cf. Od. 9.361), or σκέπασα τόν σινς? Od. 5.443 = 7.282 = 12.336 ἐπὶ σκέπασα ἄνδρον; 6.210 ἐπὶ σκέπασα ἄνδρον. The letter following σκέπασα, however, cannot be τ, and the trace distinctly suggests ρ. For σκέπασα: Hes. Ὀμ. 532 τοσσόν ἄνδρον πικάνων κεπθάμουες ἐχόμει. Ancient commentators and grammar-
ians held it to be ‘in the poets’ a poetic accusative in apocope. For ἑ[πίπης, ‘spear-throw’ (sc. Ἀχιλῆς;) see e.g. II. 12.452 = Od. 8.192 πό τό ρημῆς.

4 πατήρ. That this is the same father as in fr. 1.25 (cf. 22) is hardly a necessary conclusion. Archilochus (fr. 11) named his sister’s husband as among the dead in the elegy on the drowned Parians (see frs. g, 11, cf. 215).

5 ἴσημενος [. . .:] also resolvable as ἴση̣μενος [. . .:], but this would require a monosyllabic word at line-end, and the obvious possibilities like τε and ὡς do not fit the traces. θῦ or θῆνες?


Fr. 3 col. i

Elegiacs? (uneven line-ends in 2–3, cf. 6). The ends of 1 and 2 both show spondaic shapes at line-end (shortening of αι by correction could be considered, but the end of 1 is equidistant with that of the hexameter in 2, and αι in adjectives in -αικ in epic is regularly treated as long). If so, a pentameter has dropped, not unparallelled in transmission of elegies (see LXVI 4503 front fr. 2 7b–8b with n.). The writing in fr. 3 is distinctly smaller than in frs. 1–2 and 4–8. Marginal scholia might be suspected, but the same diminution in size of writing also appears in frs. 4–5, which show the tell-tale uneven line-ends of elegiac verses. The circumflex accent in fr. 3 1 3, a short line (pentameter) suggests that we have verses here.

1 ἔννοιαίοις: sc. Poseidon (who, according to one ancient etymology, ever ‘washes the earth/shore’ with his waves). He got at least one mention in the elegy on the drowned Parians: Archil. fr. 12 ἵδ’ σκότος / ἐν πατρῴαν τιθείοισιν ἀνδρῶν λίπη Κοίτανος ἄπτονες Ποσειδίζουν.

2 [. . .]ς. Traces suggest ἰσχεμένος. A first-person verb? Exhortation? (cf. fr. 1.4 n.). Other possible articulations are -γος μὲν or -γα μεν ὤν.


6 Although the surface survives (where we expect the longer hexameter ending), it is possibly stripped of ink here.

Fr. 3 col. ii

6-8 In margin, coroins: same shape as in fr. 6 and VI 854 (see introd. above).

Fr. 4

Elegiacs (alternating uneven line-ends).

3 δὴ περὶ πασε[λ] / + verb? (for the enjambment with this position of the verb in the pentameter in Archilochus’ elegiacs see frs. 3.2, 11.2, 13.4, 8, 10). δῆμο in the sense of ut: Archil. fr. 106.4; in the sense of δαμ: 7x Thgn.; 1x Mimm. Simonides Tyrt. Xenoph.

Fr. 5

Elegiacs? (uneven line-ends? no trace of intervening line, but spacing is consistent with lineation in frs. 1–4 assuming we have line ends of hexameters, beyond the point where ends of the pentameters would be visible). Only this fragment (out of the 10, including VI 854 and XXX 2507) shows no writing on the front, perhaps fortuitously (top or bottom margin, intercolumnium, or other blank space in the formatting of the accounts?).

Fr. 6

Status as verses and position in line are uncertain; not middles of verses. 9 ἔτι τε/α ἄει [νωδ] could end a hexameter, but there may be the end of a παράγραφος after 3, in which case we would have near-beginnings of lines (cf. 11 n.).

10 Λ. Υ. Apparently a variant entered superscript; it is difficult to be certain that the original letter (ι? α?) was not cancelled, but there is no sign of this.

11 could be read as Archil fr. 16 W. πάντα τίχη κ'αι μοίρα, Περίπλευξε, ἀνδρὶ διδοκιν.

Fr. 7

Position in line, verses uncertain. This fragment could be aligned horizontally so as to form parts of the same lines as those of fr. 6. However, this is not obviously confirmed by the accounts and horizontal fibres on the fronts, whether fr. 7 is placed on the left or right of fr. 6 (see also above on frs. 2–8).

Fr. 8

Line-beginnings. No way to confirm elegiacs.

1–4 In margin, coronis: same shape as in fr. 3 col. ii and VI 854 (see introd. above): paragraphus in centre after 1 (as in fr. 3 col. ii and VI 854). Large dot in margin is more likely a blob on the hooked end of coronis than a stichometric point, which would be expected against and not between the levels of the lines.

1 Ε. Excipit; if elegiacs, a pentameter: The trace apparently excludes Archil. fr. 5-4 ἐπρέπειος, and any other pentameter of Archilochoi or Adesc. eleg., that could end a sentence.

2 ο[λφ]. Incipit. α[δ] cf. Archil. fr. 13.6 ἄρα φίλα'.

5 ε[π] or ε[π] or ε[ξ].

5–6 In the margin, apparently the same top hook (over left and back down) of a coronis as appears in fr. 3 ii 6–8 and symmetrically (hook under right and back up) in the bottom halves of the coronides above at 1–4 and in VI 854 1–4. To judge from the height of the top half of the coronis preserved in fr. 3 ii 6–8 (and similarly the bottom halves of the coronides at 1–4 above and VI 854 1–4) and the level of the top of the second coronis here, the centre of this second, partially preserved coronis (where it will presumably have coincided with a paragraphus as at 1–2 above and VI 854 1–2) would have fallen after the first line after v. 6, thus making a poem of six lines. Assuming elegiacs, a poem of three distichs contrasts markedly with the length of the poem preserved only in part in fr. 1.

D. OBBINK

4709. Lyric Verses in ‘Doric’

15 2B.37/A(d) 8 x 7.7 cm Second century Plate 1

A scrap with remains of two columns, written along the fibres. Tantalizing hints of the Trojan war: col. i, Pylians (or Nestor), possible reference to Odysseus (3), ditches; col. ii: the son(s) of Atreus, Pylians again, Eurybates (who may be speaking), sea, ships. Style and structure remain uncertain; direct speech may be present in both columns (see below on i 10, ii 6). Dialect and diction do not exclude an attribution to Stesichorus, whose fragments have surfaced before from Oxyrhynchus, e.g., XXXII 2619 + XXXVII 2803, Iliou Persis, and XXIII 2360, Lustoi (but the scansion of this fragment does not seem to match the metrical scheme of any of the known fragments of Stesichorus). If some episode from the war’s aftermath is to be looked for here, Pylians at i 1 and ii 3 bring to mind Telemachus’ visit
there in Od. 3, when Nestor recounts, in the course of his narrative, the end of the war and the Atreidai's disagreement over when to set sail. In Stesichorus 209 PMGF, Helen speaks to Telemachus in a scene reminiscent of Od. 15.164ff.

Parts of the upper margin are preserved (at least 2.4 cm deep). The width of the column is not known; the shortest distance between the two columns comes at line 8 (1.1 cm). Vowel quantity is marked at i 6 (Doric alpha), but no other signs (cf. the practice in 2619, Stesichorus' Iliou Persis). Iota adscript is written at ii 6. Deletion by oblique stroke at ii 7, perhaps with correction entered above the line.

The hand is informal, round, upright with occasional serifs, similar to the second script of Pindar's Pamn at Roberts, GLH 14, dated to about the middle of the second century.

The back is blank.

Col. i

| πυλιον | επειατρει | ερυβατας |
| χναυ | κυνπαιδι | φωναιδε |
| νερποτον | πυλιων | γαρ[[π]]ελαο |
| αμφω | οκλαν | τεκαιανιο |
| άρα | ευρυβατας | εκποσβεν |
| παρτ...| ονορυκταν | πελαγοκκ |
| τωνδεμυθων | ναεστεμο | ....[ |

Col. ii

| ιττε |  |
|  |  |

Col. i 1 After o, a stroke in the shape of U with a hook hanging down from its right tip, pointing rightwards 2 , hight horizontal trace (could be cap of e) 3 , , speck 5 , end of a horizontal at the right level for the bar of π, but curving downwards; perhaps the serif on the right arm of γ 6 , , high trace, then long shallow curve at line-level, as of μ 7 ...[ feet of four letters, the middle two in the shape of a very gentle λ, ζζ, etc. The right slope of the last λ is drawn out 8 ...[ second, low descender; then, enough space for a very narrow letter, e.g. π (there is a speck of ink to the right of the lower tip of the descender, but it is too low to be part of a letter)

Col. ii 1 , foot of Α or Α 2 , tall upright 4 , letter feet, a short upright, then a tiny circle 5 , the lower arc is missing, but Ν is excluded 6 , , beginning of a horizontal at the right level for the bar of π, τ, etc. 7 [τ] , τ is crossed by an oblique; above it and towards the left, a very short horizontal (perhaps a serif?), then a hole 9 there is a horizontal tear in the papyrus to the left of the line 10 , , ink speck on the line 11 , the papyrus breaks off here; four apices: first a tiny loop, perhaps a or the right part of μ; then, tip of a diagonal rising towards the right, followed by a diagonal falling towards the right.
The second and third traces almost touch at their highest points. The fourth trace is like the second, but even less fighting under Antilochos (17.704), feature in Nestor's remembrance of his youth (7.133 ff., n.66gff., 23.629!?.)

Then the end of a horizontal, running into a baseless triangle, 6A or e«.

There were also stories of Pylos without Nestor. Melampous drove the cattle of Phylakos to Pylos for Neleus (II).

Aet.

Iliad, 422, Call.

the Pylians, besides Phil.

1.248, 4.293, Soph.

fr. 82.3). In the a specific reference to Nestor (cf.


2 Presumably τ]χεναν rather than e.g. λαχεων or άραχεων; cf. next note.

3 πολύκροτος: probably 'clever' rather than 'ringing loud'. The adjective is applied to Odysseus (Hes. fr. 198.3 Μ-\W; schol. Ar. Nah. 260 and Eust. on Od. 1.1); cf. Call. Att. fr. 67.3 αύτως 'Ερως εδιδαξεν Άδωνιν... τέχνην—ου γαρ ήγ' ἐκει πολύκροτος.

5 άγνως, or ] παμφώος[v-]. The adjective παμφώος is not found in Homer; it is often used by Pindar to describe musical sounds; cf. I. 5.26ff. ἐπ τε φαρωγρ'ςεκέν ἐν αὐλών τε παμφώοις ὀμωκλαίς, O. 7.12, P. 3.17, 12.19.

6 διμολαίν seems likely: Homeric in martial contexts, e.g. II. 12.413 ὑπ' ἐφαβ', α' δὲ ἀνάκτος ὕποδεικνυται διμολαίν. 16.147; or, in relation to music. Pind. I. 5.26ff. (quoted in the last note), Aesch. fr. 57.5 Radt: Dionysiac music, μάλιστα ἔηναι παμφώοις διμολαίν.

8 Prima facie πάρ τάδ[ρ]ϊων ὀρφετά (or πάρ)παρ. Hes. Th. 518; cf. Mastronarde on Eur. Phoen. 120), but 'ditch' is always singular in Homer. τάφρος ὀρφετα occurs seven times in the Iliad, twice with the preposition παρα, but in the accusative case: παρα τάφρον ὀρφετα (II. 9.67, 20.49). In tragedy, τάφρος does not occur with the Homeric epithet ὀρφετα and may be plural or singular: e.g., Soph. Aj. 1279 (plur., cf. Eust. on II. 7.344), Eur. Rh. 111 and 213 (plur.), but ὕμνῳ (sing.). The deviation from the Homeric phrase seems decidedly odd; it is an easy correction to πάρ τάφρον ὀρφετά.

If the setting is Troy, the Achaeans' wall and ditch, built on Nestor's advice (II. 7.336ff), the focus of the fighting up to book 16, were destined to be destroyed after the fall of Troy.

10 Presumably τῶν μᾶθων rather than τῶν δὲ μᾶθων. In Homer δὲ occurs almost exclusively in direct speech (Ebeling, s.v., 'eorum qui loquuntur, perraro ipsius poetae dum narrat'). I am inclined to understand μᾶθων as 'words, speech' rather than 'stories, legends'; cf. Aphrodite speaking the prologue in the Hippolytus: δι' έξι τοίς δὲ μᾶθων τῶν ἀλήθεων τάξα (q). It is possible that line 10 belongs in a speech or indicates a speech in the vicinity. Speech openings and closings in Stesichorus include 222(b).232, ὅς φαίνει ἀξιόν μᾶθος ἄναρχει ἐντεύθεν, Sts. 3, S14.4 ff., S148.3 ff., 209.2, 222(b).291.

The rhythm of this line, ---, almost invariably signals verse end in Stesichorus. The bridge in terminal x-...- is apparently never violated (QJCC 17 (1974) 49f).

Col. ii 1 ἑπι' Ατρησία-.
2 κῶν παιδ. [I. παιδ (possibly elided; cf. δαιβ', II. 4. 259); cf. 2360 i 2.
3 Πολυκ. See on 1.1.
4 An ethnic seems likely, e.g., Κεφαλί||λάκων, Ελ||λάκων, Παν-.
5 Perhaps nom. sing. Ἐπιφανής. This name places the poem almost certainly in the context of Troy. Other than the two heralds in Homer, Eurybatides is Herodorus' name for the Argonaut Eriboetes (schol. Ap. Rh. 1.73-4); later, several famous athletes were so named: the first Olympic wrestling champion (Lacedaemonian, 708 bc), a winner in the Olympic foot-race (Athenian, 670 bc), and the Argive pentathlete general at Herodotus vi 92.16, ix 75-3 (ca. 488/7 bc) (see Pape--Benseler, RE VI).

At Troy, however, Eurybatides the herald of Agamemnon is best known for fetching Briseis (II. 1.320; cf. Ovid Her. iii 9, LMIC IV 1 95-7). Either he (Aesch. fr. 212a Mette) or, more likely, Odysseus' herald of the same name is selected by Nestor to accompany the embassy to Achilles (II. 9.170, cf. Hainsworth ad loc.). The latter also stands near Helen in Polygnotus' painting of the fall of Troy as described by Pausanias, who interprets the scene according to a story told by Lesche(ο)ς (s 25.4 - 8 = EGF II. para. F23).
LYRIC VERSES IN ‘DORIC’

6 φωναί δε [ ], cf. Stesichorus 209.2 (= 236ο) ὑδης δ’ ἔτη Ελένη φωναί πιν[ ] παύθ. Οἰδίπεδον[ν, Lobel in his note comments that the Homeric parallels suggest loudness, which would suit here if Eurybates the herald is the speaker. Alternatively, Lobel also suggested the verbal form, φωναί, citing the MSS of Pindar at O. 12.67, X. 10.75 (φώνατε).

7 ἐξα[ ]: this may be ἐξα— ἐκάω (the object being ships rather than anything on land? — but cf. αἰνε in the next line), a form of λάος, or conceivably a personal name, Ἀλαο—.

8 τε καὶ, if that is to be recognized here, is quite common in Stesichorus, e.g. Σ148 Ι81, πινὲ τε καὶ θαλάσσ / [ἐκφραζε] θυμόν. But if we assume from ii 4 that verses could run over to a new line, and if this is direct speech, -τε imperative might be a better bet.

-άνεο- from ἀνεμο, ‘return’, is one possibility; another is ἀνεο[χ]- (e.g. II. 12.111, ἵππος τε καὶ ἴππον), Rhythmically τε καὶ ἀνεο[- makes four successive shorts (improbable in Stesichorean versification), unless synizesis is assumed to scan - τε-; but the problem disappears if we treat the second alpha as long, i.e. Doric ἀνεο[χ]-.

11 E.g., νάετ τέ μοι; or, an aorist form of βλασκεν (μολ-) is conceivably to be recognized (cf. Eur. El. 432 κλεινα νάετ, αἱ ποτ’ ἐβατε Τρόιαν).

J. YUAN

4710. FRAGMENT WITH MUSICAL NOTATION

A scrap with the remains of four lines set to music, written along the fibres. There is nothing on the back. The same scribe wrote both the text and the musical signs in a rapid, flowing, practised hand showing similarities to documentary cursive: Υ, Ρ, Α, Ν made in a single sequence; Λ, Υ, Π, Α, Ε, Α in ligature. The letters are generously set out; blank space may have been used to indicate word-end (2, 4; cf. GMAW2 p. 7 n. 28). The musical signs are normally placed directly above the simple vowel, or in the case of a diphthong, the first note above the first vowel (2, 4). Exceptions are 2 ] + (+ represents an incomplete or uncertain musical note-sign), where the note is late, and 3 ο, where it is early, but these may have been influenced by adjacent notes which are now lost.

The text eludes interpretation. Nothing prevents the metre from being iambic-trochaic. The musical notes are compatible with either the Lydian or Hypolydian key. The unidentified note-sign that resembles a modern quaver appears in 4 (transcribed with ν). It is followed by a leimma with a sigme above (cf. W. A. Johnson, JHS 120 (2000) 81). An oblique stroke in 1 probably served to link a group of notes (see LXV p. 82 and 4466).
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Text
The first letters are so neatly arranged (and enlarged?) that these could be line-beginnings. Music texts were usually written as prose, without colometry; see E. Pohlmann, M. L. West, Documents of Ancient Greek Music (Oxford 2001) 15.

1) θον αν γαρ or θηνον γαρ.
2) The blank space after ν would favour word-end there, ν διεει., [.
3) ξεν πρότ., or possibly, ξεν πρότ.
4) Prima facie, βουλαίς; but the space after βου and the leimma suggest βου λαίς; cf. Φοίβος, Ἀδικ. Ευξ. Phoen. 35.

Music
The only securely read notes are ζ, ι, ζ, Ϋ (inverted Ω), and the so far unidentified ι (see M. L. West, Ancient Greek Music (Oxford 1992) ch. 9 for the system of notation). The first four are compatible with the Lydian, Hypolydian, and Hyperaeolian tonoi, while ι always appears in compositions where the prevailing key is Lydian or Hypolydian. (This note appears on three other musical fragments, Pohlmann and West, Documents of Ancient Greek Music nos. 45, 49, 56. See discussion at Pohlmann and West, 154; LXV p. 82; cf. LIII p. 48.) The Hyperaeolian key would be unusual for a contemporary composition (cf. West, op. cit. 259 n. 9), and none of the three candidates for the first sign in 1 would be at home in it. In the Lydian key, the first sign in 1 can be read as ν (lithanos hypaton), and in 2, ζ rather than ι. The genus would then be enharmonic or chromatic. In the Hypolydian key, θ would represent the diatonic paranete hyperbolaion, the first sign in 1 may then be read as ι (parhypate hypaton); in 2, either ζ (nephe diezeugmenon) or έ (trite diezeugmenon).

In either Lydian or Hypolydian key, the melody moves up a fourth in line 3. In line 2, if the notes are ζ ι ζ rather than ι ζ ι, first up a third, then down a fifth in oye. If the word is (-)δύεις, the fall of a fifth conforms to the principle of relating melodic movement to word accent.

J. YUAN

4711. Elegy (Metamorphoses?)

122/1(a)  
Fr. 1 17.5 x 11 cm  
Sixth century  
Plates II–III

Four fragments of a papyrus codex re-used in a book-binding. The hand is a form of the Coptic uncial, recently discussed by N. Gonis in H. Melaerts (ed.), Papyri in honorem Jo-
47ii. ELEGY (METAMORPHOSES?)

hannis Bingen octogenarii (P. Bingen) (Leuven 2000) 125 ff., with bibliography; one may compare the more formal hand of the Callimachus XX 2258 (GMIV 2 47), assigned to the sixth century. Variations in letter size are common: contrast for example the enlarged ε of fr. 1 ↓ 2 (probably word-initial) and the narrow ο of fr. 1 ↓ 6 (second) and 7 (third) with other examples. c sometimes has a long downward-sloping overhang, as in ℃ in fr. 1 ↓ 8, 9, → 10. αι is written with the tail of α joining τ at mid-line level (fr. 1 ↓ 3, → 10), and ϵ is commonly attached to an upright by an extended cross-stroke. Elision is marked (fr. 1 ↓ 5, 6, 12, 15, → 10, 13, all δ'). A few tremas are found (dividing vowels: fr. 1 ↓ 11, 12, → 13; marking initial υ: fr. 1 ↓ 10, 13). An omitted ι is inserted between consonants at fr. 1 ↓ 15 and omitted οι restored above the line at fr. 1 ↓ 8; what I take to be a more serious corruption at fr. 1 ↓ 13 is left uncorrected. I have silently restored iota adscript, which the scribe consistently omits in both ηι and οι.

The most extensive of the fragments, fr. 1, contains elegiacs, and the same is to be assumed for the others. Fr. 1 has on the ↓ side the story of Adonis (1–6) and, following without connection, that of Asteria (7ff.), on the → side that of Narcissus. Since metamorphosis is mentioned in the first two and may confidently be supplied in the last, it seems natural to assign the fragments to a collection of metamorphoses. Nicander's Ετερωούγενα and Nestor of Laranda's Μεταμορφώσεις were in hexameters; such works as Antigonus' Ἀλλουώσεις (SH 50; T. Dorandi (ed.), Antigone de Caryste: Fragments (Paris 1999) pp. xxi–iii) and the Μεταμορφώσεις of Didymarchus (SH 378A) and Theodorus (SH 749, 750?) would not have been expected to turn up in Egypt at such a late date. There remains Parthenius' Μεταμορφώσεις (SH 636–7; fr. 24 Li.), of which the metre, if indeed it was not in prose, is unknown, but which would provide an obvious home for SH 640 (fr. 28 Li.), elegiacs on Comaetho and Cydnus: cf. E. Rohde, Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer (Hildesheim 1960) 100. There is no evidence that Parthenius anywhere mentioned Narcissus, but SH 654 (fr. 42 Li.) is certainly and SH 641 (fr. 29 Li.; elegy) probably concerned with Adonis, and Stephanus of Byzantium quotes in three places an elegiac Δηλος (SH 620–22; frs. 10–12 Li.), which may I suppose have been a section of the Μεταμορφώσεις. Verses of Parthenius are preserved in P. Gen. inv. 97 (SH 609–14; frs. 2–5 Li.) and P. Lond. Lit. 64 (SH 626; fr. 27 Li.), both parchment codices, dated to iii and iii/iv ad respectively.2

↓
Fr. 1

] λομεσίδ[

1 Stephanus of Byzantium's introduction, (πηγή . . .) περὶ τὴν II. γράφον πάντα τι λέγει καὶ προθείων κτλ., need not imply any more than that his quotation begins in mid-sentence and mid-distich; it provides no support for the view put forward by Martini (on his fr. 22) that the story formed a digression in a longer description of the spring.

2 I am grateful to the British Academy for supporting my work by the award of a Postdoctoral Fellowship.
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Fr. 2

]....ε.[
].οναπ[...

Fr. 3

]....α.[
].ουλυθρο.[
].υθεκέφ[...
].ησπαρ[...
].γ.[...

Fr. 4

]....λ.[
].ομηρ[...
].εδακρυ[...
].νε...[
].με...[
].κ.[

→

Fr. 1

].[...
].ο.[...
].κεραιη.[...

5].[......]
].μβροτο[...][
].ν.[......]
].δ.[......]
].[......]
].οεικέλονε[...

10].ονειχεναπεχθαυρεκ[...][
].ορφής[...][
].ρπηγής[...][
].ψ[...]
].δ'αγλαίν[...
].δωκεδεγαί[...
].φερειν[...

15].[...
].ο.[...
].κεραιη.[...]
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

fr. 2–4: largely obscured by foreign papyrus

fr. 3

5

fr. 4

4. fr. 1 1], specks on edge 2], damaged traces, second perhaps right-hand arc of small circle 3], (third), lower left-hand arc of circle 4], perhaps parts of base and cross-stroke of e or θ 5], (last), high trace close to a, perhaps apostrophe 6], βε, of θ only lower parts, represented by ink and surface damage where ink once stood; trace on line followed by end of cross-stroke touching β 7], lower left-hand arc of circle with specks in place for upper left-hand arc, base, and cross-stroke; specks 8], left-hand arc of circle; base of circle; upright 9], speck at letter-top level 10], µγ, of μ, part of right-hand side of belly and much of tail; ω fairly clear but abraded and with surplus ink (offset?) in middle 11], upright with left-pointing finial at top; on badly damaged surface, touching descender of δ (4), right-hand arc of circle or perhaps upright joined from left at foot, then trace of upright (?); close to π, upright 12], low specs, perhaps lower left-hand corner of α or λ 13], only part of tail 14], end of cross-stroke 15], first upright and part of cross-stroke with another dot higher up belonging to finial on second upright 16], (above line), perhaps two round letters 17], apparently has a short vertical stroke growing out of its cap, no doubt casual 18], trema doubtful 19], high trace close to 20], touching µ, perhaps tip of tail of α 21], specks, perhaps casual π], ink at top does not belong 22], upright unusually tall, omitted at first to judge by spacing 23], dot level with tops of letters 24], traces level with tops of letters, first an upright

Fr. 2 1], left-hand arc and base of circle

Fr. 3 1], traces on line: third, stroke descending from left to right α, foot of upright 2], edge of left-hand arc of circle 4], tip of cross-stroke level with tops of letters 5], trace level with tops of letters 6], top of p, o, or θ
Fr. 4 1 λ, of Α only the fest; base of circle 2 |, traces at mid-letter level, perhaps cross-stroke 3 [ , dot level with tops of letters 4 [ , cross-stroke level with tops of letters; specks; end of cross-stroke level with tops of letters touching upright

→ fr. 1 Severe abrasion and the presence of offsets and scraps of foreign papyrus adhering to the surface make much of this side illegible. 1 Trace on under-layer 6 o, traces of left-hand arc and base of circle [ , foreign scrap glued to surface ... |, two uprights, perhaps N; left-hand arc of circle 7 f. Further traces on foreign scrap stuck to surface at line-end 8 |, 9, scattered specks at mid-line level; traces at left and right with lightening of papyrus, possibly where ink has flaked off, suggesting upper right-hand arc of circle ... |, perhaps an upright 9 |, (first), descender 10 After ‘a’, high trace, now resembling upper left-hand arc of circle, but abraded, perhaps offset 11 |, first perhaps an upright An abraded L-shaped trace above, and cross-strokes approximately level with tops and bottoms of letters after τι I take to be casual 12 [ , apparently most of loop 13 ... , perhaps a round letter; last, perhaps an upright together with traces (offsets?) above letter-top level

Fr. 1 There is no way of telling whether ↓ precedes → or vice versa. The stories of Narcissus and Adonis both conclude with transformations into flowers, and they were told in close proximity in GDRK 6.3 (I, ii; 8; pap. of ii/iii A), but a poet equally concerned with metamorphoses of other kinds might well place a contrasting story between them.

4-6 Adonis.

1 φλαομένι[ in this context no doubt of Aphrodite, as almost always elsewhere. Dr M. I. West suggests restoring the usual poetic form φλαομένι (μέλαν), perhaps rightly, though there are late examples with a short second syllable (Greg. Naz. Carm. 1.1.7-77 [PG 37.444], Pamprep. 3.107, AP 9, 524-22, 6, 66.9 [Paul. Silent.]; f. 1 at H. Men. 481).

2 ἐλεγεὶ— would suit the boar that killed Adonis: cf. II. 17.281-3 εἰπ... / καπρίων, δὲ τ’ ἐρχεὶ κυκάς θαλεροὺς τ’ αἰγαρθοὺς / μηθίδους ἐκδισίνεαν ἐλεήμονον διὰ θῆκας, 725–9, 8, 338–40. For an account of the fatal hunt, see Ov. M. 10, 710–16.

3 ff. Adonis was said to spend his time alternately with Aphrodite and with Persephone (Apollod. 3.14-4, sch. Theoc. 3.48, Orph. H. 56.8–11).

3 ἀμαμιατ[; probably some part of ἀμαμαίον; then e.g. ἐν Ολύμπῳ (balancing 4 νεφόθ).

4 βεβληθα[; Hsch. β 420 β.: μέλεις, φροντίζεις; cf. 421 βεβληθα— μέλεις, 500 βεβληθα (βεβληθεῖ φωνῆ) ἔφορτες. I have accented the word as a perfect (with E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik (Munich 1933) 768). But Latte regards βεβλα— as a corruption of μεμβα—, perhaps rightly: cf. LSJ s.v. μέμβα. The supplement may appear a little on the short side, but could I think have extended far enough.

5 Adonis gave his name to the river of Byblos (RE s. v. Adonis (1)): cf. Luc. Syr. D. 8 ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ἐκάτου ἔτους ἀιματεται ... μυθέωνά δέ ὅτι τοιαύτης τῆς ἡμέρης ὁ Ἀδωνις αὐτῷ τὸν Βίβανον πετράκεται, καὶ τὸ νεκρόν ἐς τὸ ἄγαθον ἀρρητόν ἀλλάξει τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ τῶν ρωμῶν τῆς ἐπομονής διαλείπει. At the end of the line, γ’ ἑξογ χῃ εἰσαρκειότερος ἢ οἵτινες ἐκ τοῦ ἀτόμου, perhaps a toilet; perhaps by no means an obvious interpretation of the remains, since it would require a very narrow τ, does not seem ruled out (unlike e.g. 8). The usual way of expressing this sense using this verb would be Ἀδωνίς ἐγκυνεῖ τὸν ἑλέος τὸν παράλλος, perhaps rightly, though there are late examples with a short second syl¬

11 ἐξελεύνατον or παι[η— Ἀδωνίς might be considered, 599, though by no means an obvious interpretation of the remains, since it would require a very narrow τ, does not seem ruled out (unlike e.g. 8). The usual way of expressing this sense using this verb would be Ἀδωνίς ἐγκυνεῖ τὸν ἑλέος τὸν παράλλος, perhaps rightly, though there are late examples with a short second syl—

13 Adonis. 0] tāo/rei S[ in this context no doubt of Aphrodite, as almost always elsewhere. Dr M. L. West suggests restoring the usual poetic form [ταῖο/reiS[; perhaps rightly, though there are late examples with a short second syl—

17.281–3 εἰπ... / καπρίων, δὲ τ’ ἐρχεὶ κυκάς θαλεροὺς τ’ αἰγαρθοὺς / μηθίδους ἐκδισίνεαν ἐλεήμονον διά θῆκας, 725–9, 8, 338–40. For an account of the fatal hunt, see Ov. M. 10, 710–16.

Another possibility is suggested by El. Gen. s.v. Ἀδωνις: τοπαμός τῆς Κύπρου: Ἀδωνις γὰρ ὁ Ἀδωνις ἐμφάτει, καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ὁ Κύπρος βασιλεύειται [sic] ... Φιλάς δὲ πρῶτον βασιλεύει Ἀδωνις, μοῖρα ἤματα καὶ κυβάλλον, ἄφθ' ὅδε καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀκραπόλεως Ἀδωνις κέλευσα, ὡς δὲ τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸν τροφήνην ἔχων τὴν τρόπον, καθὼς ὄριον ὁ Παρθένοις Κυρικόνεις εὐφιλοῦς ἐξ ἄδρων [SH 641 (fr. 29 Li.)], ἀνατολικῶν ὄρων δύναται δὲ σύστω καλείσθαι καθ’ ὃ ἡ Κυκλοβορούσα ἀπλά πᾶλιν ὁμοίως ἤτοι. But while the Cilician Aous is attested elsewhere (Hsch. a 895) with R. Merkelbach and J. Stauber (edd.), *Sünnbiogramme aus dem griechischen Osten* (Munich and Leipzig 2002) no. 19/08/01,
NEW LITERARY TEXTS
cited by Latte), we have no other evidence for the use of the name with reference to a river on Cyprus, and the SH
eeditors suggest that Parthenius in the passage cited had simply claimed that the Cilician Aous re-emerged as the
Setrachus. It can hardly then be considered safe to replace 'Aousov in the above reconstruction with 'Λοίσον and
take the reference to be to the Setrachus.

6 His blood produced a blood-red flower: cf. Ov. M. 10.735, 'flos de sanguine concolor ortus'. No doubt the anemone
is meant (Nic. fr. 65, Ov. M. 10.379, LXIII 4352 fr. 5 ii suppl. (ZPE 143 (2003) 18)), though in Bion's version
(1.64-6) Adonis' blood produces the rose and Aphrodite's tears the anemone, and according to Servius on E. 10.18
'many' say that Adonis was turned into a rose. (In GDRK 6.3 i.6f. Α'[βάνδος / ] πρόσων, 'strong-scented' would
suit the rose, but the anemone may also have been mentioned.) Euphorion's Υάκωνος contained a reference to the
dead Adonis (fr. 43 P.), perhaps connected with the flower metamorphosis: cf. F. Scheidweiler, Euphorionis fragmenta
(Diss. Bonn 1908) 40.

α'στια δ' ἀβροσία: cf. Orph. L. 652f. ἁμοροσία ... α'στιος: also ἀμπροσίν ἀλομ (ib. 5.339, 870), ἵππον
ἀλομ (Bion 1.22).
The κονια is likely to have been used at the end of the story, to judge from its appearances between α'στια in
papyri of Call. Aet. iii-iv (cf. Pfeifer ad fr. 64 init.), though none of the copies concerned is as late as the sixth
century.

7ff. Aetria.
7ff. For the genealogy, cf. Hes. Th. 404-9, etc.
7 Φοίβης Tηταρνών: cf. A. R. 1.233 Κλούκσ Μνεμοσεν ενεκαγον, 4-260 Θήβης Τριτόκενδος
ενεκαγον; A. En. 6f. Τιτανίας . . . Φοίβης.
8 (. . .) - {- -| before the pentameter caesura is a rhythm avoided by Callimachus (M. L. West, Greek Metre
(Oxford 1962) 158), though he has an example at HE 1092 (AP.5.6.2).
9-11 Cf. Apollod. 1.4.1 'Ἀστρεία . . . ὡμοσθέσαι ὄρστην εὖστήν εἰς βάλακαν ἐφήκε, φίλλουςα τὴν πρὸς Δία
κοιναίον, sch. Lyco. 401. Pl. Pte. 704-5 and Call. H. 4.36-8 both have the jump, but Callimachus at least does not
mention the transformation into a bird. For other versions, see RE 3 s. v. Aetria (6).
9 end, probably Κοιναέτα (A. R. 2.710, of Leto, like Pindar's Κοιναέτα, fr. 33d.3). Dr West suggests e.g.
λίτταρ θεόν.
10 ἕρμον . . . ν' ἐφέων: cf. Duris, HE 1773 (AP. q.424.1) ἕρμαν νεφέλα, Nomn. D. 45.135 ἕρμον νεφέων; also
Art. An. 337. Not ν' ἐφέων, to which dactylic verse at all periods prefers νεφέων (νεφέων only Pall. AP. 10.80.4).

ἠσχος has a short iota, as expected: see J. La Roche, WS 29 (1900) 205.
11 end, μέσον ἐνείκε ἐπέπεμμεν πάντων? Cf. Dionys. Gigantias fr. 73 c 7 L. ἐγκάπτετε πάντες[preceded by μέσον
(δ')?], and for the pattern Il. 12.206 μέσον δ' ἐν κάββαλ' ἀμφόν, A. R. 1.1239 μέση δ' ἐν κάββαλ δύνη; ἐπέπεμμεν
πάντων Od. 4.508, 5.50, 318. θ' ἐντοί . . . is less likely; correction being avoided in words of this shape in Hellen¬
sic elegics (West, Greek Metre 157).
12-14 She became an island, at first mobile, but fixed to the spot when she served as the birth¬
place of Apollo and Artemis (Pr. fr. 33d, Pte. 704.7ff, Call. H. 4.51-4).
12 [π]ηρι: Dr West compares E. Πεπάραγα (of the Αργο).

ἡπείρα νηρέα: cf. Call. H. 4.36 ἄφοιτο πέλαγεκες ἐπέπεμμε, 53. A monosyllable before the pentameter caesura is
generally preceded by | - | or | - - | in Hellenistic elegy (West, Greek Metre 158; exceptions listed at n. 67).
Floating islands are termed πλοῦδες by Theophratus (HP 4.10.2, etc.), and πλοῦδες could be supplied at the
end of the line, but clearly there are other possibilities.
13 ἰδών is used of Zeus' descent in a shower of gold in the Danae story (Pherecyd. fr. 10.BE. Fowler, Isoc.
10.59), but this can hardly be relevant, even if Pindar extended the motif to the conception of Heracles (L 7.5-7).
Ἄχις may be a corruption of βίζας: cf. Call. H. 4.53f. ἐν πάντων / κόμασιν Ἁλκαμοί ποδών ἐνθήκαιον βίζας.
A connection with the next line could then be obtained by supplying at the end of 13 e.g. ὡς[ὁ κόμας ἢκε Κρονίος
(> Zeus, a misplaced gloss?), 'put pillars [cf. Pl. fr. 391.5-9] under her for roots', and in 14 όφοιον καλὸν
'Απχρεμίν εὖν έτεκεν. Zeus is not said elsewhere to have been responsible for the stabilization of the island, but
I suppose a poet might without particular boldness ascribe it to him. (Alternatives to my βίζας include βίζως(e) and
μιζόκεα(a), both mentioned by Dr West.)
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14 'Ap[τεμώ]ρ οὐ "Απ[τέμωδα (H. Vén. 16). For καλ[ή] used of her, see Barrett on E. Hüb. 61–71 (but δ ἄρα at A. Ag 14.0 is metrically doubtful; see West, *Studies in Aeschylus* (Stuttgart 1990) 177f.; *Lexis* 17 (1999) 50f., 60).

15 δ[ή] is suggested by the context, and by the restriction of elision in nouns, adjectives, and verbs (West, *Greek Metre* 156); then perhaps some part of ἄμαθος. For the omission of ο, before λ, here corrected, cf. e.g. P. Köln VI 245.31 (III AB) φιλοτρόφοι υ [contra metrum]; F. T. Gignac, *Grammar i* 307–9.

→ 8 ff. (and earlier?) Narcissus. The present account seems to be in general agreement with that of Conon in the twenty-fourth of his Ἀργοθήκηes as summarized by Phonius, *FGH* 26 F 1 (M. K. Brown, *The Narratives of Conon* (Munich and Leipzig 2002)), though there is no trace of Ameinias, the lover who killed himself when Narcissus rejected him (Conon §1). See in general RE s.v. Narxissos (1).

8 ἰδ[άθ]είκελον, if correctly read and restored, no doubt with reference to Narcissus. Then εὐξ[δον;]

10 He rejected all his lovers: cf. Conon § 1 υπερβάπτης Ἕρως τε καὶ ἐραστών. For the start, one might consider e.g. ἄτοκο ἀμαθί|νων (the rhythm uncommon but not unexampled: West, *Greek Metre* 155 with n. 52). Dr West suggests ἀνεμεπολ ν[ό]ν or the like. The iterative (-)χθαίρεσσε does not occur elsewhere.

11 start, perhaps μεσθ' ὑπὲρ δὴ (Call. Hes. fr. 64.9 H.; see Campbell on Q. S. 12.256f) or εἰκότε ν](δὴ (e.g. A. R. 4.164, where see Livrea). Dr West suggests (−) ὑπὲρ or μι[λε.

12 ἕρακαστο εφ[τέρης]; cf. Greg. Naz. Carm. 1.2.20.155f. (PG 37.893) and μορφής τις ἐς ποτ' ἐράσατο, καὶ κατὰ πηγῆς / ἦλθ' ἐπ' ἐβάλλον κάλπος ὀδηγήθηκεν, 2.2.3.52f. (PG 37.1484) μορφής μὲν τις ἐς ποτ' ἐράσατο, καλ. The phrase is hardly so distinctive as to suggest that Gregory knew our text, and it seems clear from 1. 14 below that Narcissus did not drown in this account as he does in the Neoplatonist version of the story followed by Gregory. (In view of what is said in the introduction, it should be noted that Gregory goes on in the first place to mention the story of Comaetho and Cydus (157–60); but there are no good grounds for believing that he drew directly on Parthenius' account. R. Kedell, *ByzZ* 53 (1960) 123, suggests Nestor of Laranda as a possible source. See A. Knecht (ed.), *Gregor von Nazianz: Gegen die Putzsucht der Frauen* (Heidelberg 1972) 93 f.)

12 ff. Following 11, one would expect 13 μορ[φήν] to represent γαλαξ and the couplet to explain how Narcissus came to fall in love with himself; cf. Conon § 2 δε ὁ Νάρκικος ὁδόν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὀψιν καὶ τὴν μορφήν ἐπὶ κρίνης ἀναλαμβάνετο τῶν ὠδών καὶ μένων καὶ πρῶτος ἐκατόφιτος ἄξιόν πλούσιον: cf. West, *Greek Metre* 155 with n. 52. At the start of 13, we require something to account for the case of τριγ[ήν], e.g. ἐνδοτικ: for the displacement of the prepositional phrase, to be taken with the participle supplied in the next line, cf. Call. fr. 75.10ff. Pf. Τρισ[ήλ] ἐν ὀδάτα φθιμον ἅμεμεν / έχει δέ σε θαμον ἄμμερα / έν γάτε αὐτον δερκόμενοι δοράδα.

13 τριγήν: cf. LXIII 4352 fr. 5 ii.7 πηγήν with n. (where for 'bear' read 'bear').


14 Probably the subject is Narcissus and the object his blood: cf. Conon § 3 δοκοῦσε δ' οἱ ἐπιχώροι (of Theseiaca in Bocotia) τὸν νάρκικος τὸ ἄθροις ἐξ ἀναγωγῆς πρῶτον τῆς γης ἀναχεῖν εἰς ἡν ἐξῆθε τὸ τοῦ Νάρκικου αἷμα (contrast Ovid's account, *M*. 3.509ff., where the flower appears in place of Narcissus' corpse). His suicide (Conon § 2) will then have been mentioned in the vicinity.

Fr. 3 42f. Perhaps from a martial context, with ὅν λύθρ, [, κόρ][ός κεφ[αλ]. Other possibilities include ἄρα λύθρ [, [, ίδηθ πτερν (II. 1.491 φιλοτρόφοι τίνα κόρη).
A manuscript containing an epic poem: of the original 116 fragments, most of them tiny, only six have been joined, bringing the number to 113.

The hand of the text is a formal round type, rather large sized, carefully enough executed though not particularly beautiful. The letters lean slightly forward. Only $\phi$, $\gamma$, and occasionally $\nu$ break bilinearity. $\alpha$ and $\gamma$ are always of the angular type; $\alpha$ is executed with four strokes usually with shallow centre: the first stroke may be upright, or leaning slightly forward, while the last is always inclined, and ends with a curve, similar to the descending oblique of $\alpha$; the horizontal of $\tau$ is executed in two movements (the right stroke after the descending vertical), and so is the rounded part of $\varepsilon$, whose upper section is sometimes separated from the lower one: its cross-bar often does not touch the arc. The second vertical of $\nu$ (which, as in $\pi$, is curved leftward) descends from the horizontal stroke’s right extremity, without any loop, and its left upright is taller, producing an $h$-shaped form, a cursive feature paralleled both in earlier and in later hands (for a perhaps more or less contemporary example, cf. P. Med. inv. 68.41 [= Montevecchi, *Papirologia*, pl. 35] a private letter dated AD 13, whose writing is comparable to the other documentary hands mentioned below). The descending oblique of $\kappa$ departs more often from its rising oblique than from its upright (cf. e.g. P. Fouad inv. 266, *GMAW* 56, i bc, assigned, P. Herc. 1507, i bc, assigned, and 336/1150, i AD). The most distinctive feature of this hand is the small serif following $n$ (and, less frequently, at the bottom of the descender of $\phi$, $\gamma$, and $\nu$): this seems to be due to the influence of earlier cursive hands (cf. e.g. P. Lond. I 35, 161 bc, pl. 2 in G. Menci, *S&C* 3 (1979) 23-53) rather than to any aesthetic purpose. Moving towards the foot of the column lines begin progressively further to the left (Maas’s law). Accents and breathings, very sparsely provided, are, in most cases, in a darker ink, and must have been added at a later time (cf. e.g. fr. 3.10).

The general appearance of this hand can be compared to the (less formal) one of II 282 (a petition dated between 30 and 35), and to the rhetorical exercise of II 216 (apparently under Tiberius: cf. also Roberts, *GLH* 10a-b: in both cases $\alpha$ tends to have a more rounded shape). Comparable hands are found in other literary rolls assigned to the first half of the first century AD, such as the texts grouped together by Menci, *S&C* 3 (1979) 39 ff., with commentary on p. 43 (a group which includes XXXVII 2808, a more careful example of a similar style), and, for instance, in the (less formal) Homer papyrus Mertens–Pack 0643. It seems unlikely that it is much later than the middle of the first century AD and it may conceivably be somewhat earlier.

The text is sparingly marked up with lectional signs: high stop (fr. 1.10, 11, 12, 14?; 2.19; 3.2; 14.3; 25.3); diaeresis organic (14.7) and inorganic (on initial upsilon, 1.9, 14?; 2.12; 14.8?; 25.3; 47.2?; on internal upsilon: 14.4?); rough breathing (3.10; 5.2; 14.3?; 6;
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42.2; 47.3; 55-1; 94.3?; circumflex accent (1.9?); acute (94.3?); grave, or rough breathing (14.3?); rough breathing and circumflex together (1.19; 3.10). Elision may be effected tacitly (1.12?; 2.8?; 14.4; 50.4); no clear example of elision mark or of scripsio plena. There are no identifiable orthographic errors, or omissions of iota adscript (written correctly at 1.19; 3.8; 14.9; 52.2?). An apparently different hand has added a correction above the line at 85.3.

The fragments, as far as they can be read, would fit in the frame of an Argonautica. The context is quite clear in the two major pieces, where apparently Medea (whose name does not appear in the extant text) utters a monologue, falls asleep, has a nightmare (featuring Jason (fr. 1.12 Aἰκονιδήν) and the fire-breathing bulls) and suddenly awakes. The long description of Medea's dream is paralleled in A. R. 3. The other fragments are in such condition that they cannot be used, as far as I can see, either to prove or to disprove that the rest of the poem dealt with the same subject (cf. also on frs. 14 and 26).

Style prevents attribution to the apparently archaic hexameter poem mentioning Argonautic themes transmitted by LIII 3698 (on which cf., most recently, A. Debiasi, ZPE 143 (2003) 1–5) and possibly XXX 2513, and suggests a date not earlier than the late classical or, much more probably, Hellenistic period (a slightly later date cannot be ruled out on palaeographical grounds).

Apart from A. R. himself, we know of only one author of a poetic Argonautica in this period, Cleon of Kourion. The first book of his Argonautica is quoted in schol. A. R. 1.587, p. 51 W., and he is mentioned also in schol. A. R. 1.77–8, p. 13 W. and 1.623–6a, p. 55 W. (= SH 339). Lines 11 ff. of P. Mich. inv. 1316′ (= SH 339A) contain a general comparison between the narrative technique of two poems, one of which is A. R.'s Argonautica. One of the authors seems to be κύντωμος (l. 11) and to show ἀνάγκασιν τὴν οἰκονομίαν (l. 14); in a rather Homeric way? l. 13); it is possibly the same one who uses digressions (ll. 12? and 17: this feature is attributed in the introduction of the SH apparatus to the second poem, but I find it difficult to reconcile it with κυντωμενο in l. 15); the other seems to be lengthier (l. 15) and the two adjectives κυντωμενο καὶ πολυτταχῶς must refer to him. Since in ll. 1 ff. the Argonauts' route in A. R. (who leads them to the Bebrycia by the end of book i) is opposed to their route in Cleon (where they are first brought to Troy, where Heracles rescues Hesione), it seems highly probable that the second poem in the comparison (i.e. the lengthier one) was Cleon's Argonautica (so Parsons ap. J. S. Rusten, Dionysius Scytobrachion (Köln 1982) 60ff., and SH ad loc.; contra Rusten, op. cit. 56ff., and n. 13, who suggests that the lengthier poem might be A. R.'s one, and leaves the first one anonymous). From SH 339A.23ff. it seems that Cleon dealt with Medea's love as well, though it is not clear which version of Aphrodite's intervention he actually followed. A terminus ante quem for Cleon seems to be provided by A. R.'s poem itself, since, according to Asclepiades of Myrlea (FGrHist 697 F 5 in schol. A. R. i 623–6a, p. 55 W. = SH 339), A. R. is said to have taken from Cleon the story of Thoas' rescue. A terminus post quem is provided by the fact that, according to SH 339A.3–6, in narrating the Argonauts' involvement in the rescue of Hesione, Cleon is thought to be following Dionysius Scytobrachion: the remains ἀλλʼ ὁ γε Κουριάς ο[ ] / κατ]αβαθμημένος πραγματείαν. / ], Τιον αὐτοῦ ἀγαθῶν ἄκολον. θ- [ ], Διονυσίωι σuggest this. Dionysius
himself was active in the first half of the third century BC (cf. Rusten, op. cit. 89 f.). Cleon therefore might have been an older contemporary of A. R., and his poem cannot have been much earlier than A. R.’s. A further, rather speculative, argument for dating Cleon in the first half of the third century BC may be inferred from the diegesis of Callimachus Ια. 5, where the diegetes identifies Callimachus’ anonymous addressee with a Cleon or an Apollonius. This is clearly guesswork, but it is suggestive that exactly these two names have been proposed for the identification. A reason might have been that there was an allusion to an Argonautica in Callimachus’ poem. If so, the author of the conjecture must have thought that both Cleon and Apollonius were Callimachus’ contemporaries. Since Cleon was known to Asclepiades of Myrela and to the author of P. Mich. inv. 1316 (if they are not the same person) it is rather likely that his work was still circulating in the early imperial age. For a more detailed assessment of the evidence on Cleon, cf. G.B. D’Alessio in R. Pretagostini (ed.), La letteraturaellenistica: Problemi e prospettive di ricerca (Roma 2000) 91–112, and L. Lehnus, ΖΕΠ 138 (2002) 12 (who argues that Cleon’s name may lurk behind the words τω ἄνω in the catalogue of Callimachus’ adversaries of schol. Flor. ad fr. 1.1 Pf., line 4).

There is, however, no positive reason to think of Cleon as the author of our text, apart from the fact that he is the only poet known to have written an epic poem dealing at length with this subject in a suitable period. It is of course possible that our papyrus might be the work of some otherwise unknown poet: a couple of passages, however, suggest at least the possibility that this poem might have been known to Vergil and Valerius Flaccus (cf. on 1.12 and 2.16 ff.). A poetic Argonautica has been postulated as the common source for the cases where Argonautica Orphica, Valerius Flaccus and other Latin authors converge against A. R. (H. Venzke, Die orphischen Argonautika in ihrem Verhältnis zu Apollonios Rhodios (diss. Berlin 1941) 110 f.): some think it must be later than A. R. (H. Herter, Gnomon 21 (1949) 72), some that it must be earlier (so e.g. F. Vian in his introduction to AO (Paris 1987) 27 ff.). In the second case it may (or it may not) be identical with Cleon’s. It is worth noting that Valerius Flaccus does have the Argonauts’ Trojan diversion, which, as we now know, was present in Cleon, though not in A. R. (nor in AO, for that matter).

It is difficult to assess if our poem should be dated earlier or later than A. R.’s. The two major fragments parallel rather closely one of A. R.’s most celebrated episodes. Medea’s falling asleep, her nightmare and her sudden awakening are to be compared with A. R. 3.616–35 (cf., in some respects, also her sleepless night in 751 ff.), while the mention of the possible reaction of the Colchian women at the end of her monologue recalls Medea’s words in 794 ff. On the other hand in A. R. there is no monologue followed by the heroine’s sleep (the sequence monologue – short nightmare – sudden awakening is to be found also in Val. Fl. 7.127–52, but the two nightmares are rather different). A general comparison of the contents is not easy: one may note, however, that, judging from fr. 1.13 f. and fr. 2, in Medea’s dream the fearsome bulls occupied far more space than they did in A. R., who brilliantly focused on Medea’s unconfessed desire.

Since no single line is entirely preserved, one cannot fairly judge the style of these verses. They show a remarkable preference for the feminine caesura, with a percentage
higher than 90%: in fr. 1.5.f., 8–14, 16 and 17, very likely also in ll. 7 and 15, and perhaps also 19.f. (see comm. ad fr. 25); in fr. 2.18, perhaps 20 (if not elided) and possibly 17; the only plausible case of a masculine caesura is fr. 2.14 (reading uncertain), to which fr. 14.9 may perhaps to be added. According to the figures for Hellenistic and later authors in West, *Greek Metre* 153, 177, the only cases with a higher percentage are the remains of Philo Iudaicus in SH 681–6 (100%), and Agathias (99%). The preserved verses are not enough to draw any conclusion: in Callimachus, for example, the proportion is much lower, 74%, but it is not difficult to find random stretches, as, e.g., hy. 4.87–102, where no masculine caesura occurs in 16 lines. Such figures, however, tell against any date in the fifth or fourth centuries BC, when masculine caesura seems to have predominated. For a possible breaking of Hilberg’s law in fr. 1.20, see comm. ad fr. 25.

I think it can be fairly stated that the style of this author shows neither the imprint of the Alexandrian refined manner associated with poets such as Callimachus, Theocritus, and their followers, nor (even less) the close adherence to Homeric tags characteristic of much narrative epic from the late archaic to the imperial period. He uses quite a few very rare words, attested only in lexicographical sources, or found in a single occurrence before him, and at least one *hapax legomenon* (fr. 14.4), but these seem to be isolated cases: most of his lexicon is rather plain, and he does not avoid prosaic terms. A remarkable example is the sentence μενθηρας καθες[κ]ον in fr. 1.11, where an extremely rare noun goes together with a rather unepic verb (though in an ‘epic’ form). The use of γενετήρ in 1.14 may be seen as pointing to a later date (see n. ad loc.).

The remains are too meagre to assess whether this is the work of some later imitator, or one of the models outshone by A. R. A last, though extremely unlikely, possibility is that these fragments may represent the προεκδοςας of A. R.’s own *Argonautica* 3. The scholia preserve just six short fragments from the προεκδοςας of Book 1, and, while some of them substantially differ from the final version (cf. M. Fantuzzi, *Ricerche su Apollonio Rodio* (Roma 1988) 87–120, with bibliography), none of them is even remotely as distant from it as our fragments are from the relevant Apollonian passages.

I wish to thank Revel Coles for his generous help, and Giulio Massimilla and Enrico Magnelli for comments on selected problems.
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κάππεεε' κεκλι[μέ]γη δετο[ ]

ηρέμα δε βλεφ[ά]ροι ~ καταπτ[ ]

. λ [.] ν υπο[ . . . . . . ] οιειν αν [ .

οια καθυπνοουσα: δια κραδιή[ ]

μενθήραι σοβέες[ κ]ον[ . . άποπρ[ ]

Αἰκονίδην ὅρ[ά]ς[θ]αν[ . . δε] δ’ ἐνικ[ ]

ο ξένος η ταύροις[κ] πεπαρμένο[ς[ ]

άνδρο[φ]όνοις γενετήρος[ ύτ . .[ ]

κατ' ιποτοβικε[ ]

][πρε[ ] κυκω[ ]

[φοτ[ ] ]εμετα [ ]

. εν π[ ]

]. ηπελ[ ]

]. ςμμυρ[ ]

]. α ροι[ ]

]. πυρος[ ]

]. ν[ . . . . . . ]

1 ), dots high and low in the line ] . . . . [ , on the edge to the left, a low dot, then feet belonging to Κ rather than to λ, followed by a low horizontal (or a lower arc); possibly ] , κα[ ] 2 μ, or Λ λ [ , upper left-hand are ] , upper right-hand are 3—5 the fibres are much damaged and in some cases misplaced ] , the right-hand extremity of a curl, thicker in its upper part (e.g. the end of λ, etc.) after δο only two specks on a single fibre λ/ rather than λ or δ; the following gap might accommodate at least one letter; after the gap two rather close traces on the lower edge, as of the right-hand end of a lower arc, then the thick foot of an upright and another dot further to the right (shape and distance suggest Ν rather than Κ, but the traces might belong to more than one letter); at the end of the line isolated traces of ink on disturbed fibres, whose level is difficult to ascertain 4 ], ] , second, foot of upright ], ] , small left-hand hook of a descender τ , ] , dot in the line, seemingly part of a left-hand lower arc Εθ or Κε; the following letter is almost completely lost, apart from a curl (open toward right) low in the line at its left-hand edge, possibly the end of λ after Ε, very uncertain traces suggest a high horizontal, perhaps departing from an upright (e.g. Ν?), then a misplaced scrap, whose level can not be determined, but which might belong to this line: a (high?) horizontal followed by the first stroke of e.g. λ 5 ], only a trace on a fibre now displaced up to the left a , a narrow letter, whose foot in the line alone survives (ι, ρ); then Η or Π ν a, a high horizontal stroke after ν, before a a linking stroke at half height: the space might be filled by two narrower letters, but π would be wide enough by itself 6 φ, μ, two dots in the line; then the far left lower dot of a μ, followed by its right-hand half, rather than λ ] , traces of ink on the upper right-hand edge suggesting an upper right-hand arc (ο?) after κατ, a slightly displaced fragment, with possibly the upper part of λ followed by the end of an upright and the beginning of a descending oblique (i.e. Κ), seems to belong here 7 , . π, possibly traces of the rising oblique of Κ and rising oblique of Λ (but no trace of cross-bar) ] , top of an upright ] , upper part of upright hooked to right at top, joined to left, at bottom, by a thinner horizontal, suggesting the right-hand half of Ν, then, after a gap, dots high and low in the line, and then a low dot: the space
suggests \( \mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{A} \). The first letter is an upright, with a turn to the left at its top \( \lambda \), a triangular letter with neither cross-bar nor horizontal base (but the surface is damaged); high dot (as e.g. the start of \( \gamma \)); above, broken in two, probably a circumflex accent \( \gamma \), a descender \( \gamma \), high dot, as of the beginning of a horizontal or an oblique stroke to after \( \nu \), upper part of upright, apparently with no oblique or horizontal stroke down to half-height; to the left-hand edge of the gap a high dot; after the gap a slightly rising stroke low in the line \( \xi \), middle part of descending oblique, end of rising oblique and upper part of upright \( \eta \), high dot, conceivably part of an arc \( \iota \), high dot followed by unidentifiable traces on disturbed fibres \( \zeta \) is followed by a dot at its right, perhaps a washed-out wrong punctuation \( \theta \), lower left-hand arc \( \mu \) is traced in an anomalous way that could suggest \( \lambda \lambda \), but no doubt \( \mu \) was meant \( \delta \), only the right-hand angle low in the line \( \phi \), upper part of a tail upright \( \upsilon \), only the left-hand dot of a diaeresis, or, perhaps more likely, a high point \( \chi \), lower right-hand part of a circle, followed by a horizontal, or rising oblique, whose original height in the line is difficult to ascertain \( \iota \), right-hand arc \( \iota \), of the first an upper and lower arc: the surface between them is damaged; then foot of upright and descending oblique further to the right \( \epsilon \), \( \eta \), \( \varsigma \), \( \zeta \), equally possible \( \iota \), \( \omega \), or perhaps \( \epsilon \), since its cross-bar might have started in the gap (cf. e.g. \( \epsilon \) in \( \kappa\kappa \) in \( \gamma \)) \( \theta \), end of descending oblique \( \iota \), left-hand lower arc \( \iota \), top tip of \( \varsigma \), low dot \( \zeta \), the space would not allow a reading such as \( \tau \rho \), \( \zeta \), \( \alpha \), faint foot of upright: the space suggests \( \tau \) or \( \gamma \) \( \iota \), lower and right-hand arc: the distance from the preceding suggests either the right-hand half of \( \omega \) or \( \iota \) \( \theta \), \( \iota \), \( \zeta \) not ruled out \( \zeta \), horizontal ligature to top of \( \omega \) or \( \iota \); at the end horizontal joining top of upright.
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\[ \ ] \ \eta \delta e k r o w c o i o k [ \ ]

\[ \ ] \ \pi \rho \chi e e w \tau o c o u [ \ ]

\[ \ ] \ \epsilon \chi e o v a n e p a l t [ \ ]

foot

\[ 20 \] \ eioc \[ \]

2 \( \theta, \xi \) may also be considered.

5 \( \pi \) rather than \( \tau \).

6 \( \zeta, \xi \) or \( \theta \).

8 \( \gamma \), upright with horizontal departing from it to the right at half-height (\( \kappa \) rather less likely).

9 \( \lambda, \) left-hand arc.

11 \( \pi \), traces suggesting a left-hand arc.

13 \( \rho \), foot of upright.

14 \( \kappa, \) traces on disturbed fibres: an upright and, close to its right, a broken second upright or two deformed obliques.

16 \( \phi, \) two diagonals.

18 \( \gamma \) at half-height.

19 \( \tau \) or \( \xi \) (\( \xi \) not excluded).

Fr. 3

\[ \gamma \delta [ \]

\[ \sigma \alpha [ \]

\[ \eta \tau o i o d e \tau [ \]

\[ \epsilon \lambda c e \theta l i s i e [ \]

\[ \pi \tau \rho o c e \xi [ \]

\[ \alpha \chi e o c k \xi [ \]

\[ \gamma \tau e r a n o i o [ \]

\[ k o t i o k l a k [ \]

\[ \omega \nu, \omega \delta e i r [ \]

\[ \phi e [ \]

Fr. 4

\[ \eta v [ \]

\[ \alpha \gamma \nu o [ \]

\[ \kappa e k i \tau o [ \]

\[ \omega \nu, \omega \delta e i r [ \]

Fr. 5

\[ \rho e r [ \]

\[ \alpha [ \]

\[ \kappa e k i \tau o [ \]

\[ \omega \nu, \omega \delta e i r [ \]

Fr. 3 2 \( \), foot of upright.

3 \( \pi, \) or, less probably, \( \tau \) followed by upright.

4 \( \), low dot, probably foot of upright: the distance suggests \( \tau \).

5 \( \), lower part of right arc.

6 \( \), a slightly descending oblique departing from the upper extremity of \( \epsilon \) (\( \gamma, \kappa ? \)).

7 \( \), an almost horizontal stroke joins a at top-letter level.

8 \( \), or \( \tau \).

\( \), or \( \pi \).

\( \), other wise, the letter on the edge would probably be \( \phi \).

9 \( \omega, \) a letter joining \( \omega \) low in the line, and represented, high in the line, by a slightly rising oblique, compatible with \( \zeta \), but conceivably \( \zeta \), not exampled elsewhere in this papyrus.

10 \( \), lectional signs in darker ink.

Fr. 4 1 \( \), \( \tau \) or \( \xi \).

2 \( \), upright with horizontal extending to the right above it.

3 \( \), low dot.

\( \theta [ \), left arc only.

5 \( \), trace high in the line.

6 \( \), upright.

7 \( \), left-hand arc.

Fr. 5 2 \( \), a horizontal level with letter-tops.

1 \( \), dot level with letter-tops.
Fr. 6

\[ \lambda \alpha [ \]
\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \theta \alpha . [ \]

Fr. 7

\[ \alpha \varepsilon . [ \]

Fr. 8

\[ \beta \alpha [ \]

Fr. 9

\[ \alpha \varepsilon . [ \]

Fr. 6 2 \], three upright strokes

Fr. 7 1 \], foot of upright with diagonal to left and serif to right? \n
Fr. 8 1 \], rising oblique

Fr. 9 1 \], fleck, then flattened lower arc

Fr. 10 1 \], dot in the line

Fr. 11 1 \], dot at half-height on the edge

Fr. 12 1 \], upper arc

Fr. 10 2 \], dot in the line

Fr. 11 2 \], left-hand upper arc

Fr. 12 2 \], lower part of upright, then dot on the line followed by foot of upright ending with a small right curl (both may belong to \( \pi \))
Fr. 13  
2 after ε the line is broken: of each of the letters I read as N only the four extreme dots remain, but the first at least seems reasonably secure; of the following letters traces are preserved only in the upper part: an upper arc, a dot (with a left-hand tip), a second dot

Fr. 14  
1 ]ε, little curl open to the right, as of the end of λ, c, e, a dot, slightly higher, may belong to a cross-bar ], thick dot at half height 2 ]γ, traces of a loop level with letter-tops ]γ, or o γ, o equally possible 3 ], lower part of descending oblique with muddled traces above it: a descending oblique above the line (if not on a misplaced scrap) must belong to a rough breathing or to an accent after φ only the feet of the supposed λ oγ seems likelier than τ 4 ], or T v, possible trace of diaeresis above ], upper left-hand arc 5 ]φ, a lower arc, open at top, somewhat narrower than usual o, e, c, but perhaps acceptable as right-hand half of o; above it an upright meeting at its base a short rising oblique (i.e. an anomalous rough breathing?) ], or 9 7 τ, only the very first dot of its juncture with the upper extremity of ε o c, thick high dot, part of a slightly descending oblique: γ (× unlikely), rather than high stop ], traces of ink above the line, conceivably part of a trema and a circumflex, or a breathing; of the letter written in the line only a trace remains, possibly belonging to an upper arc 9 ], a very small left-hand loop on the edge

Fr. 15  
1 ][, left-hand arc 2 ], the traces are higher than expected for line level: the first may represent a rough breathing (though no preserved breathing in the papyrus has this divaricated shape) or a supralinear γ. The second may be part of an accent (a circumflex?) almost joining the top of a vertical, with traces of a high horizontal farther to the right, or, more probably, a supralinear τ.

Fr. 16
Fr. 17
Fr. 18
Fr. 19
Fr. 16 1. the first traces are on distorted fibres: a serifed upright, followed by a trace on a single fibre, to be located level with letter-bottoms 2 ], traces of lower part of upright 3 ], low dot 4 ], a dot at half height on the edge 5 ], a speck low in the line  6 ], more likely than H
Fr. 17 1.], speck 2 ]; traces of upright, then dots suggesting a descending oblique and a second upright; perhaps N; further to the right, dots low in the line 5 ];, e not ruled out 7 ], or 9 ];, a horizontal at 2/3 height with a small dot on the edge down at its left
Fr. 19 1.], horizontal joining the top of a ];, low dot 2 ];, or 3 ];, high dot
Fr. 20 1 ];, it is possible that no letter is missing 5 ];, part of a descending oblique or of a right-hand arc 6 ];, dot in the line 7 ];, low trace at edge 8 ];, or 9 ];
Fr. 21 1 ];, left-hand lower arc 2 ];, 3 after ]; (which may, perhaps, be  )); traces of an upright are visible on the edge (slightly thicker at the centre, indicating a cross-bar?); then, after a 5-mm gap, a  or a horizontal joining the top of the last letter ( or ); ]; fits into the space better than ]; 4 ], final curl of descending oblique 5 ];, dot, part of a horizontal, high in the line 6 ];, top of upright, higher than average letter-tops level ( ); ];, foot of a rising oblique 7 ];, upper part of the arc seems to be missing; a flattened  would be a (probably less plausible) alternative
Fr. 22 1 ];, part of a right-hand lower arc, rather than the final curl of a descending oblique, very close to the next upright ( being an unlikely alternative) 3 ];, foot of upright 4 ];, rising oblique and top of descending oblique:  also possible
Fr. 23 1 ];, 2 ];, or 3 ];, 4 ];, 5 ];, 6 ];, 7 ];, 8 ];, 9 ];
Fr. 24 1 ];, or 2 ];, or 3 ];, or 4 ];, or 5 ];, or 6 ];, or 7 ];, or 8 ];, or 9 ];
Fr. 25 1 ];, 2 ];, or 3 ];, or 4 ];, or 5 ];, or 6 ];, or 7 ];, or 8 ];, or 9 ];
Fr. 23 | [ ], speck 2 | , after a dot on the left edge of a gap, high in the line, followed by other dots low in the line, perhaps parts of a lower arc; the following two letters are represented by a lower arc and a left-hand lower arc 4 | , a slightly rising horizontal joining the top of c, r, t 5 | [ , top of upright; high horizontal; traces of an upper arc

Fr. 24 | [ ], a dot at half-height; final curl of descending oblique 2 | , a dot at half-height follows e at a distance of about 4 mm; cf. also line 7, below. This may be the beginning of a new column, but a the two columns would be closer than elsewhere in this papyrus and b more importantly, the traces in line 7 are not moved towards the left, as expected (Maas’s law, verified in the two main fragments), but towards the right, and c there seems to be no trace of writing to the right of line 5. Perhaps some lectional signs (e.g. paragraphoi), referring to the following column? 3 | , traces of two horizontals (or parts of arcs) both low and high in the line; foot of upright; thick dot at half-height, close to an angular letter (a, a, a, right-hand part of μ); then probably ελλέε with the first λ squeezed against the first ε 4 | fibres very damaged; end of descending oblique (or lower arc?); thick foot of upright; round letter; traces suggesting the cross-bar of ε 5 | , it is not clear whether the writing surface further to the right is preserved 

Fr. 25 | [ ], low dot 3 | , dot at one third height 4 | , low dot and thick high dot: π? 5 | , two traces of a horizontal high in the line, possibly τ 6 | [ (first), right-hand upper circle ] [ (second), part of a right-hand upper circle

Fr. 26

Fr. 27

Fr. 28
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Fr. 26 1 π[ or τσ[ or τσ[ or similar 2 ω[ a dot at half-height; rising oblique with traces of ink low in the line: κ less likely τσ[ rather than τσ[ 4 λσ[ better than τσ[ 5 the second c is represented only by a high dot at the edge of the gap, at the junction with the preceding letter, and by the last bit of the right-hand lower arc further to the right 6 , an upright with a stroke at half-height departing toward right 7 , speck , part of upright?

Fr. 27 1 π[ or τσ[ 3 γ[ or θ[ Fr. 28 1 , a descending oblique , lower left-hand arc? 2 , a dot at half-height

Fr. 29 ........................ Fr. 30 ........................ Fr. 31 ........................

Fr. 29 1 , , two lower arcs , dot below the line: τσ[ 2 τσ[ the beginning of the second upright is faintly visible 3 , , an upright Fr. 30 1 , , dot at half-height Fr. 31 1 , , (one or two letters) foot of scissored upright and final curl of descending oblique (κ?) or lower left-hand arc 2 , , traces of ink at half-height; of θ only the right-hand upright 4 , , an upright taller than letter-tops level

Fr. 32 ........................ Fr. 33 ........................ Fr. 34 ........................

Fr. 32 2 , , damaged surface, the end of horizontal at half-height and low dot: κ, θ[? 4 θ[ the second part unusually traced in two strokes Fr. 33 1 , , upright with low dot 4 mm to its right 2 , , traces of upright, then high horizontal joining upright, possibly also τσ[, τσ[ 4 , , tall letter followed by dot level with letter-tops Fr. 34 1 , , low dot 2 , , descending oblique joining θ[ , upright 3 τσ[ or θ[ 4 , , a short stroke low in the line, as the rising end of a descending oblique? 5 , , top of upright and horizontal departing from it towards right: θ[, τσ[ or τσ[.
Fr. 35  2  ε, end of lower arc with trace of ink suggesting a cross-bar 3  ν, lower part of first upright and part of descending oblique: κ possible 4 , a slightly curving upright, as of the end of ἀ or τ 5 , top of upright, and top of rising oblique: e.g.  κ (too narrow for ἀ), top of upright

Fr. 36  1 , descending oblique, as of κ 3 , end of descending oblique

Fr. 37  1 ]φθ, traces on distorted fibres: a descender, then, on a single fibre, a trace compatible with the extremity of the loop of φ, followed by further traces suggesting a letter with a cross-bar 2 ],[, upper arc δ, the junction of a rising and of a descending oblique (λ, κ also possible)

Fr. 38  2 lower margin?

Fr. 39  1 τ, or ρ 2 γ, or η; there is some stray ink above ε and at the base of ν, τ or τ 3 the first trace belongs to an upper arc; the second is the top of an upright with a horizontal departing from it towards right

Fr. 40  1 ]ς, right-hand end of lower arc and traces belonging to a cross-bar, or to the top of a c  π, or τ 5

Fr. 41  1 λ, likelier than κ 2 [, left-hand arc 3 ], upright λ, μ also possible

Fr. 42  1 γ, π less likely, but not ruled out 2 τ, ι also possible 4 [, left-hand arc 5 ,

Fr. 43  2 top dot (foot of upright?)

Fr. 44  2 Top?

Fr. 45  1 .[ ]εδη[ 2 ]. Αδ[ 3 .]
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Fr. 43 1 ]], foot of upright hooked to right, then an upright with a horizontal departing from its middle part towards right: ἵ or κ 2 ]]e, junction of descending oblique and second upright 3 ], lower arc 4 ], foot in the line

Fr. 44 1 ], a horizontal joining e high in the line (r, τ, etc.) 2 ], traces suggesting a left-hand lower arc, rather than an upright 3 ], foot of upright 4 ], foot of upright

Fr. 45 1 ], dot in the line and foot of upright further to the right (also ], possible) 2 ], part of a right-hand upper arc 3 ], upright slightly inclined to right

Fr. 46 Fr. 47 Fr. 48

Fr. 49 Fr. 50 Fr. 51

Fr. 46 1 ], part of a descender, fairly close to the previous letter 2 ], end of descending oblique
Fr. 47 1 ], ], low dot; foot of upright slightly hooked to left and a dot in the line 5 mm to its right (as e.g. η); foot of upright or of rising oblique; end of descending oblique; start of rising oblique and foot of a descending one: e.g. χα or similar combinations? 3 ], faint traces of right-hand upper arc on the edge; to its right, higher, the top of a slightly curving descending oblique and, further to the right and higher, a short rising oblique (this latter most probably part of a rough breathing: the former stroke is also a lectional sign rather than part of a letter (if it is a letter, it must be γ) 7, only the top of the first upright and part of the horizontal (τ also possible).
Fr. 48 1 low dot (start of a rising oblique?) 2 ]γ, junction between an upright and an horizontal, slightly damaged; τ also possible 3 ], left-hand upper arc

Fr. 49 Fr. 50 Fr. 51

Fr. 49 1 ], ], κρη[ 2 ], ], χε[ 3 ], ], ωνεκλ[ 4 ], ], υντ[ 5 ], ]ωπωτ[ 6 ], ], εικώ[ 7 ], ]σοκ[ 8 ], ]σοκ[ 9 ], ]σοκ[ 10 ]
Fr. 49 2], lower part of upright

Fr. 50 1], [low dot; 5 mm to the right a further dot (part of upright?); 8 mm further to the right the foot of an upright 2], foot of upright, then a lower arc and descending oblique suggests this, or λ, rather than χ

Fr. 51 1–2 stripped; specks of ink on underlying fibres of a descending oblique, higher than average letter-tops

Fr. 52 1], [low dot, then left-hand lower arc and right-hand end of the cross-bar?

Fr. 53 1], [c or υ 2], high dot

Fr. 54 1], [low dot, then left-hand lower arc and right-hand end of the cross-bar?

Fr. 55 1], a rough breathing or an accent and a long-mark 2], foot of upright and a dot 3 mm to its right specks could belong to a τ (only) if not part of last e 3], right-hand upper arc, τ also possible 4], a left-hand upper arc

Fr. 56 1], a low dot, and traces of a cross-bar: ϥ is the most obvious possibility

Fr. 57 1], right-hand lower arc 3], a right-hand arc 4 fibres very damaged. Traces of: a descending oblique; high horizontal, or flattened upper arc? upper arc with cross-bar underneath it 6]
Fr. 58  
\[\text{a}a\text{a}k\]
\[\text{a}\text{l}\text{i}\text{v}o\text{c}\text{t}o\text{c}e\text{c}\text{c}\text{a}\]

Fr. 59  
\[\delta\]
\[\phi\]
\[\nu\]

Fr. 60  
\[\omega\nu\nu\]
\[\nu\text{t}a\]
\[\gamma\nu\]

Fr. 58  1, a slightly descending but almost horizontal stroke joining \(\alpha\) at half-height  
Fr. 59  3 \(\eta\), slightly curving descending oblique, larger than expected: perhaps lower end of a \(\alpha\)ronis?  
Fr. 60  2 top of upright and traces low in the line, a bit too wide apart for a single \(\eta\)?
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Fr. 61 1–4 traces on damaged fibres, mostly unreadable 5 ], confused specks and blots 6 ], dot on distorted fibre 7, foot of upright; 4 mm to its right a low dot; 2 mm further to the right a second low dot, on distorted fibre 8, rather than 6, upright 9, left-hand upper arc, 8 also possible 10, a dot at letter-bottom level and another one at middle height, upper arc: a dot at half height to its right may be the end of its cross-bar, or part of another letter (in which case read 11, or 12, a more natural reading than 11, because of the inclination of the descending oblique (but cf. e.g. fr. 1.3)

Fr. 62 3 ], 8 also possible.

Fr. 63 Above 1, 1 cm of damaged surface with a few ink specks 1, foot of upright, rather close to the following letter: instead of 1, 1, would be possible 3, traces high in the line, 1, upper arc 4, junction of the top of an upright and a descending oblique with a high dot to the right

Fr. 64 Fr. 65 Fr. 66

Fr. 64 1 ], faint traces of a cross-bar perhaps visible; then a deep upright, the foot of a rising oblique, and a low descender 2 ], low dot 3, 8 not ruled out, 1, left-hand upper arc 4, top of tall upright; dot at level with letter-tops; small loop high in the line (p, b), upper arc: tops of two uprights close together

Fr. 65 1, or 8

Fr. 66 1, lower left-hand arc 3 ], thick dot on the edge, level with letter-tops; a higher dot, probably a stop, between this letter and 8, junction of top of an upright and a horizontal, 8 also possible

Fr. 67 Fr. 68 Fr. 69

Fr. 67 1 ], foot of upright slightly inclined to right? 2, foot of upright, followed by dot higher than letter-tops level, 5, horizontal joining the top of the first upright of 6, 2, also possible
6 |, high dot |, left-hand lower arc 7 |, first a descending oblique, then a rising and a descending oblique (e.g. ΛΛ, ΛΛΛ, ΛΛΛ), then the top of a taller upright

Fr. 68 |, foot of upright with right-hand curl; left-hand lower arc; low dot 2 |, parts of lower and upper arcs; η, η less likely 3 |, specks high in the line

Fr. 69 |, traces on loose fibres 5 |, traces of upper arc

Fr. 70

Fr. 71

Fr. 72

Fr. 73

Fr. 74

Fr. 75

Fr. 76

Fr. 77

Fr. 78
Fr. 76 1 ], descending oblique 2 ], horizontal slightly lower than letters-top
Fr. 77 1 ], upright with start of horizontal? 2 ], upright and start of diagonal? 3 ], speck
4 ], descending oblique 5 ], two dots low in the line 6 ], an upright and, high to its right, a vertical
stroke possibly belonging to a descender from line 6.
Fr. 78 1 τ, or τ! 2 ], traces low in the line and foot of upright 3 ], dot at half-height,
perhaps part of a descending oblique 4 ], high dot


Fr. 82 1 ], left-hand arc 2 ], horizontal at half-height: r, τ 3 ], thick high dot
Fr. 83 1 ], right-hand arc (or end of descending oblique?); foot of upright (hooked to the left) 4 ],
lower right arc (ε, ι); foot of upright 5 ], upper right-hand arc; upper junction of two obliques: λ,
α, etc.
Fr. 84 1 ], foot of upright 2 ], traces on disturbed fibres

Fr. 82 1 ], high trace
Fr. 83 1 ], high horizontal joining ρ 2 ], high and low specks; κ? 3 part of
lectional sign?
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Fr. 85  Fr 86  Fr 87

\[\beta\alpha\]
\[\varpi\alpha\tau\alpha\]
\[\tau\varepsilon\theta\]
\[\varepsilon\zeta\]

Fr. 85  2 [, a left-hand arc an upper arc 3 \(^\circ\), superscript, in a different hand 4 [, a horizontal joining

Fr. 87  1 ]\(\tau\), also possible.

Fr. 88  Fr. 89  Fr. 90  Fr. 91

\[\nu\varrho\]
\[\gamma\mu\]
\[\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\]
\[\gamma\eta\]

Fr. 89  1 ]\(\varrho\), right-hand arc, \(\omega\) also possible 2 ]\(\zeta\), also possible 3 [, top of an upright

Fr. 90  1 ]\(\lambda\), or \(\lambda\).

Fr. 91  1 [, \(\kappa\) or \(\varsigma\), \(\xi\), or \(\omega\) 2 ]\(\tau\), or \(\eta\), dot at level with letter-tops.

Fr. 92  Fr. 93  Fr. 94

\[\ldots\]
\[\lambda\alpha\zeta\]
\[\chi\varrho\]

Fr. 92  1 [, traces of lower arc; low horizontal; foot of rising oblique 2 ]\(\lambda\), or \(\lambda\)

Fr. 93  1 ]\(\gamma\), or \(\tau\), or \(\omega\), or \(\xi\), or \(\zeta\) 2 [, perhaps the right-hand end of \(\omega\), \(\xi\), or \(\tau\) 3 [], a horizontal joining the top of \(\chi\), \(\mu\), rather than \(\lambda\)

Fr. 94  1 [], horizontal low in the line, or lower arc; foot of upright and descending oblique (\(\nu\)?) 2 [], high dot 3 ]\(\delta\), a horizontal (cross-bar of \(\varepsilon\)? the cross-bar of \(\lambda\) is usually inclined upward) joining \(\iota\) at halfheight; under it, a low dot; the sign above the line may be interpreted also as a rough breathing
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Fr. 95

Fr. 96

Fr. 97

Fr. 98

Fr. 99

Fr. 100

Fr. 101

Fr. 102

Fr. 103

Fr. 104

Fr. 105

Fr. 106

Fr. 107

Fr. 108

Fr. 109

Fr. 95 1 [, foot of descending oblique; lower left-hand arc
Fr. 96 1 [, high horizontal joining γ
Fr. 97 2 [, upper arc
Fr. 98 1 [, lower arc
Fr. 100 1 [, high horizontal touching α? 2 [, start of a high horizontal
Fr. 101 2 [, ω not ruled out 1, upright visible at the right hand edge: perhaps not ink?
Fr. 102 1 [, foot of upright, hooked to right 1, lower arc
Fr. 103 1 [, upright.
Fr. 105 1 [, high dot, as of right-hand arc. This fragment may also be read the other way up as ις 1: the ις, followed by the foot of an upright, may also be a η; at the end a left-hand lower arc.
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Fr. 106 1 ], upright
Fr. 107 1 ], rising oblique, almost upright
Fr. 108 1 ], Ν? ], right-hand lower arc
Fr. 109 1 ], high horizontal, joining ε ], foot of rising oblique

Fr. 110 1 ], end of horizontal at middle-height ], upright
Fr. 111 1 ], dot on the line 2 ], thick top of upright or part of right hand upper arc ], lower left-hand arc
Fr. 112 1 ], speck 2 ], mid-line horizontal touching tall upright? 3 ], abraded upright?
Fr. 113 1 ], dot on the line; lower arc 3 ], upright (rather than flattened right-hand arc?)

Fr. 1 5 This was the last line of Medea's monologue. Cf. A. R. 3.794 ff. καὶ κέν με διὰ εὐθαμβοῦς φορὼν / Καλύπτει ἀλλὰ ἄλλα ἄκηκα μμήκοντα (imitating ll. 441 ff.), leading to the end of her third monologue. In this context, if Medea has already considered the possibility of helping Jason against his father's will, it is likely that ἀρήσοντα is used in ἄλοιπον μεθ. At the end of the line the choice is limited to forms of ἁμαρτωλος, and ἁμαρτωλος (Medea fears that after her betrayal nobody would accept her in his/her house?), ὄμως and ὄμως. The last solution might be suitable for a situation similar to A. R. 3.791 ff., ἄλλα καὶ ὅσο φθιμενὴ μοι ἐπάλληλον ὑπέκκεισ / κερσομίας (e.g. διμοῦ καταπέθυμων?).

6 At the end of the line the articulation κατ’ ἄρ’ ἃνδεισεν looks more promising than κατὰς. It is possible that ἔλετρον is governed by κατ’ or κατα- (some compound verb?); it is however perhaps more likely that the preposition (or a compound verb) might govern a noun in the final lacuna, dependent on ἔλετρον. For ἔλετρον and κάπερκες in 7, cf. A. R. 3.655 ἐλετροσειν προνή ἐπικάπετες ἐλετριθεία, after Medea's second monologue (cf. also κάπεκες/εν εὐς ἐν Νονόν. Dim. 24.331, 25.572, with ἔλετρον in the preceding line, 34.86).

7 κεκλημένη seems suited to the context, and, though not certain, is fairly close to the traces: cf. A. R. 3.672 κέκλητ’ ἔλεσσε (and Nonn. Dim. 2.368 ἄχριστο ἐκκλημενή). With κεκλημένη a new sentence starts. I assume that the sense of 6–8 was After having said so she fell down on the bed; once she lay down she was tormented by anguish; but she was relieved by sleep: cf. A. R. 3.616–17 κοίμητ’ ἁδ' ἐξ ἀκαλωμος καταλάκθειν ὑπόκινο / ἔλετρον ἀνακαλθεῖσιν (cf. Od. 18.189), picking up Medea after v. 471 (Ἡ μὲν ἀρ’ ἔς ἄλατρο νόν μελετήμας κοίμητ) and introducing, as here, her nightmare. At the end of the line δὲ τα[ is perhaps more promising than δ’ έτος.

8 In 8f. Sleep comes, with a precarious relief for the girl (this is a natural inference from 1. to καθαρούσσω and the description of the nightmare in the following lines). βλέπ(ν)ευει suits the space better than by βλε(φάρσο). This implies that the dative cannot be governed by κάπα not; I think, it is likely that it is by a compound verb
beginning with κατα-. So perhaps sleep is here κατάπτης as Nisë, ἵππονιδέα τῶν πολυτήρων βροτῶν, is in E. Ὀτ. 174–6. Hypnos himself gets wings only after Call. ἴ. 4.234 in extant literature (but cf. the difficult text of A. Αγ. 426; common after the Hellenistic period, as e.g. in Nonnus and Latin poetry, but much earlier in visual arts; here in particular cf. Melaeager AP 5.174 (50 GP), if εἰλ. ἰπτ. κοιν. / ἔπτερος εἰκόνως Ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροις; for ἔρμα in this context cf. Nonn. Dion. 24.119 (πτερόν ἔρμα πάλλων, of an eagle; cf. 25.436). To fill the end of the verse various solutions are available: if a main verb is to be supplied, e.g. Ὕπνος ἐπιθήκη/ ἔκτης; if the main verb was in the next line, as it is perhaps more likely, one might consider e.g. Ὕπνος ἐφίζων. If βλεφάροις is to be preferred (the singular indicates collectively both eyelids, or both eyes, in B. 5.157, 17.11, fairly often in Euripides [cf. Willink ad Ὀτ. 302], cf. also Аγαθίας, Ἀρρ. Πλ. 109.3), a possible solution might be e.g. βλεφάροις κατά πτερόν ὕπνος ἔρεις / ἐλεκτ..

9. I cannot find any convincing reading for the traces at the beginning of this line, where also the fibres are disturbed. The first letter seems to be either τ or γ; it was followed by ι, ι, or ι, and by a vowel with a circumflex accent (almost certainly γ). This does not, however, produce any acceptable sequence. ταφροτετρα... would be too large for the gap. The verse may have dwelt on some physical description of Medea’s going to sleep, but am not able to find any solution. I had thought of a form of ἴπτανεν, ἴπτανε, with Ὕπνος in the gap of the preceding line as a subject. Sleep might be binding Medea, or her sight: the usual verb for this is πεθάομαι (Od. 23.17; Soph. Α. 675; Πλ. Τύ. 71c), and δειμνεώ and derivatives are used in this context; cf. particularly Mosch. Ἱερ. 3f. Ὕπνος . . . βλεφάροις ἐφίζων / λυκεινή πεθαίδα μαλακών κάτα φάες δειμνεώ (and Bühler ad loc.; ἴπταν εἰς is sometimes used in connection with δειμνεйте: cf. Α. Ρ. 1.129, 2.1299 and Πλ. τ. 158 Ρ.). On this hypothesis, at the beginning of the line, what I take for the left hand part of τ’ is horizontal should in fact be part of a diacritics, but I do not think this fits the traces very well, and, in any case, leaves the ink after the first ϊ unexplained.

Without a solution for the first word, attempts to restore the second are mere guesswork: ὡτά [ἐπιθάγχων] would be a possibility (cf. e.g. Α. Ρ. 1.1299; Νεοτης 7.99 in the same metrical mode, ης, as, with different meaning, in A. R. 3.1195; for its use in erotic context, cf. Headlam ad Herod. 1.57, Gow ad Theoc. loc. cit., and Arg. Ορφ. 8.69, of Medea), but it seems slightly too wide, and N is not very promising, since the last stroke before ο is a descender; a new verb, and Medea as the subject, must start (describing, I suppose, her sleep or her agitation).

The meaning here might have been (she moved here and there in agitation) as it happens to a sleeping person, as she was’ (cf., in a very similar context, Α. Ρ. 3.617f. ἀνάφη ἐτελεσθῆς, / ὅτι τ’ ἀκοῦσθείν, ἵππον ἐρθεικόν ἀνεκτυι), or (she lay in bed and her body relaxed) ‘since she was sleeping; but her mind was troubled . The only other occurrence of this verb in poetry seems to be in the clumsy hexameters of Μαϊστας 16 (p. 69 Powell: καθημενατός, also describing a dream). διὰ κραδήσεις or κραδής(ή). I suppose that with these words a new sentence started: (because: γογ.?) through her heart worries were violently driving (e.g. her soul)’.

11. μενθῆρας: the only literary occurrence of this term was in Panyassis (?) fr. 16.16 Bern.; cf. Hesychius (ном. sing. and dat plur, glossed with φρονίτης and μεμήδωσαν) Et. Μ. 580.6 (μενθῆρας: αἱ φρονίτης: cf. Suid. Σ. ν. μενθῆρας: αἱ φρονίτης), XXIV 2390 fr. 50(ε).17(Π. and Lobel ad loc.). ἀπόστημα ὑποτ. ὑποτ. ἀπό την, or a compound verb beginning with ἄποστροφ. At the end of the line some form of δοκεῖον might be lost in the gap (e.g. ἀπόστημα δοκεῖν σε αἰών δοξής, or ἀπό της ἐκ δόκησεν). The verb κοβίσω is not attested elsewhere in epic texts: its use in poetry (with the exception of the Hellenistic tragedian Sositheus, fr. 1.1 ΤήΔΓ) is limited to Comedy and epigram.

12. At the end of the line probably some verbal form beginning with ἔνει (αρτ.-?). For ἔνει cf. Verg. Αμ. 4.466 ff. (Dido’s dream) sempereque reliquiis / sola sibi, sempere longam inanitatem videtur / ire viam etc.

13. For the article with ἐνει cf. A. Svensson, Νεοτης des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklassischen griechischen Επίκ (Lund 1937) 4 (Α. R.), 132–6 (Homer).

14. ἄνθρωπος is used as an epithet of ὕπνοος thrice in Nonnus. The possibility that it might refer to another term lost in the gap of the preceding line (after the expected second disjunctive) cannot be ruled out, but none of the nouns attested with this epithet in earlier (e.g. ἡ μελησθη, after [Hes.] Σαε. 420, and Tyrt. fr. 19.9 West) or later times (e.g. ἡ παράμεινος) is appealing. The high dot after γενετήρας may not have been a punctuation sign, but the remains of a trema, and the syntactical period may therefore continue with the following words.
and with the preceding line, is probably no coincidence.

15 Probably καὶ πῶς τι (for this group of particles, cf. Denniston, GP 494 ff).

The first letter after the central gap is probably κ. The other readings leave some ink unexplained, and do not offer viable solutions. (If ), is to be interpreted as λ or ζ, metre and space prevent restoring any form or compound of λεκανάς and δέδυκώς, while δ)]λυκώς does not seem very promising: λεκανάς does not offer any probable solution. Some form of κωναπ should be restored: (δ)]κωκάς or, far more likely, ]κωκατοµ-. The 'distracted' form is attested only in the oracle Parke-Wormell 112.4, in this metrical sôdes, but it may be restored in Nic. Al. 25 (κωκαµένη Headlam: MSS are divided between -κομήτ-. -κοµήτ-. and the manifestly inferior ταρακοµάτιτις), and perhaps (Magnelli, Per litt. in *Claud. Gigant. 72. Position in the line and metre suggest that the word comes just after the caesura so that a compound form is ruled out. Before it, a possible articulation would be -ρος ε[( ](as e.g. Βαρµής)]( ). If I cannot find any satisfactory solution with a different articulation: an optative ending in [κότις ε[ ] (optative forms of ἄριστος, ἀερίου, διαρέω are frequent in this sôdes in Nonnus, but not, as far as I can see, in other epic authors) would be too long to fill the gap.

17 α]φότε[ρο]ς ε[ ] would perhaps fit in the gap (cf. κρακοςου in fr. 218), and, assuming that ]ς after the gap must belong to the same metrical word, I cannot think of any other solution.

18–21 Cf. commentary ad fr. 25.

19 ἇ: πέλει(ε)
20 μέµατο[h.
21 ταυρότος.
22 Some form or compound of πῦρ.

Fr. 2

This fragment, describing Medea's nightmare and her awakening (cf. on 20), is likely to have followed fr. 1 at not too long an interval. Frs. 1 and 2 might come from two consecutive columns. I cannot detect any kollesis in fr. 1 (there are vertical fractures after the second/third letter, and at about two thirds across the fragment, but, though the fibres are disturbed, there seems to be horizontal continuity), so that it is likely that a kollesis must have followed its right-hand end at a short distance, and the horizontal fibres cannot be of any help.

2 ελθέ, ελθέ, ελθέ, ελθέ, ελθέ (in this sôdes: Hes. Theog. 688, A. R. 1.1606, Nic. Thea. 547, Alex. 517), ελθέ.
3 Traces and space suggest either δνν[ε]ς or, perhaps better, δννς[ε].
4 The aorist optative πλήκει, τί ε(πλήκεις in Hl. 16.72) or (in a direct speech?) the future πλήκεις.
5 If ]ένερ. [ in 9 marks the end of a direct speech, φέτι(ε) might conceivably be an imperative, but an imperfect is equally possible. Then either ]ενετε[ ]/ - /-τε, or ]ενετε[ ]/ - /-τε. If the scene depicts Medea's fear for Jason, the first solution looks more reasonable.
6 ένετο[ν], ένετο(ν), of either πῦρ or adverbial (cf. Bulloch ad Call. Po. 5.77).
7 Cf. app.: e.g. καὶ πῆς[ν] γε(ν), καὶ πῆς]κε[ν, καὶ πῆς]ν[ν- (sel sim), καὶ πῆς]ρ-.
8 μεµήρα [ ]]. The word, in extant literary texts (Hes. Theog. 55, *Theogn. 1325, IG XIV 1942, *Greg. Naz. Π 1, 130), is always plural. It is worth noting that in the lexicographical tradition, it is specifically connected with sleeping (cf. e.g. Hesych. μεµήρα (the paroxytone form, transmitted only here, is prescribed by Hdn. Ι.260.21 Lentz = Theognostos 107.16, and presupposed also by the plural μεµήρα in Hesych. s.v.)): έκ τῶν κατασκοµίας φροντίς, πο θύγας μεµήρα ή εί τῶν κατασκοµίας περὶ τὴν ζω. This meaning, not relevant for the literary occurrences quoted above, is connected with the ancient explanation of ἀποµεµήρασις in Ar. Isp. 5 (sch. 5c: μεµήρα ή μεµήρα καὶ ή φροντίς: έκ δί τοῦτο τὸ καθεδρῆ: οἱ γὰρ καθεδρικες ἀποδέχεται τὰς μεµήρας καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὅρθρον δὲ γίνεται τὰς θυγας οὖ ταῖς ἐπιστάςων ἑλπίσθε, οὐ τούτῳ τῷ ὄνοματε καλούσων: cf. also sch. 5d). The whole lexicographical tradition on the word might well look like guesswork based on the Aristophanic passage (so MacDowell ad loc.), but its use in the context of a nightmare, just before Medea's awakening, and with θυγας in the preceding line, is probably no coincidence.
15. The bulls' ἐρυθάματα breathe flames: cf. e.g. A. R. 3.231, 410 = 496, and, above all, 1303 ff., where their fiery breath is compared to ἐφεροντι (cf. below, on v. 17). Here too, apparently, the flame was the first term of a comparison.

16. ἔκχυω may be used of a wide range of objects. Its collocation here, between the description of the bulls and the following comparison, suggests that it may be used of the fire (with e.g. cf. Dion. Per. 583 ἐκκεύοντα πῦρ, and Val. Fl. 7.566 (cf. Aietes' bulls) ἀρδέντες σταβάλα ὀφθαλμοὶ εὐθαμαί τεθρασάν.)

17. ἐλαύνω (in this metrical sede: Nonn. Diom. 6.148, 30.81) is used in a comparison at ll. 12.156 of the wind rolling along a fire in a wood (the same image, with ἐλοφός, in 204.492), and of Zeus' κεραυνοῖ at Hes. Thesp. 692. The object of the verb is πῦρ (ll. 12.156) or φῶλα (204.492 and Hesiod, cf. also Hesych. s.v. ἐλοφός); the verb is intransitive in Nonn. Diom. 6.148, as it possibly is also in 30.81 and 48.380 (and as ἐλωφάξει was in [Hes.] Sat. 275, with ἐκλαυχ as a subject). The ἀρθουριγον passage, where the κεραυνοῖ ἐν τῷ πεῖρα κοιτάζουσι, is the model of the description of the bulls in A. R. 3.1303 θηρύνη φωλάμα φυσιώττετε (cf. also 410 = 496). It is likely that the verb here refers to the deadly fire produced by the bulls. The whirling flame was then compared to a wave, ὁ ἀτταύη (a): it may be worth noting that in Dionysius, Gigant. fr. 73 mete & Livrea, ἐλαὐνόυκεν occurs in the context of a sea storm. The comparison with waves is a very common type in epic: Jason taming the bulls is compared to a rock standing firm against the waves in A. R. 3.1293 ff, but there the comparison does not involve the fire/wave motif. Much more similar is Val. Fl. 7.570ff. (i.e. like two thunderbolts or two winds) τοιούτων δὲ τρόπον ἐν ἀρχοι ἄτοτι ἄρῃ τοῖς ἐνεκάδα φλουδάτας. At 581 ff. the bulls are compared to waves against a rock: thunderbolts and waves derive from A. R., but the description of vv. 571 ff. has no parallel in A. R. and may have been influenced by this passage (volens being a good rendering of ἐλαυνόω, and fluctu of κύτωμα, the use of this word being rather unusual in this context in Latin: cf. A. Perutelli ad 572, where also the possibility that the verse may be an interpolation, or an author's variant for 571, is discussed).

18. The image introduced with κρούκω (does not easily fit with the one in 17; since τόκον in the next line requires an antecedent, I suppose that we have here a new comparison. The image seems to be that of a liquid poured out of a vessel, and it could be compatible with ἐκχύεσθαι in 16. It is however possible that the comparandum is no longer the fire of the bulls: the second half of 19 must have introduced the subject of ἀνέπταλον (20), and the comparison might have involved the description of some psychic process leading to the awakening, just as A. R. in 3.755-60 used the image of the light reflected by the water in a vessel to describe Medea's state of mind.

At the beginning of the verse, space and syntax suggest δεκατον (for its correlation with τόκον, cf. e.g. ll. 16.589-92. A. R. 4.172-6). κρούκω (Nic. Alex. 502): the noun does not occur at the singular before the Hellenistic age (if 'Erinna' in AP 7.710 is Hellenistic), while the Tragedians (5x), like Lycephon (2x), always have the plural. The vessel seems to be relevant (cf. next verse) in its use as a large container of water (for drinking or ritual purposes), a pitcher, as it is in the Tragedians, Lycephon 1965, Theocrit. 13.46, Nic. loc. cit. and fr. 48 Schm., AP 9.438, 3 (and, perhaps, Euph. 429 i.4 SH). Its most conspicuous function in Hellenistic and later poetry, as a funerary urn, (‘Erinna’, loc. cit., AP 15.12.8, 9.272, 2 (κρούκων), Lycephon. 369, [Mosch.] Megara 34, epigram in Vita Pind. i 3.13 Drahman, Peak V. 2013.4) seems out of place here (on κρούκω, cf. also Breitenstein, Recherches sur le poème Mégara (Copenhagen 1966) 45-7).

19. ἐκ[προ][κέω] seems very likely (a poetic verb: cf. I.S.J s.v., Livrea ad A. R. 4.605 f.); for the repetition of ἐκ(-), at least thrice in five lines, cf. κρατο/-κατα in fr. 1. 6-8, at least thrice in three lines, but other solutions are conceivable.


Fr. 3

The position of these words in the structure of the line may be determined on the following grounds: (1) in 6 ὀκτέως was probably in the 4th position, or in the 2nd (only if followed by ἔκχως τυρι, σίμμω); a location on
the 5th position is very unlikely, even more so if καὶ τάξεστε is read (Herrmann's bridge); other articulations like [οὐχ γαρ τάξεστε] would fit also in other positions; (2) in 5 and 7 πτυχαντε and τερεπαν may fit best in the 3rd or in
the 5th position, if no infringement of Herrmann's bridge is allowed; 5 could in itself also be line-beginning, e.g.
nε καὶ μετὰ τρομος εὐείς (Parsons), trespassing against the far less frequently observed Meyer's first Law; τερεπαν (7),
on the other hand, might be accommodated within the 2nd position only if followed by elided δοῦλη, which is
hardly appealing; in the 3rd position it would infringe Nauck's law (δοῦλην or δοῦλης being the two most likely
supplements: the presence of an enclitic seems unlikely here), but it is far from certain that this poet observed the
rule; (3) τε in ζωτεραφα (9) may be the 3rd, the 4th or the 5th princeps: the second case would imply a violation
of either Herme's bridge or Nauck's law, unless the noun was followed by an enclitic or elided: the first case seems
unlikely, because of the alignment with the other verses. On the whole, the likeliest reconstruction seems to be the
one entailing the position closest to verse-end.

3. -[η] τοιο δι(ε) or -[η] τοιο δι(ε), with the second syllable occupying either the 3rd or the 5th princeps (in the latter
case, which is favoured by the alignment with the following lines, the first articulation would violate Nauck's law).

to the right of ε, however, is too distant to suggest a letter other than τ, which would leave us with +[η]ε[ι]αι δακτ διαβ[η]ε[ι]αι o (-ηλακ διαβε[ι]) or -[η]ε[ι]αι δακτ διαβε[ι]αι t (-ιηλακ διαβε[ι]), this latter only with τι, enclitic, to avoid
infringing Herrmann's bridge).

5. The articulation ] πτυχαντος εὐείς is more likely than the alternative ] πτυχαντος εὐείς. In a description of
the enchantment of the dragon a sentence like κατά γαρ μετὰ πτυχαντος εὐείς is perhaps conceivable: μ, instead of ε, is
not prima facie the most obvious reading, but it is difficult to find any alternative.

6. The most probable solution seems to be καὶ τάξεστε. If the subject was the guardian dragon, the adjective
might have been governed by some equivalent of ὑπνοι, while δοῦλην τοιο or δοῦλης ομοιο would suit the description
of the relaxation of its body. This only is guesswork.

7. πτυχαντος may govern the genitive δοῦλης or go together with the accusative δοῦλην. The first possibility
is somewhat favoured by the occurrence of the tucta περιβοληπτεραν δοῦλης (of the syrinx) in Nom. Dion. 24.39
(who uses this and other verbal adjectives with a similar metrical shape in a variety of other contexts too). For
-τερα forms in Hellenistic poetry (here also l. 9), see Magnelli ad Alex. Act. fr. 4.5 (who for this passage, per litt.,
suggests καθήτεραν, attested only in Hesychius; if the metrical reconstruction tentatively proposed above is
correct, it would have been preceded by a prepositive monosyllable such as καθ'}. Alternatively, e.g. καθ'ε[τεραν
δοῦλην (cf. Hes. Οp. 464), which might suit if this is the incantation with which Medea put the dragon to sleep,
or δοῦλης ομοιο (cf. PJP).

8. Almost certainly εὐστοιαν, followed by κλάσανς[ν], κλάσανς[ν], or κλάσανς[ν]. If some form of κλάσανς is to be
supplied, it may be mentioned that the verb is sometimes used also for musical instruments such as the syrinx
mentioned above, on v. 7.

9. The only reading I can think of is ζωτεραφα, a word attested in Hesych. s.v. as an epithet of Athena in
Bocotia. The goddess is more frequently called ζωτεραφα in literary and epigraphical sources: cf. Paus. 9.17.3,
Schachter, Cults of Bocotia i 31, 128f, 132, 134 (Bocotia: Thebes and Tanagra); IG I 369, 92 (Atica, Cape Zoster),
Paus. 1.31.1 (Atica); Steph. Byz. s.v. ζωτεραφα (Epicanedian Locro); 319 Schwyzter, Dial. gr. ex. epigr. pot. (Delphi),
P. Ceccarelli, La separati nell'antichità greco-romana (Roma 1998) 106 f. The form ζωτεραφα is transmitted in Lex. rhet.
(Bekker, Anecd. i 261).

The word may have been used here too as an epithet of the goddess. Her presence may fit in a scene where
the guardian snake was put to sleep. In A. R., which follows Antimachus (fr. 63 Wyss = 73 Matthews; it is possible
that some sort of enchantment is obliquely referred to already by Pind. Pyth. 4.249 τραχων), Medea enchants the
dragon with songs and magical herbs. In some more ancient version, attested in vase paintings (cf. LLUC v. s.v.
"Iason", nn. 32 and 46), Jason faced the monster with the aid of Athena. If this was indeed a description of the
dragon episode (which is very speculative), the possible mention of a pipe may recall Hermes' role in the Argos
episode, on the one hand, and Athena's invention of the ναονα πολυέχθεσα on the other hand.

10. ής δ τε[λ]ι (e.g. τε[λ]ς [ος, τελ]ς [τος] perhaps more promising than ἄντε Λι simm.)
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Fr. 4
3 Some form of ἐπιθύμησα (but A. R. has also ἐπιθύμας, and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo ἐπιθυμᾶτι).
4 Some form of the participle ἐκκυμώκες.
5 κων[ε-], Κων[ε-], κων[δαλ-].
6 Forms of this passive aorist or future of κέβνυμι do not seem to be used elsewhere in epic texts.

Fr. 12
7 πατρις [(προσό]πατρις, πατας [], or πατας[c-].
8 πεντα.
9 Some form of ἕγγαι (κατ-, μετ-).

Fr. 13
2 δ' ἐνν or δ' ἦν ν-.

Fr. 14
Metrical position of the fragment: 3 θαληθωτι seems fit only for the 3rd princeps (the 2nd necessitates a mono-
syllable ending in -ατ at the beginning of the line; the 4th would break Hermann’s bridge; with the 5th it is dif-
ficult to imagine an apt supplement for the end of the line: τοιοκ με συμμ. ?); 4 ἀδρπ may be the 2nd, 4th or the 5th
princeps (with, e.g., ἄδροθείοντο[εσί/εο]; 5 στροφηγήα may be the 3rd or the 5th princeps; 6 ἄοι κε may have occupied
the 2nd, the 3rd or the 5th princeps (this word-group, arguably prepositive, is attested before Hermann’s bridge
only in [Opp] ζυν. 2.528, an author who does not observe the bridge on several occasions; it occurs, on the other
hand, before the third foot caesura in ll. 12.4.47, 15.228, Οδ. 1.236, (in 4.64 the caesura may be postponed to the
4th foot), A. R. 1.1157, 2.986, 4.6.39: ll. 15.228 and A. R. 2.986 are the only two, clearly related, passages where no
bucolic diaeresis follows); if ἄοι is read, positions 2 and 4 are available: for its possible collocation in the third foot
see Bulloch ad Call. Ῥώμ. 5.103; in the fifth foot it would infringe Naeeke’s law; 7 ακτενεσε may represent the 2nd or
the 4th princeps; 8 the usual position of an adjective like ὑδροποδηρτος would be at the main caesura, but a colloca-
tion between the 4th and the 5th princeps may not be ruled out; the simple verbal adjective after the main caesura
entails breaking either Naeeke’s law or Hermann’s bridge; its collocation before the caesura, if not preceded by
a non-postpositive monosyllable, would break Meyer’s first law; 9 the molossian word would fit before the main
caesura; if ἠ[εί is the preposition, a collocation between the penthemimeral and the hephthemimeral caesuras
is also possible.

Taking account of the alignment, the following seems the most likely solution: 3 θαληθωτι 3rd princeps; 4 ἀδρπ
2nd princeps; 5 στροφηγήα 3rd princeps; 6 once 2nd (or 3rd?) princeps; 7 ακτενεσε 2nd princeps; 8 φορητος at the main
caesura; 9 molossian word at the main caesura.

3 Either θαληθωτη (an alternative name of Apsyrtos in A. R. 3.245; or the hero, son of the sun, mentioned
by A. R. when narrating the Argonauts’ adventures in the Adriatic sea, in 4.623: cf. also Eumelos, fr. 8 Bern., 22* West) or θαληθωτι. If τεοι[ει τεοι (τεοι) is correctly read, someone must be addressed, perhaps in direct speech, rather
than in an authorial intervention.

4 ἠ[εί ἄδροθεθην (κατασ). Its occurrence after the possible mention of Apsyrtos in line 3 may suggest the pos-
sibility that his murder was described in terms of a human sacrifice.
5 E.g. μα[εου, κε μου, κε αου? Some form of στροφηγες, apparently its only occurrence in an epic poem.
6 ἄοι ἄοι δαμάςες is an obvious possibility; another is ἄοι ἄοι δαμάςες[ει-, optative (in epic usage the, not
very common, sequence ἄοι κε(μ) is attested after a relative/anaphoric pronoun), perhaps favoured by the occurrence
of an optative in the next line: this solution is possible only if ἄοι represents the 3rd princeps in this line: in the
same position, a form such as δαμάςειας would yield the, perhaps desirable, bucolic diaeresis; its position in the
2nd foot, on the other hand, would imply an aorist indicative active form.
7 Χε[ε, presumably some aorist form of Χάκεω. It may have suitably described the snake’s open jaws.
A possible alternative might be a sentence like γαῖα με] δίκτυσει Χε[ος, with an elided vowel, if not at
line-end.
8 ὄψωπος (only in Procl. Hy. 4.14 and Synes. Hy. 4.36) may be compatible with traces and space, while ὄψινος is too wide for the gap; the simple ὄψινος is also possible.

9 ἑπὶ λείων is possible, though unexpected in an Argonautica (but conceivable as an epithet of Heracles; used of Hylas in Theocr. 13.49 [Magnelli, _per litt._]. ἑπὶ λείων may represent a viable alternative.

Fr. 16
6 ἐπ/ὑποτροπο[...], ἐπ/ὑποτροπο[-, or ἐπ' ὑποτροπο[-.

Fr. 20
ἀρχή (2) in some form of the singular, or some subjunctive form from ἀρχέω, νήσων[π/v (4), κούρη, (?). At the end of 3, if the reading is correct (which is far from certain), position would only allow ἀνθραξ (for which epic poets seem to prefer ἀνθραξί) and the obscure Hesychian gloss ἀνθραξ δρόπτεα (a nominative ἀνθραξ, instead of ἀνθρακώη, for a kind of bec, is attested only in sch. Ar. Nud. 947), or the monosyllabic ἄνθραξ (at the end of the line in Nic. Thet. 328, [Opp.] Cyn. 3.308).

Fr. 21
2 ἐξ/καθ[...v is a not impossible reading (for the presence of a second-person form, cf. fr. 14-3). Many alternatives are possible.

Fr. 22
3 E.g. ἐκ λέπα δ[+ cons., but many other articulations are possible (λεπάδ[ν...], ἐλπ' ἐπ' (etc.).

Fr. 23
4 Some form of ὀτάμβων or ὀταμῦν.

Fr. 24
2 (ε)μῆλθε.
8 ὁ πτηνο[...?

Fr. 25
The physical appearance of this fragment is not incompatible with a collocation under the right-hand side of fr. 1.17 (the vertical of the last τ in that line being aligned with the beginning of τ in fr. 25.2); cf. Plate V. The text itself does not offer decisive confirmation for such placement, producing something like

```
.ἐν τ., [...], παρετ[...
- - - -], ἐν τ. ἐλευ[...], ὀκ. ὑπο[...
20 - - - -]γε μῆμ[...], δύν ἐπ[...
- - - -]τ. ἄργου[...].[...].[...].
```

1.20, where the monosyllabic πε does not seem to be an appealing solution, would break Hilberg's law; before the caesura, a form of μῆμων ending with a diphthong, shortened by the hiatus, would seem unavoidable (ἐν and ὀκ are too long); after the caesura: δύν ἐπτ[...].

Fr. 26
3 -δουνής(ς), perhaps a toponym (as μακροδούνίς(ς), χελόδονής(ς), etc.)?
4 As a proper name, Χάρωφ is attested from Homer onwards; if we were dealing with a historical poem (which, as it seems, is not the case) the possible identification with Chareps of Epirus might go well together with Μακρίν in the previous line. Here, however, it may also be the adjective χάρωφ, attested only in [Opp.] Cyn. 3.114 instead of the more usual χαρωπός. Χάρωφ is an epithet of Heracles in Boeotia (cf. Schachter, _Cults of Boeotia_).
ii (London 1986) 3–10. His sanctuary, not far away from Coroneia, was close to the one of Zeus Laphystios where Athamas tried to sacrifice Phrixus and Helle (Paus. 9.34.5), and this may be the right solution if this fragment really belongs to an Argonautica. The following letters may be articulated as et λέες- or as a form of λεές.  

5 various articulations are possible (-accc των(a), -ac cε, -acce 'έτε να-, etc.).

Fr. 33
2 e.g. πηρ]σει[i. πα]σετ[ (only in Call., SH 259.17), πο]τισετ[ (vel simm.), but other articulations (with -8) are conceivable.
3 λαγασον. If λαγασον, its occurrence in an epic text of this period is remarkable (cf. also fr. 64.2). In the archaic and classical periods its use in poetry seems limited to Old Comedy, with an occurrence in Simonides (519 fr. 9.6 PAG, possibly a paean) and two cases in the epigraphic paenae (Aristonous 16, with βοματο as, possibly, in Simonides, and in [Thespis = Heracleides Ponticus?] fr. 4.5 TiGF); it very rarely appears in Hellenistic poetry; cf. Call. h. 4.275, A. R. 2.608 and Diodorus, AP 6.245.5 (1 bc – i AD). On its history, see E. Williger, Hagios: Untersuchungen zur Terminologie des Heiligen in den hellenisch-hellenistischen Religionen (Giessen 1922) 72–108.

Fr. 35
4 probably πατε ναι.

Fr. 36
4 /αεθ[]. Some form of ἄθλυ- or ςυναθυ-. It is likely that only one syllable is missing at the end.

Fr. 37
1 (-)δηλ]φάσα[- is a possibility (but it does not join to the right of fr. 60.6), along with the less likely ἄφασατος, ἄφαστος.

Fr. 43
This fragment represents line-ends: at the end of 4 and 5 only a syllable is missing [δευ[- but also ] να κος[- in 4; in 5 a verbal form πδλε[θυαι / πδλε[θε has a fair chance compared to a noun, πδλε[θαι vel sim.].

Fr. 44
2 perhaps some form of κενή.
3 κα[ς]κοιξή[-, or κα[ς]κοιξή[-.

Fr. 50
4 Cf. Erinna fr. 401.27 SH μετεβάλλετ' στραών (the word in this form is used at verse end starting from hom. hym. Cer. 157 down to Nonnus, who uses it frequently).

Fr. 51
4 -κε κα[ς] would be just a guess.
5 δέκω[θ] or δέκω[θ], but also ]κοι κοι[.

Fr. 55
1 perhaps κενή ἄτη?
2 όληκος.

Fr. 56
1 γ]λάσσας, π]λασσας, όλας κος [,}.
Fr. 58

2 Compounds of πᾶλπι and νοτέρ-, to judge from the TLG, are all late (none earlier than Oppian, Hal): the adjectives are attested in the form παλβοτερς (first in Nonnus, several times) and παλβότερμος (first in Oppian, three times in Nonnus; cf. A.W. James, Studies in the Language of Oppian of Cilicia (Amsterdam 1970) 151); παλβοτερς with a single ν, if the editions used in the TLG are to be trusted, seems to occur only in a dodecasyllable Byzantine version of a fable from the Aesopcan corpus (212 οίης, 7 Chambry, not guaranteed by metre). So, perhaps, πάλπι νοτέρς (ΠΠ). An alternative articulation as e.g. εἶνεν ἄλπι νοτέρς is conceivable (though I have found no parallels for it nor for similar expressions in hexametric poetry). έθερ αἱ [ἀν [οι [ώς [ς] is a possible supplement.

Fr. 61

5 Φλε[γγην γε ή] γγην, [αγρην?

6 έθερ γε [κε [κε- does not seem to be a promising articulation. -ε[ροόν is a possibility: such forms are always attested before the bucolic diaeresis (with the exception of Nonn. Dim. 44-272).

10 βου[ρι] looks like the beginning of a word, and in this linguistic context the only alternatives are βου[η] (ll. 7.2.58, Call. Il. 6.1.108), and βου[τρηνέων, attested hitherto only in Call., Hec. fr. 35-2 Hollis (v.l. βου-). The possibility that μ[ή] may be read (e.g. ε[θ]μ[ή]μεν [ιν[θ] or βου[εκ]ίτης) must be kept in mind.

Fr. 63

2 ἤρθο]ρέων [υ[ν[ν.

Fr. 64

2 ἄν:] ἄγιας, though a theoretically possible articulation (see also on fr. 33.3), is not particularly attractive. Perhaps better ἄν:] ἄγιας, with an adjective attested only in Pind. Nem. 7.69 (ψάγυνον δαρων), to which Hesych. s.v. ψάγυνος is likely to refer.

Fr. 69

2 possibly -]ου επ[θ, but e.g. λ]ος π[ε[θ cannot be ruled out.

Fr. 81

1 E.g. c]ρε[ς, or something like παδ]ρε[ς[θ, more probable than ν]δρε[ς] (Magnelli).

Fr. 113

3 C]κεφ[θ[ is one among several possibilities.

G. B. D’ALESSIO

4713. HEXAMETERS

87/315(a) c.13.6 x 10 cm

Second century
Plate XI

Second century
Plate XI

Two fragments, almost touching, make up the upper part of a column of hexameters, written across the fibres. Some traces at the lower left edge may represent line-ends from the preceding column; they are obscured by superimposed vertical fibres, perhaps a repair-slip. The front contains remains of writing in two different hands: it seems that an account was written first in a large script in two columns; later, in the empty space between the columns, a minute cursive hand wrote a dozen or so lines, apparently a letter (εππο' ω κε εςξαθ can be read in the last line).
The hexameters are written in a practised informal round and upright hand, bilinear except for φ. Comparison with GLH 15b (145/6) and GMAW² 33 (ii; assigned) suggests a date in the second century. Punctuation is by high stop (4, 6). There are no other lection signs in evidence, with the possible exception of an acute accent in 5; elision is not marked (4, 6). Iota adscript is written (5 eύπσ). The upper margin was at least 2 cm; likewise the intercolumnium.

There is both narrative in the past tense and direct speech; and if ἐγὼ is to be recognised in 2, as seems likely, the narrative is in the first person. The situation is not altogether clear. Speculatively, we may envisage a scene describing resistance to a proposal to cut down something (a grove of trees?). The speech urging restraint will start with line 4, and we will have the following structure: (i) 1–3 past first-person narrative: the speaker ordered (his men) to cut down (the grove?); but X held them back; (ii) 4ff. X’s speech (unless the narrator changed his mind after X’s opposition), advocating caution, since the grove may be an ἀγαλμα θεῶν; he sees ivy, bay, an extraordinary pine-tree.

The object of the ‘cutting’ in line 2 (ταμνέμειν or τάμυμε μέν) does not have to be trees (the immediate context appears to be martial; cf. 1 n.); there is no indication that trees are involved until the ivy and bay of line 6 — plants moreover that normally stand for Dionysus and Apollo respectively rather than characterizing a sacred grove (see 6–7 n.); there is no actual mention of a grove. Nevertheless, the scene may have some affinity to the tale of Erysichthon told in Callimachus’ Hymn to Demeter and Ovid’s Metamorphoses 8.798ff. (see A. Henrichs, BASP 16 (1979) 85–92). Armies on campaign ravaged vegetation in sacred groves, e.g. Herodotus 6.75 (mad king Cleomenes), Thuc. 4.90 (see B. Jordan and J. Perlin, in Studies Presented to S. Dow (Durham, NC 1984) 158). Lucan describes a sacred grove (lucus) of the Gauls, the opposite however of a locus amoenus, whose trees Caesar orders felled to build a siegework (BC.3.399ff.; cf. Hunink ad loc). If this is on the right lines, it is interesting to have the first-person narrator cast in the role of the violator. There is nothing to show whether or not the warning was effectual.

The versification shows none of the metrical refinements of the Callimachean hexameter, but seems far from amateurish. The mannered structure of 6 is notable, and ἑρυκάνδακυκε (3) is not the product of an inexpert composer.
...[ c5 ], εη...οχβ[, νυο[ c7 ], ργ...ν[...]θ[
κατ[ c7 ]π[
κ[ c7 ]μθ[
π...ν[
δ[.
...

. . .[ c5 ], εη...οχβ[, νυο[ c7 ], ργ...ν[...]θ[
κατ[ c7 ]π[
κ[ c7 ]μθ[
π...ν[
δ[.
...

1] τ...χ, ink speck at lower line level; short, stocky τ; top half of an upright, υ, i, etc.; indeterminate traces, one or two letters; then, stubby right-hand arc or upright; π, π is not excluded; a break in the papyrus, on the other edge, vestigial speck close to base-line of β, ι? π[, lower left tip of ι? π[, π; perhaps not excluded 2...4, first two minimal specks; then a short horizontal running into an upright above the middle, τ, τ, ι, α., traces either side of hole, the second a shortish upright ι, ..., ι possible; then a hole, with speck on either edge, followed by the left half of a circle embracing a small hole, ι[1] possible; then ι or conceivably ω ]ι...: long horizontal on the line, Δ? b possible; a break in the papyrus, on the other edge there is ink that may belong to another letter; upright with small loop attached to the top, π; then indeterminate traces of two letters χ, ι, is unlikely 3 ι, π? fin., π or τ 5 ε, ι, two indistinct traces, then a short horizontal at mid-line level, with what appears to be an acute accent above ]τ, τ, π also possible ιοδ, α corr. from τ by m. 1 6 final high stop uncertain 7], vertical with stroke joining from left in middle, υ possible 8, left extremity of possible baseline on edge of hole, suggesting ι, ι, ι between a and φ, lower part of longish upright, π? 8, small hook high in the line, ι, ω, π? 9 λ[ or perhaps ι, η 11, ι, ι, ι 10, ε only the cap of c remains, π or τ also possible ιοδ, α possibly Διφε, ι, or ι, π, τ 12...[, possibly το [ ...]ι[, or π, τ 13...[, damaged traces, first back of λ?, but λ not excluded?, then Διο suggested (ιοδ[1]δ) 14, τ, or perhaps τ (προφει[? less likely προφιν]) 16 [, left tip of crossbar, τ or π

...τ...χ, βέλεμνα π...[...]απ[...], ει ορος[αυ
αυτικα...σαλ[...], εγω...ε[...], νι άνωγο[τραμεμεν ειχρ[1]μιθέντας ειρ[υ]κανάκεκα δε,[
φραζώμεθα, φίλου, — βουλή δ', επί τ[α]ίων ἀρίστη—
μη δε ε[...]τόδ' ἐπεις θεών εξα[ετ]ον ἀγάλμα.
κικάνον τοι λεύκσων λέυκσω δ' ευαλδέα δάψην—
ηλ[ c7 ]ε τάσιν ἀριφραδ[...].

1...[?] ordered (them) to approach and cut, but [...] was restraining (them): "Let us take thought, friends—deliberation is best in all things—in case this may be a special adornment of the gods. Indeed, I see ivy; I see well-grown laurel; and among them is a pine such that (no woodcutter [?] could fell it, even if the god himself commanded [?] ... conspicuous to all..."
1. θέλεμα, whether or not throwing-spears, must be missives. At line-end άρος seems likely, preceded by a participle (cf. II. 16.258), or possibly an adverb, πάντες (π. δ., Od. 10.47 same position, I. 12.83, Nunn. Dion. 37.88) might be tried, but would be a little long for the space, and the low ligature joining ε from the left does not suggest τ. The articulation θέλεμα' απ- is not excluded.

The context is probably martial, though in Nunnus, trees (πέυξι, πίτυς, δάφνη) are attacked by the Indians under Dionysiac influence (έξει κ' έπέπηκτο ταυστόρθως ένι δένδροις / Ηδων πυκνά θέλημα 17.337–9; cf. 15.44–51, 60–63) and they serve as practice targets for Dionysus' archers (24.139–42, πελέκη, οὐκίη, πίπτω, πέψω). 2. E.g. απίτικα τα' ἄλμα(ο)ι [ς] could suit the remains (cf. II. 9.417), but τ[ς] λίκ' would be too wide. If έγώ is right, then ἄφωγος at the end. What came in between is unclear: perhaps a participle agreeing with έγώ (έγώρς is too short).

3. τάμημα rather than τάμει, μή seems indicated; 'I gave orders to assault and cut'.

έξει κ' έπέπηκτο ταυστόρθως ένι δένδροις / Ηδων πυκνά θέλημα 17.337–9; cf. 15.44–51, 60–63, and they serve as practice targets for Dionysus' archers (24.139–42, πελέκη, οὐκίη, πίπτω, πέψω). T. The articulation άταμήμα' απ- is not excluded.

At line-end, the traces suggest τ or πτ, a name or perhaps δέ πέπηκτο, ἄδντας, etc. δέ κέινος (δέ έκλεις) is difficult palaeographically. Unless τάμημα is imperfect, there must be a change of subject. It appears that the verb leads straight into direct speech.

4–5 'Let us take thought, friends—deliberation is best in all things—lest this be a special adornment of the gods'.

φράξμεθα. Speech beginning. The speech may continue to or beyond the end of the fragment. In Homer, this exhortation in the first person usually comes some way into a speech rather than opening it (except Od. 17.274). (The second-person forms, on the other hand, often open a speech, e.g. e.g. Hera to Poseidon and Athena (II. 20.114), Apollo's warning to Diomedes (II. 5.440), Achilles to his horses (II. 15.446, 22.358, 16.446, 22.338, Od. 17.595 (Monro, §281). The form φράξμεθα occurs twice in Homer, II. 9.112, Od. 2.168, both same position. The second person φράξατε occurs with φλαμα at II. 18.254 (speech-opening) and A. R. 2.423. Φλάμα may be possible palaeographically but would be startling. At the beginning of line 5, μή τα' έπι έπι έπι έπι could do (cf. Od. 24.491, 13.421, and Denniston, 592), but is grudgingly accommodated by the traces. The apparent accent is unaccounted for; it does not seem to be a supralinear correction.


In Soph. OC (161) Antigone guesses a place to be sacred (ιρράος) from the proliferation of bay, olive, and vine (δάφνης έλαιος άμπελον), plus nightingales (cf. 10 ή πρός βιβλιθοκ ή πρός δέκκας δέκκας). 6–7 ημιέκα τον λεύκου λέικου δέ επιδέα δάφνη is an elegantly constructed line. έ[ι]υ- could be scanned disyllabic if preferred.

έλαδος is unhomeric; of φίλοκε at AP IX 325.2 (Gow–Page, HE 38961) and of Hippocrene in Aratus (1.217), ειλαδέ βάθη Nunn. Dion. 17.84 (same position).

At first blush, we would imagine ivy and bay to have special reference to Dionysus and Apollo, but the pine-tree (πίτυς) of the following line complicates the picture and suggests that they do not have such particular significance. The πίτυς is especially notable for its pastoral associations (Theoc. 11, Hopkinson on Call. H. 6.27, Hor. c. 2.3.9 with N.-H.'s note. The tree, in her anthropomorphic form, becomes a beloved of Pan (e.g., Theoc. Syrinx 4 with Gow's note, Prop. 1.18.20, Longos 2.7.39, Nunn. Dion. 16.363, 42.259 et passim). All three—ivy, bay, pine—frequently appear in descriptions of the locus amoenus. The Cyclops' cave in the Odyssey is framed by δάφνης and πίτυς (9.163ff), in Theocritus by δάφνας and κεκάκας (11.45ff). In Nunnus' nature scenes, the pine is often
found in conjunction with Ἀθηναίοι (12.133-5. 21.105f.; personified together at 2.94ff., 16.362) and sometimes with κοκώλα (12.314). It is also one of the trees, the first mentioned, that grow in Demeter’s grove in Cal. H. 6. ἐν πῖνοι, ἐν γεγομάτο σπεῖλε ἐπάνω, ἐν δὲ καὶ ὥποια, / ἐν δὲ καλὰ χλωκύμαλα. Priority can hardly be determined, but I would guess belongs to Callimachus.

Other associations with πῖνοι seem less important here (cf. Der neue Pauly, s.v. Fohre). The pine is the subject of a sympoistic discussion at Plut. Mor. 675c-677b. Victors in the Isthmian games were at one time crowned with πῖνοι (12.314). It is also one of the trees, the first mentioned, that grow in Demeter’s grove in Call. H. 6: βερνερ', εύ πεπαξαι ενρεμαε, καὶ εὐβούς κυπαρίσσος (Od. 6.363; personified together at 2.94ff., 6.363) and sometimes with κοκώλα (12.314). From Roman sources, we learn that the pine (= πῖνοι, John Lydus, de Mens. iv.59) was sacred to Cybele, because Attis is said to have fallen asleep or castrated himself under one (see H. Hepding, Attis, seine Mythen und sein Kult (Giessen 1903) 110, 114, 150; Attis becomes a pine according to Ovid Met. 10.104; cf. Bürner’s note ad loc. Aeneas’ ships were built from Cybele’s pines, Verg. Aen. 9.77, 10.220).

All three plants here (κοκώλα, δίσφυς, πῖνοι) are in the singular; cf. the woods on Calypso’s island, ἀλγή δὲ επίκες ἀμφύ πεθώσασι πληθύσσα / κληρον τ’ ἀγαμέροι τε καὶ εὐβούς κυπαρίσσος (Od. 5.63f.).

7 f. Cf. H. 13.208 ὡς πῖνοι βλασθή̑σθι, τόις τ’ οὐρίς θέτετεν άκρον. The πῖνος pine is noted for its height, coastal habitat (φαλάγγεια, Alciphron 2.9.1), rustle in the wind (Theoc. 1.1, Mosch. fr. 1.8, Nic. Alex. 301f.), use in ship-building (Plato, Laws 705c), suitability as a garden tree (Verg. Ec. 8.65), etc. (see RE XX 2, s.v. Pinus). According to Herodotus (6.37) the πῖνος once cut down does not grow back again. The point of the relative clause is not clear (cf. the description of ἀγαμέροι at Call. H. 6.37f., ἐλάτη at Q. S. 1.625-7). A negative seems inescapable, but not οὐδὲ unless also κεῖνος. The end of 7 has proved intractable. A compound in -μοιοφος was initially attractive (e.g. εἰλικρύνομος, Opp. C. 2.98), but -ομο- cannot be accommodated. Hardly ἤτα ιευκόμος (Hsch.); nor do κο [π]ει (violating Hermann’s bridge), ε[π]οι, κε[π]ε, ἤτα ιευκόμος seem to help. If the relative clause continues beyond 7, perhaps an optative, ἤτα ιευκόμος may perhaps be considered—C. Meliadó.


11 ὅλοντοι the most obvious, but ὅλοντοι or something more recherché is possible. ἐρυ̑—later in line? After γ, ὡς κατ’ ἐρυ̑ς or κατ’ ἐρυ̑ς would be possible.

J. YUAN

4714. Late Hellenistic or Imperial Hexameters

88/260

Fr. 1 6.9 × 11 cm

Third century

Plates X–XI

Forty-nine fragments from a roll, written along the fibres; back blank. The lower margin was at least 3.2 cm (fr. 4).

The copyist writes a sloping mixed hand, in which the down-strokes of Π, Τ, Υ and Φ, the left lower arm of Χ and sometimes the initial curve of Λ descend well below the line. I would compare this specimen with II 223 (Roberts, GLH 210) and assign it to the third century.
Iota adscript occurs in frr. 1.19 and 246.2 but is not used in frr. 1.15 and 22.7. Elision is marked in frr. 13.4 and 14.3. There is no example of scriptio plena. The middle point in fr. 20.2 could be a punctuation mark or follow a suprascript addition (cf. fr. 13.4). The original copyist is responsible for most of the numerous suprascript letters, which represent either corrections or variae lectiones (frr. 1.3, 2.3, 10.9, 19.4, 22.3). He effected two deletions (frr. 7.8, 10.4). In fr. 13.4 he apparently crossed out some letters and certainly inserted a suprascript correction (preceded and followed by a high point). He produced corrections currente calamo in frr. 1.2 and 22.2. In fr. 38.1 he probably rectified the omission of a letter by inserting it within the main text.

Additions by one or more later hands are to be found in frr. 10.8 (suprascript letters) and 29.9 (marginal note). Fr. 30.2 is written in a peculiar way, perhaps by a different hand. In the smaller scraps I could not account for two interlinear signs (frr. 10.4, 43.2), which seem to be due to the original scribe. A symbol is possibly used in fr. 29.3.

Frr. 1 and 6 and perhaps frr. 8 and 47 deal with the fight between the Lapiths and the Centaurs. The two groups are expressly mentioned in fr. 1.9; the name of the Lapith Dryas occurs in fr. 6.3. Words referring to war and grief are found in many verses of fr. 1 (2.3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12-17) and in two verses of fr. 6 (4, 6). Ancient sources inform us that the Lapiths used spears as their weapons, whereas the savage Centaurs brandished tree trunks and branches: see here frr. 1.15, 6.6 (Lapiths), 1.11, 2.7 (Centaurs). ἄγριοτης (fr. 1.14) is a characteristic feature of the Centaurs. Lapiths perhaps appear also in fr. 47.4.

Fr. 2 presents a different subject. Heracles seems to be mentioned in v. 3. In v. 6 we read the name of Andromeda’s mother Cassiepeia, who offended the Nereids and caused her daughter’s exposure to the sea monster: it can be surmised that, immediately afterwards, the poet told how Perseus saved (v. 7) and helped (v. 9) Andromeda by killing the κῆτος. It is possible that also frr. 5 and 9 belong to this part of the poem: in fr. 5.3 we find perhaps the rock to which Andromeda was tied; the words ἤβης (fr. 9.2) and θάλασσα (fr. 9.7) would be appropriate for Cassiepeia’s arrogance and Andromeda’s ordeal.

It is not certain that the myths of the Lapiths and the Centaurs on the one hand and of Cassiepeia and Andromeda on the other were somehow connected here in a single poem. If they were, we may wonder whether the likely mention of Heracles in fr. 2.3 can be taken as a link between the two sections, since this hero fought against the Centaurs after their battle with the Lapiths (cf. [Apollod.] 2.5.4). But then why should Heracles be named just before the story of Cassiepeia and her daughter? Can Heracles be relevant to this myth just because Perseus was his great-grandfather on both his mother’s and his stepfather’s sides (genealogies: Perseus–Electryon–Alcmena–Heracles; Perseus–Alcaeus–Amphitryon–Heracles) or because the legend of Perseus and Andromeda resembles very much that of Heracles and Hesione?

If we assume that the hypothetical link between the two stories was not Heracles’ fight against the Centaurs, we may imagine other possibilities. I have thought of two:

1) After rescuing Andromeda from the monster, Perseus wants to marry her but must beforehand engage battle with her suitor Phineus: eventually Perseus petrifies Phineus and
his followers by means of the Gorgon's head. This nuptial struggle resembles the fight between the Lapiths and the Centaurs, which took place during the wedding of the Lapith Peirithoos and Hippodameia, when the drunken Centaurs tried to rape the Lapiths' women but were defeated. It may be relevant that Ovid (Met. 4.663–803 and 5.1–249; 12.210–535) presents the two episodes in very similar terms (see Bömer's commentaries: II 231 f., VI 79 f.). Of course this reconstruction does not account satisfactorily for the likely mention of Heracles in fr. 2.3.

2) In the pseudo-Hesiodic Αςπικε, the fight between the Lapiths and the Centaurs and the struggle between Perseus and the Gorgon are both represented on Heracles' shield (vv. 178–90 and 216–37). It is possible that our poem offered a similar pattern. This reconstruction would have the advantage of explaining why Heracles was probably mentioned in fr. 2.3. Besides, fr. 1.1–3 deal with craftsmen and hammering; a shield appears probably in fr. 1.7 and perhaps in fr. 8.9; ἡλας in fr. 1.6 may also be referred to forging (but these verses would also suit a different interpretation: see on fr. 1.1–3). The weak point of this reconstruction is the use of the aorist in frs. 1, 2 and 6: when a poet describes the scenes represented on a shield, we would expect him to employ the imperfect (as at Hom. Il. 18.491–605, [Hes.] Scut. 144–317, Quint. Smyrn. 5.3–101, 6.200–93 and Nonn. Dion. 25.417–561).

The poet's style is basically Homeric: a very close Homeric imitation may be responsible for a metrical inaccuracy in fr. 1.14; Nauck's bridge is perhaps infringed in fr. 1.9 and 1.14 (this is frequent in Homeric poems, but sometimes occurs e.g. in Aratus, Apollonius Rhodius and Theocritus: see West, Greek Metre 154 f.). Nevertheless some features are not to be found before Hellenistic or Imperial epic, as regards vocabulary (fr. 1.15), phraseology (frs. 1.7, 1.15, 6.6) and morphology (fr. 1.13); a verb is possibly used in its post-Homeric sense at fr. 2.9. Therefore the composition could be assigned to the first century bc or to the first or second century ad.

Fr. 1

[109x753]4714
[109x753].LATE HELLENISTIC OR IMPERIAL HEXAMETERS 89

Fr. 1
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

[πευκτημεγανοζουνετις [πεύκης μέγαν ὁζον επικ. [ε]νθα δὲ εὐμμετέρην α... δ... [μενεπληγοντες πατριν[μεν πεπλήγμονες ἐπανεύρετε[ρ-άγιριον καὶ ἀλατον ε... [δαρμηνιεχρεβδασταδαν [τις η ἕταρον περιδείδε [μεοδουσαντοκακην[μετα δακρυον τος ἀκηδ[υμε[... οιανεμον[... χ]εμερημή στε τις κατ[... ζενοφων κατα [τεκνεφωνκατα [τε κενοφων κατα

1 ], faint spot level with the horizontal of τ on edge... presumably lower part of κ; descender as of ρ, τ,γ, ϕ[... flat trace at line level]... or A 2 ]... upright with stroke joining on left near the top (rather than l) the second υ has been converted currente calamo from μ... indistinguishable spots of ink on edge, ranging from top to bottom of the line, followed (on stripped fibres) by spot at mid-height above flat trace at line level 4 ]; high trace, perhaps tip of up-stroke to right 5 ]; top of upright e, c or n 6 i, a speck of ink not accounted for projecting from the upper left-hand part of letter... (damaged fibres), two spots one above the other, one level with letter-tops and the other at line level 7 ]... spot on edge at line level... descender as of ρ, τ, γ, ϕ; middle part of upright followed by two dots, one high and one at line level 8 ]; high horizontal (τ?); upright (probably t) 9 ]; (stripped fibres), dot just below top of a on edge, perhaps tip of horizontal 10 ]; foot of upright... ]; spot at mid-height followed by curved trace at line level (one or two letters represented); angular trace at line level (with apex upwards and slightly curved right-hand stroke) and high trace 11 ]; faint spot at mid-height on edge 12 a... curved down-stroke to right from top to middle of the line, followed by spot at mid-height (μ suggested); trace at line level, perhaps part of upright 13 ]; foot of upright; lower left-hand part of circular letter 14 ]; higher part of upright e, left-hand part of e or c 15 ]; trace on edge, ranging from top to bottom of the line 16 ]; upright followed by tip of up-stroke to right level with the letter-tops (κ?); angular trace (apex upwards), suggesting A or α; foot of upright touching the lower tip of the previous letter; probably right-hand part of π 17 ]; faint traces just below the line on edge (delusory?) and on stripped fibres a spot above the line and another at mid-height 18 ]; tip of down-stroke to right touching the horizontal of τ, e.g. e 19 ]; traces on edge (mid-height and line level) 18 ];... (damaged fibres), tip of upright; high trace of confused ink; top of thick curved up-stroke to right; top of upright; perhaps diagonal and right-hand upright of τ 20 ]; π or τ (if τ, after it another letter represented by trace ranging from top to bottom of the line on edge)

Fr. 2

[μοσηρ[μοσηρ[ηρακλ[Ἡρακλ[γειωλίπ[γειωλίπ[εμοναν[εμοναν[
LATE HELLENISTIC OR IMPERIAL HEXAMETERS

Fr. 3 1. FOOT OF UPRIGHT FOLLOWED BY TRACE (PART OF HORIZONTAL?) AT MID-HEIGHT 2. THICK HORIZONTAL ABOVE; PART OF A SUPRASCRIPT LETTER? 3. LEFT-HAND PART OF \( \epsilon \) OR \( \iota \) 4. TRACE AT MID-HEIGHT, PERHAPS RIGHT-HAND ARC 5. FOOT OF UPRIGHT; DOT JUST ABOVE MID-HEIGHT FOLLOWED BY UPRIGHT; DOT JUST ABOVE MID-HEIGHT AND TRACE RANGING FROM MIDDLE TO BOTTOM OF THE LINE ON EDGE 6. DESCENDER AS OF \( \rho \), \( \tau \), \( \gamma \), \( \phi \), \( \epsilon \), \( \tau \) OR \( \tau \), \( \lambda \) OR \( \mu \) 7. UPRIGHT 8. HIGH DOT 9. ABOVE \( \epsilon \) A HIGH TRACE, PERHAPS BELONGING TO THE PREVIOUS LINE 10. SPOT LEVEL WITH THE HORIZONTAL OF \( \tau \) 11. LOWER PART OF UPRIGHT FOLLOWED BY SPOT AT LINE
level (perhaps ρ followed by another letter)

New Literary Texts

Fr. 4 1 ] , [, horizontal at mid-height followed by lower part of upright (λ suggested)

Fr. 5 1 ], κ or λ , [, tip of diagonal at line level

Fr. 6

Fr. 7

Fr. 8

Fr. 9
LATE HELLENISTIC OR IMPERIAL HEXAMETERS

Fr. 7 [ ], [ ]., trace below the line, possibly part of descender [2 ] , , upright; dot at line level, perhaps foot of upright, and oblique upright with thicker ink on foot (n suggested) [4 ], foot of up-stroke to right [5 ], tip of up-stroke to right [6 ], foot of upright [6 ], probably α [8 ], higher part of upright (blurred ink, perhaps part of the deletion); I cannot recognize the deleted letter [9 ], lower part of upright [11 ], top of upright; high horizontal (τ rather than α); higher part of curved up-stroke to right followed by spot at mid-height

Fr. 8 [1 ], [ ], apparently Α, Α, or λ; indistinguishable traces at line level [2 ], descender as of Ρ, Τ, Υ, Φ [4 ], trace at line level (perhaps part of upright) followed by high horizontal touching ο (τ suggested) [5 ], lower part of up-stroke to right [6 ], dot at line level below the left-hand arc of Φ (λ possible) [6 ], trace below the line, probably part of descender [7 ], remains of upright [8 ], faint medial trace on edge [9 ], (damaged fibres), perhaps the two ends of a high horizontal; trace level with letter-tops above faint spots at mid-height; high trace (three or two letters represented) [8 ], [8 ], [8 ], [8 ], apparently tail of Α or cross-bar of Ε, traces at line level on edge [9 ], tip of upright above the line, as of Φ [10 ], top of upright touching the horizontal of τ

Fr. 9 [1 ], [ ], horizontal at mid-height; small loop at line level (?); specks from descender [2 ], foot of upright just below the line [2 ], faint traces on edge (top and middle of the line); oblique descender (λ or Χ suggested) [3 ], top of Α, Α, or Λ [4 ], two consecutive dots at mid-height (perhaps parts of a loop) followed by a faint high spot [4 ], trace level with the cross-bar of Ε with speck on the line below [5 ], (stripped fibres), two spots followed by upper right-hand part of circle slightly below mid-height [7 ], thick dot at line level touching the tail of Λ (perhaps λ) [8 ], apparently right-hand tip of horizontal touching a at mid-height [9 ], foot of up-stroke to right (Λ suggested) [9 ], tip of up-stroke to right touching top of Κ [10 ], trace at line level compatible with Α, Α, Λ [11 ], dot at line level on edge [11 ], right-hand part of horizontal at mid-height

Fr. 10 [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ]
Fr. 10 1 ], upright  2 ], initial curve as of λ  3 ], high spot on edge  4 ] [πψπu], above the deleted letters there is an angular sign (apex upwards), the right arm of which is long and curved (PJP writes: 'the suprascript ink looks almost like a hyphen, but perhaps the extra ink to the left excludes that')  5 ], apparently left-hand part of ζ, ζ, or ς; two consecutive spots, one slightly above the line and one at line level  6 ], trace at mid-height, perhaps right-hand part of horizontal; two thick high dots (the arms of γ?)  7 ], up-stroke to right with slightly curved tip above δ there are two suprascript cursive letters, perhaps ce  8 ], foot of up-stroke to right  9 ], high trace, perhaps curved top of letter (ς corrected into ζ?); high curved trace, apparently top of circular letter, and speck above the line (from above or below?)

Fr. 11 1 ], faint high spot  2 ], γ rather than ζ, τ  3 ], the gap fits a narrow letter  4 ], thick down-stroke to right with curved top (λ?); up-stroke to right starting from the lower right-hand part of the previous letter and forming an angle on top (λ?)  5 ], upright followed by spot at line level on edge  6 ], high spot above trace at mid-height (perhaps cross-stroke joining upright)  7 ], upright followed by arm?

Fr. 12 1 ], horizontal slightly above line level; descender as of ζ, τ, ϒ, φ  2 ], e or c; left-hand part of high horizontal touching the previous letter  3 ], right-hand tip of high horizontal touching θ  4 ], o rather than ω  5 ], lower part of letter beneath faint spot above the line on edge  6 ], perhaps τ or p (blurred ink)  7 ], perhaps top of circular letter; high horizontal (above faint spots at line level on stripped fibres); perhaps tip of up-stroke to right

Fr. 13 1 ], dot below the line, perhaps tip of descender  2 ], γ or π  3 ], speck at mid-height  4 ], the deletion mark, if not delusory, is quite faint  5 ], oblique descender (λ or κ suggested)  6 ], foot of upright

Fr. 14 1 ], two consecutive dots at line level  2 ], two spots on edge, one high and one at mid-height  3 ], upright  4 ], the elision mark is written above the right-hand top of τ  5 ], trace at line level, perhaps lower left-hand part of circular letter  6 ], faint spot at mid-height on edge  7 ], on account of the blank space beneath με (4), it is possible that v. 4 was the last verse of a column; but it is also conceivable that a short line followed v. 4

Fr. 15 1 ], upright  2 ], c rather than ε; perhaps foot of upright  3 ], dot at line level com-
patible with \( \alpha \), left-hand part of loop (\( \theta \) rather than \( \lambda \)) 4 \( \varepsilon \), apparently left-hand part of \( \varepsilon \) 5 \( \tau \), possibly \( \tau \), but there are spots of ink not accounted for after the second letter

Fr. 16 Fr. 17 Fr. 18

\[ \text{4714. LATE HELLENISTIC OR IMPERIAL HEXAMETERS} \]

Fr. 16 1 \( \text{, perhaps } n \) 2 \( \text{, up-stroke to right (\( \lambda \))} \) 3 \( \text{, remains of the loop of } \lambda \text{ or } \theta \) 4 \( \text{, lower part of } \varepsilon \text{ or } c \); the same 5 \( \text{, left-hand part of } \varepsilon \), \( c \), or \( \omega \) 8 in the blank space beneath the final letter of v. 7 some of the horizontal fibres are stripped: therefore we can neither be sure that v. 7 was the last verse of a column nor that it was followed by a short line

Fr. 17 1 \( \text{, two spots at line level} \) 2 \( \text{, top of upright} \) 3 \( \text{, perhaps } \epsilon \); perhaps \( \phi \)

Fr. 18 1 \( \text{, mid-line speck} \) \( \text{, upright} \) 2 \( \text{, (letter-tops), faint spot; angular trace (apex upwards); tip of down-stroke to right} \)

Fr. 19 Fr. 20 Fr. 21

Fr. 19 1 \( \text{, upright} \) 2 \( \text{, upright with slightly curved top} \) 3 \( \text{, high dot} \) 4 \( \text{, slightly curved tip of upright the suprascript letter appears to be } \phi \text{ rather than } \phi \) 5 \( \text{, top of } \tau \text{ or } \varepsilon \) 6 \( \text{, spot just below mid-height on edge} \)

Fr. 20 1 \( \text{, foot of upright followed by faint spot at line level} \) \( \text{, perhaps lower right-hand part of arc; foot of upright; trace at line level (horizontal?); trace at line level (part of up-stroke to right?)} \) 2 \( \text{I am not sure whether } \vee \text{ belongs to the main text and the middle point is a punctuation mark, or } \vee \text{ is part of a suprascript addition followed by a middle point (cf. fr. 13.4); } \vee \text{ looks large enough to be main text, but on the other hand the top of } \gamma \text{ (v. 3) is written at the same level as the lower parts of } \vee \text{ (without any interlinear space), which may suggest that } \vee \text{ represents a suprascript} \)
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Fr. 21 1 ] [, foot of upright 2 o, faint down-stroke to right starting from lower right-hand part of letter (not accounted for) [, perhaps tip of oblique descender of λ or x 3 ], faint spot at mid-height on an isolated fibre [, τ or γ 4 ], ε or c ..., [, left-hand arc (ο suggested); very faint spot level with top of preceding arc followed by high dot (top of triangular letter?); high dot, perhaps part of upright

Fr. 22 1 ] [, oblique upright 2 ε is apparently written currente calamo over a letter that I cannot identify ..., [, foot of up-stroke to right (λ suggested); upper left-hand part and top of a letter followed by faint spot at line level (perhaps two letters represented) 3 ..., curved foot of up-stroke to right followed by high roughly circular traces (damaged fibres; λ with superscript?), remains of up-stroke to right 4 ], right part of high horizontal (τ suggested) ..., trace at line level, perhaps foot of up-stroke to right

Fr. 23 1 [, probably λ 2 ], apparently right-hand part of ω ..., [, λ (followed by ?ν, ??) or (if only one letter represented) μ 4 ], [, faint high trace

Fr. 24 1 ] [, ε (?); τ or 1 2 ], spot at mid-height on edge 3 [, tip of upright 4 ], [, faint trace close to ν 3

Fr. 25 1 ] [, foot of down-stroke to right; ε or c 2 [, up-stroke to right (λ or μ suggested) 3 ], right-hand arc in the upper half of the line ν, top of triangular letter (λ rather than Α or λ) 4 ], high trace on edge (λ?) 4 ], trace just below letter-tops (part of horizontal?) followed by faint high spot

Fr. 26 1 ..., (lower parts of letters), thick dot; possibly tip of up-stroke to right; possibly lower left-hand part of Α or Α 2 [, two faint spots on edge, one at mid-height and one below the line 3 ], apparently top of up-stroke to right with tip of vertical before it (not κ)

Fr. 27 1 ], [, top of Α or Δ; apparently left end of horizontal (τ?)
LATE HELLENISTIC OR IMPERIAL HEXAMETERS

Fr. 28

Fr. 29

Fr. 30

Fr. 31

Fr. 32

Fr. 33

Fr. 34

Fr. 28 1 ], foot of upright; A rather than λ 2 ], up-stroke to right from middle to top of the line; lower part of δ or ε; lower part of loop (A or Ω suggested) 3 ], (abraded fibres), top of circle just above mid-height; thick curved down-stroke to right from top to middle of the line (possibly A, the left leg of which may also be partly extant).

Fr. 29 1 ], (lower parts of letters), spot at line level; two dots at line level (one above the other), perhaps part of upright; spot slightly above line level; spot at line level 2 , confused traces at mid-height; A or Ω? 3 , thick upright compatible with n (letter-tops), thick dot, very thick up-stroke to right above the line and faint spot level with letter-tops beneath the up-stroke (perhaps some symbol rather than a letter); dot above the line and spot level with letter-tops beneath it; upright followed by up-stroke to right (κ?); down-stroke to right touching the preceding stroke (κ?)

In the left margin of v. 3 if, a cursive note, perhaps ζ(αρ) | —, central part of upright above horizontal below the line; horizontal at mid-height touching a).

Fr. 30 1 ], descender as of p, τ, υ, Φ 2 ], very faint spot at line level 3 a very strange line: the hand looks different from the other fragments and the letters overlap (perhaps to spare space at the end of the verse?) 4 , apparently top of upright 5 , right-hand arc; perhaps part of upright

Fr. 31 1 ], faint trace below the line (part of descender?) 2 ], upright 3 ], faint trace at line level followed by high spot and foot of upright followed by curved up-stroke to right above the line (Χ?); foot of upright to right (Α suggested) 4 ], high very thick dot (blurred ink), perhaps loop of ι, probably Α but ι cannot be ruled out.

Fr. 32 1 ], (damaged fibres), trace at line level (foot of upright?); then perhaps ο (if only one letter represented, possibly ω) 2 , (damaged fibres), thick up-stroke to right at mid-height beneath high horizontal
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

(a distorted o); upright; dot at line level; descender as of ρ, τ, γ, φ, very faint high spot on edge, apparently remains of loop at line level (κ?)

Fr. 34 , apparently tip of roughly horizontal stroke touching loop of a at mid-height, foot of upright touching the lower tip of a; foot of upright 2 , probably λ 3 , (striped fibres), spot just above mid-height 4 , high spot, possibly tip of upright 4 , (striped fibres), two very faint spots at mid-height

Fr. 35  

Fr. 36  

Fr. 37  

Fr. 38  

Fr. 39  

Fr. 40  

Fr. 41  

Fr. 42  

Fr. 43  

Fr. 35  2 , speck

Fr. 36  1 , foot of upright 2 , θ or ω rather than ε or c? 3 , thick spot at line level on edge 4 , faint high traces; perhaps top of circular letter

Fr. 37  1 , two feet of upright 1 , descender 2 θ, the upper vertical is not visible 1 , apparently tip of descender (p?) 4 , (damaged fibres), faint horizontal at mid-height

Fr. 38  1 , upright θ, the lower loop (the only extant part of the letter) is abnormally large 1 is probably inserted

Fr. 39  1 , blurred thick spot below the line 2 , foot of upright

Fr. 40  2 , apparently left-hand angle of μ or ν 3 , speck
Fr. 41 2 . . . [ , very faint spots of ink at mid-height close to the next letter; perhaps λ

Fr. 42 1 [ , apparently foot of upright 3 ] . . . [ (letter-tops), two spots one above the other; top of triangular letter (specks of ink below both traces on stripped fibres)

Fr. 43 1 [ , (damaged fibres), spot at mid-height on edge followed by faded top of upright 2 intrā linēas above ν, a speck of ink not accounted for 3 , thick down-stroke to right at mid-height 4 of θ only the descender remains . . . [ , traces (top and middle of the line) on projecting fibres 4 . . . [ , foot of upright

Fr. 44 Fr. 45 Fr. 46

Fr. 44 1 . . . [ , very faint spots just below the line 2 . . . [ , near-horizontal touching the back of ε 3 . . . [ , thick upright with foot curving to left on edge (n?) 4 . . . [ , top of vertical to right 5 . . . [ , top of vertical touching the back of ε

Fr. 45 1 . . . [ , near-horizontal touching the back of ε 2 . . . [ , top of vertical to right 3 . . . [ , higher part of thick upright sloping down to right; faint high trace; high flat trace

Fr. 46 1 . . . [ , thick upright with foot curving to left on edge (n?) 2 . . . [ , trace at line level on edge, possibly foot of upright 3 . . . [ , very faint spot at mid-height on edge 4 . . . [ (letter-tops), top of triangular letter; apparently the same; high up-stroke to right

Fr. 47 Fr. 48 Fr. 49

Fr. 47 1 . . . [ . . . [ . . . [ 5 . . . [ , ηπυ

Fr. 48 1 . . . [ . . . [ 5 . . . [ , ηπυ
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Fr. 47 
1, part of down-stroke to right at mid-height A or o 
2, upper right-hand part of loop at mid-height 
3, . . . . (damaged fibres), upright; perhaps p; perhaps e or c; two faint horizontals, one close to the previous letter just above mid-height and the other further to right just above line level 
4, upright 
5, (damaged fibres), apparently not ink, but scrap of superimposed papyrus 
6, stripped fibres, middle of upright 
7, faint upright touching the tail of a 8, . . . , possibly e; thick dot at mid-height

Fr. 48 
1, foot of oblique descender, as of \ or x 
2, faint spot at line level on edge

Fr. 49 
1, faint spot at mid-height; speck of ink projecting from left arm of v at mid-height

Fr. 1
1 Cf. Hom. Ill. 6.315, 13.390 = 16.483, and see ἰαπτής in v. 3.
2 An elided monosyllable (e.g. γ', δ', τ') would fill the lacuna. Then ἔπιθο-, ἐπὶ δο-, ἐπὶ ἑδο- are equally possible.
3 ἔβη or ἔβη, τε is varia lectio or correction of πι (δ' ἔπι converted into δε τε?). PJP compares Hom. Ill. 11.361 
τόπουδοι ροπόλοις ἔβη δε τε νυφή αὐτῶν, which recommends the supplement τόπουδοι and the articulation 
δε τε [rather than δ' ἔπι] or δ' ἔπι] in our verse. At the beginning κάπτουν is also possible and perhaps suits 
better the following ἰαπτής (cf. Hom. Ill. 18.379, Od. 8.274).

1–3 I have thought of two possible reconstructions: (1) Two or more craftsmen forge some object (a shield?

Fr. 47: 4, 5, 6, 7
Fr. 48: 1, 2
Fr. 49: 1, 2

1 Cf. Horn. Ill. 18.379, Od. 8.274.

1–3 I have thought of two possible reconstructions: (1) Two or more craftsmen forge some object (a shield?

Fr. 48: 2
Fr. 49: 2

1 Cf. Horn. Ill. 18.379, Od. 8.274.

1–3 I have thought of two possible reconstructions: (1) Two or more craftsmen forge some object (a shield?

Fr. 47: 8, 9
Fr. 48: 3
Fr. 49: 3

1 Cf. Horn. Ill. 18.379, Od. 8.274.
Andromeda (TrGF IV p. 156) and became a common motif in later poetry: ness occurred already in Sophocles' *Kproc.* Cassiepeia's ruinous boastful¬
the god's fury, Andromeda had to be bound to a rock and be exposed to the
beautiful than the Nereids). Poseidon, sharing the Nereids' anger, sent a sea monster against Ethiopia: to appease
OP 64 and, implicitly, Antiphil. Fab. = App. Plan. logo say that she proclaimed her daughter Andromeda more
147.4 I
I 2
666 43-> 5631 2
3.3.17f., Met. Am.
PMGF 8

5 Perhaps *κακάνοια*? Cf. Horn. II. 5.37 Τρόινα δ' ἐκλάων Δαναοί, Od. 9.59. However, this reconstruction raises metrical difficulties. To avoid a breach of Hermann's bridge, we must suppose that *ἐκλάων* was followed by a word begin¬
ning with a consonant; but even then there is a particularly harsh violation of Naeke's bridge, given the short quantity of a (see West, GM p. 155 n. 50). *ἐξήτερο* (cf. Horn. Od. 3.282) does not seem to suit the context.

For ὅν ἐγείροντο, cf. Quint. Smyrn. 2.130. The spears are used by the Lapiths (also in fr. 6.6): cf. Horn. II. 12.128, [Hes.] Sat. 178, 190.

The adverb *διασάλω* is not to be found before Arat. 209.

16 ἦ, ᾧ, ἦ, ἦ.

προδέδωσι with gen. means 'I feel fear for' someone: cf. Horn. II. 10.93 (with Leaf's comm.), 17.240. Here the poet could be making the same statement: during a struggle, one always *fears about a comrade* (killed and left unburied? cf. v. 17 ἄρμα). JPP remarks that this verse may be the beginning of the simile tentatively identified in vv. 18–20 below (see n.); he proposes e.g. ὅς ὅς ὅς τε. 18 Given the content of vv. 19–20, *διαμύον* is very attractive.

18–20 Possibly a simile: the fight or one of the fighters is compared with a winter gale. It is noteworthy
that all the passages of the *Iliad* listed in the note on v. 20 belong to similes. Cf. also Ap. Rh. 3.165f. [Jason is
going to face the trial imposed by Aeetes] παίς κεν *ζωφέροι κατ' αὐθέρος δίσσωσιν* | κειμέρην ετεροπή θεμι¬

15 For ὅν ἐγείροντο, cf. Quint. Smyrn. 2.130. The spears are used by the Lapiths (also in fr. 6.6): cf. Horn. II. 13.128, [Hes.] Sat. 178, 190.

The adverb *διασάλω* is not to be found before Arat. 209.

16 ἦ, ᾧ, ἦ, ἦ.

προδέδωσι with gen. means 'I feel fear for' someone: cf. Horn. II. 10.93 (with Leaf's comm.), 17.240. Here the poet could be making the same statement: during a struggle, one always *fears about a comrade* (killed and left unburied? cf. v. 17 ἄρμα). JPP remarks that this verse may be the beginning of the simile tentatively identified in vv. 18–20 below (see n.); he proposes e.g. ὅς ὅς ὅς τε. 18 Given the content of vv. 19–20, *διαμύον* is very attractive.

18–20 Possibly a simile: the fight or one of the fighters is compared with a winter gale. It is noteworthy
that all the passages of the *Iliad* listed in the note on v. 20 belong to similes. Cf. also Ap. Rh. 3.165f. [Jason is
going to face the trial imposed by Aeetes] παίς κεν *ζωφέροι κατ' αὐθέρος δίσσωσιν* | κειμέρην ετεροπή θεμι¬

15 For ὅν ἐγείροντο, cf. Quint. Smyrn. 2.130. The spears are used by the Lapiths (also in fr. 6.6): cf. Horn. II. 13.128, [Hes.] Sat. 178, 190.

The adverb *διασάλω* is not to be found before Arat. 209.

16 ἦ, ᾧ, ἦ, ἦ.

προδέδωσι with gen. means 'I feel fear for' someone: cf. Horn. II. 10.93 (with Leaf's comm.), 17.240. Here the poet could be making the same statement: during a struggle, one always *fears about a comrade* (killed and left unburied? cf. v. 17 ἄρμα). JPP remarks that this verse may be the beginning of the simile tentatively identified in vv. 18–20 below (see n.); he proposes e.g. ὅς ὅς ὅς τε. 18 Given the content of vv. 19–20, *διαμύον* is very attractive.

18–20 Possibly a simile: the fight or one of the fighters is compared with a winter gale. It is noteworthy
that all the passages of the *Iliad* listed in the note on v. 20 belong to similes. Cf. also Ap. Rh. 3.165f. [Jason is
going to face the trial imposed by Aeetes] παίς κεν *ζωφέροι κατ' αὐθέρος δίσσωσιν* | κειμέρην ετεροπή θεμι¬

15 For ὅν ἐγείροντο, cf. Quint. Smyrn. 2.130. The spears are used by the Lapiths (also in fr. 6.6): cf. Horn. II. 13.128, [Hes.] Sat. 178, 190.

The adverb *διασάλω* is not to be found before Arat. 209.

16 ἦ, ᾧ, ἦ, ἦ.

προδέδωσι with gen. means 'I feel fear for' someone: cf. Horn. II. 10.93 (with Leaf's comm.), 17.240. Here the poet could be making the same statement: during a struggle, one always *fears about a comrade* (killed and left unburied? cf. v. 17 ἄρμα). JPP remarks that this verse may be the beginning of the simile tentatively identified in vv. 18–20 below (see n.); he proposes e.g. ὅς ὅς ὅς τε. 18 Given the content of vv. 19–20, *διαμύον* is very attractive.

18–20 Possibly a simile: the fight or one of the fighters is compared with a winter gale. It is noteworthy
that all the passages of the *Iliad* listed in the note on v. 20 belong to similes. Cf. also Ap. Rh. 3.165f. [Jason is
going to face the trial imposed by Aeetes] παίς κεν *ζωφέροι κατ' αὐθέρος δίσσωσιν* | κειμέρην ετεροπή θεμι¬

15 For ὅν ἐγείροντο, cf. Quint. Smyrn. 2.130. The spears are used by the Lapiths (also in fr. 6.6): cf. Horn. II. 13.128, [Hes.] Sat. 178, 190.

The adverb *διασάλω* is not to be found before Arat. 209.

16 ἦ, ᾧ, ἦ, ἦ.

προδέδωσι with gen. means 'I feel fear for' someone: cf. Horn. II. 10.93 (with Leaf's comm.), 17.240. Here the poet could be making the same statement: during a struggle, one always *fears about a comrade* (killed and left unburied? cf. v. 17 ἄρμα). JPP remarks that this verse may be the beginning of the simile tentatively identified in vv. 18–20 below (see n.); he proposes e.g. ὅς ὅς ὅς τε. 18 Given the content of vv. 19–20, *διαμύον* is very attractive.

18–20 Possibly a simile: the fight or one of the fighters is compared with a winter gale. It is noteworthy
that all the passages of the *Iliad* listed in the note on v. 20 belong to similes. Cf. also Ap. Rh. 3.165f. [Jason is
going to face the trial imposed by Aeetes] παίς κεν *ζωφέροι κατ' αὐθέρος δίσσωσιν* | κειμέρην ετεροπή θεμι¬
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

9. ἄφησα, ἄφησα. For this explicit, cf. Hom. Il. 1.408. Conceivably the verb applies to Perseus helping Andromeda; cf. Ov. Met. 4.737 (Perseus) auxilium . . . dômos. If this hypothesis is correct, note the post-Homeric sense of the word (in the Homeric poems ἄφησα means always 'to succour in war').


Fr. 3

5. PJP proposes e.g. ἄδε γε and points out that this could be the fifth foot.

6. μυχοῖς, μυχοῖς, πεντεμύχοι, πεντεμύχοι [cf. ἑπτάμυχος at Call. Del. 65, Nonn. Dion. 4.14, 10.66].

Fr. 4

3. Perhaps ὑφὶ ἀγιαζεί (cf. Hom. II. 8.402 al.).

4. Ἀφέων νέων α. [Cf. Arat. 241 Βορέαον νέων κατοικίσει.]


|, αἱ βασιλεῖαι[. βασιλεῖ, βασιλεῖ, βασιλεῖ.]

Fr. 5

1. κατενεξίγ (cf. Hom. II. 3.448 κατενεκαθεθεσε?)


3. ἐπικόκκος, ἐπικόκκος[γες] and the like, ἐπὶ κόκκος[λα-. The rock to which Andromeda was tied (cf. Ov. Met. 5.26, Manil. 5.551, 628 σκαφείς)?


Fr. 6


4. Homeric explicit (Il. 2.526 al.).

5. Homeric explicit (Il. 2.501 al.).

6. Cf. [Opp.] Ζυώ. 1.163 χάλκεα δῶρα. The Homeric expressions are slightly different: cf. Il. 6.3 and Od. 5.309 χάλκηρεα δῶρα (end of verse), Il. 13.247 al. δῶρον χάλκεον. For the Lapiths' spears, see on fr. 1.13.

7. Some case of ἀλεξ or ἀλεξα, ἑκαλεξα[ει], ἑκαλεξα[ει].

Fr. 8

2. μέλγαν δξίον (see on fr. 1.11)?

9. ἀεὶδά, ἀεὶδά (see fr. 1.7 and the introduction above)? θέπτειδι (cf. Nonn. Dion. 3.41 al., Par. 1.37 al.)? θέπτειδα (cf. Nonn. Dion. 25.452, Par. 1.473)? The Homeric poems have only the form θέπτω (Od. 1.328, 8.498, 17.385).

Fr. 9


7. θέπει θαλας[εει-], perhaps κραύγει (cf. Opp. Hal. 2.637, Nonn. Dion. 33.31)? The word θαλας would suit the myth of Andromeda.

Fr. 10

474. LATE HELLENISTIC OR IMPERIAL HEXAMETERS

Fr. 11
2 ἀξεμθ[].
3 δέξητα, δέξατ'. Cf. Hom. Il. 2.186, 5.158, Od. 5.462.
6 Some form of συμμάρπτω (cf. Hom. Il. 10.467 συμμάρπη, beginning of verse) or συμμα]χ.-

Fr. 30
Apparently ends of verses (blank space after πε in v. 3).

Fr. 31
3 ἤρωα?

Fr. 37

Fr. 39
2 ἀκρα or μ[

Fr. 46
2 It is not possible to join this line with fr. 5.3, to give ἐπικαπτήρια.

Fr. 47
4 Perhaps Ἀπίθη[].

G. MASSIMILLA
III. KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

4715–4716. Lysias

Under these two numbers we give fragments of two speeches of Lysias. 4716 comes from that group of Lysian speeches transmitted in medieval MSS, and is the only such example thus far identified in the collection (others of possibly Oxyrhynchite provenance have been published from other collections—see below, and for lists of published papyri of Lysias see the on-line edition of the catalogue of Mertens-Pack at http://wwwulg.ac.be/facphil/services/cedopal/MP3/fexp.shtml, and the Lewen Database of Ancient Books at http://ldab.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/). 4715 is among the group of speeches that did not survive to be copied in medieval MSS, but were known and circulated in antiquity under the name of Lysias.

Papyri of Lysian speeches of the second group are well exampled: see G. Indelli, ‘I papiri di Lisia: alcune osservazioni’, PapLup 9 (2000) 195–204, and M. Cocurullo, ‘Il contributo dei papiri alla conoscenza di Lisia’, PapLup 10 (2001) 113–70. These include (i) P. Hibeh I 14 (iii bc cartonnage, written on the front of P. Hibeh I 7, a gnomic anthology of passages from Euripides, Ps.-Epicharmus, and Menander or Euripides) containing Κατὰ Θεοκοστίδου—a strikingly early manuscript of Attic oratory; (ii) MPER I 13 (ii ad Indelli; ii/iii ed. pr.; pap. roll, provenance unknown) containing Πέρι τῆς Ἀντιφώντος θυγατρός and fragments of other unknown speeches; (iii) XIII 1606, a late second- or early third-century papyrus roll containing Πρὸς Ἡπποθέρσειν, Πρὸς Θεομνήστεον, and two to four other unknown orations, found together with the roll of Pindar’s Paeans, Euripides’ Hypsipyle, and other papyri (see XIII 1606 introd.; Cockle, Hypsipyle p. 22 n. 14; on the identification of speeches in XIII 1606 and the constitution of their texts see M. Sakurai, ΖΕΕ 109 (1995) 177–80; E. Medda, ΖΕΕ 129 (2000) 21–8; 135 (2001) 23–31, and id., Lysiae In Hippothersem, In Theomnestum et fragmenta ex incertis orationibus (P. Oxy. 13.1606) (Florence 2003) for a re-edition of the whole); (iv) P. Ryl. Ill 489 + P. Lond. inv. 2852 [Pack 2 1290] (iv ad Indelli; 1st half of iv Cavallo–Maehler GBEBP no. 8b; iii/iv ed. pr.; pap. codex from Oxyrhynchus) containing Υπέρ Ἐρυξιμάχου. In addition to these, XXXI 2537 contains hypotheses of no fewer than 18 Lysian speeches unknown in the medieval tradition. (On these see also J. C. Trevett, ‘P. Oxy. 2537 and Isocrates’ Trapeziticus’, ΖΕΕ 81 (1990) 22–6.)

Speeches of Lysias of the former group—those transmitted in medieval MSS and instanced on papyri—are few in number, especially in comparison with papyri of surviving speeches of Demosthenes, Isocrates, or Aeschines. These are significantly outnumbered by papyri of Lysian speeches that did not survive antiquity (see above, with the studies of Indelli and Cocurullo cited previously). This confirms (what can be seen from ancient critics of oratory) that the collection of Lysian works in circulation in the Roman period was vastly greater than those few that survived to be copied in the Middle Ages: see K. Dover,
Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1968) 15. Pseudo-Plutarch (Vitae dec. orat. 836A) credits Lysias with 425 speeches, of which Dionysius and Caecilius (De Lysia 17) recognized 233 as genuine; we know the names of about 170, but only 34 are extant in medieval MSS, of which only 31 are agreed upon as authentically Lysian by modern editors (who regard XI, perhaps XV, and possibly VI as spurious; Dover is still more sceptical). Of the remains of the twenty-two hypotheses of Lysian speeches given by XXXXI 2537 only four are extant in the surviving Lysian corpus. Of the Lysian speeches (at least four, more probably six) preserved in XIII 1606, none are extant in medieval MSS.

Papyri of speeches of Lysias transmitted in medieval MSS include (i) PL III/284 B containing De caede Eratosthenis 14.25—15.28 (published by R. Pintaudi and A. López García, AnPap 12 (2000) 19—20 (1 BC/i AD pap. roll probably from Oxyrhynchus); (ii) PSI XI 1206 containing Epitaphius 75–9 (pap. roll in the same hand (early iii AD Indelli; ii AD ed. pr.) as XIII 1606 and PSI XI 1202); (iii) P. Ryl. III 489 + P. Lond. inv. 2852 containing Κατά Έρατοσθένους 47.21 (see above); and (iv) PSI inv. 966 (mentioned without provenance or date by Pintaudi and López García, loc. cit. 19), a tiny fragment possibly containing Κατά Διογένετον ουκ. Further on the papyri of Lysias see the bibliography listed in E. Medda’s re-edition of XIII 1606 (cited above). There are still no examples of papyri of the extant speeches of Lysias of Ptolemaic date, perhaps indicating a revival of interest in Attic oratory under the Atticizing influence of the Second Sophistic: Caecilius of Calacte, for instance, famously declared ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ Λυσίου εὐγενάματι that he was ἀμεῖνον Πλάτωνος (Longinus De subl. 32.8), while Dionysius of Halicarnassus devoted two treatises to him, only one of which survives. On the other hand P. Hibeh I 14, from iii BC, is a MS of ‘Lysias’ lost Κατά Θεοζώτιδον.

4716. a transmitted speech considered as genuinely Lysias’ by ancient critics, augments the repertoire of surviving speeches preserved on papyri, but does not necessarily call into question the thesis (already mentioned) of Indelli (loc. cit. 197) that ‘Lisia non aveva grandissima diffusione’, especially when measured against the numbers of surviving papyri of Demosthenes, Isocrates, or Aeschines. But the addition of 4715 (known in antiquity, but not transmitted in our MSS) confirms the impression already given by the papyri that Lysian speeches not transmitted in our MSS were as well known and exampled in Roman Oxyrhynchus as those that survived to be copied in the Middle Ages.

For collation and reporting of readings of medieval MSS we have used the editions of C. Hude, Lysiae Orationes (Oxford 1911); Th. Thalheim, Lysiae Orationes, ed. maior altera corrector (Leipzig 1913); L. Gernet and M. Bizos, Lysias: Discours i—ii (Paris 1955), U. Albini, Lysia: I discorsi (Florence 1955). We designate Codex Palatinus 88 as X, and Laurentianus plut. LVII. (often called ‘C’), now known to be a copy not of X, as had been thought, but of an intermediary MS, itself a copy of X (F. Donadi, ‘Esplorazione alla tradizione manoscritta dell’Encomio di Elena Gorgiano. II: i mss Laur. LVII.4 (C) e Amb. H 52 sup. (Amico)’, BIFG 3 (1976) 226—53) as Af, following G. Avezzù, Lysis: Apologia per l’uccisione di Eratastene; Epitafio (Padua 1985) and C. Carey’s revised Cambridge commentary on and forthcoming
OCT edition of Lysias. Agreement of witnesses listed by Albini p. lxxv we designate as Ω, and the remainder of these as Ω.

We are grateful for Professor Carey for supplying a draft of his forthcoming edition of Lysias as well as comments on this introduction and the new texts which follow.

D. OBBINK

4715. Lysias, Περί Τῶν Ἀνακαδημηθηκόν End-Title

101/6(a) 1.9 x 12.2 cm First half of second century

A narrow strip of papyrus with four lines of writing across the fibres in the narrow direction. On the other side, along the fibres and the same way up, are a top margin and 13 lines of faint cursive writing assignable to the early second century. The literary side preserves the name of Lysias and (in three further lines) the title or colophon of a speech not transmitted in the medieval MSS of Lysias, but attributed to him (with doubts about authorship) by ancient authors.

The writing is an informal round hand typical of the second century, especially the first half, with a slight tilt to the left. ο is round but slightly oval, exhibiting minimal but definite shading (thicker strokes at lower left and upper right quadrants). The hand is generally bilinear. Only the descender of ρ dips slightly below the line. c is in the same oval shape as ο and falls slightly forward. ά has a hook upward on the right leg. γ in 1 has a rounded bowl floating detached on top of a short stem (more cursively formed in 3, with tail descending from the right side of the bowl). The mid-stroke of ε does not quite touch the inside of the bowl. ω is very rounded with a high middle and exhibits a connecting stroke with a repeated circular motion to the following η (4). The adjoining arms of κ do not quite connect with the upright. The diagonal of ι extends to the left of the left upright, but meets the right upright at the base-line. For a comparable hand see P. Lond. Lit. 152 = GLH no. 13b (Hyperides, Orations; first half of second century, judged from the cursive titles and subscriptions), except for γ, for which see the somewhat earlier P. Fayum 110 = GLH 11b (private letter, ad 94). In general the impression of the writing is of an informal copy produced with some insouciance but not entirely unstylized.

Short decorative hairline underscorings separate each of the four lines at beginning and end. The lines are centred, one above the other, possibly written in such a way that all begin and end at exactly the same point. The first (name of author) is written in slightly larger and more formal letters with proportionately greater space between the letters, and between this line and the following. Space between lines in 2–4 is slightly less than that between lines 1 and 2.

Orientation suggests the title or colophon at the end of a roll written on a reused documentary papyrus, rather than a sillybox or title-tag (one would have expected the latter to have been written the long way, i.e. parallel to the greater dimension, though P. Ant. I 21
is an apparent exception). A parallel case is LX 4026. Possible explanations for the narrowness of the column of writing and its short lines (necessitating the division άνακαλυπτηρίων) include (i) that there was shortage of space at the end of the roll; (ii) that the columns of the main text (including possibly a short column above the colophon) had an equally narrow width, a familiar enough format for oratory on papyrus (notwithstanding W. A. Johnson, ‘Is Oratory Written on Narrower Columns? A Papyrological Rule of Thumb Reviewed’, Pap. Congr. XX 425–7). Space above line 1 is 4.5 cm; below line 4 5.0 cm. If these spaces represented the original margins, the roll would have been a miniature one—not inconceivable, but perhaps an unlikely format for oratory. It is possible that the original layout showed the title centred under a block of text in the top portion of the same column.


The speech Περὶ τῶν άνακαλυπτηρίων is cited by this title and ascribed to Lysias (while recording doubts as to its genuineness) by Theon Progymn. c. 2, I 165 Walz = Lysias fr. VII Thalheim (ed. maior 1913) = fr. VIIIa in C. Carey’s forthcoming edition. Περὶ τῶν άνακαλυπτηρίων (of which 4715 now attests a copy at Oxyrhynchus = fr. VIIIb Carey) was doubtless among those 425 speeches that pseudo-Plutarch (Vitae dec. orat. 836A) says passed under the name of Lysias in Roman antiquity. Doubts recorded by Theon about its genuineness make it unlikely that it was among those labelled γνήσιοι, ‘correctly ascribed’ by Caecilius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (De Lysia 17). Theon notes that the speech contained an examination (ζητείται) into the question of whether objects given to a woman getting married were hers to keep either τείρω, ‘inalienably’ (so the two earliest MSS and the Armenian version according to the Budé editors Patillon and Bolognesi (Paris 1997),
and of marg. Victorii according to Walz, adopted by Thalheim, or βιαίως, 'by right of forcible recovery' (so MS M of Theon, assuming that the speech belonged to that class of speeches known as δικαίως—so for which cf. XXXI 2537 introd.; cf. Lys. 23.12, Plat. Læg. 914c, Demosth. 37.33; Dover op. cit. 11–12). At any rate it concerned the disposition after the dissolution of a marriage of ἀνακαλυπτήρια, 'gifts given to brides by the husband or his relatives or friends', during the ceremony in which the bride is 'revealed to the husband for the first time' (so the lexicon of Harpocrates s.v. ἀνακαλυπτήρια without mention of Lysias: δῶρα διδόμενα ταῖς νύφαις παρά τε τού ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῶν οἰκείων καὶ φίλων, ὅταν τὸ πρῶτον ἀνακαλύπτωνται ὅστε ὀραθήναι τοῖς ἀνδράσι καλεῖται δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ ἐπαύλια. ταύτα δὲ εἰς τὰ παρ᾽ ἡμῖν θεώρετα). Theon (op. cit.) recommends as 'all the same not unrewarding' the speech Περὶ τῶν ἀνακαλυπτήριων (along with the one about the abortion, Περὶ τῆς ἄμβλωσεως = fr. X Thalheim = XI Carey) to students of rhetoric learning θετικά κεφάλαια, 'topical subjects', against the objections of the purists and contemporary doubts about the authenticity of the ascription of these speeches to Lysias: Λυσίον μὲν οὐ βασικὰ ἐστὶ τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις, δὴν δὲ οὐκ ἄχριστον τοῖς νέοις γυμνασίας ένεκα καὶ τούτοις ἐντυγχάνειν.

1 Above and at left of Α there is ink: an upright curving outward at right, as of the right arm of γ (but hardly enough to suggest it), with a short diagonal entering at bottom. It is impossible to imagine this as any part of the colophon (e.g. stichometric count). Alignment of the lines of the title will prevent it from having been any part of the preceding column (e.g. line-ends from the end of the speech). Possibly a decorative stroke.

D. OBBINK

4716. LYSIAS, ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΔΟΡΟΔΟΡΙΚΑΣ (Or. XXI) 3–9, 15, 17

Parts of three columns (fr. 1) from a papyrus roll written along the fibres and showing its full height of 31.6 cm. On the basis of word-count it may be determined that one column of Lysias XXI preceded in the roll before col. ii. Col. ii retains between one and seven letters from line ends; col. iii is substantially complete; col. iv shows a few letters from the beginnings of lines. Three columns are missing between column iv and fr. 2; these will have come at the bottom of the eighth column of the original roll. The columns consisted of 25 lines, with generous spacing (much greater than the height of the letters) between lines. An upper margin of 8 cm and bottom margin of 5 cm survive; the intercolumnia are about 2 cm. Lines contain 18–20 letters. The columns show little tilt and the beginnings of lines do not drift to the left as one moves down in the column.
The single hand at work is an elegant formal mixed type that is usually assigned to the mid-second century. It exhibits the highly upright and regular quality associated with the beginnings of the Severe Style, but also observed in such calligraphic examples as the London Bacchylides. I, τ, χ dip below the notional baseline with a spiky tail slanting slightly to left at bottom. α in four strokes with upright legs (the right one curving slightly inward), thus giving an early impression (but possibly archaizing). c and ε are full height but narrow, the latter with a tongue that does not exceed the jaws nor touch the bowl on the inside (a genuinely early feature). Arms of κ meet the upright at the centre-point and do not touch the notional guide-lines, thus producing a narrow central bird-beak-like angle. o is diminutive and floating to the top-line, as do Δ (wider than tall) and ο (rising to midpoint in centre). For a comparable hand see I 26 (= Roberts GLH no. 19a), Demosthenes, Prooemia, dated to the second half of second century (assigned, on the basis of accounts on back in small cursive, ‘not later than the early part of the third century’ by Grenfell and Hunt). Here, however, h, χ, and other letters are formed consistently differently: in h the cross-bar extends to the left, while in χ the tail descends from a central convergence of the arms, whereas in I 26 the left-hand arm is shorter and joined to a diagonal that continues into the tail.

No accents and no real corrections are present. (The scribe wrote μ above ν in iii 24.) Punctuation is by high point (ii 1, iii 7, 17, 20), combined with a short paragraphos under first letter of the line and not extending into the left margin (iii 20); and by paragraphos alone (iii 12, 21). At ii 6 and iii 15 a final vowel is tacitly elided (cf. ii 3–4 bis). Iota adscript is consistently written, and irrational iota at least once (iii 21). Once there is a short horizontal line-filler at line-end (ii 10). The papyrus in general presents an attractive, well-wrought appearance in an expansive format. The back is blank.

At ii 8 the papyrus fails to confirm an emendation accepted by most editors. It possibly contains in iii 8–9 an original and correct variant. It also shows significant divergence from the transmitted text at iii 8, iv 11–16, and possibly in fr. 3.

Speech XXI in the corpus Lysiacum is titled Ἀπολογία διωροδοκίας, apparently on the basis of §21 (which denies taking bribes; but cf. §16, implying embezzlement of public funds). In addition the speech is labelled in the Palatine MS (X) as διωράσθημος, apparently indicating that its authenticity was not impugned by ancient critics. (It is the only speech to be thus designated: cf. Hsch. s.v. διωράσθημος; LSJ s.v. παράθεμος 2, perhaps implying the circulation of a non-authentic version?) The MSS seem to give only the conclusion of a defence speech without giving the actual charges and names of accusers, and providing only the defendant’s general account of his personal character. Because of the missing beginning, not even the exact accusation (probably corruption or embezzlement during the holding of an office) is known. The only new information given by the papyrus text is that the part between the beginning of the text in the MSS and the beginning of col. ii in the papyrus can be accommodated in a single column of the format of col. ii. This might suggest that in the papyrus the speech itself began at the same point as the MSS without additional material preceding—perhaps a remnant of a genuine defence speech sketched-
out by Lysias, or a practice exercise produced for the use of students, accepted as of Lysian authorship. Cf. K. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1968) who notes (p. 160) that ‘perhaps on occasion the original consultant put into circulation only that part of a speech which he regarded as likely to interest the general reader’, so that in these cases ‘the strictly forensic element in each speech was not committed to writing at all’ (he adduces as examples the ‘acephalous’ speeches Isocr. XVI and XX, Lysias XVIII and the present speech).

Fr. 1
(Col. i lost)

Col. ii

χορω ὑπακοεια: τ[ον δὲ μεταξὺ χρονον ετρηρ
5 δ[α]πανας δα[πα]νω[μ]ενος και καθ ημε[ραν
δε] τετρακις[χιλιας] δρα 
10 χμ]ας εισε]νειη[οχα επειδη δη κατ[επλευς επι Αλε 
ξιου αρχο[ντες ευθε εγν μ]ναιρηρ[ον εις Προμη 
15 θε]α Κ[α]ι ενι[κων αναλως] 
δ]ιωδεκα μνας και νετε [ρον κατετηηχ χορηγου 
παιδικου χορωι κα]ν α 
νηλως πλευ νη τεκ[αι
20 δεκα μνας επι δε Ε]υκλει 
δου αρχ[οντες κωμ]ωδους 
χορηγου Κηφισο]δοιοι 
ε.16 Κ]αι α 
ηλως ε]ι ανα 
25 δεκει εκκαιδεκα μνα]ς
Col. iii

καὶ] Παναθηναῖοις τοῖς μι
κροῖς ἔχον[ηγοῦν]ν πορρίξι
έτας ἀγξ[νεοίς κ]αὶ αὐρηλ[ω]ςα
ἐπ[τ]α μ[νας] γενικ[η]ς κα
δὲ τριη[ρεῖ] μεν αμμ[ιλ]ω
μενος επὶ[Co[ν]νινοι ανάλ[ω
κας] πε[ν]τεκαὶ δέκα μνας
χωρὶς δὲ αρχιθεωρίας καὶ
ז[α]ρ[ρ]φορίας καὶ ἀλλα
τοι[α]υνα εἰς α ἐμοὶ δέδα
πανηθα[ς] πλ[..]ν ἡ τριακον
τα μναι [καὶ] τ[ουτ]ων ὄν
κατελεξ[α] εἰ εμό[ν] υλομην κατα
τα γεγραμ[με]να εν τοι νο
μων λητουργεῖν οὐ[δ] αν το
τεταρτον μερος α]ρ[λω
ζα·] τον δὲ χρονον] ὁν ἐτρι
ηραρχον η [να]ς αριστα μοι
ε]πλει παντο[ς του] ετατοπε
δοὺ· τεκμηριών δε του
του νυμν μεγίστον ερω[ι]
πρωτον μεν χαρ[Αλκυβι
α]δης] ὁν εγὼ περι πολλον
αν εποιησαμην μὴ συν[]
πλειω μοι ουτε φυλ[ος] ὄν

Col. iv

ουτε [συγγενῆς ουτε φυλε
της ε]πλει επί της εμης νεως
(3 lines missing)
ον[κ] 0.17
(1 line missing)
arιε[τα] 0.14
κινδ[ουε] 0.4. επειδή δε

§5

§6

§7
KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

6 ημών is written further out into the intercolumnium than the other line-ends.

8 ημών. Of ης are visible tops of two uprights curving inward at top, followed by top of small round letter.


10 Note horizontal line-filler taking up space at line-end to produce an even right-hand edge of the column.

22 Κυψεόδωρος: with Ω, emended to Κυψεόδωρος by H. F. Clinton, Fasti Hellenici (Oxford 1834) ii 97. The speaker claims to have produced a comic performance in the archonship of Euclides (402) for this poet. A poet whose name is preserved as Κυψέοδωρος, appears in the list of victories at the Dionysia (IG II 2325.69), identified as the old comic poet Κυψεόδωρος (PCG IV) named at Sud. Χ 1565, as well as by Athenaeus, Pollux, Photius, and Herodian. Mention in Lysias XXI of a different, otherwise unknown poet Cephisodotus is possible, but identity of the two seems likely in light of the appearance of Cephisodorus in these authors in conjunction with Cratinus, Aristophanes, Callias, Diocles, Eupolis and other poets of old comedy who cohere around the date (402) stated in the text. The papyrus now lends Roman-period authority to the correctness of the MSS for the name of Cephisodotus in Lysias XXI, the earliest evidence for the poet's name. It may seem implausible that Athenaeus and others, who give quotations from his plays by title are all wrong about the name of the poet. Yet there is an identical interchange (Κυψεόδωρος for the correct Κυψεόδωρος) in ancient authors in the names of the archon of 338 (see Clinton, Fasti Hellenici ii 134).

23 The papyrus had 6—8 more letters in 23 and several fewer in 24 than the transmitted text (showing no sign of disruption at this point), which reads Κυψεόδωρος ο Νίκων, Και Ανθήλαος συν θες ης εκείνης Βιαθέους. Και κάθεδεκα μως κελ. It is possible that θης εκείνης was not present in the papyrus in 24, but it is hard to see (given the syntax as transmitted) how it could have come in 23.

23 η: the bottom of a vertical. In addition the scribe left a small space afterwards before α, suggesting that και Ανθήλαος was written.

Col. iii

2 πυροχιταίς correctly: πυροχιταίς Ω. Probably the papyrus had χωρίς δεί (είς) conjectured by Pluygers. That the scribe elided δεί is suggested by space and the scribe's practice elsewhere (cf. ii 15 αυδο άνευ), but not certain.

8-9 ἀρχιθεωράς: with Ω: emended to ἀρχιθεωράς by Reiske.

9 Βαργισφόρας: Βαργισφόρας Ω: Βαργισφόρας conjectured by Robert. After the gap there is horizontal ink at the top-line connecting to an upright, η suggested, but also compatible with η. But the following two letters before ιοπάρα look like nothing so much as η followed by a tiny round letter with closed centre resembling the scribe's diminutive ζ. These letters cannot be reconciled with the transmitted reading, but do not yield sense either. On the other hand, the papyrus does not confirm Robert's conjecture, adopted by Hude.

-φοράς: with Ω: emended to -φοράς by Reiske.

10 είς αμα: with Ω: deleted by Pluygers: είς deleted by Francken.

11 πλούς: πλούς Ω: πλεύς Ω. The papyrus does not decide.

12 [και] suggested by space, with Ω: omitted in Af.

16-17 αἰσθάλα: Ανθήλαος Ω. The triangular-shaped trace after η suggests α, i.e. αυ, and is incompatible with η (apparently scribal error).

19 επλά: with C: πλέω Ω.

20-21 τεκμηρίων . . . μεγίστον: with Ω: τεκμηρία . . . μεγίστον conjectured by Zaka.

21 ομοί μεγίστον: with Ω: μεγίστον ομίου Af.

24 μη: with Ω: καί Af.

Col. iv

8-9 The text as transmitted reads ἄριστα πλέοσιν, μελλόν αὐτὸς καῦνηνεκέεσσι: i.e. it has 5—6 more letters than the papyrus in line 8. It is possible that the papyrus did not contain αὐτὸς (the sentence can be understood
without it, but the emphasis is clearer with it and there is no reason to doubt that it stood in Lysias' original). However, since μέλανων and the future infinitive is redundant, it is equally if not more likely that the papyrus lacked μέλανων in 8 and read καθυστέρουσαν in 9. If so, it could have been an original and correct variant. On the other hand, 6–7, with 32 letters between them (taking the average letter count as 20 per line and assuming that 9α(κ) is correct), have more space than the transmitted text requires. Did the papyrus have πλεύσανα before ἀπετεί? That would fill exactly the space in 7, at the cost of an unexpected word-order (so unexpected that it could only be a mistake). On the other hand it would leave 8 slightly short.

10 εκείνῳ c with Ω: emended to ἐκείνῳ by Taylor. y is a tiny trace of the tail of a vertical below the letter of the line, suggesting γ, τ, φ, excluding n. Defending the correctness of the plural Thalheim compares Xen. Hell. I 5, 16.

11 The papyrus will not have had space for all of the transmitted τοῖς δὲ μετὰ Θρακίλλου δέκα εἴδεθε. Either τοῖς or μετὰ must have been omitted, in error.

11–12 Θρακίλλου X. Spacing shows that X's corrupt orthography here was unrelated or subsequent to the papyrus' tradition.

13–17 Several divergences from the transmitted text are revealed by spacing: the layout of the papyrus text would require restoring:

\[\text{τοῖς παρ']τε} \epsilon\betaουλονττο}
\[\text{τῷ εὐ]ς νέος πλευν α}
\[\text{νε}][\text{βη με[ντοι πολλῶν λαοδώρων}}]
\[\text{αυτ[ις γενο}}]
\[\text{με[ννων}}]

thus leaving 16 too short, while 15 would be longer than the papyrus' line-lengths elsewhere (18–20 letters). One solution is that πολλῶν λαοδώρων was transposed en bloc in the papyrus after αὐτοὺς and before γενομένων. This will leave 15 too short, but trouble has long been suspected before αὐτοὺς: Kayser proposed (ἐν) αὐτοὺς, and Auger emended to ἀλλῆλοις. Neither of these will occupy all of the required space; at least one other word has dropped between μετατι and this word. In addition, 16 in turn will be too long (25 letters). The simplest explanation might be a hyperbaton, μ[ντοι λαοδώρων] 16 αυτ[ις πολλῶν γενο], but of course this still leaves 16 short, so that further emendation (παρ'πολλων, πλειστων, γεγενη-) would be required. It should be borne in mind that the papyrus may have contained corrections in the portion now missing.

17–18 Φρείραπ[ιος; with Ω: ψφαίρας X. Note that as in 11–12 the papyrus does not agree with X in a minor error in orthography.

21 The papyrus will not have had space to restore εἰκ before οἴσω as suggested by Naber.

22 The papyrus will not have had space to read τὴν after παρκεκεκαμένων as suggested by Halbertsma (accepted by Thalheim, rejected by Hude, Albini, and Gernet and Bizos).

Cols. v–vii

These three columns containing §§9–14 are lost.

Fr. 2 (col. vii?)

The exact position and line-numbers in the column cannot be determined. Word- and letter-count suggest that the fragment came from the lower portion.

1 A near-horizontal line (with perhaps a slight hiatus in the middle), two to three letters in width (before the papyrus breaks off at right), slightly below the line of writing, such as one might expect from the lower horizontal of a flamboyant X. It stands at about the position of the second δ of the expected reading for the line: (ὁμιτηρέων ἐκοί διδάσκει ἡ τῶν. One could hypothesize the bases of two successive deltas slightly below the line, with iota floating higher in the line now out of sight, as of δ[ι]ς[ι]ων, expected at this position. But the base of X elsewhere rides above the line at about mid-height. There is no reason to expect a line marking division in the text (as e.g. for the ματροπνόος after §10) at this point.
The handwriting and line-spacing of this fragment are identical to those of frs. 1–2 (the back is likewise blank). But placement in Or. XXI, or elsewhere in the attested corpus of Lysias, is problematic (assuming the same MS as frs. 1–2, and not another text written by the same scribe). In Or. XXI the sequence καί οὐκ εὑρείτε μέγα φρονύ, ἄλλι' ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰς ύμᾶς ἄστηλομένων ἤγοιμένος τοῦτον μὲν αὐτός αἰτιος εἶναι, this would yield lines much longer than the scribe writes in frs. 1–2. Variation in line length from column to column, though not expected, is not impossible, especially in columns at some distance from one other. But there are contrary indications: after οὐκ εὑρείτε the papyrus seems to diverge from the transmitted text (assuming the same MS as frs. 1–2). After the putative ἄλλι' the space excludes the transmitted text; after ἤγοιμένος the trace excludes it. Perhaps the papyrus text skipped from ἄλλι' to ἤγοιμένος (and possibly part of the line beginning καί οὐκ as transmitted), but this still leaves 4 incompatible with anything in the text of Lysias as transmitted.

The trace is negligible, a dot at the level of the line.

2 After οὐκ the traces are the lower left portions of an elongated bowl (and perhaps part of a horizontal at mid-level) compatible with (if not exactly suggesting) ε, followed by the foot of an upright close-in, compatible with π.

3 Tops of two triangular letters, λ, λ, λ, before the certain λ. But the following letter η does not conform to the expected ἐπὶ after ἄλλι'. After η the surface is badly abraded: the extant trace at the top line would be compatible with either θ or ρ from ἤγοιμένος.

4 The first trace is a tall curving upright, bowing out to the right in the middle, not readily conforming to any letter in the scribe's hand (apparently nothing connecting at left, but ink may have been abraded). After this a triangular letter, λ, λ, λ, before π. After π, λ or λ.

D. OBBINK

4717–4725. Isocrates, Ad Nicoclem and Nicocles


Ad Nicoclem and Ad Demonicum are the Isocratean speeches most frequently represented among published papyri. Thanks to their gnomological content, Ad Nicoclem, Nicocles, and Ad Demonicum had a particular fortune in antiquity. They were known as παρακαταθέσεις and were widely used for teaching: cf. the wooden tablets P. Kell. III G 93 and T. Brux. E 8507, and BKT IX 149, a papyrus carrying portions of Ad Demonicum and Ad Nicoclem with a word-for-word translation into Latin (see K. A. Warb, A. Rijksbaron, Mnemosyne 51 (1998) 718–23).

Traditionally, scholars have divided the textual tradition of Isocrates into two
branched: \( \Gamma \) and its descendants \( \Delta \) and \( E \) represent one, and the other MSS the other; this latter branch is often referred to as the vulgata (for the use of the term vulgata and the question whether the \( \Delta \) has independent value, see now M. Fassino in I. Andorlini et al., Studi sulla tradizione del testo di Isocrate (Firenze 2003) 151 ff.). The papyri show that any definitive separation between the tradition of \( \Gamma \) and the so-called vulgata does not go back to the Hellenistic period, as was once believed, and that papyri circulating in the Roman period presented differing combinations of variants (including variants that have not survived in the medieval tradition), some closer to \( \Gamma \) or to the vulgate, some more distant. Thus we need not reject on principle good readings of the vulgate MSS (see F. Seek, Untersuchungen zum Isokratetext (Diss. Hamburg 1965) 17–21; K. A. Worp, A. Rijksbaron, The Kellis Isocrates Codex (Oxford 1997) [hereafter: Worp–Rijksbaron, KIC] 140–5, 149–50). The new papyri provide fresh support for the view that the text of Isocrates in the Roman period was mixed and the two branches were not yet separated.

A further point of interest is that the new papyri transmit portions of the text of Ad Nicoclem omitted in the quotations of this speech in De Antidosi in MS \( \Theta \), which have been considered later interpolations (Drerup and Mathieu–Brémont print them in smaller size). In this respect, they agree with the other papyri that contain the relevant sections of text.

The papyri have been collated with the edition of E. Drerup, Isocrates: Opera omnia i (Leipzig 1906), and compared with the editions of G. Mathieu, É. Brémont, Isocrate: Discours ii (Paris 1938), and B. G. Mandilaras, Isocrates: Opera omnia ii (Stuttgart/Leipzig 2003). For Ad Nicoclem, the reports of F. Seek, Untersuchungen zum Isokratetext (Diss. Hamburg 1965), are taken from Drerup, except for N, which Seek collated himself. For P. Massil., the published transcript by B. Keil, Hermes 19 (1884) 596–643, has been used.

D. COLOMO

4717. ISOCRATES, AD NICOCLEM 1–3, 13–16

A fragment of a parchment codex containing a large portion of one bifolium (plus another fragment which presents only illegible traces and probably belonged to the edge of a sheet). Upper and lower margins are preserved to 1 cm and 1.8 cm. Inside margins to the fold are a minimum of 0.5 cm; outside margins are 1.3 cm. Each page originally measured \( c. 7.5 \times 10.2 \) cm, with a written area of \( 5.8 \times 7.4 \) cm; the four preserved pages contain 18 lines each. This is a miniature codex, belonging to group XIV of Turner, Typology 29–30. Most of Turner's examples are Christian texts, but note two other small parchment texts of Isocrates: VIII 1096 (iv AD) and P. Ant. II 84 (iii/iv AD).

Our bifolium must represent leaf 1 (pp. 1–2) and leaf 6 (pp. 11–12), since the text missing in between would occupy 8 pages, i.e. 2 bifolia. The speech begins at line 1 of page 1. Thus, unless there was some prefatory material, the first gathering was a ternio. Page 1 is written on the flesh side, as normal for the first page of a gathering (Turner, Typology 56).
In this format, the whole speech could be contained in 40 pages or a little more. Despite its size (and limited number of pages), the miniature codex is likely to have contained other speeches as well. It began with *Ad Nicoclem*, as can be seen from the fact that this speech begins with the first line of a right-hand page. (Otherwise we should need to suppose that the speech before it ended with the foot of a page, which would be statistically very unlikely; but if it ended in mid-page, the scribe would have begun the next speech at once; compare e.g. VIII 1096, which contains the end of *Panegyricus* and the beginning of *De Pace* on the same page.)

Furthermore, there is evidence that the speeches *Ad Demonicum*, *Ad Nicoclem*, and *Nicocles* formed a group together. They occur in this order as speeches 5–7 in Ι (following the group of ἐγκώμια), and as speeches 1–3 in Α and the list of Photius (see Drerup, *Isocratis Opera omnia* i p. lxxix). Collectively, the three speeches were designated as παρανείκες according to the anonymous *Vita* (Mathieu–Brémond, *Isocrates: Discours* i p. xxxiv), which notes that these are the first three speeches to be read; Ps.-Hermogenes, Περὶ μεθόδου διδακτήσεως p. 441.19–20 Rabe refers to *Ad Demonicum* with the phrase ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ λόγῳ τῶν παρανείκεων. This arrangement goes back at least to the third/fourth century, as three different papyri show: (1) The same speeches occur in the same order in P. Kell., where the first and second are labelled πρώτος and δεύτερος λόγος; (2) In P. Massil., which transmits only *Ad Nicoclem*, we find an end-title Ἰσοκράτους παρενείκεων λόγος ΒΒ (the initial title is similar), interpreted as 'the second speech of the second group' (i.e. the παρανείκες; cf. B. Keil, *Hermes* 19 (1884) 637); (3) A sillybos from Oxyrhynchus, Ἰσοκράτους Ἰππανείκες, presumably belonged to a roll which contained all three speeches (S. Stephens, *TCS* 28 (1985) 6–8; cf. the end-title Πρὸς Δημοκρίτου παρανείκες, ibid. 5). However, we find papyri that do not present the order of speeches attested in medieval MSS, which advises caution; cf. P. Yale II 102 (ii bc), with *Helena* on the one side and *Plataicus* on the other, or VIII 1096 (iv AD), where *De Pace* follows *Panegyricus*. If our codex began with *Ad Nicoclem*, we have a parallel in PSI XI 1198, a papyrus roll where this speech begins with the first line of a column; compare also 4723 below.

The text is written in now-brown ink in a formal book-hand of medium size, of the mixed type, with a slight slant to the left. It is basically bilinear, although initial letters are frequently enlarged, and even internally letters are sometimes of uneven size. An even right edge is produced by adjusting letter-size at line end. There is some contrast in thickness between the strokes. Α often presents a quite sharp wedge, especially when enlarged at the beginning of the line. Β is very large; the lower lobe has a triangular shape. The right-hand oblique of Α projects above the apex. Ε is well rounded, and its central stroke tends to be rather high and extended. The arms of Κ are rather long, and occasionally detached from the upright. The left-hand oblique of Α is shorter and thinner than the right-hand one. Μ shows a deep curve. Ξ has a 3-shape. In a number of cases the foot of the right-hand upright of Π ends in a tiny hook. Υ is V-shaped. Φ has the central roundel oval-shaped. Ω is quite broad and well-rounded; the stroke which separates the two lobes is quite extended.

The script looks back to Informal Round hands of the second and third centuries:
KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

XXVI 2241 (GMAW² 22), Pindar; P. Lond. Lit. 27 (GMAW² 82), Demosthenes, parchment codex (both assigned to ii ad; but cf. GBEBP 3b); and PSI I 2 + II 124, Luke, parchment codex (iii ad); III 412 (GLH 23a), Julius Africanus (copied between 227 and 275/6). Closer parallels are VII 1007, Genesis, assigned to the late third century, and 1010, Esdras, fourth century (in particular for the contrast), PSI X 1171, Aristophanes, fourth century (GBEBP 12b). Thus a dating in the third or fourth century may be assigned. The ink type, rare before the fourth century (GMAW² p. 19 n. 107), inclines toward the later dating.

No lectional signs other than two middle stops indicating strong pause, added by the same hand (p. 11.1, p. 12.14). Elision is effected in most cases (p. 1.9, 13, p. 2.8 and probably p. 11.7), but there is one instance of scriptio plena (p. 12.9). Iota adscript is not written where required (p. 11.17, p. 12.1, 12). Some itacistic spellings (e.g. p. 1.1–2). In division the scribe syllabifies the group sigma + consonant after the sigma (p. 2.7–8, p. 11.5–6, p. 12.3–4).

The parchment attests some new variants: (if correctly read) a word-order of its own, which may be considered superior to that transmitted otherwise (p. 1.3–4); a possible omission (p. 2.3–4); and another curious reading, probably an error (p. 11.12). Of note also are: a (good?) reading shared by 4717 and the other papyri against the medieval manuscripts (p. 1.13); a case in which 4717 and two other papyri present a better word-order than the rest of the paradosis (p. 2.7–8); and its agreement with the two other papyri found at Oxyrhynchus, viz. 4718 and PSI 1198 (so far as these are preserved).

4717 overlaps with P. Kell. III G 95 (= M–P² 1240.03), PSI XI 1198 (= M–P³ 1253), P. Massil. (= M–P² 1254), P. Vindob. G 2316 (= M–P³ 1255), T. Brux. inv. E 8507 (= M–P³ 1257.01), and 4718.

---
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οἱ μὲν εἰμιδοτεῖς ὦ Νε[ίκο
κλεῖς] ὑπερ τοῦ βασιλε[ῦνων
ἐκδητός αγών η ἔργον το[ν εἰρχαμένον ἡ ἀλλο τὸ τῶν
τοιούτων κτῆ]ν[α]τω ὠν αὐτὸν
δὲ πλούτεστε]ὲ[ν διὰ] τὸ 
ὡς[ιμ]α]ριν 
[τοὶ τοῖο ὑμάντοι καὶ

[§1]

πὸ[ν] τέξ[υ]κω[τερον αὐτά πώ
λα[τα]ντείν μ[τε]ρον ὑμοί
δὲ ἀρ[τα]τὴν γε]νεθλαὶ καλλιετ[ην

[§2]
καὶ μα[λι]κτα [πρεπούσαν εμοί
tῇ δὲ[ν]ναι κα[ὶ οὐ λαβεῖν εἰ δὲ
ν[ηθεὶ]ν ὀρθ[ει] ποιών ἐπὶ
τῇ δεῦμ]ατω[ν] υ ὀργομενον καὶ
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τν[ῶν ἀπεχομενος α[μετ a]ν
κα]ι τῇ πολν καὶ τ[ην βα
εἰλειαν] διοικησις τους μὲν
ἰδωτας ε[ς]τι πολλα τα παιδευ

οντα μαλιστα με[ν] τῳ μῃ τρυ
φαν ἀλλα αναγκα[ζεθαι περι του
βιου καθ εκαστ]ῃ την βουλευεσ
θαι την ἡμερα]ν επειθ οἱ νῳ
μοι καθ ους εκ]αστοι πολιτευ

[ομενοι τυχχανους ετι δ η παρ]
ρησα και το φα]ερως [εξεναι
τοις τε φιλοις επι]πληςαι καὶ
tοις εκβροις επιτε[θ][εθ][αι τα]ς
αλληλων αμαρ][αις [π]ρος
δε τουτοις και τῳ τν ποι[η]των
tινε[ς των προγγ]ε[νη[με]
νων υποθηκα]ς ως χ[η η]ν
καταλεουσας]ν ω[ς εξ α
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εξειν] αλλα τω[ν με]ν ακρα
τ[ης γεγυνον των δε μα]θητης
και [παρακεκεμε]ς εαυτο]ν
των [μεν ελ]ας]τος κριτη]ν
των δ[ε με]ι[ζοναι]ν αγωνις
tην [δε]ι α γαρ τουτ[ων τω]ν χ[ν
μνασι]ω[ν] τυχιστ [αν] γενοιο
τοιουτοι[ε]ιν υπ[εθ]εμεθα
δειν εναι τον ορθω[ει]βασι[ε]
onτα και την πολιν ω[ει χ]ων
known literary texts

§14

διωκήσαντα μαλιστὰ δ ὁ
οὔτως υπὸ σαντοῦ παρακλῆς
θεὶ᾽ς εἰ δεινὸν ἡγεσαίον
τοὺς κηροὺς τῶν βελτεῖον

§15

νῷν αρχὴν τὰς καὶ τους ανοητοὺς
tεροὺς τὸ [ἐς φρο]γυμντεροῖς
προκαταπτεύοντος ὁσῶν γὰρ ἂν
ἐρεὺς ἔμετεν [ητῶν τ]ῶν
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ἀλλῶν [ν ἀναί]αν ατμιάσας
τοκοντω [μαλλὸν τὴν σαντ]ὼν
δὲ ἄνοιαν ἀκηκησίας αἰ.[α]χὲς

§15

μέλλοντας [τ]ι ποιήσε[ε]ὲν τῶν
dειν[τ]όων προκ δὲ [τ]οντων
φιλανθρ[ω]ῶν εὐαί[ε]ὶ δει καὶ
φιλοσοφ[ω]ῶν οὐτὲ γαρ ἵππων
οὐτὲ κ[ὐ]ῳ οὐτὲ αὐθόρων

§16

οὐτ[ὲ] ἀλλὰ πραγματος οὐδὲ
νο[ὶ οίο]ν τε καλῶς αρχὲω εὲ
ἀν [μ]ὴ τὰς χαίρῃ τουτοις ὁ ὁ
αὐτὸν δὲ ποιεῖ σαν [τ]ὴν εὶ
πρεμελείαν—μελετοὶ σοι τοὐν

πληθοῦσι καὶ π[ερ]ὶ παντὸς
ποιοῦ κεχαριζ[μ]ὲνως αὐ
τι κ[ἀι] τῶν ὄλιξ[αρχ]ῶν καὶ

page 1

1 This line probably coincides with the beginning of the codex, as in PSI 1198 it probably coincides with
the beginning of the roll. In P. Massil, there is an initial title; in P. Kell, the text is preceded by a short elementary
hypothesis (see Worp–Rijkshaven, KIC 30, 91). The medieval MSS contain an initial title: Πρὸς Νικολέα (Γ),
Πρὸς Νικολέα περὶ βασιλέως (ΑΠΝ).

2–3 νομεὶς (Ι. ὡς) τὸς βασιλεὺς with P. Massil, PSI 1198 P. Kell. ΑΠΝ: τοὺς βασιλεῶν ἡμῶν Γ. The ap¬
position normally follows the word it defines, but it can precede when it carries special emphasis (Kühner–Gerth,
Ausführliche Grammatik ii.1 282.2). Thus Blass accepted the reading of Γ as 'die gewähltere und ausdrucksvollere
Stellung' (JGPh 129 (1884) 420), and F. Versmeeten, Isocratis admonitio Ad Niconem (Leiden 1890) 34, thought that it
emphasised the ‘notionem potestatis’ in βασιλείων. F. Seck, Untersuchungen zum Isokratext 36 n. 1, argues for the major-
ity reading, pointing out that none of the passages added in support of Τ involves apposition with a personal
pronoun, as is the case here.
3-4 τῶν ἁτονον η τίνος ἀλλοιον τιν Γ. The former is clearly the inferior reading, because it produces hiatus (see Seck, Untersuchungen 37 n. 2).
12-13 τηρησαμεν | 8 9 with P. Massil. PSI 1198 P. Kell. ΓΑΠΝ: εγιν δ’ ἡγησάμενος in Γ’ Α’. Seck, Un-
tersuchungen 37-8, supports the minority reading with parallels, arguing that Isocrates uses a personal pronoun to
introduce his own views or behaviour, in contrast with another’s.
13 ταυτην γενετευ παλαστην with P. Massil. PSI 1198 P. Kell.: γενετευ ταυτην καλλετην Γ: ταυτη
καλλετην γενετευ Γ’ ΑΠΝ. K. Münsters, Questions Isocrateae (Diss. Göttingen 1895) 17ffl, argues that the
demonstrative should stand first in the phrase, as at Paus. 4 and Hel. 22.
18 Space excludes the longer version και τινων | εργυλοι; see next note.

Page 2
1 τινον with 4718 PSI 1198 Γ: τινων έργων P. Massil. P. Kell. ΑΠΝ. The latter may be: (1) an interpolation
from Ad Demoniacum 5; (2) the genuine reading: Isocrates tends to such symmetric expressions, cf. e.g. Epist. VI 9
tην βιον προσελθεια και πολες δόξης δριγμηθηναι; (3) a normalization on the basis of Isocratician usage. See further
Seck, Untersuchungen 38 n. 5.
3 διοικεςει with P. Kell. ΑΠΝ: διοικεςει P. Massil. Γ (in PSI 1198 the space would allow either). The latter is
clearly to be rejected as a mistake ‘litteris ommissis’. (1) φανερα γε μεν 
[1 διωσται. All witnesses have γάρ after μεν, except Stob. 4.8.25 (presumably because these are the
first words of his extract, so that γάρ would have nothing to which to refer). The space seems too short for the
transmitted text, so perhaps the parchment omitted γάρ.
4 μεν πολλα with 4718 PSI 1198 ΛΠΝ: μεν πολλα Γ: πολλα μετα P. Massil. P. Vindob. G 2316: πολλα
ceti P. Kell. The latter apparently produces hiatus, but may be a case of scripta plena. For the paragonic ‘και’ see on
4719 ii 20.
4-5 ου τι παδεω[ν]οτα with 4718 P. Massil, ΓΑΠ: ου παδεοντα φωσε P. Kell.
5 μελετα restored (by reason of space) with P. Massil. Γ: και μαλετα P. Kell. ΛΠΝ Stob. μαλετα μεν . . .
επειτα occurs three times in Isocrates, και μαλετα μεν . . . επειτα και (Γ'); επειτα δε και eet.) only at Philosp. 75,
a similar passage in which και introduces a more precise definition of a general term.
7-8 καθ εκαστην βασιλειαν|καθω των ημεραν| with PSI 1198 P. Kell.: καθ εκαστην ημεραν P. Massil.: καθ’ εκαστην ημεραν βασιλείαν Γ: καθ’
εκαστην ἐγωνιζεθαι των ημεραν ΛΠΝ: βασιλείαθα των ημεραν (omitting καθ’ εκαστην) Stob. The reading of the
vulgate MSS is an interpolation from §11, per δυν καθ’ εκαστην ἐγωνιζεθαι των ημεραν, where the tradition shows
a similar split concerning the word-order. In both places the word-order of Γ causes hiatus (βασιλείαθα, επειθ’
. . . ἐγωνιζεθαι, δε), but there remains the question whether instances like these, where the final vowel could be
elided or in the case of final οι shortened by correction, and where a short or long pause follows, should be treated
as special cases (for the general question see Worp-Rijksbaron, KRC 277–81). In both places the word-order καθ’
εκαστην των ημεραν unsplit conforms to Isocrates’ usage elsewhere (9 examples; there are also 9 examples of καθ’
eκαστον των εικεταν), see Worp-Rijksbaron, KRC 183. P. Vindob. G 2316 omits την before ημεραν, as the MSS

frequently omit the article with forms of ἐστιν elsewhere. Seck, Untersuchungen 43, argues in favour of retaining the article on the basis of inscriptions and papyri. S. Zajonz, Isocrates' Enkomion auf Helena (Göttingen 2002) 260–1, after examining the textual tradition of certain Isocratean passages where the phrase καθ' ἐκείνην τῆς ἡμέραν occurs, concludes that the presence of the article adds emphasis (‘every single day’), while without the article the expression simply means ‘daily’.

The lacuna in P. Massil. seems too narrow to allow supplying the verb βουλεύεσθαι which we expect: see B. Keil, Hermes 19 (1884) 628.

9 καθ᾽ αὐτὸν restored with MSS other than P. Vindob. G 2316, which has καθ᾽ αὐτός.

10 τοῦ φανεροῦ with MSS: τοῦ μὴ φανεροῦ Stob.

12 τε restored with the majority of the witnesses; N and Stobaeus omit it. But spacing does not prove that τε was present here.

13 επὶ τοῖς θέσις ἑαυτῷ is restored with PSI 1198 P. Massil. P. Kell. P. Vindob. G 2316, though space would not exclude ἑαυτῷ θέσις, transmitted in Γ. ΑΙ. The aorist infinitive should be preferred to the present, since it forms a pair with ἐπιθέμα.

13–14 τε χαίρει with MSS other than P. Kell., which has τε χαίρει (a mistake; see Worp–Rijksbaron, KG 31).
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3 κατά τοὺς restored with ΠΓ: κατὰ τοὺς Π. Massil. Π. Kell.: αὐτῶν ΠΘ. Ν. κατά) has been restored here on the basis of the occurrence of the disyllabic κατάτο συνth on p. 11.12, but the trisyllabic form would fit the space equally well. αὐτῶν in ΠΠΘ. Ν. may be considered a case of κατάτοι/κατάτοι - = κατάτοι/κατάτοι; cf. L. Thretace, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions iii 327. Seck, Untersuchungen 62–3 n. 51, points out the paucity of evidence for this form in Isocratean.

4 εὐηθὺς with P. Massil. P. Kell. Γ. Ν. θέλεσθαι ΑΠΘ. The restoration has little palaeographical support, given the trigraph traces. In documentary papyri δέεσαι and ἐλέεσαι fluctuate between -εε and -ετι (Gignac, Grammar i 146–8).

5 μεγάλον[ν] with P. Massil. P. Kell. Γ. μεγάλοι... τοι... ΠΠΘ. In Seck, Untersuchungen 60 n. 46, points out, μεγάλον is the genuine reading, since the comparative contrasts with the preceding μεγάλον.

5–6 ἀγαπῶν[α] with P. Massil. P. Kell. Γ. ἀγαπῶν[ε] ΠΠΘ. (too long for the space here). Isocratean usage favours ἀγαπῶν[ε]: he employs ἀγαπῶν[ε] in the sense of κατακρισία (In Soph. 15; Antid. 201, 204; cf. Plut. Phaedr. 269d), but ἀγαπῶν[ε] in the sense of κατακρίσις in military and political contexts (Phan. 75; Eun. 31.58; Hel. 29), in passages concerning sport (De Big 33; Phan. 73.85), and referring to competition between the Sophists (Hel. 9). See B. Keil, Hermes 19 (1884) 603, and Seck, Untersuchungen 60 n. 47.

9–10 ἀφοῦ with PSI 1198 P. Massil. ΠΠΘ: ἀφοῦ βασιλεύεισθαι Π. Kell. Γ. Ν. The choice between variants is determined satisfactorily by context: βασιλεύεισθαι and δοξάσκεισθαι are trivializations of the future; cf. Seck, Untersuchungen 60 n. 48 (and the following note).

11 δοξάσκεισθαι with PSI 1198 P. Massil. Π. Kell. Γ. The parchment exhibits an inferior reading, since the context requires the future; cf. the previous note.

12 κατατόσια δῶρον restored with P. Massil. (μαλλάτιστα) ΠΠΘ γ (by reason of space): μᾶλλόντα δωρόν. The variant given by θ at Antid. 73 is to be rejected there also, since Isocrates does not begin his quotations in asyndeton (Seck, Untersuchungen 61 n. 49).

13 αὐτὸς αὐτὸν with PSI 1198 P. Massil. P. Kell. Γ. AΠΘ. The parchment's unique reading may be explained as a simple mistake, due to the similar spelling and pronunciation of the two words. It is, however, construable in itself: cf. Ad Dominicae 35 αὐτὸν δίνει μᾶλλον... παραδείνεις, εἰ... ἐπιθέμα. And αὐτός ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ could well be a trivialization, in spite of the dominance of the sources.

κατὰ τοὺς with ΓΑ: κατὰ τοὺς Π. Massil. P. Kell. ΠΠΘ. The interchange of the disyllabic and trisyllabic forms of the pronoun κατὰ τοὺς and κατὰ τοὺς, as well as ἀφοῦ and ἀφοῦ, is particularly frequent in Ad Nicodem and Ad
Demonicum, while in the other speeches the disyllabic forms prevail (cf. Seck, Untersuchungen 53-4 n. 35). In Attic inscriptions the uncontracted ευανόι is almost universal before ε.400 B.C., and normal in the fourth century, αετόι being a less frequent alternative (Threatte, Grammar ii 315). In papyrus documents, the form έανοι becomes less and less common in the Hellenistic period, and occurs only occasionally in the Roman (Gignac, Grammar ii 168). Gignac suggests that these late examples reflect Atticist influence. It is possible that in the paradosis of Isocrates, especially in Ad Demonicum and Ad Nicoclem (the best known and most read of his works in antiquity), the common trisyllabic forms gradually penetrated and tended to displace the disyllabic forms which were peculiar to Attic. For the general inconsistency, compare the practice of P. Kell. (Worp-Rijksharmon, KIC 45-6).

12-13 παρακλήσεις μετά το Μασσίλ. ΓΑΠ. Παράκλησις Π. Κελλ. (a ‘Atticist haplography’: Worp-Rijksharmon, KIC 41).

13 A blank space seems to have been left before εἰ δεινόν. This may mark a pause or syntactic articulation, given that εἰ δεινόν begins the protasis of the conditional sentence (note that the ε of εἰ appears slightly enlarged). Alternatively, it may be just accidental, cf. the blank left in p. 12.16 between πνοιας και κεχάρα ημείς, without any syntactic reason.

16 φρονισμός with P. Kell. ΓΑΠ. γυναι. φρονίμος Λ.

17 όσο γαρ γε μετά το ΓΑΠ. οδος γαρ Π. Κελλ.

From the tables of Seck, Untersuchungen 46, and Worp-Rijksharmon, KIC 47, it emerges that for Ad Nicoclem (which presents 11 cases) Γ tends to transmit Δ, θ, η and Γ ΑΠ. Ε in, supported by papyrus (apart from one case in §36, see Worp-Rijksharmon, ibid.). In other speeches the tendency of MSS is different. For example, for Φιλίππος the MSS unanimously transmit Δ, with 12 times (4 instances are supported by two papyri), η 24 times and Ε in once; there is one case of a split between Δ, θ (Γ) and ειρι (Θ, ΑΠ). For Ad Demonicon Δ tends to transmit Δ, against the rest of the MSS, which record ειρι (cf. Worp-Rijksharmon, KIC 46-7). For Τρίπαντιζος, the MSS unanimously transmit Δ, 23 times (two instances are supported by a papyrus), η 6 times; there are no occurrences of Ε, while there are two cases of split (Δ Δ; Ε Δ; Ε Δ). In any case, epigraphic evidence shows that in Isocrates’ time the usual form was ειρι; see Threatte, Grammar ii 672-4; E. Mayser, Grammata i 3, 85.

17 γεί συνωκίων (κ. γις) with P. Kell. Τ. Βρούξ. Γ ΑΠ. Θ, ΑΝ. Μ. Κέλλ. Π. Kell. Τ. Βρούξ. Γ ΑΠ. Θ, ΑΝ. Μ. Κέλλ.
Drerup. γύναικα and γυνάκεια are the normal spellings (for γυναίκα and γυνακέω) in papyri of the Roman period; see Gignac, Grammar i 176. However, both spellings may occur in the same manuscript in different passages: this is the case in P. Kell. (see Worp–Rijksbaron, KIC 38).

D. COLOMO

4718. ISOCRATES, AD NICOCLEM 2

51.48.22/J1–5a  
3.8 x 8.5 cm  
Third century

A fragment of a roll with line-beginnings, written along the fibres and blank on the back. The upper margin is extant to 1.2 cm; the surviving intercolumnium measures c.1.5 cm. On average there were 12 letters to the line, which yields a written width of c.4 cm—a narrow column.

No lectional signs are present. The script is an unpretentious version of the ‘Severe Style’ in its mature phase; descendents tend to hook leftwards at the foot, o is larger than usual in this type of hand, ο has well-rounded loops. A date in the third century would suit.

The papyrus overlaps with 4717, P. Massil., P. Kell. III G 95, PSI XI 1198, and P. Vindob. G 2316. What is preserved shows no divergence from the text of the two other overlapping papyri of this speech found at Oxyrhynchus, viz. 4717 and PSI 1198.


6–7  
tioun [apécho]menocos  with 4717 PSI Γ: τίνων ἐργον ἀπεχόμενος P. Massil. P. Kell. ALIN. Spacing excludes that the papyrus had ἐργον.

10  
δημίους restored with 4717 P. Kell. ALIN: δουμιές P. Massil. Γ. The line as restored seems short in comparison with the others; we may consider whether it ended with a punctuation mark or line-filler.
4718. **Isocrates, Ad Nicoclem 2**


13–14 P. Kell. adds φιεινεί after πανδεινα, a variant not found elsewhere.

N. GONIS

---

4719. **Isocrates, Ad Nicoclem 19–23**

**Third century**

Parts of three columns (the middle one virtually intact), with intercolumnia of c.1.5 cm, written across the fibres of a reused papyrus roll. The upper and lower margins are preserved to c.2 cm. A sheet-join is visible on the left. On the other side and the same way up are parts of three columns of a list of village liturgists, assignable on the basis of the hand to the second century.

The text is written in relatively wide columns (7 cm), belonging to the ‘wider group’, identified by W. A. Johnson, *The Literary Papyrus Roll: Formats and Conventions: An Analysis of the Evidence from Oxyrhynchus* (diss. Yale 1992) 167–77, 253–8. Johnson argues that oratory was not necessarily written in narrower columns (ibid. 211–5), and finds that most such wider columns have a height of more than 18 cm (p. 186), so that the column here is an exception, being relatively short (25 lines in 13.5 cm).

The text lost before col. i would occupy 9 or 10 columns (0.75–0.85 m of papyrus); the text lost after col. iii would require about 14 columns (1.2 m), so that the whole speech would need 27.5 columns occupying 2.4 m. Columns i and ii carry column-numbers, probably written by a hand different from that of the main text: 8 and 6 (= 14 and 15). Assuming that all columns contained exactly the same number of words/lines, this implies that we have to account for three extra columns at the beginning of the roll. Perhaps they contained some prefatory material such as a *hypothesis* or *vita*, cf. the Kellis codex. Such numbering is relatively rare; five examples are cited in *GMAW*² p. 16: ; add LIII 3702, 3711, LXIV 4432, and P. Mil. Vogl. VI 260V (four of these nine contain commentaries or other textbook material, and another four non-classical literature). In P. Massil, each column (two or three per page) is numbered by a second hand. The document on the other side of 4719 has column numbers too (col. ii = 78). If the columns of the documentary text were roughly even in width (not a necessary assumption), we may extrapolate that 7.8 m of papyrus preceded. If the whole roll was recycled, there would have been 6.5 m to spare after the end of *Ad Nicoclem*. However, given the uncertainties about the order of Isocrates’ speeches, it is pointless to speculate about how many and which additional speeches (if any) were originally contained. In any case, the roll may have been cut down from its original 9 m. Many reconstructed rolls of single Isocratean speeches are shorter in their physical length, e.g. P. Lond. Lit. 131, *De Pace* 13–145, would have had 145 paragraphs in 49 columns of 4.25 m.

The script is a formal bookhand of medium size, upright, basically bilinear, apart from the uprights of ι, Ρ, Υ, Φ, and sometimes τ, the lower loop of Β, and the lower part of Ξ, which protrude below the baseline. Λ tends to be rounded, but sometimes is wedge-
shaped. The right-hand oblique of Δ projects above the apex. ε is rounded and has a long central stroke, thinner than the curve; but sometimes it is written more rapidly, so that the central stroke is drawn in one movement with the upper arc or the lower arc. μ presents a deep central curve; its two uprights tend to slant outwards. ο varies in size. The body of φ is rather flat. The pen seems to be crudely cut, and the scribe has some tendency towards connection of letters. Sometimes the feet of uprights present tiny rightward hooks, while the top may have a similar leftward hook.

The papyrus may be assigned to the third century. Compare III 412 (Roberts, GLH 23a), Julius Africanus, Kestoi, copied between 227 and 275/6. Cf. also P. Bodmer II (GMAW^2 63), Gospel of St John, assigned by Turner to the first half of the third century.

There are no accents or breathings. Inorganic diaeresis in ii 12. Punctuation is by high stop in conjunction with a blank space and in some cases with a paragraphus to mark a strong pause. Elision is marked by apostrophes in i 2 and ii 10, but there seems to be a case of scriptio plena in ii 1. Iota adscript is written in i 3 and 8. The scribe has corrected himself currente calamo twice (ii 1, iii 23). It is unclear whether the correction in ii 2, marked in the left margin by δ = δ(обрοθωται) or δ(обрοθωτέων) (see K. McNamee, Pap. Congr. XVI 82 n. 10), is due to the first or second hand.

There are a few textual points of interest: a good word-order, in agreement with two papyri and θ (i 15–16); a new but inferior reading, partly supported by an indirect witness (ii 6); an agreement with the other papyri and one indirect witness against the medieval manuscripts (ii 7); an agreement with one papyrus and one vulgate manuscript over a superior reading (ii 12); and an apparent agreement with three other papyri and a part of the vulgate on a superior reading, though 4719 seems to have something curious, concealed under the damage (i 12–13).

4719 overlapps with 4720, P. Kell. III G 95, P. Massil., P. Bodmer LII (= M–P^3 1257.02), and P. Köln VI 253 (= M–P^3 1257.03).

Col. i

ιδ

τ]ων ευθὺς αφανίζο

προ[ειρημένου] κ[αι τ]ών
κ[αι λ]ητο]ν [κτηµατων
και ταις τών [ν] φιλων εν
ερ]γείας τα γαρ τοιαυ
ται των αρ[α]λοµ[α]των [ν]
αυ]τωι τε και τ[α]ρ[α]λω[ε]
και τοις επιτυγχανόµε
ν]οις πλε[νος α]ξιοι τ[ων

§19
δηδα]πανημενον[ν κατ]α
λευψ]ει[ε τα π]ερι το[ν
ει ] ποτει [μεν] ως
οι προγον]οι κα[τεδ]ει[ι
ξαν ηγου δε του]το
θυμα καλλιτον ει]ναι
και θεραπειν μεγι[ς]ην
αν ως βελτιτον κα]δι
καιστατον εεαυτον π]αρε
χης μαλλον γαρ ελ]πις
τους τιοιοντους η το]με εε
ρεια πολλα καταβα[λλο]ντας
πραξειν τι παρα των θ]ε
ων] c.112 ]).
§20

Col. ii

ε
δε αληθετατας τους ευ
Δ'] ν[ου]ετατ[α]σους· φιλακην α
φαλαττην ηγου του
ε]ωμ[ε]σ ποιαι την τε των
5 φιλ]ων[ν α]με[τη]ν και την
των α[λ]λων πολιτων ευ
νο[ιαι κ]αι την εεαυτου φρο
νη[σι] δια γ[αρ] των και
κων] και] νομιμ
ζε]το]με δασπαοντας α
10 αναλε[κ]εων και]ς τους εργα
ζομε[ν]οις τα εα πλεων ποι
ει[ν] ασπαυτα γαρ τα των οι
κοιντον την πολυν· οι
κεια των καλως βασιλευ
οντων ετι· δια παντος
tου χρονου την αληθειν
αν ου[τ]ω φαινου προτι[μ]ων
ω[σ]τε πιστοτερους ειναι
tους [κ]ους λογους η τοις των
αλλων ορκους· απαει μεν

§22

Col. iii

τοις ξ[ενοις ασφαλη την
πολυν]ν [παρεχε και προς τα
ευμελαια νομομον περι
πραστουν δε ποιου των
αφικομενων μη τους
ξηπι δωρε ας αγοντας αλλα
to[n]ε πα]να σου λαμβανειν
αξιουν τας τιμους γαρ τους
toμους· τους μαλλον παρα τους
αλλοις ευδοκιμηθεις τους
φοβου]c εξαιρει των πολιτων
και μη [θ]ουλον περιδεις
ειναι τους μηδεν αδικουν
τας· στως γαρ αν τους αι
λους προς εαυτον διαθεις
outω και ει προς εκεινους
εξεις· τους μεν μηδεν
μετ αργι]ς δοκει δε τους αλ
λοις στιαν σου καιρος η γει
νος με]ν φαινου τωι μη
δεν σι]ανθανειν των γι
γνωμε]ν ων προς δε τωι
τας τιμωρις ελαττους
ποιεις]αι των αμαρτανο
μενων· [
Col. i

1–12 Omitted (down to καταλείψεις) by θ.


10 πλεον] ποιος P. Massil. (πλεον) P. Bodmer, P. Köln 253 ΑΠΝ: πλεονας P. Kell. (confusion between ο and α; cf. Worp-Rijksbaron, ΚΙΧ 33].) In Attic inscriptions forms of πλεονας consistently have οι before, ω or ον, before short vowel ε is normal in the fifth and fourth century, ει rare before ες.300 BC. (Thurau, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions 3:21–2). Later ει tends to spread to all forms (cf. Gignac, Grammar i 153–4). We might expect Isocrates to follow the apparent Attic usage. But in his papyri and MSS πλεονας and similar forms predominate, with πλεον as only as variant (see Seck, Untersuchungen 67 n. 64). Cf. also M. Gronewald on P. Köln 253.7.

αε[ια] with all witnesses, except αεια P. Kell. (careless error).

11 δεδαπανηκαναν [ν]. At the start of the line, there does not seem to be enough room for δεδα-; but there are no attested variants, and it would be perilous to assume an error δεδαπανηκαναν [ν].


τα μεν is transmitted only by Γ. In 4719 and P. Köln the words are in lacuna, but spacing seems to exclude μεν. In any case, the repeated μεν cannot be paralleled from Isocrates (Baiter-Sauppe, Oratores Attici 1.2 (Torino 1850) 157), produced similar passages from Antiphon and Lysias. As for choosing between προς (P. Köln ι) and περι, Isocratean usage favours the latter (see Seck, Untersuchungen 68–9 n. 65).


15–16 ηγου δε του του | [θυμα καλλες] ειμαι with P. Massil. P. Bodmer θ: θυμα τουτο καλλες ειμαι P. Kell. Γ: τουτό είμαι θυμα καλλες P. Köln ΑΠΝ. The restoration, though not entirely certain, seems to suit the space best. With the second reading (θυμα before τουτο) line 16 would be too short by ε.4 letters; the third reading (θυμα καλλες after ειμαι) would not fit at all. Editors have argued in favour of the first reading on the grounds of style: θυμα καλλες corresponds symmetrically with θραπες κε μεγίτην (Münscher, Quaestiones Isocrateae 1–18); τουτο should stand first, since it prepares the subordinate clause (Seck, Untersuchungen 69 n. 67).

17 και with all witnesses except P. Bodmer, which omits it by mistake.

18 αν restored with Γ, against ου (P. Massil. P. Kell. ΑΠΝ) or ου (θ); but the space would allow any of these.

και] with all witnesses except P. Massil., which omits it.

19 εισαποσ restored with P. Kell. AΠΝ, against εισαποσ (P. Massil. ια) since the trisyllabic form occurs in ιι. 7.

19–20 παρει[χις with ΓΑΠ θ (εξερειχτις P. Bodmer); παρειχτις P. Massil. P. Kell. B. Kell, Hermes 19 (1884) 629, points out that Isocrates uses both forms, present and aorist, without any distinction of meaning.

24–25 θο ειτα 2 θο ειτα 2 ζετοι ταις μεν του βασιλευτων εκτι.

24–ιι 2 A difficult passage, where Γ and the rest of the MSS divide; the four papyri by and large agree with the so-called vulgate against Γ. Here is the text of Γ, with a summary of variants:


In 4719, the first clause is entirely lost. The standard text would require 53 letters (or 50 if this papyrus too omitted μεν), i.e. 3 lines at the average of 17 letters, whereas we expect only two lines by comparison with col. ii. The traces of line-ends are too small to help. It seems that either the scribe wrote an extra line, or the text was substantially shorter.

The readings of Γ are difficult to explain. If we take them to mean ‘honour with offices the closest of your friends’, and with actual realities the most loyal’, it can be objected that (a) oikeutatws elsewhere means ‘nearest relations’, without genitive; and (b) the contrast between αληθειας and αληθειτατας is odd (see Seck, Untersuchungen 69–70 n. 68; Worp-Rijksbaron, ΚΙΧ 239). Scholars who accept αληθειτατας on the authority of Γ have explained


**KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS**

...ālβheκτάς as an interpolation from Ἰξὸ νῆμε ἔτων τῶν ἀλβεκτάς εῦκα μὴ τὰς ἐν τῷ φαινεῖ μετὰ δέως γεγομένας, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτων παρ᾽ αὐτῶν ὄντες μᾶλλον εἰς τὴν γνώμην ἢ τὴν τόχην δομηλέουν.

The ‘vulgate’ ταίς μὲν ἄρχαι τῶν τιμῶν . . . ταίς δ᾽ ἀλβεκτάς also presents difficulties. Seek suggests ‘honour your nearest relations with the beginnings of offices (i.e. lesser offices), but the most loyal with truest offices’. Yet that, as Seek himself says, gives a false suggestion of the Roman context; and he offers no parallel for this use of ἄρχαι.

In any case, it is clear that the ‘vulgate version’ goes back to the Roman period. P. Kell, offers a new possible solution with its unique reading ταίς μὲν ἄρχαι τῶν τιμῶν, ‘honour your relatives with the traditional honours, but the people who are most loyal with the truest ones’. Worp—Rijksbaron, *KKC* 239–40, argue that this was the usual reading for this use of ἄρχαι.

Col. ii


6 τοῦ τελευταίου πολίτην τῶν πολίτων ΓΑΠΙΝ: τῶν ἄλλων P. Massil. P. Kell. P. Bodmer: τῶν ἄλλων πολίτευν Antonius Monachus 11 1 (Migne PG 136:1068). This variant can be explained in various ways. (1) An original τῶν πολίτων was corrupted to τῶν πολίων (cf. similar variants at Φίλλῳ 136, Εὐαγγ. 5), which was interpreted as ‘the crowd’, i.e. the rest of the people, and glossed with τῶν ἄλλων, which intruded into the text; see Keil, *Hermes* 19 (1884) 630. Alternatively, it may be that a reader wanted to clarify the distinction between τῶν φῶν τῶν πολίτων, given that friends too are citizens, and added ἄλλων (cf. Εὐαγγ. 45 τοῖς μὲν φίλοις . . . τοῖς δ᾽ ἄλλοις), which was then interpreted as a variant and replaced πολίτων. See Seck, Untersuchungen 71 n. 69. (2) An original τῶν ἄλλων was glossed τῶν πολίτων, which was taken into the text. In favour of (1) are other cases where ἄλλος may have replaced a noun or its epithet, see Keil, Untersuchungen 4719 seems to present a conflouation of the two (partly in lacuna, but the space is too long for τῶν πολίτων alone). This might be the work of the scribe, who combined a reading and a variant found in his exemplar. However, Antonius Monachus shows that the same reading existed elsewhere in the paradigm (except that its text corrupts πολίτων to πολίτευν).

7 κεπτούσαν with P. Massil. P. Kell. P. Bodmer Antonius Monachus 11 1: κατούσα ἘΑΠΙΝ. For the alternation of the two forms, see on 4717 p. 11.3 and 12.

8—9 ἐν καὶ τῆς ἐμαθαν ἐνω with Γ: καὶ ἐφέξω καὶ κτάθας Ἀντωνίου Monachus: καὶ κτάθας καὶ διασκόξω Π. Massil. P. Kell. P. Bodmer ΙΠΙΝ. The compound διασκόξω is itself acceptable, since Isocrates uses the simple and the compound form of this verb almost as synonyms (Seck, Untersuchungen 71 n. 70). In this passage, however, according to Münzscher, Quaestiones Isocrateae 61, the simple form is to be preferred for the sake of symmetry with the simple κτάθας.


το μάλετα δ᾽ αὐτ Π. ᾿Ο. [wrong, since δέ does not make sense here].

11—14 ζήγγαρος . . . τοῦν κατούσα. This section is transmitted in different ways by the different witnesses; cf. the notes below. P. Bodmer offers a completely different text, ζήγγαρον τοῦν | [τοῦ] πολίων ὡς τοῦν | [τοῦν] τοῦν κατούσα, on which see P. Schubert, MH 54 (1997) 105.


12 οἰκεῖοι with P. Massil. Α: ἰδιωτικῶν P. Kell.: ἰδιωτικῶν ΠΙΝ: πολίτευκαν Γ. The reading of 4719 can be supported by several passages in which ἰδιωτί is used with ὀικεῖοι, usually in the plural, to indicate private property (Nicod. 41, 55, etc.). In this context, it must be the property of private citizens, not the private property of Nicoles; the variants ἰδιωτὸν and ἰδιωτικῶν (cf. Aristoph. 6 ἰδιωτί Γ, ἰδιωτικῶν ΑΠΙ) perhaps aimed to avoid this ambiguity (cf. Keil, Hermes 19 (1884) 630–4). τῶν πολίτευκαν τοῦ Γ would need to mean ‘belonging to your fellow-citizens’; see Mathieu—Brémonard’s translation and Münzscher, Quaestiones Isocrateae 61, but Seck, Untersuchungen 71 n. 71, points out that Isocrates does not use the adjective in this sense (only at Εὐαγγ. 10 does it mean ‘common’, ‘ordinary’).
12-13. The reading of Greek with P. Massil. P. Kell. ΑΠΟΝ ΙΝ (fort. recte Seck); νομίζει καὶ τοῖς Γ. Both readings are acceptable; cf. Seck, Untersuchungen 71 n. 72.

13. διαφοροῦσα with Γ': διαφοροῦσα P. Massil. Γ' is unacceptable; διαφοροῦσα P. Kell. (confusion of α/ε, see Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 39). Scholars have considered two arguments in favour of the medio-passive form: (i) from the point of view of style, it produces a homosoteuton with the coordinate participle ἐπαγωγοῦσα; (2) from the point of view of force, the middle 'spending from one's own means' suits the context better than the active 'spending' from some other source. However, Isocrates has passages which offer active and medio-passive participles alternating in parallel clauses; and it is not clear that the distinction of meaning between active and middle is so clear-cut. See further Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 241-2.

14. απὸ τῶν διώκων with P. Kell. The paradox is απὸ τῶν διώκων or the like (the variant έκ is less likely in Isocrates' usage; see Seck, Untersuchungen 71-2 n. 73). 4719, P. Kell., Γ' and Λ add ἀπὸ τῶν διώκων. Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 241-2, consider that this was part of the original text. They support their view with two arguments: (a) ἀπὸ τῶν διώκων makes a good contrast with ἐκ τῶν κῶν P. Massil.; or τά τῶν διώκων ἐκ τῶν κῶν P. Kell. The paradox has ἀπὸ τῶν κῶν or the like (the variant έκ is less likely in Isocrates' usage; see Seck, Untersuchungen 71-2 n. 73). 4719, P. Kell., Γ' and Λ add ἀπὸ τῶν διώκων. Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 241-2, consider that this was part of the original text. They support their view with two arguments: (a) ἀπὸ τῶν διώκων makes a good contrast with ἐκ τῶν κῶν P. Massil.; or τά τῶν διώκων ἐκ τῶν κῶν P. Kell. The paradox has ἀπὸ τῶν κῶν or the like (the variant έκ is less likely in Isocrates' usage; see Seck, Untersuchungen 71-2 n. 73). 4719, P. Kell., Γ' and Λ add ἀπὸ τῶν διώκων. Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 241-2, consider that this was part of the original text. They support their view with two arguments: (a) ἀπὸ τῶν διώκων makes a good contrast with ἐκ τῶν κῶν P. Massil.; or τά τῶν διώκων ἐκ τῶν κῶν P. Kell. The paradox has ἀπὸ τῶν κῶν or the like (the variant έκ is less likely in Isocrates' usage; see Seck, Untersuchungen 71-2 n. 73). 4719, P. Kell., Γ' and Λ add ἀπὸ τῶν διώκων. Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 241-2, consider that this was part of the original text. They support their view with two arguments: (a) ἀπὸ τῶν διώκων makes a good contrast with ἐκ τῶν κῶν P. Massil.; or τά τῶν διώκων ἐκ τῶν κῶν P. Kell. The paradox has ἀπὸ τῶν κῶν or the like (the variant έκ is less likely in Isocrates' usage; see Seck, Untersuchungen 71-2 n. 73).

The reading of 4719 and Λ may result from incorporating the explanatory ἀπὸ τῶν διώκων into the text and then omitting the second διώκων (if deliberately, was it understood as a single phrase, 'from your private property', or was τῶν κῶν taken as partitive genitive with ἀνάλληλον, as at Panath. 12.3). Note that 4719 combines a unique reading of Α (διαιροῦσα) with a reading of the 'vulgate' Μ Λ.

17. αποτάσιμα with ΓΑΠΝ (αποτάσιμα) P. Bodmer; πάντα P. Massil.; αποτάσιμα P. Kell. (a mistake; see Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 194). For the interchange of ἀποτάσιμα and πάντα, see 4721 1-10 n.
19. οἰκεία with P. Kell. οἰκεία P. Bodmer: οἰκεία οἰκεία P. Massil.: οἰκεία οἰκεία οἰκεία P. Kell. As Seck, Untersuchungen 72 n. 74, points out, the reading in Γ', from which two corrections have originated, represents an attempt to adjust οἰκεία to the preceding noun πᾶλιν.
20. εἰτε with P. Kell.: εἰτε P. Bodmer ΓΑΠΝ: εἰτε εἰτε P. Massil. (an influence from §9). A part of the paradox transmits the paragogic -ειτε, which here occurs at a strong pause. Paragogic -ειτε is used inconsistently in papyri of the Roman period; see Gignac, Grammar i 144ff. (cf. Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 273 n. 150). It is consistently written in Γ, also before consonants (see Drerup 1906, Praef. pp. lxvi-lxvii; cf. 4717 p. 24). As regards Isocrates' usage, Threatte, Grammar i 641, says that in inscribed decrees a gradual increase in the frequency of movable νy can be noted from the later fifth century until Hellenistic times, by which the use of it is virtually universal before vowels and pauses, and certainly normal before consonants'.
24. λόγους η with 4720 P. Massil. P. Kell. ΓΓ' ΑΠΝ Stobaeus: λόγους μᾶλλον ἐς θ. The second reading may be supported by a number of passages where the comparative is followed by μᾶλλον διὰ in phrases expressing choice/alternative (listed by Seck, Untersuchungen 73 n. 75). However, in these passages (apart from two) μᾶλλον may be considered a means of avoiding hiatus. Furthermore, μᾶλλον is not present in the two expressions where the expression is closely paralleled: Paneg. 8) (πικτοτήρας τοῖς λόγοις ἐς τοῖς ἄρχοντας χρωμάτω̣ς) and Buciat. 25 (Οἴκετε καὶ τοῦτο ἄρχοντας πικτοτήρας ἐς τούς ἐκείνους λεοὺς τοὺς παρὰ τοῖς μᾶλλον καθεκτοται). 4720 (but partially in lacuna) P. Massil. ΓΑΠΝ θ: P. Kell. and Stobaeus omit τούς.
25. θ omits the portion of text from ἄποτε μὲν τοῖς ἄμαρτσαμοιμάν.
Col. iii

2 παρόδχε restored with P. Massil. P. Kell. Γ ΛΠ: παρόδχε N.
2-3 και προς τα] | ἐξερευναίνα νομίμων with MSS other than P. Massil., which omits it. Spacing shows that the words were present in 4719.

6 αγαντακ restored with Γ: εἴκοσινακ P. Kell ΑΠΝ, but this would be too long for the space. Seck, Untersuchungen 73 n. 77, argues on the basis of syntax and Isocratean usage that the compound in this passage is to be rejected.


11 εὔαμει is restored with P. Kell, and Γ (see Worp—Rijksbaron, KIC 39, 194), against the middle εὔαμοι (ΛΠΝ). See Seck, Untersuchungen 73 n. 79.

12-14 περίδες[εν] | ειναι τοις μεθὲν αδικοί[νων] τα with P. Kell. Γ: περίδες είναι τοις μηδὲν αδικοίων ΛΠΝ.

In the latter reading, περίδες must have a causative meaning, i.e. 'inspiring great fear'. Seck, Untersuchungen 73-4 n. 80, objects that this sense is first attested in Alciphron II 4 (4.19.12 Schepers).

15 For the restoration of σεαυτον (ΛΠΝ; cf. P. Kell. προσεαυτον) against αυτον (Γ), see ii 7.

19-20 σκίν [μὲν] with Γ ΛΠΝ: δικαστὴς Γ, which would not be excluded by the space.

24—5 των αμαρτανομενοι with Γ ΛΠΝ: τους οικος των αμαρτανομενον P. Kell.

D. COLOMO

4720. ISOCRATES, Ad NICOCLEM 22

A scrap of a papyrus roll, written along the fibres. The back is blank. The original column must have contained on average 14 letters per line. This means that it was about 5 cm wide, i.e. in the 'narrower class' discussed by Johnson, The Literary Papyrus Roll 253. Both left and right margins are missing, so that the division of lines is exempli gratia. The diminutive ο at the end of line 1 suggests the scribe is nearing the end of the line; the text has been laid out on this lineation.

The script belongs to the 'Formal Round Style' (Turner's first type: GMAW² p. 21). It is basically bilinear; only τ, ρ, π, and γ protrude slightly below the baseline. There is some contrast between thick vertical strokes and thin horizontal ones. The lower or upper ends of vertical strokes sometimes have a hook or semi-serif to the left (cf. in particular η in 3), while crossbars may carry a very small initial or final blob. The most peculiar feature of this hand is the shape of ω, very broad and rectangular: three verticals of the same height are joined by two horizontals at the baseline. Other letter-shapes of note: the diagonal of η starts from the middle of the left-hand upright; ι consists of two horizontal strokes linked by a sinuous stroke; ο is well-rounded and occupies almost the entire writing-space (except for the smaller o at the end of 1); π has a rather small head.

The scribe may be identified on the basis of the idiosyncrasies described above with the writer of at least four literary papyri from Oxyrhynchus: XXIII 2373 (pl. XI), Boeotian Verse; XXIV 2404 (pl. XIII), Aeschines; PSI IX 1090 (pl. IV), Erinna; and now 4688, Isocr. De pace 96. All are high-quality manuscripts of classical authors, produced by
a professional in a hand distinguished especially by the peculiar rectangular omega and
a three-stroke χ (see Johnson, op. cit. 86–7). They may be assigned to the second century.
The column-width of 4720 is approximately the same as in 4688 and 2404. Thus the
scribe copied Aeschines and Isocrates in the same format, and it is likely that 4720 and
4688 belong to a uniform set of Isocrates’ speeches.

No accents, punctuation or other lectional signs are in evidence. The papyrus reveals
no new variants.

4720 overlaps with 4719, P. Kell. III G 95, and P. Massil.

1. δούκες λοικον γε το [νε](§22)
2. των α[λλων ορκ[νε]
3. απακι [μεν τοις ξ[ε]
4. νοις ακ[φαιη την το]λ[ν]

---

4721. ISOCRATES, AD NICOCLEM 26

A small fragment of a papyrus roll, written along the fibres. The back is blank. The
intercolumnium is preserved on the right to a width of 1.5 cm. The reconstructed width of
the column was not less than 5 cm, thus belonging to the ‘narrow’ category according to
Johnson, The Literary Papyrus Roll 167–77, 253–8 (Table 3.5).

The script is a small Severe Style, slightly sloping to the right. The two oblique of κ
are rather long and may be detached from the upright. The central elements of υ form
a single wide curve. The central part of α consists of an oval not completely closed. ω is not
divided into two lobes, but its base forms a nearly straight stroke at line-level. The papyrus
may be assigned to the third century by comparison to VII 1012 (pl. IV), assignable to the
first half of the third century on the basis of the document on the front (VII 1045, of c.205).
Also comparable is LXIV 4407, written on the back of a document with a date 241/2.

No punctuation and no lectional signs. Iota adscript is written correctly (3). There is
one correction in evidence (5), where ἄνυ has been corrected to ἑάνυ by adding ε above the
line, possibly due to a second hand.

4721 overlaps with P. Kell. III G 95 and P. Massil.
λον μη τους μεγιστην αρχην]υ [κτηματευονς αλλα τους αριφ] 
5 etαι της παρα]υση χρησα μενους και νομιμε τελεως 
ευδαιμονης][ειν ουκ έαν απαν 
τον ανθρωποι]ου μετα φοβιων και κινδυνοι]υ και καιας αρ 
χης αλλαν] τοιοντοι ον 
οιον χρη και πρ]παινοι ω 
10 [σπερ εν τοι παροντι μετριων] 
επιθυμης και μηδε]νοι[ε 

3-4 χρησα μενους ωι ΓΑΠΠ θ: θρηματευονς P. Massil. (a mechanical mistake, since this word occurs in the first half of the same clause): χρηματευονς P. Kell. 
4ff. θ omits και νομιμε ... τοιοντοι δεμχε (at the end of this section). 
6 ταμαν P. Massil. P. Kell. ΓΛΠΠ (see on 4717 p. 12.11-2; cf. on 4723 ii 8). In 4721 the ε is a supralinear addition, probably by a second hand. 
5-6 απαν ταμαν P. Kell. ΑΠΠ: παντως P. Massil. Ι. Some have held that Isocrates always uses the form with initial α, except when the preceding word ends in a vowel (K. Fuhr, RhM n.s. 33 (1878) 329-30; B. Kell, Hermes 19 (1884) 629-30). Fuhr emended the apparent exception in Antid. 190. In fact, I has only a few exceptions to this rule, among them our passage, where Dreirup accepts παντως, although there is no possibility of hiatus, relying on the authority of I; cf. the tabulation in Worps-Rijksbaron, KIC 44. Note however the phrase υπο παντως, which occurs 16 times in Isocrates (cf. Seck, Untersuchungen 78 n. 89); it would have been possible to write δις' απαντως. 
(The argument of K. Münscher, Quaestiones Isocrateae 31, that the Greeks found cacophonous a succession of two or more aspirates, receives support neither from the ancient grammarians nor from internal evidence: cf. e.g. In Callim. 7 ωθη' απαντως; De Pace 28 οι δ' ους ολοι.) The evidence of inscriptions shows that both forms were used in Isocrates' time (Threatte, Grammar ii 348-66); Threatte notes that άνας is avoided after prepositions ending in a vowel, but occurs quite frequently after other words ending in a vowel (pp. 353-4), while πας often follows consonants. Thus Isocrates may not have followed a simple rule, but chosen according to the phrase, the rhythm or general euphony. It remains possible that the variations in the MSS reflect the preferences of scribes at various stages of the tradition, and not Isocrates' own orthography. 
7 και καικας with Ι: om. P. Massil. P. Kell. ΑΠΠ. Seck, Untersuchungen 78 n. 90, argues that the phrase is an interpolation, because (1) as to the sense, it juxtaposes the external threats to the ruler (φοβιω και κινδυνω) with the different notion of καικα, the internal degeneration of character which the ruler suffers; (2) as to the style, it is inconsistent with Isocratean concinnitas to add the singular abstract καικας after the plurals φοβιω και κινδυνω. Against (1), one can argue that καικα really refers to the enemies of the ruler; cf. Νεοκλες 55 πολλαι γαρ afone δια την των δραχμας καικας τροχοστρων ... αρχων ιδρυμενοσ. Against (2), one can point out several similar sequences: De Pace 20 παλεύων και κινδυνών και ταραχής; Pirith. 77, 250; Epist. IX 8. 
7-8 απαν χρη restored exempli gratia with P. Massil. P. Kell. ΑΠΠ: δράςις (Ι) would be equally possible. 
8 αν restored with Ι against αν (P. Massil. P. Kell. ΑΠΠ), because the scribe wrote this form in 5 before correction. But the spacing does not decide.
4721. ISOCRATES, AD NICOCLEM 26

9 ονοι χρη restored with MSS other than P. Kell., which gives ονων εναi χρη (too long for the space here).
9–10 οι[τεπ]. One would expect to see a trace of τε, if the latter were written at the end of the line.

οι[τεπ] των παρωντων restored with P. Kell. ΓΑ, against οi εν τωι παρωντι (NIH), which is too short for the space: οιτεπ των παρωντων P. Massil. (by attraction to the following genitive μετριων).

D. COLOMO

4722. ISOCRATES, AD NICOCLEM 29–30

A scrap of a roll with line-beginnings, written along the fibres; the upper margin measures 3 cm, and is probably complete. Line length ranges from 20 to 22 letters (c.7 cm). The other side carries what seems to be a medical text, written across the fibres.

The hand is a round informal one, to be assigned to the second century, earlier rather than later. It is generally bilinear, but letter height varies. Left-facing serifs are attached to the feet of some uprights. β has a broad base; ω is smallish; γ has a long left- and a short right-hand oblique. Somewhat comparable are Roberts, GLH 11b and 13b.

There is one breathing mark (7). Elision is effected but not marked. Deletion dots are apparently used in τ, perhaps by the original scribe. A second hand (different ink) has made a supralinear addition that I cannot interpret; see 5 n.

The papyrus overlaps with P. Massil. and P. Kell. III G 95. The text offers no surprises.


1 ετ. Two ink spots above the two letters, perhaps cancelling dots, intended to delete the preposition (leaving χαίρει construed with simple dative).

1–2 ετ. εκείναι (ταις διαι) τριβαιες εθιζε [εισαυν οις] peve ex[ων aυtοις τε επι 

δ]οςεις και τοίς [αι διποι χελ

τε]ων εναι δοκε[εις μήτε φαι 
νοι θ]δοτιμουμ[ενος επι 

τοις τοιοι]ν[τ]οις ά και [ται τοις


2 εισαυν restored with P. Massil. P. Kell. Α: σαυνίων ί.


3–4 επιδοξεις. After this, P. Massil. adds προς αρετηπ.

5 εναι. Above ε, what could be an angular circumflex (an unusual shape); above ω, a circlet open at lower right, apparently not a breathing. Are these letters or diacritics?

εναι δοκε[εις, δοξεις is not present in P. Massil.

N. GONIS
The lower part of two columns, written along the fibres. The back is blank. Lower margin 3.3 cm; intercolumnium 1.3 cm. The width of the column was 6.5 cm, i.e. in the ‘broader’ group identified by Johnson, The Literary Papyrus Roll 167–77, 253–8. Column ii originally contained 33 lines; the column-height can be estimated at c.17.5 cm, the roll-height at c.23 cm, assuming an upper margin of c.2 cm, i.e. less deep than the lower margin (though cf. Johnson, op. cit. 165–6, 195–202). A column contained about 145 words; the first part of the speech would fit neatly into four columns before the first of our papyrus. The whole speech (3975 words) would require about 27.5 columns, i.e., about 2.1 m of papyrus, making it likely that the roll contained other speeches.

The script is a version of the Severe Style, written rather small and vertically compressed. π, τ, and γ extend their uprights below the base-line. α presents a sharp wedge-shape. The right-hand diagonal of α protrudes above. ε is rather narrow and extends its central stroke. The diagonal strokes of κ are quite long and may be detached from the upright. σ is very small and lies in the upper part of the writing-space. ζ presents a flat top. γ is written in two movements, the left-hand diagonal first, then the right-hand diagonal and upright. Ω is rather square and does not present a definite division into two lobes, but its base consists of a horizontal at line-level. The scribe effects an even right-hand margin by reducing letter size at line-end.

The script may be assigned to the late second or early third century by comparison with relatively securely dated examples of similar type: I 26 (pl. VII; Roberts GLH 19a), Demosthenes, second century (of which the verso presents a documentary script assigned to the late second or early third century); XVIII 2098 (pl. III; Roberts GLH 19b), Herodotus, first half of the third century (land survey probably of the reign of Gallienus on verso); I 23 (pl. VI), Plato, third century (the back carries a date-formula of 295); III 447 (pl. VI), Homer, Iliad, second half of the second century (the back carries cursive assigned to the late second or early third century).

No lectional signs other than the inorganic diaeresis in ii 5. Elision is usually effected, but scriptio plena occurs in ii 7. Iota adscript is written correctly in ii 15, and spacing suggests that it should be restored in ii 13.

The papyrus overlaps with P. Kell. III G 95. The only textual points of note are the agreements with P. Kell. and Π against the rest of the tradition in i 10 and ii 8–9.
[λαγεῖν ἀλλ' εἰ προεπίδει]
ξαίμι πρῶτον μὲν τ]�[ν] το
5 λειτειν τὴν παρ[ρ]ουσάν ὡς
αξίων εὐπτὶν αγ[ν]τα]ν[πά]ὶ ν' οὐ μό
νον διὰ τὴν α]ν[αγκὴν οὐ
δ' ἰν τοῦ παντα τοῦ χρό]νο]ν[ο] μὲ
τα ταύτης οἰκου]μὲν ἀλλ' ὑπ'

βελτιστὴ τῶ]ν[π]ολείτων
εὐπτὶν εὐπτὶθ' ω]ς εὐχα ταύτην
εὐχὰ τὴν ἀρχή]ν]ν οὐ παραγο

Col. ii

(18 lines missing)

§15

τείν καὶ τιμασθαὶ καὶ τα τὴν
αξίων εὐκαστί]ως οἱ μὲν τ]οι
νον ὀλογαρχ[ί]αι καὶ δὴ[μο]
κρατια]τα]ς ἵπτηται το[π[ε]
μετ]' χουσὶ]ν τῶν πολιτε[ιο]ν
ἔξαρ[τ]ο]ι καὶ τοῦτο εὐθ[ό]
κις ιπ ταρ' αὐτάς εαν μ[ῆ]

§13

π[λεο]ν εὐχα[ν] οι το[ὺς πονηροὶς
cυμφέρο]ν ε[ξ]το]ν οἱ δὲ μο
τεροι δὲ τ]ε]μ μετ' εὐκειμ[ο]

15 πρ[ιὸν δ]ὲ καὶ τεσταρτῶι καὶ
tω]ι[ς ἀλλοις κατὰ τοῖν αὐτὸ]ν
λ[ο]γοὶ καὶ ταυτ εἰ μὴ π[ν]αν

Col. i

2–3 καὶ ταύτ' απαριθμήσας ἅπαλ[λα]γεῖν with MSS other than Α, which omits this clause.
8–9 με['] τὰ ταύτῃ restored with ΓΑΠ: μετ' αὐτῷ P. Kell. (by haplography? Worp–Rijksharon, KIC 216, argue that μετὰ ταύτης is a dittography).
10. Βέλτιστη τοῦ πολεμίου (I. πολεμίου) with P. Kell. Γ: καὶ Βέλτιστη τῶν ἄλλων πολεμίων Α.Π. The reading of ΑΠ is a case of lectio longior, frequent in the vulgate MSS; for a similar intrusion of ἄλλος (excluded by space in the papyrus), see on 4719 ii 6.
13. ος seems to suit the traces better than ο> (space-filler) or ος. If this is correct, the scribe broke the normal rule by dividing ος(ως) at line-end (we expect ος(ως) or ος(ως)).

Col. ii
3 exacto|ς with ΓΔΠΠ; exactov P. Kell.: omitted by Stobaeus.
3-4. τὸ|λογοῦν with ΓΔΠΠ: τοῦ|λογοῦν οὐν P. Kell., which is too long for the space here. The reading of P. Kell. is a mistake: either a conflation of variants μὲν τοῦλογον and μὲν οὐν or a reminiscence of the use of τοῦλογον οὐν in the spoken language, attested in documentary papyri from the third century onwards (see P. Kell. I G 65.8 n.).
8. παρ αυτῶ|ς with MSS other than P. Kell., which gives παρ αυτῆς.

4724. Isocrates, Nicocles 31-4

A fragment of a papyrus codex, with remains of 21 lines across the fibres (a right-hand page) and 22 lines along the fibres on the back (a left-hand page). The upper margin is preserved for 2 cm. The outer margins reach 1.5 cm (↓) and 1.7 cm (→). The complete page contained 23 lines of 22–24 letters each. The written area was about 7.2 × 14 cm. Assuming a lower margin of 3 cm (i.e., in proportion of 3 : 2 to the upper margin: Turner, Typology 25), the size of the original page was 9.7 × 19 cm. Thus it may be included in Turner’s group 8 (Typology 20), in the subgroup ‘less than 12 cm broad’. Since each page contained 110 words, the whole speech would have occupied 36 pages (18 leaves).

The script is a ‘formal mixed’ one of medium size, with a slight slant to the right. Some combinations present ligatures. ά presents an oval loop. The right-hand diagonal of ά protrudes above. The lower oblique of κ is linked to the upper oblique instead of being linked to the upright. χ is very broad; the central elements form a wide curve approaching the baseline. The oblique and the right-hand upright of Ν appear to be drawn in one movement, so that the join is a curve instead of an angle. ζ (ζ) consists of a horizontal in the upper part of the writing-space, with a Ζ-shaped sign below. ω is rather small and usually lies high. ϊ is usually wider than it is high; its left-hand lobe is rather oval, slightly protruding to the left.

For comparison see I 23 (pl. VI) (before AD 295). There are also similarities with hands assigned to the early fourth century, e.g. P. Chester Beatty XI, LXX Ecclesiasticus (GBEBP
4724. ISOCRATES, NICOCLES 31–4

2b). Thus 4724 may be assigned to the end of the third century or the beginning of the fourth.

There are a variety of lectional signs, some at least by a second hand. Accents, diaereses and punctuation are sometimes in a lighter ink. There are rough breathings (↓ 5, →18); inorganic (↓ 4) and organic (→8) diaereses; acute (↓ 5) and circumflex (↓ 19, →9) accents; long and short quantity marks (rare in prose texts), probably by the same hand (↓ 11). Compare I 25, LVI 3849, 3850, and LXII 4321 (Demosthenes), the last perhaps marked up for use in school, where quantity marks are equally rare; see R. Cribiore, Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt (Atlanta 1996) 86; cf. P. Amh. II 21 = Cribiore no. 368, A. Wouters, The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt (Bruxelles 1979) 188–97 with pl. viii, and XLIX 3453–4, lists of προσδοια perhaps intended for school use. The breve occurs normally on vowels of ambiguous quantity (α + υ); over ω it is otiose, but perhaps it stands in ↓ 11 to mark the unusual sequence -αια.

The position of the punctuation marks suggests that they are a later addition: high stop (↓ 5 between two contrasting clauses; → 8 between the main verb and the participial clauses attached to it; → 9, between two participial clauses contrasted by means of μέν . . . δέ); middle stop (→ 6 between two participial clauses contrasted by means of μέν . . . δέ). Thus the high and middle stops do not seem to have distinct syntactical functions (cf. GMAW p. 9). A slightly forked paragraphus occurs between → 2 and 3 (marking end of sentence, perhaps originally supplemented by a stop in the line). No paragraphus was written to correspond with the stops within the sentence in → 6 and 8. A space-filler occurs in ↓ 4.

Scriptio plena occurs twice (↓ 1, →12), but elision is elsewhere effected, in three cases marked by apostrophe (↓ 4 and →18 probably by the same hand; in ↓ 5 a later addition, but probably by the same scribe). Unmarked elision in ↓ 4, perhaps sufficiently indicated by the aspiration of the preposition. An apostrophe in → 2, added by the scribe, separates double consonants. Iota adscript is written (↓ 9, → 5, probably →6).

The papyrus overlaps with P. Kell. III G 95. It does not present any remarkable deviation from the standard text; it may be worth mentioning the agreement with Ι in ↓ 17 (word-order). The other agreement with Ιττ (and P. Kell.) in ↓ 7 represents a variation of tense (or perhaps a misspelling).

↓   ek παντος] τροπον τα εφετερα αυτων
      διορθομενος και πολλα παρά την
      φυσιν την α]υτων πραττεων αναγ
      καζομενοι] οι μοι ουδεν φυ ενος > (§31)

5   τουτων δει|φθαρνην αλλα’ ουτως δει
      ις και Καλ]ως επεμεληθηθη|ν των
      πραγματων οι]ετε μηθεν [ει]ληπεων
      εξ ων οιον τι] γν αυξηθηθηναι και
      προς ευδαιμο|νιαν επιδουναι] τι[νη

§32
20 μων τα πιλι[ε]τα του[ν διελυσα τοιε μεν α]παντ [αποτινουν τοις]

(1 line missing)

→ ηδύναμην περι των εγκλημα
tων διαλλα τομειν ετει δε και των την νἠσουν οικουντων δη
ekολως προς ημας διακειμενων και βασιλεως των μου λογωι δι
ηλη[λα]χμενων την δ νὀθειαι τραχ[ε]ς εχουτος [αμφοτερα ταυ
τα κατεπραυνα τωι μεν προθεν μου μου νπητε τωι δε τους
dικαιων εμι]αυτον παρεξηων

.............]ου δειω τω αλλωρω
επιθυμει]ν ωστε [ετεροι μεν ην και μικροι μει]ξω των [ομορων
dινα]μον επω ειν αποτεμ
νονται της γης και πλεονεκ
tενη κατεκε [εγω δ ουδε την
dιδομεν]ην]ν χωραν ηνιωσα λα
βειν αλ] λι αιρο]ναι μεν μετα δικαιο
cωνης ]...

]...[
4724. Isocrates, Nicocles 31–4

2 παρα with P. Kell., ΓΠΝ: πόε Α.
3–4 αναγκάζομενος with ΓΛΠ: ἀναγκάζομενος P. Kell.
6 καλοὶ restored with ΓΛΠ: δίκαιοι P. Kell., which could also suit the space here. Cf. Worp–Rijksbaron, KIC 223.
7 εὐλαμπεῖν with P. Kell. ΓΠ: εὐλαμπεῖν ΛΠ. The morphological distinction between aorist and present is complicated by the phonetic convergence of ι and ει (Threatte, Grammar i 193–202; Gignac, Grammar i 189–91). Cf. Mandilaras, The Speech ‘On the Peace’ of Isocrates 30–1. Similar variations appear in Nic. 47 (see on 4725 4–5–6) and 48 (-ειστὶ Γ: -λειτ P. Kell. ΛΠ). It is difficult to tell how far Isocrates himself would have made a sharp distinction between the tenses; the paradosis unanimously offers the aorist in Philipp. θς, the present in two passages very similar to the present one (Nicocles 64. and Esg. 80).
11 τοιαύτης restored exempli gratia with Τ: τοιαύτης P. Kell. ΛΠ.
11–12 τροποειδηρεῖ restored on grounds of space with ΓΛΠ: τροποειδηρεῖ P. Kell. According to Worp–Rijksbaron, KIC 43–4, the use of the simple verb is an idiosyncrasy of the Kellis codex.
17 τοὺς Ελλάδος ἡμι with P. Kell. (spelled ελλατος) Γ: ἡμί τοὺς Ελλάδος ΛΠ (Ελλάδος Π).
19 παίσταιχή with P. Kell. ΓΛ: παισταιχή Π.
3 ὑλομενων restored with P. Kell. Γ: εὐλογομενοι ΛΠ.
10–11 ...[1] δεῶ: τοιαύτα γὰρ δέω P. Kell. ΓΛΠ (τοιαύτα Α). τοιαύτα γὰρ δέω might be considered (in dittoigraphy), or εγὼ δέω. But both are rather long for the space, and we would expect εγὼ to stand at the beginning of the clause (cf. Aegin. 2; Dem. Philipp. III 17, De Cov. 18). Thus perhaps εγὼ δέω (but Isocrates does not use the compound in this expression).
11 After δέω, what looks like a high point is probably an offset.
12 τοῦ καὶ restored with ΓΛΠ; καὶ αὐτὸ καὶ εἶναι (P. Kell.; paralleled at Ad. Nic. 54 and Esg. 27) might also fit in the space.
13 μετέχειν τῶν [ομορων with ΓΛΠ: τῶν ομορων μετέχει P. Kell. ομορως is a mistake for ομορων. The postposition of μετέχει is uncommon in Isocrates (the only occurrence is De Big. 47).
14 δύναμιν is short for the space by a letter or so, but ἄνδρα δύναμιν (an unattested variant) would be equally too long.
19–22 No text can be verified from the traces.

D. COLOMO
A fragment of a papyrus codex with remains of 8 lines on the front (along the fibres) and 8 lines on the back (across the fibres). → preserves line-end (note the enlarged final ν); ↓ 3–4 are shown by their initial letters to be line-beginnings. The length of the lines was c.7.5 cm, with c.20–25 letters per line as reconstructed. Since 7 lines occupy 3.8 cm, the height of the written area would be 11–13.5 cm. There were 20–25 lines to the page. Allowing for an inner margin of 1.5 cm and an outer of 2 cm, and upper and lower margins of 2 cm and 3 cm, a page would be 11 cm broad by 16–18.5 cm tall. But there are few parallels for this in Turner’s groups 9 and 10 (Typology 22), so perhaps the codex had wider or narrower top or side margins. In any case, the page contained c.100 words, so that the whole speech would have required c.40 pages. The codex could easily have contained more than one speech.

The script is a medium-sized version of the ‘mixed’ type, sloping to the right, written with a sharp pen. There is some connection between letters. The left-hand obliques of θ and ι join the right-hand obliques at mid-height. ε has an extended central stroke. The arms of χ form a wide curve, which is detached from the upright. The central elements of μ join in a deep curve, while the uprights slant down from right to left and left to right respectively. ο is rather small and lies high in the line. γ has a cup-shape. The base of ω is flat. The feet of the uprights of τ, π, and (sometimes) γ present a tiny right- or leftward hook (see also the right-hand upright of ι in ↓ 5).

The script may be compared with II 232 (pl. IV), Demosthenes, to be assigned to the late second century or first half of the third. Cf. also P. Ryl. I 57 (pl. X; GLH 22c), Demosthenes (early third century: the back was reused for a letter of c.260). 4725 may therefore date from between the end of the second and the middle of the third century.

No accents or punctuation. Inorganic diaereses occur (↓ 5, 6, 7). Elision is marked by an apostrophe in → 6 (but apparently not in ↓ 8); in ↓ 8 a τ a τ serves as an apostrophe to separate double consonants, which strengthens the third century dating (see GMAlW7 p. 11). These apostrophes are written above the line and thus could be later additions, but the ink colour looks the same as that of the main text.

The papyrus overlaps with P. Kell. III G 95 and PSI I 16 (= M–P 1259). It presents an inferior word-order (causing hiatus) of its own (↓ 5–6).

\[\begin{array}{c}
→ \\
\end{array}\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
πλειστα περι] τακ προ\xi(ei)ξ εψμαρ[τα
\end{array}\]
4725. ISOCRATES, NICOCLES 45–7

νοντας και τα]υτ’ εν ετεροις μεν [ιεως αν οικουν ειτεν ουχ γε 7 νη φιλωτ’ ου μενος επι το]ις πετραγμενοι[ε

↓ ταξει διαμενος δια τουτο δε πλεους [επουσαμην τους λογους και περι εμαυτου και
tων αλλων των προειρημε

5 νων ενα μηδεμιαν προφα εγ’ υπολειπον ως [ον δει ποι
eιν άμας εκονταις και προ
θυ]μως ατ’ αν [ ]

→ 4 1-2 αν. Before αν we expect πλειστους, but this cannot be verified.
5 πλειστα restored with Γ: μαλεστα in P. Kell. ΛΠ, which suits the space equally well. In support of πλειστα
Drerup notes the parallel expression in §51.
6-7 παλυτ’ εν ετεροις μεν [ιεως | αν οικουν ειτεν with Γ ΛΠ: ταυτα μεν ετεροις εις οικουν αν εισεων
P. Kell. (odd word order: see Worp-Rijksbaron, ΚΙΚ 231).
8 πεπραγμενοι[ε with Γ ΛΠ: τοιοτες P. Kell.

↓ 2-3 περι [επουσαμην τους | λογους with Γ ΛΠ: πλειους τους λογους επουσαμην P. Kell. Worp—
Rijksbaron, ΚΙΚ 267–8, citing parallels, reject the second reading, arguing that in this passage the adjective ‘is
the focus, contrasting with a comparatum later in the sentence, whereas the noun has the pragmatically unmarked
position after the verb.’
3 και περι εμαυτου και. After the second και MSS have περι (P. Kell. omits the first και). To judge from the
space, the scribe did not write the second περι, or possibly wrote λοις for έμαυτον.
5-6 προφα]εγ’ υπολειπον: προφας παραλειπον P. Kell.; υπολειπω προφας PSI 16 Α: υπολειπω προφας Γ:
ληπω προφας Π. There are three questions: (1) The word-order. Only 4725 and P. Kell. have the noun before
the verb. This is to be considered inferior for two reasons. (i) It eliminates the effective and emphatic hyperbaton
μηδεμιαν . . . προφας. (ii) In 4725 it introduces an unelidable hiatus (υπολειπω ως ον δει ποιειν κτλ.), whereas
Isocrates tends to avoid this even (as here) at a pause (see Worp—Rijksbaron, ΚΙΚ 273 ΙΙ); P. Kell. avoids this by
writing παραλειπω τοις μη ποιειν. (2) The verb: υπολειπω must be right (cf. the same expression in Dem., La Timocr.
52): παραλειπον of P. Kell. is less good for the meaning (‘pass over’); presumably the mistake is due to the fact that
this compound occurs very frequently in Isocrates. The simple ληπω (ΙΙ) is also inferior: Seck, Untersuchungen 27,
suggests that the copyist found in his exemplar υπολειπω with ληπω supscript on the second part of the word,
and mistakenly assumed that ληπω should replace the whole word. (3) The tense: ληπω and λειπω are phonetically
equivalent by the Roman period; see on 4724 ↓ 7. The choice between variants therefore rests on the sense, and
the aorist, expressing momentary action, seems to fit the context better (so Worp—Rijksbaron, ΚΙΚ 268).
6-7 ως [ον δει ποιειν] with PSI 16 Γ ΛΠ: τον μη ποιειν P. Kell. Worp—Rijksbaron, ΚΙΚ 268–9 make a strong
case for considering the second reading as an authorial variant. On the one hand, the construction with the geni-
tive of the substantive infinitive, although never found in Isocrates with the noun προφας, seems to be unobjec-
tionable; a parallel is to be found in Dem., In Timocr. 52 (mentioned in the previous note) bouλομενος δὴ μεθομιαν πρόθανεν τοἰ τὰ κοινὰ κακὰς ἔχειν ύπολιτέιας; and the same construction occurs five times in Isocrates with αἰτία (and αἰτίως), which is semantically similar to πρόθανε. On the other hand, a clause introduced by ἄν (οὗ) is not found with a noun elsewhere in Isocrates. Therefore the first reading is to be regarded as a lectio difficilior.

7 ἡμας with ΓΑΗΠ: ἡμας PSI 16: omitted in P. Kell.

εκεινος restored with PSI 16 P. Kell, ΑΠΗΝ: εκεινως Γ. The latter may be explained as a slip due to the fact that there follows an adverb ending in -ος, or as a lectio facilior that produces a symmetric hendiadys of adverbs, ἐκεινως καὶ προθζειν.

7-8 προθζεινος with ΓΑΗΠ: προθζεινος P. Kell. The latter may be explained as a confusion between οὐ and ον (see Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 30). Or, as in the previous line (see note), it could be seen as a lectio facilior that produces a symmetric hendiadys (ἐκεινως καὶ προθζειν).

στ' αν with ΓΑΗΠ: στ' αν PSI 16: απερ αν P. Kell. απερ occurs 32 times in Isocrates, while αστα occurs only 3 times: in our passage, Ad. Nucle. 38 (ΓΑΗΠ θ: α δ' αν Π: απερ αν P. Kell. Exc. Pax), and Ῥαπεκός. 51 (ΓΑΗΠ Π: α τ' Νο'). The form αστα is not frequently used by Attic orators (a TLG search yields 2 instances in Aeschines, 2 in Antiphon, 4 in Demosthenes, and 1 in Hypereides). In later times it was thought to be a peculiar Attic form; cf. the references in lexicographers (Harpocration, Hesychius, Photius, Suda), especially concerning Antiphon (frs. 27, 34-5). Thus αστα(α) in the papyrus may be regarded as a lectio difficilior; accordingly, the reading in P. Kell., as well as the variants in the two other passages, may be considered a simplification (Worp-Rijksbaron, KIC 203). The reading in PSI 16 seems to be a mere spelling mistake, perhaps due to a similar misunderstanding of αστα.

D. COLOMO

144

KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

The following ten items more than treble the total published papyri of Isocrates’ speech De Pace, already well-represented on papyrus: P. Lond. Lit. 131 (= Mertens-Pack 3 1272), of the first century AD, covers much of the speech from §13 to the end, including the repeated final title. Four other papyri preserve passages from De Pace: PSI XI 1199 (§1; M-P 3 1271); VIII 1096 (§§1-3; M-P 3 1268); P. Heid. I 208 (§§43-4, 56-61; M-P 3 1273); P. Oxy. Hels. 7 (§§46-7; M-P 3 1273-1).

For collation we have based ourselves on the new Teubner edition of B. G. Mandilaras (Stuttgart/Leipzig 2003), which we were able to consult at the last moment. Mandilaras, in The Speech ‘On the Peace’ of Isocrates from the British Museum Papyrus (Athens 1975), a full edition of P. Lond. Lit. 131 with plates, had already provided a collation from microfilm of the main medieval MSS for the part of the speech extant in that papyrus. For passages quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus the Teubner text draws on the edition of Usener and Radermacher (1899); we have instead relied on the Budé edition of G. Aujac, Denys d’Halicarnasse i–ii (Paris 1978, 1988), and referred to the MSS of Dionysius by her sigla.

For the bipartite tradition of Isocrates see above, pp. 114–15. The Teubner normally cites the readings of Γ and Ε on the one side, ΑΠΗΝ on the other; ’codd.’ apparently refers to these main MSS. The papyri generally have confirmed the view that the division between the two branches is relatively late, since they offer various mixtures of variants from both. They tend to support the readings of the Urbinae (I) group in general, though it would be risky to assume that those papyri which show no variants exclusive to the second

4726–4737. Isocrates, De Pace
family are actually representative of the Urbinas version. The conclusion seems to be that these papyri reflect different ancient \textit{échóeic}, which presented variants that can be found both in the Urbinas and in the other. The papyri published here support this view: they provide no evidence that this division goes back to ancient times, and, in fact, they behave very much like P. Lond. Lit. 131, which offers readings from both families. Only rarely do they differ from it in the choice of the different variants as regards the two groups. The new texts do differ from P. Lond. Lit. 131 when the latter presents singular readings, just as they stand with the whole tradition against readings in solitary codices. The superscript and the marginal notes especially seem to indicate that some sort of collation may have been possible at least at the time when the texts were copied, if not before (cf. 4730 and 4737).

Alongside the medieval MSS, we have the indirect transmission. Two sections of the speech (25–56, 132–45) are quoted by Isocrates himself in \textit{De Antidosi} 66; see most recently P. M. Pinto, \textit{Per la storia del testo di Isocrate} (Bari 2003), and S. de Leo in \textit{Studi sulla tradizione del testo di Isocrate} 201 ff. (on the citation of \textit{De Pace} in particular). F reduces the citations to their opening and closing words; a few MSS, notably (Δ) E Λ Θ, give the text complete (these are cited in lower case, ε λ θ, in the collation). Some passages are quoted also by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 1–16, 41–2, 50–2 in \textit{Isocrates} 16–17; 41–50 in \textit{Demosthenes} 17 and again (partially) 19. 4726–9 do not seem to support the peculiarities of the text preserved by Dionysius. Similarly, 4737 tends not to agree with \textit{De Antidosi} when its manuscripts stand on their own against those of the direct transmission of \textit{De Pace} (but see on i 21–2). The case of 4736 is different; it shows three instances where it coincides with the readings of Θ against all MSS. However, in one of these cases, the second corrector of P. Lond. Lit. 131 has modified the text into the same reading as in \textit{De Antidosi}, suggesting that there may have been some sort of collation with the rest of the tradition. (Against the possibility that 4736 is a papyrus of \textit{De Antidosi} rather than \textit{De Pace}, see the introduction and notes.)

The new texts present unique readings only in six cases; in 4727 there are two new readings, one plainly wrong, and the other inferior to that received; in 4729 we have an omission (in error); in 4732 a correction may imply a variant word-order; in 4735 we may have a variant deleted by the scribe, and in 4737 we find a new reading (probably a banalization) included in the text.

\textbf{4726. Isocrates, \textit{De Pace} 7–9}

102/35(d)  
fr. 1, 3 × 4.7 cm; fr. 2, 7 × 9.8 cm  
Early third century

Two fragments from a roll, written along the fibres; the back is blank. Three lines of text are missing in between. There is insufficient connection of the fibres on the verso to decide whether the fragments came in the same or successive columns. If they belong to a single column, it had at least 28 lines (c.17 cm). No margins are visible except on fr. 1, where line-ends are preserved and followed by 1.5 cm blank papyrus.

The hand is an example of the Severe or Formal Mixed style, slanting slightly to
the right. Thick vertical strokes contrast with thin horizontals. Vertical strokes sometimes present a tick to the left at their upper ends, as though a type of decoration; high horizontals may have a tick to the right at their left-hand end, and some obliques descending to right have a tick to the left at their upper ends that may approach a blob; this same shape can sometimes be found, to the right, at the upper end of obliques rising to the right, especially that of γ. There are no real ligatures, but prolonged horizontals that slightly touch the following letter show that the hand is fairly rapid. Somewhat comparable are XXVII 2452 (= GALW² 27), assigned to the third century (see GALW² p. 149 n. 48), and XVII 2098 (= GLH 19b), datable to the first half of the third century. Thus a date in the earlier part of the third century would seem acceptable.

The lectional signs in evidence consist of inorganic diaereses on initial ν (19, 23), an elision mark (16), and low, middle and high stops. Iota adscript was not written in 17 (see also 16 n.). There is no clear sign of a second hand at work. The high stop has a peculiar shape, very close to that of ο, though placed slightly higher in the line than the letter; in some cases there might be confusion between the letter and the reading mark (cf. ο in 19 and the high stop in 16). Middle and low stops, however, are written in the form of a normal dot, and this could raise the question whether the stops were written by different hands; but the fact that the same ink seems to have been used for all of them leads one to think that the same scribe deliberately chose different forms.

There are no new variants. The papyrus consistently tallies with the MSS against the quotation of this passage in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Isocrates 16, but this is hardly a surprise.
4726. ISOCRATES, DE PACE 7–9

μενούσ· ο θι αν τυχη δε γ[ενησο
μεγον. ουτω διανω[ειθαί πε
ρε] αυτων· ον ύμεις ου[δεστερον

§9

το] χανετε ποιουντες θ[αλις ος
οιοι] το ταραχωδεστατ[α δια
κει] ενεληλυθατε με[ν γαρ
ω]ς δεον υμας εξ απα[ντων
τ]ουν ρηθεντων εκλεξ[αθαι

20

το] βελτιτου: ωσπερ δ. [ει]
δοτες πα[ντεον ε[πτων ουκ
εβε] λετ[ι ακουε] ευ [πα[ν των
προς ηδονη] δ[ημηγορουντον

6–7 αλ[λα] των restored exempli gratia after Γ. Ε. Dion.: ἀλλ' ὡς τῶν Λ.
8 κ[α]: curious low trace to right in paler ink.
9 επικρατησων το: restored after Γ. Ε. Dion. (κρατησων Dion., too short for the space here): τῶν ἐχθρῶν
επικρατησων Λ. τῶν ἐχθρῶν επικρατῆς might be an alternative restoration here.
16 ἀλλ' ος. The apostrophe may have been used to save the reader from confusion with the adverb ἀλλως.
δοξη μεν. After δοξη the trace would allow δοξη, but the scribe does not write iota adscript in 17 τυχη. δοξη
μεν is further favoured by the space after ν.
17 ο τι αν τυχη δε with codd.: δ τι δ' αν τυχη Dion.
21 -τατον with codd. Dion. Z: -τατον Dion. F.
22 μεν ν with codd.: om. Dion.
24 εκλεξ[αθαι restored after codd., since it seems to suit the space better than Dionysius' ἐκλεξαι.
25 βελτιτου codd.: βελτιτω Dion. After π, what looks like two high stops but smaller and rounder than usual,
and in a narrower space.

δ. [. δ' ἡδη καθως is transmitted by codd. and Dion. (δ' om. F). The trace after δ would allow δε [καθη (scriptio
plena) or δ πα δη (elision unmarked, but the elision is marked at 16 αλλ'—yet the trace does not seem to admit an
elision mark).
27 εβε] λετ[ι or εβε] λετ[ι'; cf. 16. αδ θελετε δικοειων Dion., not necessarily excluded by the space.

A. NODAR

4727. ISOCRATES, DE PACE 15–20

A part of a roll, blank on the back, with remains of three columns; upper margin
extant to 3.4 cm, intercolumnium c.1.5 cm. There must have been c.40 lines to the column,
which gives a written height of c.12.5 cm; the written width measures 5.5 cm at its greatest
extent.

The script is a confident ‘Severe Style’, upright and well-spaced, assignable to the third
century. There is some shading, with little tilt to the pen. Descenders display a slight left-
ward curve at the foot; the bowl of μ is at two-thirds height; γ is formed in two movements,
the stem often a near-upright. Somewhat comparable is XVIII 2098 = Roberts, GLH 19b,
of the early third century.

A correction at i 14 is by the original scribe. Iota adscript has been used at ii 21. Elisions
are made tacitly in all but one case (i 2), but there it is uncertain whether the apostrophe
was meant as an elision mark: besides i 2, apostrophes are found at the ends of i 5, 12, and
ii 20; even if those at i 5 and 12 might be explained as separators, the purpose of the one at
ii 20 (σό’[λει]) is less clear. Perhaps these apostrophes function as line-fillers, a practice for
which, however, I can find no parallel.

The papyrus overlaps with P. Lond. Lit. 131, and covers a section quoted by Dionysius
of Halicarnassus (I. 16). It offers two new readings: one plainly wrong (ii 14–15), the
other apparently inferior to that received (ii 2). Of some significance for the history of the
text are also the agreement of 4727 with some manuscripts of Dionysius at i 2 (in error),
and its near-agreement with P. Lond. Lit. 131 at iii 23–24 against the rest of the tradition,
but also its disagreement with P. Lond. Lit. 131 at i 19–20.

col. i

υμών οὖ]δε χειροτ[ο]ν 
αν μήν]τευχών αλλ’
αποτήρα]νομενος
α τυγχα]γει γινομεκα
πρωτον] μεν περι’
οι ων ἐπὶ]πτανεις προ
τιθεισιν ε]πειτα πε
ρι των α]λων των
της πολε]ις πραγμα
των ουδε]ν γαιρ αφε
λος εκται] των νυν
περι της] ειρηνης’
γινομεν]των την μη
και περι] των λοιμων
ορθωκ[ε]βο]ιλευκωμ[ε
θα φημι] δ ουν χρη
ναι ποιεις]θαι την ει
ρημην [η] μονον
προς Χιου]και Ροδι
ους και Βυζ[αντίου]ε

(§15)
αλλα και προς απαν
τας ανθρωπους και τας θεσπικας και της Πλατανας και τας άλλας
πολεις και παρα τους ορκους κατεστησα
ειν ημεις δε εξημεν
μηδεμιας αναγκης
ουσης εξ αυτων επερχεται ην
δε δια τελος ακουν
ειτε μου προσεχουν
tης τον νουν ομαι
παντας ομας ακουν
εις ται πολλην αυτη
αν [και] μανιαν των
την αδικιαν πλεον
εξαιρετης εις ιναι τε
μην ημιν και των
των αλλων
ποιει βιας κατεχουν
των και και
μη λογιζον
των των
tης εργους
tοις ταυτα μεν ουν
δια παντος τους λογους
πειρασον.
col. iii

κ[ε]εεεεν ημιν ει την (§19)

τε [πολιν ασφαλως

οικ[οιμεν και τα τε

ρι τ[ον βιον ευπορω

τε[ροι γηγυμεθα και

τα [τε προς ημας αν

τι[ους ομονοιμεν

και παρα τοις

(13 lines missing)

ληρ[ας διαβεβλη

κεν [και κατα παν

tac τροπους τεταλαι

πωρη[κεν ημας ην

δε την ειρηνην ποι

ηε]ω[μεθα και τοιοιουν


col. i

2 μη[ηεκεκων with Dion. TB: μηηεκεκων P. Lond. Lit. codd. Dion. FAV. With αποφα[νουμενος following, we need the future participle (the received text runs παρεδηλωθα γαρ ου χαραομενος ημιν υδε χειροτονιαν μηηεκεκων, ἀλην ἀποφα[νουμενος κτλ.). The papyrus presents a conflation of the two constructions.

3 αποφα[νουμενος with P. Lond. Lit. codd. Dion. FAV: αποφα[νουμενος Dion. TB. Cf. the previous note.

4 γιγνεοκων with P. Lond. Lit. Ξ; γιγνεοκων codd. On the spelling of γιγνεοκω in papyri of Isocrates, see

4717 p. 12 17 n.

6-7 οι προτασεις προ[τιθεσει with P. Lond. Lit. codd.: ἀ προτασεις προτιθεσει Dion. FZ (προστιθε- Τ).

7 ε)πεται και add. ΛΠΖ.

8 των ομ. Dion. FZ.

11-12 των υπερ [περι with P. Lond. Lit. codd.: των υπερ Dion. FZ.

13-14 ην μη [και with P. Lond. Lit. codd.: ην και μη Δ; αν μη Dion.

14-15 των λοιπων [ορθωκ (λοιπων corrected from λοιπων) with P. Lond. Lit. codd.: των [ορθωκ λοιπων Dion.F: τοιτων [ορθωκ λοιπων Z. λογων is not known as a variant from elsewhere, and may well be due to mis-copying.

19 Χεινε] και: Χεινε τε και Dion.


21 αδια και with P. Lond. Lit. ΛΠΖ; αδια ΤΕ Dion. (too short for the space here).

21-2 προς απαρ[ιες with P. Lond. Lit. codd.: πάντας Dion. FZ.

22-3 και χρηθαι restored with codd.: κεχρηθαι Dion. FZ.
4727. ISOCRATES, De Pace 15–20

2 est ekeinoi: ei θηβαιοι codd. (Θηβαιοι) P. Lond. Lit.). The reading of the papyrus is hard to defend; there is no reference to Thebans in the earlier part of the speech.

6–7 κατελθασεις with ΛΕ: κατελθας Ι, possibly also P. Lond. Lit. (spacing).

14 παντας with codd.: πάντας δὲ Λ.


21–2 βασι κατέχωνν[τ]ινων with ΕΕ: κατέχοντων βιοι Λ.

4728. ISOCRATES, De Pace 41(?)–7

A fragment containing the remains of three columns from a papyrus roll with full width of intercolumnia and the top margin preserved to 4 cm. Of col. i there remain only a few letters at the ends of lines, level with lines 3 to 8 in cols. ii–iii, of which we have the complete width (4.5 cm) preserved in places. Of the fourth column there is only a trace level with line 1. The intercolumnium is c.1.5 cm. The columns originally contained c.37 lines, so that the column height may be reconstructed at c.22 cm. Line length ranges from 15 to 17 letters. The back is blank.

The hand is an example of the Informal Round, inclining to slightly smaller than medium size. It is roughly bilinear, with o and c much the same size as the other letters. The hand is written moderately fast: there is much connection of letters, e.g. iii 4 ντο and 8 τω. The main characteristic is rounding: m is sometimes written in one stroke and has curved legs. γ is usually written in two strokes: a semicircle on top and a leg. α is usually written in two strokes, a loop and a diagonal, sometimes in one. No decoration, apart from shading. A parallel is X 1231 = GMAW V2 17, assigned to the second century, but it shows more shading. XXVI 2442 = GMAW V2 22, assigned to the second century, also compares well and shows the shading, but 4728 is written less formally and lacks the decorative finalias.

There is no opportunity to observe whether the scribe wrote iota adscript. He tacitly elides the final vowels of short words (prepositions and particles) with consistency (but contrast ii 3 πο[τ]ρεβα αυτων). Punctuation by paragraphi (after iii 5 and 19 coinciding with the ends of paragraphs 46 and 47). There are no other lectional signs in evidence.

§43–7 is quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus no less than three times, each with a slightly different text, and each version slightly different from that transmitted by the
medieval MSS of Isocrates: once in his treatise on Isocrates (17), with a gap between οἱ μὲν ὑπὲρ τὴς (§43 = ii 1 in the papyrus) and φροντίζομεν in §50, where a folium presumably has fallen out of the archetype; secondly in his treatise on Demosthenes (17), of which excerpts are quoted later (19). The quotations show clearly that the papyrus is a text of Isocrates, with whose MSS it consistently agrees, rather than of Dionysius.

The papyrus overlaps with P. Heid. I 208 iia, P. Oxy. Hels. 7 and 4729 in col. ii, and with P. Lond. Lit. 131 throughout.

Col. i

| ]  |
| ]  |
| ]> |
| ]  |
| ]  |
| ]  |
| ]  |
| ]  |
| ]  |

Col. ii

οἱ μὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν [ν

αλλῶν εὐτυχίας?

τὴν τε πα[τ]ρὰ ἁυτῶν ἐκλιπεῖν εὐτυχῶν

εὐτυχῶν ἁυτῶν
can καὶ μαχαμενοι
καὶ [μεν] ἑυμεναι[τ]έ

τῆς ἁρμάροντος ε[ν]

κηραν [ημεῖς δ οὐ

δ ὑπὲρ [τ]ῆς ημεῖς τερας

αὐτων πλεονεξίας
καὶ[ν] ψευδεῖν αξι[ο]

scattered traces from 5 lines

(§44)

Col. iii

οὐχ ὁπως αγανακτ[τ]ον

μὲν ἄλλα καὶ χ[α]ρον

(§45)

Col. iv

τ[ ]
These lines ought to be about 36—58 lines (540—620 letters) before line 1 of col. ii, i.e. the second part of §41.

4. Upper right quadrant of a circle: o or e or p.

Col. ii

2. 

might be thought to give precedence to ἔλληνως (it had been accepted by Bekker, among others), but 4728 shows ἄλλως to be an equally ancient reading. Note that the phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν ἔλληνων τοῖς βαρβάροις occurs already in §42, and that here in either case the meaning must be τῶν ἄλλων ἔλληνων, i.e. the contrast demanded is not between all Greeks and the barbarians as in §42, but between of μὲν, the Athenians of old themselves, and (the rest of) the Greeks.


8–9 δ ουδ restored with ΓΕ: δε ουδ’ ΑΠΖ.
10 αυτων with codd.: om. P. Heid. (ut vid.) θ Dion. Dem. 17.

Col. iii

1 αγαςα: These letters appear to have very thin horizontal strokes running through them, as though cancelled, but there is no reason to delete the letters. It is therefore likely that the ink has run along a fibre.


4 τοιοστοι with ΓΕ ε θ Dion.: τοι ΑΠΖ.

5 διαπραγματευομενοι with ΓΕ λε Dion. Dem. 17: διαπραγματευομενοι ΑΠΖ.

6 μοι[ν]αι with codd. Dion. Dem. 17: τοιοστοι τ’ (τι del. Τ’).

8–9 των καθ’ ήμεραν εκεινοι: [P. Lond. Lit.] ΓΕ λθ: εκεινοι των καθ’ ήμεραν ΑΠΖ Dion. Dem. 19. For the syllabic division in καθ’ see W. Cronert, Memoria Graeca Herculanensis toff.

10 διαπραγματευομενοι with ΓΕ ε: δε έπηκε ΑΠΖ Dion. Antid. (not relevant for MSS derivation).


20 δε χειροσ restored with codd. Dion. Dem. 19. δε καλ χειροσ Dion. Dem. 17. Neither 4728 nor P. Lond. Lit. (damaged at this point) will have had room for καλ.

Col. iv

1 τα: Trace of a high horizontal, with no trace visible of the following line-beginnings on the edge of the papyrus below: thus probably the left end of the cross-bar of τα.

C. LUZ

4729. Isocrates, De Pace 42–4

A fragment of a roll with (I suppose) line-beginnings, and an upper margin of 0.6 cm. There were 16–19 letters to the line, which yields an estimated column width of 6.7 cm. The back is blank.

The hand is a mature example of the Severe Style, smallish, gently slanting to the right, and generally bilinear (only ῥ and γ plunge slightly below). There is some ornamentation, chiefly in the form of left-facing hooks at the tops of uprights. Letter forms of note: Α with curved tail; fairly broad ε, θ, κ; γ with shallow bowl; flat-bottomed ω. No lectional signs other than a paragraphus: there is no opportunity to observe the treatment of elision and the presence of iota adscript. A correction in 10 was made currente calamo.

The portion of the text transmitted by the papyrus is also extant in P. Heid. I 208 (part), P. Lond. Lit. 131, and 4728 (part). It is quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Dem. 17), and is part of the long passage that reappears at Antid. 66. The papyrus does not share the eccentricities in P. Lond. Lit. 131 and Dionysius. There are no new readings except for an omission (25–6).

]ληρ[ας ηραγομεν κακει
]νοι [μεν ελευθερουντες
4729. ISOCRATES, DE PACE 42–4

43. ταύς πολεις τας Ελληνικ.

5 δακ καὶ βοηθούντες αυ.

6 ταῖς τῆς γῆς γεμονιας γη.

7 ὧν ἡμεῖς δὲ κατα

8 διόλου τμέοι καὶ ταναν

9 τία τοῖς τοτε πραττοῦν

10 τες αγανακτουμεν η.

11 μὴ [[ν]] τῆν [αυτὴν τιμὴν

12 ἐκεῖνοις εἰ ἔφορον οἱ τοιού.

13 τὸν αἰ[ολελειμμέθα καὶ

14 τοῖς εἰ ῥγοῖς καὶ ταῖς διανοί

15 αἷς τῶν κατ' εἰκενον τούν

16 χρονοὶν γενομενων οον

17 οὐ μεν [ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ελ.

18 λην[ῶν σωτηριας την

19 τε πα[τριάδα την αυτην

20 ἐκλιπτ[εν ετολμησαν

21 καὶ μαμ[ομενοι καὶ ναν

22 μαχοῦνε τοὔς βαρβάρους

23 εὐι[η] ἐν τῆς ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν

24 ὑπὲρ της εἰ ἡμετερας αὐν

25 τῶν πλε[ονεξιαις κινοῦ

26 νευέων α[ίσομεν αλλ' αφ']

27 χειν αἰπαν [των ξητουμεν

28 χτατενε[εεθαί δ' ουκ εθε

29 λο]μεν κ[αι

30 . . . . .


32 7 καὶ τανα: τα ἐπιστρεφων 1 codd. Dion.: τα δὲ εἰς αυτὴ P. Lond. Lit.

33 8–9 πραττων] τες with P. Lond. Lit. codd. Dion.: πραττομένως ποιοῦντες λξ.

34 9 A low trace before τες which I cannot explain (not part of N).

35 10–11 την] ἐκεῖνoις with P. Lond. Lit. codd. Dion.: ἐκεῖνοις τιμην ΛΠΖ.

36 16–17 Ελ]την[ω with P. Lond. Lit. ΛΠΖ Dion.: ἐπιθαυμαζομαι 4728 ΓΕ λε β.


Considerations of space seem to favour restoring την after πα[τριάδα, but this is not entirely certain, given the variants transmitted for this part of the text; see 4728 ii 3 n.
KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

18 *auτων* restored *exempli gratia* (spacing is inconclusive) with codd.: *auτων* P. Lond. Lit. Dion.


23-4 *αυτων* with 4728 codd. [P. Lond. Lit.]: om. P. Heid. (ut vid.) θ Dion.

25 Before the first Ν, a high horizontal trace (not part of γ).

25-6 *αρχε[ν]: ἀρχε[ν] μήν* [P. Lond. Lit.] codd. Dion.


N. GONIS

4730. ISOGRATES, *DE PACE* 65–6

A fragment with remains of fourteen lines from one column, broken off at the foot, written along the fibres; the back is blank. The upper margin is preserved to 2 cm; there are a few mm of the left margin, but no right margin is preserved.

The hand is a medium to small Informal Round one. It is markedly bilinear, and letters are uniform in width. Α is written in two movements, with an oval form for its left-hand elements. Obliques, except those of Α (the right-hand one extending above the apex) and Ν, tend to adopt curved forms. An impression of flattened handwriting is conveyed by 'square' letters that are broader than they are tall. Uprights may present a tick to the left; this tick can also be observed at the foot of the upright of τ, although it is not always present, and Φ. The execution is careful and consistent, but the space between letters is not very large, which frequently causes strokes from different letters to come into contact. There are a few linked strokes (cross-bar of ε, with closed upper semicircle, and that of ο). Some letters present variations in shape; e.g. γ with and without looped lower elements, more or less closed oval left-hand elements of Α, etc. A date in the second century is likely. For comparable scripts see XXVI 2441 (*GMAW* 22) and XVIII 2161 (*GMAW* 24), both assigned to the second century, near formal examples of the style.

The text shows no accents or breathings. Punctuation is by high points, written above the line (4; 9, apparently by a different hand). There is no chance to observe whether iota adscript was written. Elision is effected and marked (4; see also on 11), but not by the same hand to which the main text is due. Corrections (5) are made by crossing out the letters thought to be wrong and superscribing those considered to be right (see however on 4–5). The superscripts are identified as by a second hand from the style of writing and angle of the pen.

The papyrus overlaps with P. Lond. Lit. 131.

*ρ]ωμενης* [και περιμαχητου] (§65)

*γ]ει[γ]ημενης* [κατηγορουν]

*τα δοκειν ανεκτιον τι λε* [κατηγορον]

*γειν ομως δ' επειδη[δηπερ ν]
4730. ISOCRATES, *De Pace* 65–6

5 πεμευ[ε]να[τε]ς τους [αλλος] 
λογους αληθεις [μεν ον] 
τας φιλαπεχθημων[ας δε] 
και τουτων ομας ανεχεθα[i] 
δειμαται και μη καταγων[αι] 

10 μου το[ι]ς αυτην μανιν ω[ς] 
α]ρ εγω προειλομην [αν δια] 
λε]χθηναι προς υμας [περι] 
πρ]αγματων ου[τω παραδο] 
ξυνει μη τ]ι λεγει[ιν]

§66

4 δεuers[ε]ν with the second corrector of P. Lond. Lit. (ποδη original hand) and Γ. E. δεuers[ε]ν ΔΠΖ. Normally concurrence of the medieval MSS with regard to such elision in prose would be taken as trivial, but the tradition seems significantly divided at this point, with the new text agreeing with another ancient manuscript. Here the elision mark has been placed by a second hand (thus from collation with another manuscript?).

4–5 υμας ανεχεθα[i] with ΛΠΖ: διων αναχεθαυ Γ. E. (υα[ς ανεχεθα]θαι has been restored in P. Lond. Lit.)

8 τουτων with P. Lond. Lit. ΔΠΖ: τουτων Γ. E.

9 The high stop in line 4 is the only mark of punctuation certainly written by the same hand as the main text. This one is placed slightly higher in the interlinear space and has a more oval shape than the one in 4, and the ink seems weaker. But in itself this is not sufficient to assign it to the second hand.

10 τοιαυτην corrected to τοιαυτην: τοιαυτην P. Lond. Lit. Γ. E (τιτη E): τοιαυτην ΔΠΖ. We appear to have an early example of contamination or at least collation: the scribe copied τοιαυτην, and the second hand noted the variant τοιαυτην.


av restored after Γ. E: om. P. Lond. Lit. (according to Mandilaras’s estimate of the lacuna) ΔΠΖ. Here av may be legitimately restored, since without it the line would have only 18 letters, shorter than usual.

A. NODAR

4731. ISOCRATES, *De Pace* 66–9, 73

8 iB.199/E(1)a+c

fr. 1 5 x 20 cm First half of third century

Three fragments, the first with remains of two consecutive columns, and the second and third from the next column but one, from a roll written along the fibres. The back is blank. (Fr. 2 + 3 have a repair strip on the back, with scanty documentary cursive remains on its inner face.) The intercolumnium is 1.5 cm; the lower margin is extant to 0.3 cm. The lines have 13–14 letters on average, so that the width of the column may be calculated as 7.3 cm. Taking the average of 14 letters per line, the gap between the last preserved line of fr. 1 col. i and the first preserved line of col. ii is around 20 lines, of which 16 belonged to
col. i and 4 to col. ii. Thus col. ii contained 332 lines, with a height of 0.20 cm; if the upper margin was not much smaller than the lower, 26 cm will have been the approximate height of the roll. About 50 lines are missing between the foot of col. ii on fr. 1 and the top of fr. 2. Thus one column (of 332 lines) is lost between fr. 1 and fr. 2, and fr. 2 begins 1.17 lines down the column following the one lost.

No accents or breathings are in evidence. Punctuation by paragraphoi and high stops. Inorganic and organic diaereses are written. Elision is effected but not marked. There is no opportunity to observe iota adscript. The scribe uses filler-signs and adjusts the spacing and letter sizes at line-ends to produce as even a right-hand margin as possible.

The writing is a medium sized Formal mixed or Severe Style, slightly slanting to the right. Shading is conspicuous. There is some decoration: uprights may present hooks at their upper ends. The same kind of ornament, to the right, can be seen at the lower end of obliques descending to the right, especially those of Α, Δ, and sometimes Ν, which does not reach the lower end of the second vertical. The lines and the letters are regularly and generously spaced, and there are no linking strokes. It is close to XXVII 2452 (GMAW 27), assigned to the third century (see GMAW 2 p. 149 n. 48), and shows even greater resemblance to XVII 2098 (GLH 19b), dated to the first half of the third century. By comparison, a date in the first half of the third century seems likely.

The papyrus overlaps with P. Lond. Lit. 131.

Fr. 1
Col. i
(five lines missing)

5 ειχον περι αυτ[ων]
  νυν δ ομαι φα[νε]
  ρον ποιησειν απ[α]

ειν ου[ν] ουτε δικ[α]
  αε αρχης επιθυμ[ου]
  μεν ουτε γενε[θαι]
  δυνατης ουτε εγι[μ]
  φερουσις ημιν] α

10 τι μεν ουν ου δικ[α]
  αε σερ ημων μα]>
  θων ημας εχω δι[δ]α

Col. ii
(four lines missing)

δ[αξιουμας αυτον] §68
καρθοκτονίαν ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς

καὶ οὐκ ὐπερήφανος ἤτερος

καὶ ἤτερος ὡς καὶ

κεκλήθη "τοῖς ἀνερῶις"

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

τοῖς ἀνερῶις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

ταχύτατα | ποιησει
5 ev ἔμακ | μετήσαν
tac a δει | β[ελτι
ονον επι[θυμ[ησαί
πραγμα[τ]ων | [υ]πε[ρ
με[]ν] οὐν τη[ν]των
loγων τραχυτητος
cαι τ]ων [ε]ρημενων
cαι των ρητησεθαι
με[λλοντω]ν ταυτ ε
χω λεγειν] προς υπ
15 μασ οθεν | δ ἀπελι
πον παλ]υν ποιη

Col. i

2–5 φο[ρε]πον | ποιησεων | επι[α]ΙΩΝ | cων | cων | P. Lond. Lit. ΓΕ.
10–11 δι[κ]αια[υ]ν | cων | cων | P. Lond. Lit. We have restored -ac: the reading of P. Lond. Lit. is unique, and -ac is also supported by spacing; even if the presence of a space-filler shows that it was a short line, and even allowing that there might have been a punctuation-space after δικαιας, restoring -a will leave the line too short.
12 δε[π]α. The space suggests that we should interpret the trace as Α, i.e. δε[π]α[ς]ων. We might expect the division c|κ, but grammarians and scribes were not unanimous in their treatment of sigma+stop: see Turner, GMW p. 17 n. 96 citing Kenyon, Palaeography of Greek Papyri 31f., W. Cronert, Memoria Graeca Herculanensis 10ff., E. Mayser, Grammar 1.57ff.; also R. Cribiore, Writing, Teachers and Students (1996) index s.v. ‘syllable’; for Attic inscriptions, see L. Threatte, Grammar i 67–8.

Col. ii

1 Running on δι|θα[νονας] | suits the space better than δ[θα[νονας]. δι[θα-] ΓΕΠ: δι[θα-] ΑΖ: δι[θα-] Π. Lond. Lit. (on grounds of space) according to Mandilaras. Either form could have stood in our papyrus.
3–4 ευ[μ]η[ρη]πο | with P. Lond. Lit. ΑΠΖ: ευμηρηπο | ΓΕ. The trace (upper part of upright) might represent ι or the second upright of Ν; but a reading ι does not seem likely, because in the sequence ει the scribe normally extends the cross-bar of ι to touch ι, and there is no sign of a cross-bar here.
22–3 ηγαγκαμεν | with P. Lond. Lit. ΓΕ: ηγαγκαμεν | ΑΠΖ. Space would allow either.
26 ίμων | with ΓΕ: ήμιν | ΑΠΖ.
26–7 καθετθηκα[ικι] | | | | | with P. Lond. Lit. ΓΕ: καθετθωκι | ΑΠΖ.
27 ac δ | | | | | restored after P. Lond. Lit. codd.: | | | | | corr. ΓΕ.

Col. iv

2–3 χρυσησμα | cων | cων | P. Lond. Lit. T. The traces here support a second r, not Ν.
3 α[π]τος | with P. Lond. Lit. ΓΕΠ: ο[π]τω | P. Lond. Lit. ΑΖ.
5–6 μετεχεισαι τακ. The itacistic spelling is also present in P. Lond. Lit., but it is likely to be accidental.

6 There is no trace of a letter in the space to the left of β, even though the surface is partly preserved. Perhaps there was a middle stop, where the fibres are now abraded at mid-height, marking pause in the sense before βελτιστῶν.

10 τραχεῖτης with P. Lond. Lit.\textsuperscript{c} codd.: βραχυτής P. Lond. Lit.\textsuperscript{c} (first hand).

12 ρηθησεθα with codd.: P. Lond. Lit. has ρηθησεθα with the first α corrected to ε.

13–14 ταύτῃ ε[π]χω with P. Lond. Lit. ΓΛΙΣ: ταύτήν ἐξω [scripto plein] Γ\textsuperscript{c}Ε.

14 I interpret the final traces as a space-filler. Since the line ends here, it is not surprising that the second dot of the diaeresis above ν should be displaced to the right.

15–16 ατρεί[του]· ταυτά with TE. P. Lond. Lit. originally had απελεπεν υμείων; the second corrector changed -πεν to -πον, deleted ποιεῖαι, and added πολυ. There is nothing to exclude ποιεῖαι in our papyrus.

16 ποιημ. The transmitted text reads ποιησομαι. The intrusive iota adscript is unparalleled elsewhere in this papyrus.

A. NODAR

4732. Isocrates, \textit{De Pace} 75–8

The tops of two successive columns from a roll, written across the fibres, with 17 lines in col. i and 16 in col. ii. The height of col. i as preserved is 10.8 cm; from the end of line 15 up to the beginning of col. ii there are 280 missing letters (based on Mathieu’s text and assuming the scribe wrote iota adscript), which, when distributed into average lines of 13 letters each, result in 21–2 lines. This gives a column of 36–7 lines, with a height of 24 cm. The upper margin is 4.8 cm deep; if we assume that there was a similar lower margin, then the roll height should have been around 34 cm. The intercolumnar space is a maximum 2.5 cm wide. Along the fibres on the other side are parts of a land register.

The medium-sized capitals keep to rather better defined upper and lower limits than is usual in this Formal mixed or Severe Style. There is a slight slant to the right. γ and φ (with an extremely long descender and almost no riser) project downwards, and so does ρ; τ may also do so, and its high horizontal is normally placed high in the line, except when followed by ε, in which case it tends to equal the height of the middle horizontal of the vowel. Similarly, the horizontal of π tends to be placed lower in the line. ο, smaller than the rest of the letters, has a variable height in the line. Letters are angular and share a general flattened look. There is some shading: in general, vertical strokes are thicker than horizontals, and so are obliques descending to the right compared to those ascending to the right. Ornament is scarce: curves and obliques descending to the right may present a hook facing down at their upper end. Lines are regularly spaced, and so are letters, although they may touch each other, especially when the right-hand elements of the first one consist of an oblique descending to the right; sometimes the cross-bar of ε touches the following letter, and so occasionally does the base of Α (an outstanding instance in col. i 10). This handwriting is comparable to that in 4731, assigned to the first half of the third century; cf. γ, in two movements with the left-hand oblique drawn separately; ε and c, the former presenting...
the same extremely long crossbar. For other comparable hands see XVII 2098 (GLH 19b, datable to the first half of the third century), with which 4731 was compared, and VII 1016 (GLH 20a), also datable to the early third century. The script may thus be assigned a date in the first half of the third century.

No accents or breathings; the only observable reading mark is a paragraphos below ii 8. Elision is effected but not marked; there is no opportunity to observe whether iota adscript was written. There is one correction, probably due to a different hand (i 7).

A new variant occurs in i 7. The same section of text is attested in P. Lond. Lit. 131 and partly in 4733.

Col. i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μιας α]υδ ελπι]δων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κεν]ων οιτα με</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εσ]πο]ν αλ]λα νικαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μεν δ]ι]εμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εν ταις μα]χαις α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>παντα]ς τοι[ς] εις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>την χωρα]ν [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Col. ii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>δε [το]υ νικαν τοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μεγ]ε [π]ο τω]ν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>χων τ[ολμαν ε]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4732. ISOCRATES, DE PAGE 75–8

\[\xi\varepsilon\varphi\alpha[; \tauοις] \tauολε \]
\[\muε[οις αυτὶ δε \tau\eta] \epsilon\nu\psi[\epsilon\iotaς \tau\etaς \tauος \rhoα] \]
\[\tauον [ευμμαχ]αν\]
\[αυτο[ις ευτιχοχον]ος[\etaς] \]
\[και \tau\etaς δοξης \tauης \]
\[\tauος \tauον \alphaλλων \]
\[Ελλη[νων εις \tauοςον] \]

Col. i

2–3 \[\Upsilon\pi\rho\thetaω][\nu]ον with \GammaΛΕ: \Upsilon\pi\rho\thetaωου P. Lond. Lit. originally, changed to \Eυ\beta\omegaου by the third hand.

7 \[τον with codd. except for Π, which omits the article. \]
\[\tauοςε[ις] deleted with a short oblique above each letter. This is a new variant. It seems quite unacceptable, since \tauοςε is required to contrast with τον above. Possibly the actual variant was τον πολιτευομενον τοτε (the corrector would have deleted τοτε here and added it superscript at the beginning of 9, where the papyrus is now broken). \]

10–11 \[ο[ν] \pi\epsilon\theta\iota\delta\omegaον \]
\[κε[ε]ν \]
\[ο[ν] \]
\[ε\iota\pi\thetaωον P. Lond. Lit. \]

14–15 \[α[ι\piα\tauας] \]
\[\pi\alpha\tauας P. Lond. Lit. ΛΠΩ \]

16 Trace above the line, of uncertain function.

Col. ii

1 \[\deltaι with P. Lond. Lit. corr. codd. The original reading in P. Lond. Lit. may have been, according to Mandilaras, \muε (?οις), with τ omitted, and inserted by the second corrector. \]

2 \[\epsilon\iota\sigma[τρα]σ[ε]υ[η]ς \]
\[\epsilon\iota\sigmaτρατευ[ης] αρτας P. Lond. Lit. \]

3 \[\tauον[ε]ς \]
\[\pi\alpha\ι\tauας P. Lond. Lit. (corrected by the second hand) 4733. \]

4 \[\epsilon\iota\delta\iota[ε][ε]v restored with codd.: \epsilon\iota\delta\iota[ε][ε]v P. Lond. Lit. originally (corrected by the second hand). \]

5 \[\tauον[ε]ν \]
\[\pi\rho ισ\]
\[\pi\ρος τον P. Lond. Lit. originally (corrected by the second hand). \]

5–6 \[\tauι\chi\nuω \]
\[\tauι\chi\nuω P. Lond. Lit. \]

8 The \[pαραγραφος very probably marks the beginning of a new element in the period, structured by means of the correlation \muεν... δε. \]

11 \[αυτο[ις] with 4733 codd.; αυτη P. Lond. Lit., corrected by the second hand. \]

13 \[\alphaλλων with 4733 codd. (except Π, where it is omitted, but added later in margin). Here spacing indicates that it was present. \]

14–15 \[το\sigmaυτο]ν τo with P. Lond. Lit. Π: το\sigmaυτον 4733 ΠΕ: το\sigmaυτης ΛΩ. Grammar requires the accusative; inscriptions show that το\sigmaυτος, not το\sigmaυτης, was the normal Attic form (see L. Threatte, Grammar ii 329). \]

15 \[\muε[ιοςο] restored after P. Lond. Lit. (\muειοςο) ΠΕΠ (\μειοςο): \μειοςο ΛΩ. Spacing would allow either reading. \]

A. NODAR
A fragment of a roll with line-beginnings and an upper margin of 3.6 cm; intercolumnion 1 cm at its greatest extent. There were 16–18 letters to the line, which gives an estimated column width of 5.5 cm. The initial letters in lines 1–5 are enlarged; lines begin progressively to the left as the column descends (Maas’s law). The back is blank.

No lectional signs are in evidence. The script is an informal rounded one, to be assigned to the second century, earlier rather than later; there are affinities with Roberts, \textit{GLH} 13b. Bilinear, only the flamboyant $z$ reaches below (no example of $\phi$ or $\phi$). $e$ has its cap drawn separately; the crossbar of $\theta$ projects on both sides; $\tau$ occasionally has a ‘broken’ top-stroke.

The papyrus transmits a portion of the text also present in \textit{P. Lond. Lit.} 131 and (partly) \textbf{4732}. Textually, it offers nothing new, though we may note that it systematically sides with the Urbinas against the ‘vulgate’.

\begin{verbatim}
τολείται[ας επαθένευσεν
ω[ῳτε μ[ηδε προ των
τειχων ν τολμαν επε
ξειναί [τοις πολέμοις
αντι δε [τῆς ευνοιας
τῆς παρα [των ευμμαχων
αυτοίς νπ[αρχουσι καὶ
τῆς δοξη[ς τῆς παρα τῶν
ἀλλων Ἑλλήνων εἰς τὸ
συντον μ[ικὸς κατέστη
καὶ ὦ[τε παρὰ μικρὸν
ἐλθεν εἴ[ξανδραποδί
cήκαι [τὴν πολὺν εἰ
μὴ [Ἀκεδαμονίῳ τῶν
εἴ [ἀρχής πολέμου
τῶν εἰνοπτερῶν
ἐποτε[μεν ἡ τῶν πρὸ
tερ[ον ἡμῖν εὐμμα
χῶν [οντων οἷσ οὐκ αὐ
δικαι[οὺς εὐκαλομέν
ο[τί χα[λεπως προς
\end{verbatim}
4733. ISOCRATES, DE PACE 77–9

9–10 το]κοντον with ΓΕ: τοκοντο

N. GONIS

4734. ISOCRATES, DE PACE 96

4.5 x 17.8 cm Second century

A fragment of a roll with 22 lines from one column, written along the fibres. The back is blank. The column is preserved to a height of 12.8 cm. The lower margin is 5 cm deep.

The hand is an example of the Formal Round category, strictly bilinear, slanting slightly to the right, with some features in common with the ‘Roman Uncial’, though it does not reach the standardization represented by the Hawara Homer (GMAW 13, second century). The letters have a square appearance; even the so-called round letters (e, σ, ο, κ, ο) are formed rather angularly: c and e may have a straight back, the verticals of ο (of the same height) are often connected by right angles instead of curved strokes, the central angle of ι is flattened and low in the line, and something similar has happened to the curved strokes of τ, which form a very broad angle. λ preserves its angularity, and so do ά and ι, although the latter may be formed with more curved strokes. There is some decoration: hooks or semi-serifs to the left on verticals, and high horizontals may present an initial or final blob, and e.g. the left branch of γ may have a blob at the end. The stylization is sufficiently idiosyncratic (especially in the forms of ι and ο) to identify it as that of a scribe who was responsible for at least four other literary rolls from Oxyrhynchus (identified as scribe no. 2 by W. A. Johnson, The Literary Papyrus Roll 149): XXIV 2404 (Plate XIII; E. G. Turner, Greek Papyri pl. VIII), Aeschines; XXIII 2373 (Pl. XI), Bocotian Verse; PSI IX 1090 (Tav. IV), Erinna, and now LXIX 4720, Isocrates, Ad Nicoclem 22. Note that the column-width in this papyrus as reconstructed (12–14 letters, 5 cm) is the same as in 2404, and the deep lower margin is similarly comparable. Lobel assigned 2373 to the second century, and was followed in this by Turner (2404 introd.). 4734 may incline towards the first half of the century, since it still shows some stiffness.

No left or right margins are preserved, except probably the right margin in 22, where we would expect to see traces if another letter had followed λή. The restored text in the lines below assumes that this was the right-hand margin, and divides accordingly. If this is correct, the line-ends were somewhat irregular (unless adjusted for size or compression) and the line-beginnings slope outwards to the left lower down the column (Maas’s Law). 2404 shows the same slope, and the scribe there sometimes writes letters smaller at line-ends in order to reduce the irregularity.

There are no accents or breathings; only high and low stops are written. There is no opportunity to observe whether the scribe elided final vowels or wrote iota adscript.

The papyrus offers no new variants. It overlaps with P. Lond. Lit. 131.
A high stop, used in 2 to separate elements in an enumeration, stands before a relative clause whose antecedent has already appeared. This may imply that the relative clause stands independently, with the relative pronoun having demonstrative function.

A. NODAR
Fragment of a roll with remains of 19 lines written along the fibres, the back being blank except for insignificant traces. The upper margin is preserved for 1 cm.

The script is very much like that in 4726, exemplifying the Formal mixed or Severe Style. It is slightly slanting to the right, and fairly quickly executed, with connecting strokes in the remarkably long cross-bars of e and ο; also the horizontals of τ and τ may occasionally touch the following letter. There is some decoration. As with 4726, it compares well with XXVII 2452 (GAl11W 27) and may be assigned to the early third century.

There are no accents or breathings, but there are instances of inorganic diaeresis (2 and 5). Elision is effected (12, and also apparently in the superscript above this same line), but not marked. Blank spaces signal pauses in the text, perhaps systematically, though spaces larger than normal may be found even inside words.

Position of line-beginning is shown at 15, where there is only one way of dividing the text between lines, so that two letters must have been lost here before the present left-hand edge. The restored beginnings of 1, 4, and 12 are shorter than the others in this division of the lines; but if another syllable is carried over, they become too long. Some line-ends may have been adjusted by size and spacing of the final letters. There are two corrections (7, 12), both due to the original scribe.

A possible new variant in 12. The papyrus overlaps with P. Lond. Lit. 131.

\[\text{\(\tau\epsilon\)} \gamma\rho \mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma[\eta\theta\epsilon\upsilon] \]
\[\text{\(\tau\epsilon\varsigma\)} \upsilon\varsigma[\alpha] \tau\omicron\nu [\varsigma\omicron\mu\mu\alpha] \]
\[\chi\omicron\nu] \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\epsilon\omicron\alpha\gamma[\delta\rho\alpha] \]
\[\pi\omicron]\delta\iota\chi\omicron\mu\omicron\nu \kappa\iota[\nu\delta\nu] \]
\[\nu\epsilon\varsigma]\alpha\nu \tau\epsilon\varsigma \upsilon\varsigma[\alpha \Lambda\alpha] \]
\[\kappa\epsilon]\delta\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\nu \nu \varepsilon \]
\[\epsilon\omicron]\theta\eta\mu\mu\epsilon\nu \epsilon\kappa[\epsilon\iota] \]
\[\nu\omicron] \tau\epsilon \pi\alpha\nu\tau\nu\nu \]
\[\alpha\upsilon\tau]\omicron\omicron\upsilon \alpha\pi\omicron\omicron\upsilon \]

\[\text{\(\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu]\upsilon\upsilon\nu\tau\nu\nu[\upsilon] \gamma\omicron\nu\mu\iota\varsigma\epsilon\tau\nu\nu[\upsilon] \eta\mu\omicron\nu\nu \]
\[\tau]\omicron\varsigma \varsigma\omicron\tau\eta\riai\varsigma[c \epsilon] \]
\[\tau\upsilon]\chi\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\iota[\omicron\iota] \]

\[\pi\omicron\omicron\nu]\epsilon \chi\rho\eta \tau\nu\nu[\alpha\rho] \]
168

KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

A small fragment of a roll with the beginnings of seven lines written along the fibres. No upper or lower margins are preserved; the left-hand margin survives to 1.5 cm. On the back and across the fibres there are remains of four lines of cursive, with names (Θέωνο[ή] τού Διός ένοι (?) in 1, Αρ[πάν] του του Αρχήν Ν. in 4). On the same side as the literary text, written downward in the left margin (i.e. with the scrap turned 90° counter-clockwise) are further remains perhaps in the same cursive hand: Καίς Παντες Παντες Παντες Παντες (possibly a second line only negligible tops of 3 or 4 letters under Γαντε ενιου. (Of a second line only negligible tops of 3 or 4 letters under Παντε ενιου survive, but these were clearly written before the papyrus was cut or broken.) Thus we have someone practice-writing in the margin of a literary text the titulature of Pescennius Niger, who proclaimed himself emperor at Antioch in mid-April 193 and was recognised in Egypt until February 194. This provides a terminus ante quem for the copying of the literary text.

The hand is a Formal mixed ('Severe Style') script, medium-sized, with a slight slant to the right. There is no appreciable ornament; blobs visible at the end of some strokes are due to the stopping of the pen, and only the curving of some strokes to the right may occasionally finish in a very tiny hook (cf. x in 6). Some strokes may occasionally touch others (especially the high horizontal of τ and the right-hand oblique of λ). Compare 4737 below, X 1234 (pl. IV; Abb. 84 in Schubart, Griechische Palaeographie, Alcaeus), assigned to the second half of the second century, and XVII 2098 (GLH 19b, Herodotus), datable to the early third century. However, the present hand retains some of the crispness of execution.
aimed at by I 26 (GLH 19a, Demosthenes, Prooemia), datable to the second half of the second century. Without an objective indication it might have been difficult to exclude an early third-century date for this hand, but the marginal jotting shows it firmly rooted in the second century, probably the second half.

The text presents no reading marks; iota adscript is written, but there is no opportunity to judge whether elision was effected or marked.

The papyrus overlaps with P. Lond. Lit. 131. It reveals no new variants, but reflects an interesting aspect of the tradition. The papyrus gives part of §142 of De Pace, and thereby falls in the middle of a longer passage (§§132-45) quoted in its entirety by Isocrates at De Antidosi §66. There Γ and most other MSS give only the opening words of this section; but some (signalled in the notes below, as in Mandilaras’s edition, by lower-case Greek letters) transmit a complete text, which differs in some respects from the texts of the same passage transmitted in MSS of De Pace. 4736 in several places tallies with this secondary tradition.

In 2 it does so with the concurrence of P. Lond. Lit. 131 and the main MSS of De Pace. But in 3–4, 5, and 6–7 it agrees with the quotation in Antid. against the MSS of De Pace, in 3–4 and 5 also against P. Lond. Lit. 131. In 6–7, the reading of the papyrus has been entered as a correction in P. Lond. Lit. 131. Of course, it is possible that we have a fragment of a copy of Antid. in the version that recorded the complete quotation of the passage (cf. XLV 3233, discussed by Pinto, Per la storia del testo di Isocrate 87–90). Antid., however, is rarely attested on papyrus. This in itself is not conclusive, but it can be argued that this is a copy of De Pace, since P. Lond. Lit. 131 shows that variants we now know only from the secondary tradition did occur in manuscripts of De Pace in the Roman period (see on 6–7 and Mandilaras, app. crit.). Presumably these have left their imprint on the manuscript tradition of De Pace from which the full quotation in some MSS of Antid. was taken.

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma\nu\rho\omicron\mu\epsilon\omicron\nu\nu & \kappa\tau\eta\varsigma\alpha\varsigma \\
\thetai & \delta \tau\iota \pi [\omega\epsilon\iota \tau\nu \\
\eta\gamma\epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\acute{\iota} & [\epsilon\iota \alpha\pi\alpha\nu \\
\tau & \tau \nu \omicron \chi\rho\omicron\nu [\nu \mu\iota\eta \\
5 & \epsilon [\delta \epsilon] \pi \alpha\varsigma \alpha \tau [\alpha \epsilon \tau\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu \\
\nu & [\kappa \alpha\varsigma] \alpha\rho\chi\varsigma \kappa [\alpha \iota \delta\nu\nu\varsigma \alpha\varsigma \\
\tau [\epsilon \iota \alpha\varsigma] & \alpha\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron [\gamma\iota \\
\end{align*}
\]
\textit{Known Literary Texts}

\textit{170.} only the lower part of the stem survives. Spacing suggests that the papyrus did not have \textit{tau}, which would have made 6 a very long line.

Before \textit{tau} in 7 in the margin is a dot. Possibly it formed part of a critical sign (if not stray ink from the marginal practice-writing).

A. NODAR

\textbf{4737. Isocrates, \textit{De Pace} 144–5}

\textit{48 5B.30/B(4)a} \hspace{0.5cm} 17 \times 20.5 \text{ cm} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{Second half of second century}

Plate XIII

Portion of a papyrus roll with the final two columns of the speech with the end-title, followed by a broad blank space. The text is written across the fibres. On the front, written the same way up along the fibres, are extensive remains of a land register; there is a mention of year 19 of an unnamed Emperor, which would suit almost any reign between 19 Trajan (115/16) and 19 Severus, Caracalla and Geta (210/11).

Column i has 22 lines at its full height; col. ii has 13, at which point the speech finishes, marked by a \textit{coronis}. The end-title follows below after a short blank interval; no author's name is given. There is a marginal gloss on ii 10 in a small script in three short lines to the right. The height of the full column is 1.13 cm. The upper margin is preserved to 3 cm, and lower (below col. i) to 4.5 cm. The intercolumnar space is 1.5 cm. In this format the speech would have filled 1.136 columns and extended to around 8 m. The blank space to the right (ignoring the gloss) extends for 6 cm, and gives the impression of having been the end of the roll (see below on title).

The text presents no reading marks (but see note on i 9). The scribe uses filler-signs (e.g. i 2) to create an even right-hand edge, and employs the \textit{coronis} (combined with a long \textit{paragraphos}, seemingly in lighter ink) to mark the end of the speech. There is no opportunity to observe whether the scribe effected and marked elision, or wrote iota adscript. One correction to the text (see on i 18) is due to the main hand, as is the marginal gloss to ii 10–11.

The hand is an example of the Formal mixed or Severe Style, with only a slight slant to the right, written small and neat, and comparable to XX 2256 (\textit{GAMSH} 25), assigned to the late second or early third century. \textit{o} is very small; \textit{omega} and occasionally \textit{z} are written smaller and likewise raised above line-level. \textit{omega} has only a slight rise in the centre; its left and right-hand curves are oblique, nearly vertical strokes. \textit{lambda} is made in three movements, with central curved stroke facing upwards without descending to line-level. \textit{lambda} is written in two movements and sometimes presents a sort of loop at the junction of the two obliques rising to the right. In \textit{alpha}, \textit{lambda}, and \textit{lambda} the oblique descending to the right may be prolonged above its junction with the oblique rising to the right. There is some contrast between thick and thin strokes, but no ornamentation. Other comparable examples are \textit{GLH} 15c and 17b (= \textit{V} 842), both datable to the second half of the second century. Both are more slanting to the right and less carefully written than the hand of 4737 (and 2256), but the treatment
of letters is similar. The hand may be assigned by comparison to the second half of the second century.

A new variant appears at i 7, and there is an unexpected agreement with one branch of the manuscript tradition at ii 10–11. The text overlaps with P. Lond. Lit. 131, and enjoys a secondary transmission as part of the quotation in De Antidosi §66.

Col. i

\[\text{\(\tau\omega\nu\varepsilon\chi\omega\upsilon\varepsilon\nu\eta\upsilon\upsilon\sigma\omega\iota\)}}\left(\text{§144}\right)\]

\[\lambda\alpha\beta\omega\iota\epsilon\iota\ \tau\eta\nu\ \delta\upsilon\alpha\nu\alpha\ >\]
\[\mu\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \eta\mu\varepsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\]
\[\mu\nu\ \delta\omega\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\iota\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \varepsilon\omega\]
\[\tau\eta\rho\]ιας αυτωις αιτι\[\alpha\nu\]\[\varepsilon\varepsilon\theta\beta\ai\]\[\pi\omega\lambda\lambda\nu\]
\[\delta\epsilon\ \kappa\ai\]\[\pi\alpha\tau\iota\iota\omega\nu\ \lambda\o\nu\]
\[\gamma\nu\nu\ \varepsilon\]\[\varsigma\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\]
\[\pi\epsilon\ \tau\eta\nu\ \upsilon\nu\pi\theta\epsilon\iota\omega\]
\[\tau\nu\ \varepsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\]
\[\mu\nu\ \tau\iota\iota\nu\ \iota\nu\ ]\[\epsilon\nu\]
\[\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\omega\iota\ i\]
\[\lambda\nu\]
\[\kappa\ai\]\[\nu\mu\]
\[\kappa\ai\]\[\kappa\ai\]
\[\kappa\ai\]
\[\kappa\ai\]
\[\kappa\ai\]

Col. ii

\[\phi\epsilon\nu\ \varepsilon\]\[\iota\nu\ \tau\ac\ \mu\e\]
\[\gamma\iota\tau\ac\ \tau\iota\iota\nu\ \pi\o\lambda\o\nu\]
\[\kai\ \tau\ac\ \varepsilon\iota\beta\iota\iota\nu\iota\]
\[\tau\ai\]\[\alpha\lambda\lambda\\iota\]
\[\kappa\ai\]\[\kappa\ai\]
\[\kai\]
\[\varepsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\]\[\pi\iota\]
\[\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\sigma\nu\ ]\]
KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

civ ε[π αρ]έτην και
dεκ[ενευ]νην ως εν
tαίς [της] Ελλαδος ευ
πρα[γμ]αις κυμβαί
νει καὶ τα των φιλο
πολιτευ
ομενων
πραγματ(a)

10

69
cοφ[ων] πραγματα
πο[λυ β]έλτειω γεί
νει[θαί]

(vac.)

15

[περι τ]ῇς ειρήνης

Col. i

1-2 ντολαβως with ΛΕΠΙΖ ε: -εω P. Lond. Lit. Γ.
5-6 αυτος αυτ[α]ν with P. Lond. Lit. ΛΠΙΖ: αυτίαν αὐτοίκ ΓΕ ε.
6 εεθασι with P. Lond. Lit. ΓΕ λε: γεωθαί ΛΠΙΖ.
7 παντοων: παντοδαιπων ΛΠΙΖ: καλῶν P. Lond. Lit. ΓΕ λε θ. παντοων is a new variant, very similar in meaning to παντοδαιπων. However, Isocrates, like Demosthenes, never uses παντοων elsewhere. In this respect it would be a banalization of an original παντοδαιπων that had crept into the tradition already by the Roman period.
7-8 λο[γ]ον επαιτων with codd.: εοντων λογον P. Lond. Lit.
9 θ[π]οθεων: a short oblique ascending to right above σθ might be an acute accent, but it would be the only accent in this papyrus, and it would be placed extremely high.
9-10 τω[ν] εμοι. The MSS of Αντίδοσις give ταύτην ελπεῖν ἐμοι, but the space in the lacuna is not enough to accommodate the infinitive.
11-12 σιμβουλευ[ε]ει restored with codd.: σιμβουλευειν P. Lond. Lit. originally, but the final ν was crossed out by the second corrector.
12-13 παναςαθα | λεγον | τι with P. Lond. Lit. codd.: λέγοντι παύσασθαι θ.
18-19 ακμαπ[σ]ων ω | γη εγον παρω[ν]. At the end of 18 the scribe seems to have first written a filler sign, which he later corrected into ν. In P. Lond. Lit. there was also confusion: ακμαπ[σ]ων [,.]γη εγον Mandilaras suggests that γ corrected an original α (Ω). All other MSS have η εγον, which suits the space here; modern editors write ἤγον.
21-2 and col. ii 1 τα τοιᾱτα | [και λεγων και] γραφειν: τοιατα και λεγων και πραττειν και γραφειν P. Lond. Lit.: τοιατα και λέγων και γράφειν codd. τά before τοιατα add, λθ; και before λέγων om. Α. To judge from the space, και was present in our papyrus, and τά may well have been. και πράττειν was certainly not present.

Col. ii

10 και τα with P. Lond. Lit. codd.: κατά Γ θ.
10-11 φιλο[σοφ]ων with P. Lond. Lit.: πολιτευομένων P. Lond. Lit.:, added as a variant (by the second corrector) in the margin, as it is here. The further writing of πράγματ(a) here in the gloss—the final α abbreviated by writing τ over the first α and extending the cross-bar to the right—shows where πολιτευομένων is to be placed in the text. Since we have this variant in two papyri a century apart, it was obviously an established
reading with extensive circulation; here it was added by the original scribe, which suggests that he found it in his exemplar. It may have been added by collation at some stage in the transmission but its parallel transmission in two ancient manuscripts suggests the authority of a variant that might have gone back to very early copies, perhaps even an authorial variant. However, one might suppose that φιλοσόφων is right, and ποιητευόμενον is a conjecture designed to give a more obvious sense (cf. §133).

12 ποιήσαντες with P. Lond. Lit. ΓΕλθήθη: πολλῷ ΔΠΖ. Spacing favours the shorter reading.

[β]ιβλιοκρατία. The spelling αί for αί in P. Lond. Lit., where it is not corrected (cf. next word).

12-13 γενεαρέας πόλεως P. Lond. Lit.: γενεαρέας πόλεως codd.

Title. Mandilaras records three different variants for the title: (1) περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης, in Γ; (2) περὶ εἰρήνης, in ΔΕ; and (3) περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης ἡ συµµαχίας, in the vulgate, P. Lond. Lit. presents (1), preceded by Ἴσοκρατος, immediately after the end of the speech, and (2) in the following column, at about mid-height, also preceded by Ἴσοκρατος. 4737 clearly had (1) without the name of the author.

The absence of the author’s name calls for explanation. The authorship of the speech can hardly have been in doubt. The author’s name may have appeared at the beginning of the roll (with or without an initial title). Its absence here might indicate that the roll originally formed (or was designed to form) part of a multi-speech copy of Isocrates’ works, i.e. with another speech following. On the other side (front), the line-ends of a column preceding a complete one of the land register show that before being reused the roll continued beyond this point, and thus it might have continued with another speech after the surviving broad blank space, but that blank space gives the impression of having been the end of the reused roll. Perhaps the papyrus was copied from a multi-speech roll (which for this reason lacked the author’s name), or it was cut down from one and used as a roll ending with the close of Περὶ εἰρήνης.

A. NODAR

4738. Lucian, Dialogi deorum (79) 10.1–2

Top of column and 18 narrowly-spaced lines written across the fibres in an informal hand. On the other side and along the fibres is LXVIII 4666, containing top of column and vv. 253–65 of the Hesiodic Scutum in a large Biblical Uncial script, similar if not identical to PSI IX 1087 (see 4666 introd.). The hand of the present text is a smallish mannered cursive of the third century, generally rounded with accentuated curves and loops (e.g. on ι, 5 ι, 2 and 5 γ, 12 κ with looped bottom). Strokes are extended horizontally (1 from foot of η at base-line, 2 from top of ι, 16 from tail of Λ) or diagonally (12 flying right arm of γ) at line-end as though to produce an even right-hand edge; but the effect is mitigated by e.g. 13, which ends far short of the other line-ends. Letter-shapes (1 end η, 12 γ) suggest a date in the third century. For a comparable hand see VIII 1100 (Roberts, GLH 20b, Prefectural Edict, dated 206).

Elision is effected and marked by apostrophe (2), and punctuation is indicated in the form of a large raised mid-point (3) with a space following and coinciding with change of speaker in the dialogue. Iota-adscript is treated inconsistently: written once (6) and omitted once (14), in the only places where we can tell; there is at least one iotacistic spelling
The width of letters and compression of writing varies considerably (cf. 3, 5, 12). As supplemented with the transmitted text of Lucian, the column of writing is very broad (43–54 letters). The cursive character of the hand and re-used back suggest a private copy. However, its extent and relation to the literary text on the front is uncertain (see on 2 ὁμολογοῦν).

The reused back of a literary text to inscribe another literary text might point to a scholar’s copy. But in this case the text copied is a near-contemporary one, consistent with the reuse of backs for subliterary texts and related writing of a casual nature. The writing of the papyrus is within a generation or so of the lifetime of Lucian himself (c.120–180). Thus we have an early copy of a dialogue with Lucianic authorship firmly attached to it. It is uncertain when the Lucianic corpus was gathered together. H. Erbse, Überlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen . . . Literatur (Zürich 1961) 598, thinks it unlikely that there was an ancient edition, and it has been supposed to have come into existence in the Byzantine period (C. W. Müller, Die Kurzdialoge der Appendix Platonica (München 1975) 274). In light of these doubts, the papyrus text, in spite of its informal production, stays remarkably close to the medieval paradosis where we can judge, agreeing inconsistently in the few places where we can tell with both the β and γ sides of the tradition.

Lucian is sparsely represented among literary papyri from Egypt: see P. Lond. Lit. 194, identified as Lucianic Asinus by J. Lennaerts, Cd’E 97 (1974) 115–20; cf. LII 3683 (Halcyon), which is attributed to Plato in its colophon, but is transmitted in our medieval MSS among the spurious dialogues attributed both to Lucian and to Plato (also in antiquity to Leon the Academic). An Anacharsis (whether by Lucian or some other) appears in the book-list PSI-Laur. inv. 19662v (Pack 2 2087) at line 7 (R. Otranto, Antiche liste di libri su papiro (Roma 2000) no. 16, pp. 89–95, at p. 90). There is no means of telling whether Lucian’s official service in Alexandria (Apol. 12) speeded the reception of his work in Egypt. This is therefore the first papyrus of a work of undisputed Lucianic authorship, and the first papyrus of Dialogi deorum to be published. The chapter preserved by the papyrus (10) consists of a dialogue between Zeus and Ganymede. The chapter will have begun with the first line in the papyrus, and would have extended as transmitted to roughly 4.5 times the amount of text preserved here. Whether it continued on to a following column to be completed is unknown. In 3, the only place where we can judge, change of speaker is indicated by mid-point and space.

The text has been restored exempli gratia to illustrate spacing from the edition of M. D. Maceoed (his libellus 79 in vol. iv, Oxford 1987), with which the papyrus text has been compared, along with the Teubner text of Lucian, ed. C. Jacobitz (1851), and the Weidmann edition of Lucian, ed. I. Sommerbrodt (1886–96).

αγε ω Γανυμήδης ηκομεν γαρ ενθα εχρην] φιληςον με ηδη
οπως ειδης ουκετι ραμφος αγκυλων εχουν]τα ουδ’ ονυχας
οξεις ουδε πτερα ους εφαινομεν σοι πτηνος ειναι δ]οκουν’ ανθρω
πε ουκ αετος αρτι ηθα και καταπταμενος ηρπ]ακας με απο

10.1
It may simply be coincidence that the text on the front contains Stat. 254 βαλλει δύνασε μεγάλον, φυγή βί γαθάδε στάτη, a line that has suffered much in transmission, in particular from corruption before δύνασ (see on LXVIII 4692 254). Other than the occurrence of the word δύνασ, the Lucianic text has no clear relation to the poetic text on the front, and there is no particular reason to think that this passage from Lucian, Dial. deor, has been copied out on the back simply for comparison of the occurrence of this word.

We have restored exempli gratia according to γ (with Macleod): οὐ β, which might better suit the space here. But the size of letters and compression of writing in the papyrus is elastic, so that it is not certain that the line could not have accommodated γ’s οὐδέ.

The only evidence here is spacing (was there room for οὐ before ορας?) which is difficult to decide in so long a line.

The central point here is the clear presence of εἳ before ὁ Παῦ, which is also in conformity with the spacing expected earlier in the line.

With γ: ἐστῃ β, correctly. But κ is read with difficulty (it looks more like ι or a U-shaped υ); compare shape of κ in 12.

The ν of ηκον is written out into the margin.
IV. DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

4739. LEASE OF LAND

First published by Marcel Hombert in Le Monde grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux (1975) 601–8, with pl. XVI. The notes below are supplementary to those of Hombert, who comments in detail on many of the individual clauses.

The basic studies of land-leases are those by J. Herrmann, Studien zur Bodenpacht im Recht der grando-ägyptischen Papyri (München 1958), and by D. Hennig, Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht im ptolemaisch-römischen Ägypten (München 1967). For the social and economic aspects of leases, see J. Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt (Oxford 1996), who gives a list of land-leases from the Oxyrhynchite nome from the 1st to the 4th centuries AD, complete up to 1994, in her Appendix 2. Additions are given in LXVII 4595 introd.; add P. Col. X 273, 280(?), 284, SB XX 14290, 14291(?), 14337, 14338, 14399, 14464, 14462, 14983, 14984, XXII 15724, and now LXIX 4739, 4745, 4747, 4753. For the rent charged in leases of land up to the reign of Diocletian, see H.-J. Drexhage, Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne im römischen Ägypten (1991) 155 ff., with Tables on pp. 192 ff.; for Oxyrhynchus, see pp. 167–74 and Tables on pp. 224–37.

εἵμεῖθας εν Εὐδαίμων Εὐδαίμονος ἀπ᾽ Ὀξύ
-
-ρόχων πόλεως Διονυσίω Διονυσίου μετρός
Θαύμισος ἀπὸ τοῦ περὶ Πέλα Ληψὸς Πέργη
t[c] ἔπιγονῆς εἰς ἔτη ἕξ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵκοντος δωδεκάτου
ἔτους Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου τὰς ὑπαρχοῦσας
αὐτῶν περὶ Πάμπων ἀροῦρας δέκα ἡμικρὸν τρίτον,
μηδεμαί[c γ]εωμετρίας γεινομένης, ὡστε κατ᾽ ἔτος
tὸ μὲν ἡμικρ. επείρασ πυρόσ, τὸ δὲ ἔτερον ἡμικρ.[ν]
ἔυλαμησαί γλωροῖς εἰς βρῶσιν, ἐκφορόν ἀπο-
tάκτον τῶν ὑδαν ἀροῦρόν κατ᾽ ἔτος πυρόσ ἀρτα-
βῶν ἐνενήκοντα μᾶς ἀκινδύνων παντὸς
κυδόνιν ἕως δὲ τὸς ἄβροχος γένηται, παραδε-
χθήσεται τῷ μεμισθωμένῳ, τῶν τῆς γῆς
κατ᾽ ἔτος δημοσίων ὄντων πρὸς τὸν μεμισ-
θῶν[κ]ότα, διὰ καὶ κυριεύειν τῶν καρπῶν ἐώς
tὰ ἑαυτοῦ κομίσηται. βεβαιωμένης δὲ τῆς
μισθώσεως ἀποδόσω ὁ μεμισθωμένος τῶ
Eudaemon son of Eudaemon from the city of Oxyrhynchus leased to Dionysius son of Dionysius, his mother being Thaesis, from Lenon near Pela, a Persian of the Epigone, for six years from the incoming twelfth year of Hadrian Caesar the lord the ten (and) a half (and) a third aruras belonging to him near Paeimis, no survey having taken place, so as to sow half annually with wheat and to plant the other half with green crops for pasture, at a fixed annual rent for all the aruras of ninety-one artabas of wheat, free from all risk; and if any land should be uninundated, an allowance shall be made to the lessee, the annual public taxes on the land being the responsibility of the lessor, who is also to retain control of the crops until he receives his dues. The lease being confirmed, the lessee is to pay to the lessor the annual fixed rent regularly in the month Payni at the threshing floor of Lenon, in wheat that is new, pure, unadulterated, free from barley, sieved, as though being measured into the public granary, by the half-artaba measure of Diogenes son of Alexander from Pela, or he is to pay whatever he still owes plus one half. The right of execution is to rest with the lessor both upon the lessee and upon all his property, the lessor having no power to [demand?] extra rent nor to relet to others nor to farm the land himself within the period (of the lease). The lease is binding.

'Eudaemon son of Eudaemon from the city of Oxyrhynchus leased to Dionysius son of Dionysius, his mother being Thaesis, from Lenon near Pela, a Persian of the Epigone, for six years from the incoming twelfth year of Hadrian Caesar the lord the ten (and) a half (and) a third aruras belonging to him near Paeimis, no survey having taken place, so as to sow half annually with wheat and to plant the other half with green crops for pasture, at a fixed annual rent for all the aruras of ninety-one artabas of wheat, free from all risk; and if any land should be uninundated, an allowance shall be made to the lessee, the annual public taxes on the land being the responsibility of the lessor, who is also to retain control of the crops until he receives his dues. The lease being confirmed, the lessee is to pay to the lessor the annual fixed rent regularly in the month Payni at the threshing floor of Lenon, in wheat that is new, pure, unadulterated, free from barley, sieved, as though being measured into the public granary, by the half-artaba measure of Diogenes son of Alexander from Pela, or he is to pay whatever he still owes plus one half. The right of execution is to rest with the lessor both upon the lessee and upon all his property, the lessor having no power to [demand?] extra rent nor to relet to others nor to farm the land himself within the period (of the lease). The lease is binding.

'Year 11 of Imperator Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, Mesore 22.'

(2nd hand) 'I, Dionysius son of Dionysius, have taken on lease . . .'


4 εἰκρν έτη έκ. The period is exceptionally long; see Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 253.
4-5 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεράντος διοδικαστὸν έτος. This is one of the relatively rare leases drawn up before the end of the year previous to that in which the lease took effect; see Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants* 252 n. 140.

6 For Πλάγμα, also in the λίμπο τοπαρχία, see Pruneti, *I centri abitati* 130; Krüger, *Oxyrhynchus in der Kaiserzeit* 285. Other leases of land from Pa(e)imis are XIV 1629 (44 BC) and SB X 10263 (205). It occurs along with Lenon and Pela in X 1285 (cf. also XLIX 3462) and SB XIV 12108; on this last text see Krüger, op. cit. 57-8 n. 59.

9 χλωρίων ἐκε ὃ πρῶτον. It is not uncommon for leases to state that land is to be planted with χῶρος or χόρτος for grazing. The nearest equivalent to the expression used here is XIV 1686 9-10, επείρα καὶ ἐξομήνας καὶ ἔτος πυρόφ μὲν τὸ ἡμετερ. χόρτον δὲ ἢ τοι ὡς ἐκ βρῶσεως ἢ καὶ κασθή καὶ ἱεροῦ ἐπιμονή τὸ ἄλλο ἡμετερ.; cf. also P. Lips. I 118.12-15 (Oxy.). See Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants* 21, and Hennig, *Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht* 44, with 125 n. 30.

9-11 The amount of rent is exceptionally high; see Homberg’s note and, for possible explanations, Rowlandson, op. cit. 242-3, 251. For all-wheat rent on land sown partly with χὸρος or χλωρία, cf. 4741 11-12 n.

22 For use of a measure that is not that of the landlord, see 4740 37-9 n.

26-9 On these provisions, see (in addition to Homberg) Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants* 204, 257. For μεταμισθοῦν in particular, see the texts cited in R. Taubenschlag, *Law* 4364 n. 39. In P. Mert. II 76.38-9 we should restore σὺν ἐξοπλ[εί] ὑπὸ με[μεθοκτόνο] έπείρα μεταμισθοῦν, not μεμε[θοκτόνο] (the note to P. Col. X 273.24 is misleading).

27 On this problematic passage, see the commentary in ed. pr.

† M. HOMBERT
J. DAVID THOMAS

4740–4744. Customs-House Receipts

These five documents are to be added to the customs-house receipts listed, and in several cases given their first edition, in P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Customs Duties in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Zutphen 1987) = P. Customs. For relevant documents published since and further bibliography, see A. Jördens’ introduction to P. Louvre I 27-29; add now O. Eleph. Wagner 55-61, and Bodl. MS. Gr. clas. g 20 (P) and 14 (P), published by C. E. P. Adams and N. Gonis, *ZPE* 126 (1999) 213-8. Sijpesteijn lists no fewer than 919 items in P. Customs (pp. 102-43), of which nearly 400 are customs-house receipts. Prior to the present texts, only two of the receipts already published had been found at Oxyrhynchus: XII 1439 (P. Customs 8) and 1440 (P. Customs 130); cf. also VI 919 (P. Customs 358).

4740. Customs-House Receipt

30 4B.38/E(1-3b) 5.5 x 18 cm 25 August 183 Plate XIV

A narrow piece of papyrus well preserved on all sides, written in a rapid cursive hand. Letters at line-end are frequently extended as filler strokes. A manufacturer’s three-layer kollesis runs down the middle of the papyrus. The back is blank.

Sarapas, an Oxyrhynchite, pays 88 dr. 4 ob. for the 3% tax on importing ten donkeys and four camels through the customs gate at Dionysias into the Arsinoite nome, these animals to be used for a variety of tasks in connection with a still unidentified activity (see
4740. CUSTOMS-HOUSE RECEIPT

10 n.). Dionysias was not, of course, on the direct route from Oxyrhynchus to the Arsinoite nome, but the text gives no clue regarding where Sarapas had been or why.

4740 presents several peculiarities. It is unusually tall for this type of document. Most examples are almost square; P. Customs 502, however, is recorded as being even taller at 22.6 cm. It is one of the few receipts connected with the village of Dionysias in the Arsinoite nome. The others (listed in 2 n.) all refer to the export of produce except P. Fay. 68, which refers to the export of camels, and SB XIV 11616, where no indication is given of what is being imported or exported. The broad destination εἰκάγων εἶκον Ἀρκωνίτην (6–8) is unusual in documents of this kind. The 3% tax (2–3) has its second element written out in full, whereas all other receipts for this tax call it ῥ Κ αί ν. 4740 is the only customs-house receipt to name not only the transporter but also the name of his father and his place of origin (4–6). 16–18 present a late usage of the imperial titulature in this class of text, against dating simply by regnal year number.

τετελείω (ώνηται) διά πήλης
Διονυσιάδος (ἐκατοστής) καὶ
πεντηκοστής
Σαράπας Παπον-
τώτο[c] ἀπὸ Ὀξυρύπυγγ(ων)
πόλεως εἰκάγων
εἶκον Ἀρκωνίτην
εἰς τὴν προβα[σ] πάσαν
ἐργαίαν [δ]πέρ
[...]. αγωγὸν δώνου
δέκα καμηλίου[ους] τέκ-
του δραχμάς[ος] ὑγ-
[δ]οξοῦσα ὁκ-
τῶν τετράδ[ος]ον.

(ἐποὺς) τρίτον καὶ ἐκκοστοῦ
Μᾶ[ρ]κου Αὐρηλίου
Κομμόδου Ἀντωνίου
Καίσαρος τοῦ κ[υρίου,

1 τετελείω 2 ρ Χ 5 αξυρύ[πυγ] (7–8) Ἀρκωνίτην 11 καμηλίου 1 καμηλίους 12 δραχμάς
14 τετράδος 15 Λ 19 ἐπαγομένον

'Paid through the gate of Dionysias for the 1% and two-per-cent tax by Sarapas son of Papontos from the
city of the Oxyrhynchi, importing ten donkeys and four camels into the Arsinoite nome for all manner of work on account of . . . , eighty-eight drachmas four obols.

‘Year twenty-third of Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Caesar the lord, Mesore, 2nd intercalary day.’

2 Διονυκατός. See A. Calderini, S. Daris, *Dizionario geografico* ii 107–10; Suppl. i 96, ii 44, 31–2, iii 31–2; E. Bernand, *Recueil des Inscriptions grecques du Fayoum II: La ‘Mèsi’ de Thémistos* 119–28. According to J. Schwartz and H. Wild, *Qasr-Qârûn / Dionysias* 1948 6, ‘il n’est plus possible de dire où était l’entrée principale de la ville’. There was a route towards the Small Oasis from Dionysias, and camels were exported through Dionysias to the Small Oasis (cf. P. Customs p. 48, and P. Fay. 68 = P. Customs 228); likewise δεπηραφεν, BGU XIII 2398 = P. Customs 327.

Other references to this customs post in the papyri are to be found in BGU XI 2029 (P. Customs 239), P. Customs 466, 467, 470, 475; SB V 7822 (P. Customs 468), XIV 11616 and 12135 (in this last document reference is made to δεπηραφητι πάλης Διονυκατός; cf. P. Customs p. 95). Most of the evidence concerns exports; see P. Customs pp. 46–7.

2-3 For the 3% tax, see P. Customs pp. 23–5; W. Clarysse, P. Thomas 3 introd.

4–6 The persons who imported or exported goods were in most cases indicated with one name only. There are 11 examples where the name of the father is given (see P. Customs, p. 29 n.11), and two examples where the place of origin is mentioned but not the patronymic (P. Customs 451.2–3 and 452.2–3). This is the only example of a customs-house receipt where both patronymic and place of origin are stated. Sijpesteijn proposed that it may be because the officials of the customs stations knew the transporters and mentioned their father’s name only when the transporter was not so well-known. There are also examples where they could abbreviate even the name of the transporter if they knew him very well.

7–8 εἰς τὸ[ν] μέσον Ἀρκουνσό. Only occasionally is it stated from where the goods had come or to where they were being transported; see P. Customs p. 41. For examples see P. Grenf. II 50b (P. Customs 197), P. Fay. 68 (P. Customs 228), and BGU XIII 2326 (P. Customs 239–256), and especially BGU III 697 (P. Customs 200) παρεδμέσσεν . . . εἰς Ἀρκουνσόν. εἰς τὸ[ν] μέσον . . . εἰς τὸ[ν] μέσον  Ἀρκουνσόν. Unparalleled. This expression takes the place of the usual note of what goods were being carried. πρὸς ἄναραφα ἰπηραφῳα is attested five times in the customs-house documents: P. Customs 194, P. Mert. I 20 (P. Customs 303), P. Customs 378, 382 and BGU XIII 2327.5 (P. Customs 671).

8–9 πρὸς[ς] πῆκαν ἐπὶ μεγαλ. Unparalleled. This expression takes the place of the usual note of what goods were being carried. πρὸς ἄναραφα ἰπηραφῳα is attested five times in the customs-house documents: P. Customs 194, P. Mert. I 20 (P. Customs 303), P. Customs 378, 382 and BGU XIII 2327.5 (P. Customs 671).

10 . . . σμογων. A horizontal links to α, c preferable to τ. The initial trace and space do not seem as if they will allow εἰκηγωνων. διηφα in 9 might seem doubtful, since ε is more easily read as ι, but for epsilon in this shape cf. e.g. 15.

12–14 88 dr. 4 ob. is a large amount to be paid when unladen animals are moved. At a flat rate for each animal, the tax would have been 6 dr. 2 ob. The same level is found in P. Customs 893, where 6 dr. 2 ob. is paid for one donkey. (This is a quite different situation from laden animals, where camels were rated at twice the donkey rate because they could carry double.) See P. Customs p. 76. We do not have any other clear information regarding how much tax was paid when donkeys were brought for work. Higher rates still are attested in P. Wise. II 80.148 (P. Customs 107), where for 5 donkeys the tax is 66 dr. 4 ob., and P. Wise. II 80.103 (P. Customs 76), for two horses 26 dr. 2 ob.

15–18 Sijpesteijn, P. Customs p. 71, quotes P. Grenf. II 50e (P. Customs 275) of 26 December 179 as the latest example of a receipt in which the imperial titles are written out in full. 4740 is nearly four years later than this. Sijpesteijn also says that ‘in P. Alex.Giss. p. 23, J. Schwartz correctly observed that beginning with the sole reign of Commodus (17 March 180) the scribes no longer wrote the titles of the reigning emperor(s) on the customs-house receipts . . . , but satisfied themselves with only giving the number of the year of a certain reign’. However, Schwartz was explicitly referring to customs receipts from Soknopaiou Nesos, so that his observation is not invalidated by 4740.

N. LITINAS
These four documents enlarge the small number of receipts issued from the customs-house of Tebtunis, which, with only eight documents (seven papyri, P. Tebt. II 461, 557, 565, P. Yale I 75–6, SB XII 10950–1 [= P. Customs 381, 387, 20, 260–1, 399–400], and one ostracon, O. Tebt. Pad. 65 [= P. Customs 312]), is still under-represented in comparison with the 176 receipts from Soknopaiou Nesos, the 51 from Philadelpheia or the 40 from Bakchias.

All the customs receipts presented here were written by the same scribe for the same transporter Thonis, who apparently went through the customs post on Messore 7 (4741–2) and 9 (4743–4), respectively 31 July and 2 August, each time carrying the same kind of goods loaded on the same number of animals. At each of his passages through the customs, he paid two customs dues: in 4741 and 4743 the tax for the protection of the desert routes (ἐχθρος ἐρημοφυλακία) and in 4742 and 4744 the 3% tax (τέλα νεώ); see P. Customs pp. 21–2, 23–5. We are, therefore, dealing with two series of double receipts: see P. Customs pp. 19–20, with a list of published double receipts on p. 19 n. 21. Note that two series of double customs receipts already came from the customs-house of Tebtunis: P. Yale I 75–6 and SB XII 10950–1.

As a loaded donkey could travel between 40 and 50 km a day (see O. M. Pearl, ‘Varia Papyrologica’, TAPhA 71 (1940) 377 n. 14), and as Thonis passed through the customs for the first time on 31 July, reached his destination, delivered or sold his cargo, returned to his point of departure, loaded a new cargo, and passed again through the customs before the end of 2 August, the distance between his point of departure and his destination must have been relatively short. (This means that at least on his first trip Thonis’ destination cannot have been Oxyrhynchus, since the straight-line distance from Tebtunis to Oxyrhynchus is c.60 km.) We may wonder how it came about that all four receipts should be discovered in a rubbish dump at Oxyrhynchus. The likely solution is that Thonis was an Oxyrhynchite (cf. 4741 3 n.), probably a trader, who was exporting goods through the gate at Tebtunis.

All four receipts concern the transportation of the same product, which appears to be new, though reading and interpretation are difficult; see below, 4741 4–5 n.

The script suggests we should place these four documents in the late second or early third century. At Soknopaiou Nesos scribes dated such receipts by regnal years only without imperial titles from the beginning of the reign of Commodus (see J. Schwartz, P. Alex. Giss. p. 23; cf. 4740 15–18 n.). If the same were true at Tebtunis, this would support the dating suggested by the script. The latest other attestations for the ἐχθρος ἐρημοφυλακία and the τέλα νεώ date to 212 and 211 respectively (cf. P. Customs p. 21; p. 23 n. 43). The combination of days in July and August with a ‘year i’ restricts the possible dates around this time to 193 (Pescennius Niger), 217 (Macrinus), and 222 (Severus Alexander), although one cannot strictly exclude Elagabalus (218); see D. W. Rathbone, ‘The Dates of the Recognition in Egypt of the Emperors from Caracalla to Diocletianus’, ZPE 62 (1986) 107.

The pattern of damage in 4741–2 suggests that they had been kept superimposed;
the same may apply to the more damaged 4743–4. It seems likely that the four items were cut from a single vertical strip of papyrus (cf. their uniform width), although we have not established which was contiguous with which. 4742 looks as if it had been turned upside down before the receipt was written. There are scanty cursive remains across the fibres on the back (4743), probably line-ends from an account, with a clear ζ on the back of 4741. Since the account must have been written before the strip was cut up for the customs receipts, and further since we may suppose that the account was written on the back of an already used piece, it follows that the strip reused for the customs texts was cut from a blank marginal area (the left margin?) of the original text on the front.

4741. Customs-House Receipt  
96/20(a) 3.7 x 5.7 cm 31 July 193, 217 or 222? Plate IV

9.55: πολληντατι δια πολιονες. Τεπτυνεως ίχνους ερημοφυλακιας. Θωνης ευξαγων
χασιαν κανονα πελοκην δονους
δεκα. (ετους) α= Μεξ[ο]ρη
έβδομη μη, ζ
χωριον χαρα(ακτηροσ).

1. τετει[νται] 2. ερημοφυλακιας 4. Ι. κασιωνες 6. Ι. 8. Χαρα

 Paid through the gate of Tebtunis for the tax for the protection of the desert route by Thonis, exporting reeds for basket-weaving (?), ten donkey-loads. Year 1, Mesore seventh, 7th. Without seal.'

3. Θωνης. There is an extra loop at the end of omega, but a reading Θωνης seems less likely, since there is no apparent attempt to make an omicron. Θονις is an Egyptian theophoric name frequently attested in the Oxyrhynchite nome, where the god Thonis, who represented Horus in his aspect as the falcon-god, had a cult attested; see L.3592 3 n., and J. Whitehorne, 'The Pagan Cults of Roman Oxyrhynchus', ANRW II.18.5 (1995) 3083.

3–6. The construction juxtaposing in the accusative the product transported and the animal on whose back the transport takes place is seldom used; see the fourth construction mentioned by B. Boyaval, 'Les formulaires d’import-export (requis de douane)', CE 33 (1978) 348–9 and the formulæ ‘2b)’ and ‘ad 2b)’ of P. Customs pp. 55–6.

4–5. κασιωνες κασιωνπολυκεφαλος. It would be at least as easy, in all four texts, to read κασιωνπολυκεφαλος. Presumably this would have to be taken as a single word formed from κασιωνος + κασιων + μεξονος, with the meaning ‘suitable for twisting into ropes’, the noun to go with it being understood. This might have been the plant in question: Strabo 3.4.9 (see also Eust. II. [ed. van der Valk] p. 293). L. 26 uses the compound κασιωνπολυκεφας to describe the plant he calls ἔπαρτος. But a compound composed of three elements in this way seems too far-fetched to appear in a documentary papyrus. The only alternative, though not wholly satisfactory, would seem to be the one adopted in the texts, namely to divide into two words. For the reading -ος in κασιωνες, cf. the ending of
This too involves supposing a new compound, of which the first element presumably comes from κάνον/κανών, 'basket', or κάνα, 'reed'; the former is attested in the form κάνι in PSI IV 428.42 (iii BC). For comparable compounds cf. κατάρσις, in ΧΧΧΙΒ 2719 (ii), and κατάστασις in SB XIV 11978.48 (c.187), referring to basket-makers' shops. κανονικάς is quoted by Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, from Ephr. 2.176, also with the meaning of 'basket-maker'.

Whatever solution is adopted, the ending of the word is puzzling. In 4741 it ends -πλοκίκης, in 4743 και πλοκίκω, and in 4742 the ending has apparently not been supplied. None suggests any straightforward grammatical construction.

8 On the notation χιλιοι χαρακτήρος at the end of customs receipts, see P. Customs pp. 8 and 14.

### 4742. Customs-House Receipt

[τετ]ελ(όνηται) διὰ πύλ(ης) Τεπτύνεως

[p] καὶ νῦ Θώνις

εξέγονος εξόνοις

κανονικάς

[έτους] α = Μεσορή

ἐβδομή, ζη

χο(ρικ) χαρ(ακτήρος).

1 [τετ]ελ 3 πυ 3 1 εξόνοις 6 L 8 κα? χαρ

'Paid through the gate of Tebtunis for the 1% + 2% tax by Thonis, exporting reeds for basket-weaving (?), ten donkey-loads. Year 1, Mesore seventh, 7th. Without seal. '

2 [p] καὶ νῦ. For the different markers possible after ρ and ν, see P. Customs p. 23 n. 41.

4 The expansion of the unmarked abbreviation is uncertain, the other three texts of this group offering -κήν and apparently -κών. Note that the sequence κ κ is oddly written; cf. 4741 4–5 n.

### 4743. Customs-House Receipt

τετελ(όνηται) διὰ πύλ(ης) Τεπτύνεως

εξέγονος εξόνοις ερη(μοφυλακίας)

Θώνις

κανονικών ἐνοὺς

5 πλοκίκων ἐνοὺς
184  

\[ \text{dēka. (ἐτους) a= Mecopol.} \]
\[ \rho[\gamma] : εὐατη, \theta^{\text{ο}}. \]
\[ [ χω(πίς) ] χα[ρ](ακτηρος). \]

1 τετελε \( πυ \) 2 επη 4 1. σχοινους 6 Λ 8 χα[ρ] \( \text{f} \)

'Paid through the gate of Tebtunis for the tax for the protection of the desert route by Thonis, exporting reeds for basket-weaving (?), ten donkey-loads. Year 1, Mesore ninth, 9th. Without seal.'

**4744. Customs-House Receipt**

96/20(d)  3.7 \( \times \) 4.1 cm  2 August 193, 217 or 222?

\[ \text{Paid through the gate of Tebtunis for the } 1\% + 2\% \text{ tax by Thonis, exporting reeds for basket-weaving (?), ten donkey-loads. Year 1, Mesore ninth, 9th. Without seal.'} \]

**4745. Lease of Land**

314B.13/J(1-2)a  6.5 \( \times \) 31.5 cm  29 September/17 October 202

This is a lease of a single arura situated near Seryphis for a two-year period, with the usual provision for crop-rotation. It is complete, except for some damage in lines 10–13. It is almost certain that the subscription is written in the same hand as the body of the contract. It is the fast, practised cursive of a professional scribe. The back is blank.

The lease is in the subjective 'private protocol' format, which was standard in Oxyrhynchite leases at this period; on it see Herrmann, *Studien zur Bodenpacht* 12, 22–3; H. J. Wolff, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* ii (München 1978) 122–7. None of the various clauses in 4745 differs significantly from the norm for leases from the Oxyrhynchite. The lessors may already be known: see 1 n. The rental is high: see 13–15 n. and 16–18 n.
έμίσθωσαν Πλούτιων Πλού-
tίων καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάν-
tες ἀπὸ Ὅξυρύγχων πόλεως
Ἀπολιναρίῳ Πλούτωνένθυσαν
καὶ Γαύω Παῆςικος ἀμφοτέρους
ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως εἰς έτη
δύο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνετῶτος Ια (έτους)
ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς
περὶ Σέρυφων ἐκ τοῦ Ἀμμωνᾶ
κλήρου ἄρουραν μίαν ὦ[ε]τε
τοὺς μεμισθωμένους τ[ῷ] μὲν
ἐνεστώτι Ια (έτει) ξυλαφ[η]σαι
χλωροῖς φόρον ἀποτάκτ[ου]
ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν ἔξηκον-
tα τετὰράριον, τῷ δὲ ιειόντι
ιβ(έτει) σπείραι πυρῶν ἐκφορίων
ἀποτάκτου πυρῶν ἀρταβῶν [οκτ]
ὅκτω ἀκίνδυνα πάντα
παντὸς κινδύνου, τῶν τῆς
γῆς κατ’ έτος δημοσίων ὄν-
tων πρὸς τοὺς μεμισθωκό-
tας οὐκ οἱ καὶ κυριεύσως τῶν
καρπῶν ἐως τὰ κατ’ έτος
ὀφειλόμενα κομίσωμεν.
εάν δὲ τις τῷ ιειόντι έτει
ἀβροχος γένηται παραδε-
χήσεται τοῖς μεμισθωμένοις.
βεβαιομένης δὲ τῆς μι-
cθώμενος ἀποδότωσαν οἱ μεμι-
cθωμένοι τοῖς μεμισθωκόις
tὰ κατ’ έτος ὀφειλόμενα μη-
νὶ Παῦνι τῶν δὲ πυρῶν τοῦ ιειόν-
tος ιβ (έτους) ἐφ’ ἄλω Σέρυφεως
{πυρῶν} νεόν καθαρόν ἁδο-
λον ἄβιωλον ἀκρίβων κεκοκκι-
Plution, son of Plution and his siblings, all from the city of Oxyrhynchus, leased to Apolinarius son of Ploutogenes and to Gaius son of Paesis, both from the same city, for two years from the present 11th year, from their possessions in the area of Seryphis from the allotment of Ammonas, one arura, for the lessees to plant with green crops in the present 11th year at a fixed rent of sixty-four silver drachmas, and to sow with wheat in the coming 12th year at a fixed rent of eight artabas of wheat, all free from any risk. The annual public taxes on the land are the responsibility of the lessors, who will also retain control of the crops until they receive the amounts owed each
year. If any land should be uninundated in the coming year, allowance will be made to the lessees. The lease being confirmed, the lessees are to pay the lessors the annual dues in the month of Payni, and the wheat for the coming 12th year at the threshing-floor of Seryphis, it being new, pure, unadulterated, free from earth, free from barley, sieved, as though being measured into the public granary, by the four-choenix receiving measure of Capparas, confirmed, the lessees are to pay the lessors the annual dues in the month of Payni, and the wheat for the coming stius, Phaophi 20(?).

We, Apolinarius son of Plutogenes and Gaius son of Paesis, have taken the land on lease on our mutual guarantee as aforesaid. I, Pasion son of Paesis alias Isidorus, wrote on their behalf as they do not know letters.'

1. Πλουτίνων Πλούτινων. He may well be the same person as the Πλουτίνων Πλούτινων τοι Πλούτινων μητράδος Ταφῶντος who submits a census return, XII 1548, in this same year (202/3). This Plution records the ownership jointly with his unnamed siblings of two female slaves. Another Plution from Oxyrhynchus, also son and grandson of Plution but with a different mother (Thaesis), is attested in P. Mil. II 51 (2nd cent.).

9 τηρεί Σερφων. A well-known village in the Western toparchy: see Pruneti, I centi abitati 171–3; LV 3795 13 n. According to Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 18, it was the largest village in the nome. Other land-leases from Seryphis are PSI X 1097 (54/3 bC), IX 1029 (52/3), VII 739 (163), P. Harr. I 137 (II) and 4747 (296).

9–10 εκ τοῦ Ἀθηναίων κλήρου. Otherwise attested only in XIV 1743 5; see P. Pruneti, Augustus 55 (1975) 168.

Its location near Seryphis is new information.

13–15 A rent of 64 drachmas for a single arura is exceptionally high (see Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 250 (fig. 5); Drexhage, Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne 172–3), exceeding even the 60 drachmas found in P. Fouad 43 (190) and BGU XIII 2340 (early III), both Oxyrhynchite; see also L 3589 5–9 n.

16–18 The rental in wheat, at 8 artabas for a single arura, though on the high side, is within the attested range (Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 249 (fig. 4), 250 n. 134).

22 εὸς καὶ κυρείσσων. The standard phrase in Oxyrhynchite leases is ἐὸς καὶ κυρείσσων, which is probably what the writer intended here. The alternative would be to correct to ἐς καὶ κυρείσσων; cf. P. Köln III 149. 20–1 ἐς καὶ κυρείσσων (Oxy.; early III), and see the editor’s note.

29 ff. For the contrast in the payment clause between τὰ δῆλομένα (= dues in both cash and kind) and τῶν πυραχάοι, see especially L 3592 25 ff. and P. Wisc. I 7.29 ff. (= P. Choix 21). These parallels make it clear that the repetition of πυράχαοι in line 34 is simply a mistake.

37–8 περακενηχητα. For the insertion of the nasal, cf. XLIX 3488 47–8, μετρῷ περακενηχητα, and XLIV 3163 21–2, κυνεγέτως ὀλετὼ; see F. T. Gignac, Grammar i 118.

37–9 It is usual for a reference to the lessor or for his name to occur at this point. In 4739 22–3, however, we have μέτρῳ ἡμιαρτιβάοι διογένους Ἀδελφάδον ἀπό Πέλα, which, as here, specifies repayment by the measure of a person who has not previously been named in the text. XXXIII 2676 31–3, for example, is similar; cf. also XLIX 3489 32, with the editor’s note. Generally on the specifying of particular measures see Herrmann, Studien zur Bodenpacht 13–21.

39 Καππάρατος. The name may have occurred in P. Leipz. 11.8 Διάδομος Καππάρατος; cf. also the name Καππάρινος Καππάρινος, in e.g. P. Corn. 30 a.1, P. Köln II 122.6, P. Mich. IV 224.3252, 225.2742, 359 F 2 (perhaps not necessarily always a proper name: see P. J. Sijpesteijn, BASP 28 (1994) 66).

40–1 τῶν παρὰ τῶν μεμιαντότων, ἐντούτωμεν μετροῖν. The same phrase occurs in P. Fouad 43.50–1 and PSI V 168.26–7; cf. also XXII 2351 49–50, PSI VI 702.5–6 (all Oxyrhynchite) and Herrmann, Studien zur Bodenpacht 103–5, Hennig, Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht 15–21.

53 Κεβίατοι. The writer certainly intended to delete the whole of this word but has failed to do so.

54 Φανοί. It is also possible to read Φανοί β.

59 Α Πέρατος καὶ Κεβίατοι occurs in the Oxyrhynchite P. Oslo III 114, but the text is assigned to the first/second centuries by the editors.

†D. MONTSERRAT
4746. Sale of a Donkey

Although only the close of the subscription of the original document, a sale of a female donkey, has survived, the text is nonetheless of interest for the occurrence of an *eques imaginifer* of the *ala Apriana Philippianorum*. This cavalry regiment is well attested in the papyri, but its description as *Φιλιππιανοὺς* in honour of the emperor Philip the Arab and his young son and co-emperor Philip, is new. Some twenty years later we find the same unit named after the emperor Claudius II Gothicus: *εἰδὴς Ἀπριανῆς Κλαυδιανῆς* (SPP XX 71.2, of 269/70).


The back is blank.

---

πέπηρον [ακόμη] ὅν ὑπήρχε σύνην καὶ ἀπεξεῖ ήρξε τὴν τις μην καὶ βεβαιώσω ἑώς πρόκειται καὶ ἐπερωτήσεις ἥμαλλης.

Τιτός Αιλίου Ἀμμον ἔχει έκατερον ἐν τῷ ἐμπορεύμα καὶ ἔναν ἐπικράτειον καὶ ὅπως αὐτὸν ἔπεσεν ἀντίον

και τις ἐπὶ τὸ δομεῖον οἰκήματα.

---

4 προ[
7 ᾧ ὡμα[[1] ἵνα ἄγινησθή
8 ἄνῃ]
10 [ἔγραφα] ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ
11 εἰστὶ; ἕντος  γρφ

I have sold the donkey and received the price and shall guarantee it as aforesaid, and in reply to the formal question I consented.

'Titus Aelius Ammon, *eques imaginifer* of the *ala Apriana Philippianorum*, wrote on his behalf . . . for he does not know letters.'

6 A Titus Aelius Ammon has not been recorded previously.

The fact that the subscriber is a cavalryman might suggest that the buyer of the donkey was another soldier; cf. the third-century P. Lond. III 1128 (ed. N. Litinas, ZPE 124 (1996) 195–8), in which the buyer is a soldier of the legio III Augusta.


9 Φιλαππιανη. See introd. The plural shows that the object of the name of the ala was to do honour to both Philippi, father and son; cf. SB I 5467-17, νυ (έτοις) β Φιλαππιανη. Another Egyptian military unit renamed in honour of the same emperor(s) was the legio II Traiana Fortis; see P. Rain.Cent. 69.7–8 (258) λεγοντος δε[ν]τέρις Τριανης Γερμανικης Ιχνορους Φιλαππιανης (but Φιλαππιανης may also be considered). In XLIII 3111 6 (257) the same legion is called Θεωλερν(α)ων και Γαλλερν(α)ων may now be paralleled by Φιλαππιανηων. Other cavalry units named after Philip include the ala nova firma cataphractaria Philippiana, created in Philip's reign (see M. P. Speidel, 'The Roman Army in Arabia', ANRW II.8 (1977) 702–5 = Roman Army Studies i (1984) 244–7), and the ala Celerum Philippiana (see Speidel, Tyche 7 (1992) 217–20). Cf. also the various cohortes praetoriae Philippianae, attested in CIL XVI 149, 151, 153, and in (the Greek) ΙΚ Ephesos 737, a honorary inscription for a tribune of the 10th cohort Φιλαππιανης. On regimental dynastic titles, see generally J. Fitz, Honorary Titles of Roman Military Units in the 3rd Century (1983); for the papyrological attestations, see F. Mitthof, CPR XXIII p. 76 n. 3.

It should perhaps be specified that the date range of the text is defined by the elevation of Philip Junior to the rank of Caesar, and the earliest Egyptian dating to the emperor Decius.

11 At the start of the line it is tempting to restore παρόντος, even if the formulation έγραφα άνω παρόντος has not otherwise occurred before the fourth century.

N. GONIS

4747. LEASE OF LAND

44 5.62/C(7–8)a

Like 4745, this papyrus relates to land near Seryphis. It records the renewal of a lease of 6 ½ aruras for a period of two years. Each year one half of the plot is to be sown with wheat and the other half with fodder crops, the rent for the whole plot being paid in wheat. The lease is written in the 'private protocol' format (see 4745 introd.), but is noticeable for the way the text vacillates from line 9 onwards between the normal, objective style and the subjective style used in the epidoche format; cf. e.g. XLV 3259–60. There are also several small errors in the drafting: see 11 n., 14, 16 n. The lease omits the ἀβροχος-clause, as is normal by this date (Herrmann, Studien zur Bodenpacht 162; the latest example in Rowlandson's list is XIV 1689 of 266).

The papyrus is complete and the back is blank. The pattern of the worm holes suggests that the papyrus was rolled up from the right and stored as a small roll; cf. the introductions to L 3560, 3591–2.

έπι υπάτων τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Διοκλητιανῶν
Σεβαστοῦ τὸ Σ καὶ Κωνσταντίου Καίσαρος τὸ β’.

ἐμείσθομεν Αὐρηλία Ἀμμωνίλλα Διονυσίου τοῦ Διονυ¬
cίου γυμνασιαρχής[α]ντος γενομένου βουλευτοῦ τῆς

λαμ(πράς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης) Ὥξυρυγχειτῶν πόλεως Αὐρηλίως

N. GONIS
DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

Παύς Ηρακλάτος μητρός τοις Ταμαμίτος ἀπό κόμης Κερ-
κυθέως ἐπὶ χρόνον ἐτη δύο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔνεστώτος
ἰν (ἐτοις) καὶ ἱβ (ἐτοις) καὶ ἓ (ἐτοις) τὰς προμετρο-
μένας ύπὸ ἐμὸν ἁροῦρας ἐξ ὑμοῦ ἀκμὴν ἀκμήν ὡς
tu  ἐπὶ 
τὸς ἑρμῆ τῆς ἑρμenance

Under the consuls our lords Diocletianus Augustus for the 6th time and Constantius Caesar for the 2nd time.

Aurelia Ammonilla, daughter of Dionysius son of Dionysius, ex-gymnasiarch and former councillor of the illustrious and most illustrious city of the Oxyrhynchites, leased to Aurelius Paesis son of Heraclis, mother Taamois, from the village of Cercethys, for a period of two years from the present 13th and 12th and 5th year, the six and one-eighth aruras belonging to her near Seryphis which were previously cultivated by me, to sow and to plant annually with wheat (and) fodder crops half and half at a fixed annual rent in wheat of twenty artabas, free from all risk, the taxes on the land being the responsibility of you the landowner, retaining control of the crops until you recover the amounts owed. The lease being confirmed, the lessee is to pay the annual fixed rent in the month Payni at the threshing-floor of the village, in new, pure, unadulterated wheat, free from earth, free from
barley, sieved, by the collecting measure of you the landowner, with two choenices added to each artaba, the right of execution lying against the lessee, and so on. The lease is binding, concerning which the parties put the formal question to each other and gave assent to each other. Year 13 and 12 of our lords Diocletian and Maximian Augusti and year 5 of our lords Constantius and Maximian most noble Caesars Augusti, Phaophi 29.

(2nd hand) I, Aurelius Paesis, have taken the land on lease and I shall pay the rent in cash and in kind as aforesaid and on being asked the formal question I gave my assent. I, Aurelius Sarapammon, wrote on his behalf as he is illiterate.

1–2 On the consuls, see CLRE 126–7 and CSBE 173.
3 Ἀθηνία Ἀμμοειδῆ. There is no particular reason to identify her with the Ammonilla attested in XIV 1714 (285–304). For women as landowners in the Oxyrhynchite, see Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 112–15, 263–4, 284.
3–5 Several persons by the name of Dionysius are known to have been gymnasiarchs in third-century Oxyrhynchus—see P. J. Sijpsteijn, Nouvelle liste des gymnasiarques (Zutphen 1986)—but all have aliases and there are no good grounds for identifying any of them with the man in 4747. A βολευτής of this name is attested in XLIV 3171 9 (225 or later; see BL VIII 266). Our man was presumably dead by the date of 4747; see K. A. Worl, ΖPE 30 (1978) 239–44, on γενέμικον βολευτής.
6–7 Cercethrys is a neighbouring village to Seryphus (8) in the Western toparchy; see Pruneti, I centri abitati 79–80; Krüger, Oxyrhynchus in der Kaiserzeit 274; Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 12.
8 πρὸ τῆς Ξσιρίσιας. See 4745 9 n.
9 On renewal of leases, see Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 254.
9 ff. On the switch to the subjective format, see the introd.
10 ἐκφοράς κατ' ἐκτός ἀποτάκτου. Although the plural ἐκφοράς is not infrequently used (as here in line 28), there is no example of ἐκφοραί ἀποτάκτων; presumably the writer intended the normal ἐκφοραί ἀποτάκτων.
11–12 On all-in wheat rent when the land was subject to crop rotation, see Hennig, Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht 4 with 102 n. 6; Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 40–3. On the amount of rent, see 19–20 n.
13–14 κυριεύεινες εἰς. The same haplography in LXI 4121 14–15; cf. also LXVII 4595 25 n.
16 From the fourth century it is common for rent in kind to be called φόρος, and there are some earlier examples (Herrmann, Studien zur Bodenpacht 99–100; Hennig, Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht 102 n. 1); cf. below, 28 n. However, a number of Oxyrhynchite leases use ἐκφοραί ἀποτάκτων πωροῦ to describe the rent, but go on to state that payment is to be made of τὸ ἀπότακτον, e.g. PSI VII 739, P. Palau Rib. 7. It is probable that that is what was intended here and that we should delete φόρον rather than correct τὸ to τῶν.
19–20 προσμετροτρωένων ἐκάστη ἄρταβθι χινικῶν δῶ. This phrase is unusual and is only found in three other leases, all Oxyrhynchite: SB VIII 9199.10, προσμετροτρωέων ἐκάστη ἄρταβθι—not ἐκάστης ἄρταβθις—χινικῶν ἔτσι (τοῦ), which in this text is added as an after thought after the κυρία- clause: 4753 25–5, which also has an amount of 4 choenices; and XLVII 3354 42–3, where, after μέτρῳ παραλημμετρῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ γεωλού, we have a slightly fuller phrase in the active, τῶν ἐπὶ μετροτρωών καὶ προσμετροτρώων ἐκάστη ἄρταβθι χινικῶς ὄν. Also relevant is a loan of cereals from the Oxyrhynchite, P. Strasb. VI 538.6–9, where the phrase προσμετροτρῳ[ν]ώτης μοι (τοῦ) ἐκάστη ἄρταβθι ἀπὸ διὰ[φόρον] [ἐκάστη ἄρταβθι] τοῦ γεωλού διὰ[φόρον] τριτόν is added. In this case the addition is explicitly stated to be the equivalent of interest on the loan. The extra payment in the leases should be expressed in this way, and not simply added to the rent due, is unclear. It presumably has nothing to do with the surtax on taxes in kind, often called τὸ προσμετροτρώμενα (see S. L. Wallace, Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian (1936) 30–41; G. M. Parăscogolou, Stud. Pap. 14 (1975) 92–3). The additional amount in 4747 is ¼th, if we assume the usual artaba of 40 choenices, making the annual rent in effect 21 rather than 20 artabas. Such an amount for 6½ surtax is on the low side but within the attested range; see Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 249 (ft. 4).
21 ὁκαθήμερα. In effect this means καὶ τὸ λοιπόν; see XXXI 2585 18–19 with notes; also Herrmann, Studien zur Bodenpacht 150 (where correct γεωμέτρης to γεωμέτρης), but note that this expression is now attested as early as AD 243 (L. 3595 40).
The same Aurelius Sarapammon wrote for an illiterate in SB VIII 9833.17–24 (299), as is clear from the plate in the original publication as P. Corn. 45. In SB 9833.25–4 the reading given is ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν [παράδειγμα] ἀμάτων 1. ἄραμμαμάτων; this would be an early example of the phrase, not found elsewhere before the mid 4th century and in any case rare at Oxyrhynchus. 4747 suggests that a better reading would be ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν [μὴ εἰδέ] τῶν γράμματων (Traianos Gagos, who has been kind enough to check the original, thinks this a more probable reading; he adds that in αὐτῶν omega is corrected from omicron); but there is a clear ων after this. Did the writer begin to write ὁτ' αὐτῶν ἄραμμαμάτων? There is no sign of deletion.

28 τὸν φόρον καὶ τὰ ἐξήφρα. The most probable explanation is that Sarapammon automatically wrote the standard subscription without referring to the actual provisions of the text, where there is no rent in cash (φόρος); cf. 16 n.

+D. MONTSERRAT

4748. Sale of a Donkey

32 4B.4/A(1–2)a

In a contract of χείρογραφον-form Aurelius Ophelius, from the village Isieion Kato in the Oxyrhynchite nome, acknowledges that he has sold a young donkey to Aurelius Theodorus, from Oxyrhynchus, for 5 talents 1000 drachmas. The donkey is described as male in the body of the contract, but as female in Ophelius' subscription.

4748, together with 4750 (307) and 4752 (311), and probably 4749 (307), forms part of a group of sales made to persons from Oxyrhynchus at the market in the Upper Cynopolite nome. Documents in this category already published are P. Berl. Leihg. I 21 (309), P. Corn. 13 (311; see BL VI 31), and XIV 1708 (311). All these texts fall within a very short time-span, and all have very similar formulas, especially for the ἄραμμαμάτως-clause. The buyer in 4748, Aurelius Theodorus, is known in the same capacity from four other texts of the group (P. Berl. Leihg. I 21, 1708, 4749, 4752), and must either have operated a business using donkeys or have been a dealer.

The script is a rapid cursive where individual letters cannot always be defined. The back is blank.

ἐπὶ υπάτων τῶν κυρίων ἦμων Σευρόν Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Μαζιμίνου τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου Κ[αί]σαρος.
Αὐρήλιος Ὁφέλεις Παύλου μη(τρός) Τικαίητος ἀπὸ κόμης Εἰκίου Κάτου τοῦ Ὀξυρυγχείτου νομοῦ Αὐρηλίῳ Θεοδόρῳ Ἀρ[πόκρα]τίων ἀπὸ τῆς Ὀξυρυγχείτων [πόλεως χαίρειν]. ὀμολογῶ πεπρακέναι [καὶ παραδησεθείναι σοι ἐπ'] ἄγορᾶς τοῦ Ἀνω [Κυνόπ(ολίτου)] ὄνομ ἀρρεναν ἅβολον λευκόχρω[μον, τιμήσ] τῆς προὸς ἄλληλοις εὐμετεφ[ωνη]
SALE OF A DONKEY

Under the consuls our lords Severus Augustus and Maximinus the most noble Caesar.

Aurelius Ophelius, son of Paulus, mother Tisals, from the village Isieion Kato of the Oxyrhynchite nome, to Aurelius Theodoras, son of Harpocration, from the city of the Oxyrhynchites, greetings. I acknowledge that I have sold and given over to you in the market-place of the Upper Cynopolite a white-coloured male donkey, which has not yet shed its first teeth, at the price agreed with each other of 5 talents and 1000 drachmas of silver of the coinage of the Augusti, which I have received from you on the spot in full from hand to hand, the guarantee in every respect being incumbent on me, the seller, for ever and against anyone taking legal action and in answer to the question I gave my assent (?). The sale is enforceable.

(Year) 15 and (year) 3 and (year) 1 of our lords Maximianus and Severus Augusti and Maximinus and Con-
stantinus the most noble Caesars, Mecheir 18.' (2nd hand) 'I, Aurelius Ophelius, have sold the (female) donkey and I have received the price in full as aforesaid. I, Aurelius Heracles, son of . . . , wrote on his behalf as he is illiterate.'

1-2 On the consuls, see GLRE 142-9 and GSBE2 175.

3 Ticâidôc. The central element is the name of the god Shaf, which, according to J. Quaegebeur, 'Subatianus Aquila, épistreège de la Thébaïde (P. Oxy. XXXIV, 2708)', CE 87 (1969) 130, and Le Dieu égyptien Shai dans la religion et l'onomastique (1973), is spelled shai in the Fayûm and shoi in Middle Egypt. In our case the form used is Ticaic, not Ticàidôc as we would expect.

4-5 ἀπὸ κόμης Εἰσίου Κάτω (l. Κάτω). On this village, see now F. Morelli, CPR XXII 3.5 n., with references. It was located in the Κάτω Τοπαρχία of the Oxyrhynchite nome. The adverb κόμη in the name of the
village is not an indication of the toparchy (see G. M. Parassoglou, ‘Sitologoi Documents’, Stud. Pap. 12 (1973) 87), since the village Ιτικίον "Ανοι was situated in the same toparchy. It would have been a small place: in X 1285 39 and 133, the payments of 20 and 18 drachmas levied upon Ιτικίον Κάτω are lower than those of all other villages recorded in this third-century tax list. In XII 1529 5 the payment of grain from this village appears to be relatively high, but the papyrus is too fragmentary for any reliable conclusion to be drawn.

Κάτων. The same form in XVI 1917 97 and elsewhere. For the interchange of ου and οι, see Gignac, Grammar i 210, with an example with ίνης for ήνης in P. Tebt. II 417:20 (III).

5-6 Αδρίαθεν Θανάθων Αρ[ηποκράτιος]ιώνος ἀπό τῆς Οὐχοραγχείων [πέλεκου]. For this person, see introd. In P. Berl. Leihg. I 21.4 (398), another donkey sale transacted at the same market, he is referred to as ἀπό τοῦ Οὐχοραγχείου νομοῦ. That text, however, is said to have been found at Hermopolis, and the seller was a Hermopolite who retained the contract; contrast 4749 and 4752.


"Ανοι [Κουσσί(ολίτου)]. The definition "Ανοι is used as a distinction from the Cynopolite nome in the Delta; see XIV 1708 introd. and XLVII 3345 50 n.

9 δνοῦ ἄρνεαν. Here the donkey is said to be male, but in the subscription (22) we find τῇν ἄρνην. For the ending -αν see Gignac, Grammar ii 45-6.

άξιον. On this term see the commentary to CPR VI 2.

12 The statement of the price in words has been left out, requiring us to understand the talent- and drachma-symbols as genitive. The same occurs in P. Berl. Leihg. I 21 (another donkey sale with the same buyer, from two years later; the hand is not the same). In 4751 below it is the price in figures that is not given.

16 Ζ[περομφηθείας]. The stark abbreviation is unexpected, but almost as abrupt an abbreviation occurs in 4752 18. If the version here is rightly interpreted, then presumably ύμωλογής was also abbreviated; there would be room for ὁμόλογος. Cf. also 4750 19.

17 The κυρία-clause would be expected to precede the ἐπερομφηθείας ύμωλογης-clause (see above), as it does for example in most of the others of this group of donkey sales, i.e. 4750, 4752, P. Corn. 13, and 1708, and also in 4751. The words κυρία καὶ πράσις at first seem oddly spaced and aligned relative to the line preceding, but the writer has simply wished to avoid an awkward gap on the papyrus surface resulting from the strip construction. Similar avoidance is obvious in the subscription at 24.

22 τῆν ἄρνην. See above, 9 n.

N. LITINAS

4749. Top of Document (Sale of a Donkey?)

28 4B.60/C(4-5)b 17.9 x 6.6 cm 12 February 307

The top of a document, conceivably a donkey sale: it features Aurelius Theodorus, son of Harpocration, attested as a buyer of donkeys (and a colt) in 1708, 4748, 4752, and P. Berl. Leihg. I 21; see 4748 introd. This is also suggested by the archaeological context: the papyrus was found in the fourth excavation season at Oxyrhynchus (1904/5), which also yielded 4748 and 4752 (and just possibly 1708; see the preface to vol. XIV).

The back is blank so far as it is preserved.

ἐπὶ ὑπάτων τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Κεσηρίου Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Μαξιμίου ἐπιφανεστάτου Καίσαρος.
4749. **TOP OF DOCUMENT (SALE OF A DONKEY?)**

**Aυρήλιος Σεούρηρος Οθαλερίων οὐδετρανός καταγενόμενος ἐν τῇ λαμ(προτάτῃ ?) μεγάλῃ Ἕρμου πόλει. Αὐρήλιος Θεοδώρῳ Ἀρποκρατίωνος ἀπὸ τῆς Ὀξυρυγχιῶν πόλεως . . .**

3 l. καταγε- 4 λαμά

'Under the consuls our lords Severus Augustus and Maximinus the most noble Caesar.

'Aurelius Severus, son of Valerius, residing in the most (?) splendid great Hermopolis, to Aurelius Theodorus, son of Harpocration, from the city of the Oxyrhynchites . . .'

3 Aυρήλιος Σεούρηρος Οθαλερίων. This person does not seem to be known otherwise.

It is interesting that the scribe wrote Σεούρηρος; contrast the spelling of the emperor's/consul's name, written Cεοῦρηρος in 1 and in most consular formulas of 307.


4 ἐν τῇ λαμπροτάτῃ μεγάλῃ Ἕρμου πόλει. This sequence of epithets of Hermopolis appears to be new, unless P. Vind. Sijth. 11,5 (453) does have 'laμπροτάτης μεγάλης' (cf. BL X 113); P. Cair. Mas. II 67164.2 (569) [λαμπρα]ς και μεγάλης is too isolated; μεγάλη και λαμπροτάτη is relatively common. See generally N. Liémas, 'Hermou polis of the Thebais', *APF* 41/1 (1995) 76–84.

N. GONIS

---

4750. **SALE OF A DONKEY**

**28 4B 62/B (5–7) a**

**10 x 21 cm**

In a contract of χειρόγραφον-form, complete except at the foot, Aurelius Isidorus from Euergetis in the Upper Cynopolite nome acknowledges that he has sold to Aurelius Heraclammon, from Oxyrhynchus, a male donkey for 5 talents 4000 drachmas and has received the total sum.

The back is blank.

ἐπὶ υπάτων τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν

Σεούρηρος Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Μαξιμίλου Καίσαρος.

Αὐρήλιος Ἰσιδωρος 'Ἀνοβίων(ος) μη(τρός) Πλουσίας

ἀπὸ πόλεως Ἐνεργέτηδος τοῦ Ἀρν Κυν(οπολίτου)

5 Αὐρηλίῳ Ἡρακλάμμωνος Διδυμίωνος

ἀπὸ τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὀξυρυγχηεῖτων πόλεως χαίρειν. όμολογοῦ πεπρακέναι καὶ παραδεδωκέναι κοι ἐπὶ ἀγορᾶς

Plate XV
of the coinage of the Augusti, total 5 talents 4000 drachmas, which I received from you on the spot in full from hand to hand, the guarantee with regard to every other guarantee being incumbent on me, the seller, for ever and against anyone taking legal action. The sale, written in a single copy and free of mistakes, is enforceable and in answer to the question I gave my assent.

'Year 15 and year 3 and year 1 of our lords Maximianus and Severus Augusti and Maximinus and Constantinus the most noble Caesars, (month and day).

(2nd hand) 'I, Aurelius Isidorus, have sold the donkey . . .'

1-2 The consular formula fixes the text somewhere in 307, excluding an uncertain portion at the end of the year when Severus was dropped from the formula. The regnal-year figures are lost at 20. Month and day were given at the foot (22) but are much damaged and remain unread. (δ, α, or λ seem to be the best possibilities for the day, i.e. the 4th, 14th, or 30th.) Without a month to provide a control, 15/3/1 must be the most likely year, thus restricting the date of the text to the first eight months (until 29 August) of the year. This would tally with the analysis by D. Hagedorn and K. A. Worp, 'Von κόμος zu δεσπότης: Eine Bemerkung zur Kaisertitulatur im
SALE OF A DONKEY

We cannot strictly exclude 16/4/2 as the regnal-year figures to be restored in 20, since the earliest attestation of Maximinus as sole consul is LXIII 4355 of 20 November 307; see also the commentary on LXIII 4354, where Severus still features. Severus was probably not dropped from the formula until after 25 July 307 (see 4355 6—7 n.), so that it remains possible that he could have featured in a consular date falling in year 16/4/2. However, while the scanty traces of the month in 4750 22 have not yielded a positive identification, they are probably sufficient to exclude Thoth, Hathyr, and Choiak, and with them any assignment to the regnal year 16/4/2.

2 For the omission of τοῦ ἐπισκοπῆταν, cf. P. Sakaon 64, the only papyrus published so far to add τὸ α'.


8—9 ἐπὶ ἀγοράς τοῦ Ἀνω Κυρείπολιστου. See 4748 8 n.

10—11 οὐλὴν ἐχθρίτης τοῦ δεξίου ποτήρι. The only certain parallel for the use of the phrase οὐλὴν ἐχθρίτης regarding a donkey would appear to be P. Lond. Ill 1128 (ed. £PE 124 (1999) 195—8), where lines 6—7 read ἐχθρίτης οὐλὴς ἐπὶ τῶν η.; there (p. 197, 6—7 n.) it is suggested that the phrase also occurs in P. Coll. X 264.7—8. See further 4751 6 n.

That this detail was not a usual one is suggested by the fact that the scribe began to write, after the basic description of the donkey, the word Τιπὲντε, i.e. the phrase that appears in the next line. (He began Τιπ, [and more, erased?], stopped, left a space, moved down a line and began Τιπὲντε again; then οὐλὴν κτῆς was inserted into the space. The scribe did not erase the already written Τιπ, but overwrote it with οὐλὴ.)

19 καθαρά. Cf. 4752 18, and P. Oslo II 33-21. Presumably it represents an abbreviated form of καθαρὰ ἄπο ἀλέας καὶ ἐτοπορημένη κατὰ σίμαν. (e.g. P. Lips. 10 ii 3), 'a clean copy'.

20—2 For the restoration of the regnal-year numbers in 20 and for the importance of the traces of the month in 22, see above, 1—2 n.

N. LITINAS

SALE OF A DONKEY

In a contract of χειρόγραφον-type, which has lost a large rectangular section from its upper right but is otherwise well preserved, Aurelius Bassus, possibly from Syria (see 2 n.), acknowledges that he has sold a male donkey for eight talents and has received the total sum. The name of the buyer is lost with the upper right section.

The main hand is a stylish upright practised professional script of official type; beta is very tall, extending both above and below the line. The consular date (16—17) is in a much smaller rapid sloping hand. The spelling in the crudely-written subscription (18—25) is extraordinary, with omicron extensively substituted for alpha (e.g. τόλοντα for τάλαντα, 20—1). A manufacturer's three-layer kollesis runs down the line beginnings, around three letters in. The back is blank.

Aὐρήλιος Βάκκος

Phoinikē
Aurelius Bassus, son of ..., from ... of the province of Phoenice(?), to ... from ... I acknowledge that I have sold to you ... a male (donkey) ... at the price agreed between us of eight talents of silver of the coinage of the Augusti, which I received from you on the spot in full from hand to hand, concerning which sum I was asked the question by you and gave my assent, and that I shall guarantee to you the same donkey with every guarantee and I shall necessarily oppose anyone taking legal action or making a claim concerning the same donkey or a share of it immediately at my own expense, as one does when bringing a legal action. The sale, written in a single copy, is enforceable and in answer to the question I gave my assent.

(2nd hand) In the consulship of Tatius Andronicus and Pompeius Probus, viri clarissimi, praefecti, in the month of June, Payni 21.
SALE OF A DONKEY

I, Aurelius Bassus, have sold the aforementioned donkey and I received the price of eight talents of silver and I shall guarantee as aforesaid and in answer to the question I gave my assent. I, Aurelius Athenodorus, wrote on his behalf as he does not know letters.

At this point we might expect the origin of the seller to be specified, and it is tempting to see here a reference to the province of Phoenice.

The sales in 4748, 4750, and 4752 took place in the market of the Upper Cynopolite nome. That seems unlikely here because the formula from to on is quite different.

In these lines we expect the description of the donkey. The gender (male) is stated at the beginning of 5; the age and the colour should have followed.

This occurs as part of the description of a donkey in P. Col. X 264.7-8, as corrected in ZPE 124 (1999) 137: δεν θέλων λυκόκχυρων οὐλήν έχων [l. έχουσα] εἰς τό έπροεδρέαν τον έπροεδρέαν is not temporal but indicates the part of the animal where the scar was to be found. No doubt we should look for a comparable expression in the present papyrus.

This might be the end of παρεληρήσας followed by the τούτων τοιούτων ἀναπόρρητον και ἀνεπιλημμένον clause, which does not appear later in this document. The text might have run as follows:

\[\text{δυ ἐντεῦθεν παρεληρής-}\]

\[\text{παρέση τούτων τοιούτων ἀναπόρρητον και ἀνεπιλημμένον} \]

This relative clause appears in contracts concluded in Oxyrhynchus from the third century onwards (only P. Köln VII 329 is from Hermopolis). It is always attested after the statement of the receipt of the price and concludes with the stipulatio ἐπερημηθηκέν τὸν ἀκολούθον.

In these examples after τοῦ τοιούτου ἀναπόρρητον clause seems to have stood in 6-7 above (see 7 n.). For the meaning and the role of this clause, see L. Dorner, Zur Sachmängelhaftung beim graco-ägyptischen Kauf (Diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg 1974) 59–71; A. Kränzlein, 'τούτων τοιούτων ἀναπόρρητον in den Eselverkaufsurkunden aus dem kaiserzeitlichen Ägypten', Grazer Beiträge 12 (1985/6) 225–34; id., 'Probleme Kaiserzeitlicher Tierveräußerungsverträge auf Papyrus', Symposion 19/6 (1989) 325–33, for its use in sales of slaves, see also Z. Borkowski, J. A. Straus, 'P. Colon. Inv. 4781 verso: vente d’une esclave', ZPE 98 (1993) 252 (12-14 n.).


16–17 On the consuls, see CLRE 154–5 and CSBE 176. The usual gentiliciun of the first consul is Tatius, but there are a few examples of Statius.

18 Bácoc. For the spelling, cf. e.g. XXXIV 2727 ; III IV.

19–25 Aurelius Athenodorus, who signed on behalf of Aurelius Bassus, was a βραδίκος γράφων. His text is full of mistakes. Most remarkable is his tendency to write omicrons instead of alphas, especially when the alphas were not part of a diphthong (αι, αυ).

18–19 προκόμησων. For the interchange of v and ει, see Gignac, Grammar i 273.

N. LITINAS

SALE OF A COLT

In this well-preserved contract of χειρόγραφον-type Aurelius Horion, from the Hermopolite nome, acknowledges that he has sold a colt, the species of which is not specified.
DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

(cf. below, 9 n., and P. Mich. IX 552 introd.), to Aurelius Theodoras from Oxyrhynchus (see 4748 introd.) for 9 talents 3000 drachmas and has received the total sum.

It is not clear whether the contract and the date and signature are all written by the same hand. 19 ff. are written more heavily, but a change of style is less obvious. A repair strip was affixed down the right hand side from 9 onwards before the contract was written. There is a docket down the fibres on the back.

Aὐρήλιος[...] Ὀρίων Τυφάννου

μὴ τὸν Μαρίας ἀπὸ ἑποίκιόν Ἡ, λανδρος
τὸν μεγάλον Ἐρμοπολείτου νομοῦ Ἀὐρηλιὼν Θεοδόρῳ Ἀρσεκρατίωνος

ἀπὸ τῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης Ὀξυρυν(ν)-
χειτῶν πόλεως χαῖρεν. ὡμ[ο]νογ ἐμε

πεπρακέναι καὶ παραδεδω[ἐ]ναι καὶ εἴπ’ ἀγοράς τοῦ "Ἀνω Κυνοπολείτου

πώλον ἄβουλον λευκάχρωμον,

τιμῆς τῆς πρός ἀλλήλους εὐνεφωνη-
μένης ἀργυρίο(ν) Σεβαστῶν νομίζματος

ταλάντων ἑνήματα καὶ δρακμῶν

τρισχλείων, γ[ὐ]ναται (τάλαντα) θ (δραχμαί) ΓΙΣ, ὁ κ[αι] αὐτόθει ἀπέκσεχ’(ν)

παρὰ σοῦ ἐκ πλήρους διὰ χειρός, τῆς βεβαιώ-


cεως πρὸς τὴν ἀλλήν πάσαν βεβαιώσιν

ἐξακολουθούσης μοι τῷ πεπρακότι

dιὰ παντός καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ ἐπελευσμένου.

{k} κυρία ἡ πρῶς ἀ(πλή) γρ(αφεία) καθαρά, καὶ ἐπ(εροτηθείς) ὁμολο(γησά). ὑπάτας τῶν δεσποτῶν ἤμων

Μαξιμιανοῦ τὸ τῇ καὶ Μαξιμίλου τὸ β’, Φαμ(ε)νὸθἡ ἦ.

Ἀὐρήλιος Ὀρίων οὐλὴν ἔχον ἐπὶ τὴν

{τὴν} ἀριστερὰν χεῖραν πεπρακα

tὸν πώλον καὶ ἀπέκσεις τὴν τιμήν

πλήρη ὡς π[ρόκειται]. Αὐρ(ήλιος) Εἴξιδω(ρος) ἐγρ(αφα) ὕπερ αὐτοῦ

γρ(άμματα)

Back:

πρ(άςι) πώλου
4752. SALE OF A COLT

Aurelius Horion, son of Tyrannus, mother Maria, from the farmstead of P-landros in the great Hermopolite nome, to Aurelius Theodorus, son of Harpocration, from the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, greetings. I acknowledge that I have sold and given over to you in the market-place of the Upper Cynopolite a white-coloured colt, which has not yet shed its first teeth, at the price agreed with each other of nine talents and three thousand drachmas of silver of the coinage of the Augusti, total 9 talents 3000 drachmas, which I also received from you on the spot in full from hand to hand, the guarantee in every other respect being incumbent on me, the seller, for ever and against anyone taking legal action. The sale, written in a single copy and free of mistakes, is enforceable and in answer to the question I gave my assent.

In the consulship of our masters Maximianus for the 8th time and Maximinus for the 2nd time, Phamenoth 8.

I, Aurelius Horion, having a scar on the left hand, have sold the colt and have received the price in full as aforesaid. I, Aurelius Isidorus(?), have written on his behalf as he does not know letters.

(Back) ‘Sale of a colt.’

1-2 The seller has not been attested elsewhere in papyri.

2 ἀντὶ ἐπωκέων Π. λανδρος. It is possible that the name was a later insertion. The writer might have meant the ἐπώκεων Πάλλαυτος, several times attested in the Hermopolite nome (see M. Drew-Bear, Le nome Hermopolite 189–90), including a form with a single lambda.


8 ἐν’ ἀγορᾶς τοῦ Ἀνω Κυνοπολέων. See 4748 8 n.

9 πόλου. The word can be used of various animals, e.g. donkeys, horses, and camels. Since the purchaser is known from other texts to have bought donkeys in the market in the Upper Cynopolite at this period (see 4748 introd.), a young donkey would seem likely. This is also supported by the price, perhaps on the high side for a donkey that was not adult, but it is much lower than would be expected for a horse or camel at this period.

19-20 On the consulship, see CLRE 156–7 and CSBE 2 176–7. This short formula occurs only here.

After the word ὑπαστάς (19) the writer first wrote Κρατίου 'Α-, denoting the consulship of Status Andronicus and Pompeius Probus, i.e. 310, the year before (see 4751 16–17 n.).

24 Αἰτὶπόλος Ἐξιζιδιοῦκος. This part of the subscription is in an extremely difficult and ambivalent script. While ἔξορος κτλ. do not pose problems, it is hard to be sure of the ductus and abbreviation-point of Αἰτὶπόλος and the individual name that follows.

N. LITINAS

4753. LEASE OF LAND

This lease is in the form of an epidoche, the format characteristic of Oxyrhynchite leases in the fourth century: see Herrmann, Studien zur Bodenpacht 12, 41. It relates to two plots of land near Cercemunis, of four and four and a half aruras respectively, half to be sown with wheat and half with grass (cf. 4747 10–11). It is noteworthy that the rent on the half to be sown with grass is to be paid in barley (see 15–16 n.). For the omission of the
DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

ἀβροχος-clause, see 4747 introd. The lease is for one year only. The land formed part of an estate (23) and the owner, who is at this date still a minor, is known to have later been prytanis at Oxyrhynchus and strategus of the Oxyrhynchite; see below, 3 n.

The document is complete and the back is blank. The hand is an ugly though practised cursive, sometimes difficult to read, and one which uses a variety of letter-forms.

ἄπατειας Ἀ[ντ]ιούνιον Μαρκελλίνου καὶ Πετρωνίου
Προβίνου [τὸν] λαμπροτάτων, Φανόφι κβ.
Γαϊῳ Ἰουλιῶ Λευκαδίῳ νῦν Ἡρακλειανοῦ διὰ
Φλαουνίου Εὐ[ν]εβίου ἀπὸ λογιστῶν κήδαμινος
παρὰ Ἄφρη[λίῳ] [μ] Ὄρου Πανεχώτου καὶ Παπού-
θέως . . . . . . . [. . . .] ος ἄφιστέρων ἀπὸ ἐπισκύνην Παν-
κύλεως. ἐκουσιως ἐπιδέχομαι μεθώσα-
σαί πρὸς μ[uδῆν] τὸ ἐνεστὸς [λξ] καὶ ντς καὶ θς ἐτος ἀπὸ
τῶν ὑπαρχ[όντων] καὶ περὶ Κερκέμουν ἐκ τοῦ
Φίλωνος κλ[ήνου] ἀροῦρας τέσσαρες ἐκ τοῦ Στρα. νος
κλήρου εξ Κ.4 [c.4] traces of c.13 ἀλλας ἀροῦνας τέσσαρες
ἡμικεν ὀμοία ἀροῦας (ἀροῦας) ὅτε . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . πυρῷ χώρῃ
ἐκ ἡμείςας καὶ τελέεσι καὶ ὑπὲρ φόρου τῆς εν πυρῷ ἡμι-
κειάς πυροῦ [ἀρτ]άβας τεκε[πα]ρά[φ]φυτα τέσσαρες καὶ τῆς
ἐν χόρτῳ ἡμείςας ἐκάστης [ἀροῦ]ρης ἀνὰ κριθῇς ἀρτά-
βας διὸ καὶ τῆς τῶν αἱροῦ[ν] τῶν ναυβίων ἀναβο-
λήν ποιήσομαι. ἀκύδωνος ὁ φόρος παντὸς κινδύ-
νου, τῶν τῆς γῆς δημοσίων ὄντων πρὸς εἰς τῶν γε-
ούχων κυριεύοντα τῶν καρπῶν ἐως τῶν φορῶν ἀπο-
λαβῆς. βεβαιομένες δέ μοι τῆς ἑπιδοχῆς ἑπάναγ-
κες ἀπόδωσί τοῦ φόρον ἐκ νέων γεννημάτων(ν),
tῶν μὲν πυρῶν ἀκριβοῦν καὶ τή[ν] τό[ρ]η[ν] κρεκκι-
κινεμένα, μέτρων δεκάτ[ν] τ[ῆς] τοιοῦτος, προς-
μετρουμένων ἐκάστη ἀρτάβη ἄνδραίκων τῆς ἑκά-
ρων, τῶν Ἐπείθῃ μην τοῦ α[ντ] ἐτοὺς ἀναπροθέτως,
γενομένης καὶ τῆς πράξεως παρὰ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὡς καθῆκι.
κυρία ἡ ἑπιδοχὴ καὶ ἐπερωτηθείς ὀμολογήσα.

(m. 2) Ἀφρήλιος Ὄρος Πανεχώτου μεμέθωμαι
τὴν γῆν καὶ ἀπρόδως τὰ ὀφειλό-
30 μενα πάντα πλήρης ὡς πρόκειται. Αὐρήλιος

Φρόντων ἐγραμμα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ φαμένου

μη εἶδένα γράμματα.

3 γαώκοιμίου υπό 4 φλασκοῦ 1 κεφαλήνος 6–7 1. Παγκλέως 10, 11, 14 1 τέτσαρακ

12 6 13, 13–14, 15 1. ημείς 14 1. τέτσαράκοντα 15 1. τελέσεων 21 γενηματώ

1 In the consulship of Antonius Marcellinus and Petronius Probinus, cii clarissimi, Phaophi 22.

To Gaius Iulius Leucadius son of Heraclianus, through his guardian Flavius Eusebius, former curator civitatis,
from Aureli Horus son of Panechotes and Papontheus son of . . . both from the hamlet of Pancylis. I [sic] willingly undertake to hold on lease for the current 36th and 18th and 9th year only from your possessions in the area of Cercemunis four aruras from the allotment of Philo and another four and a half aruras from the allotment of Straton(?)[?], making together 8½ [ar], to sow(?) with wheat [or] fodder crops half and half, and to pay you as rent on the half in wheat forty-four artabas of wheat and on the half in fodder crops a rate of two artabas of barley per arura, and I will perform the raising of the dyke works incumbent (on the landowner). The rent is free from any risk, the taxes on the land being the responsibility of you the landowner, retaining control of the crops until you recover the rent. The undertaking being confirmed for me, I shall pay the rent of necessity out of new crops, the wheat unadulterated with barley and it and the barley both sieved, in the one-tenth measure of the estate, four choenices being added to each artaba, in the month Epeiph of the same year without delay, the right of execution for you lying against me and so on. The undertaking is binding and having been asked the formal question I gave my assent.'

(2nd hand) 'I, Aurelius Horus son of Panechotes, have taken on lease the land and shall pay all that is owed in full as aforesaid. I, Aurelius Phronto, wrote on his behalf as he claims to be illiterate.'

1–2 On the consuls, see CLRE 216–17 and CSBE3 184.

3 In P. Mert. I 36, C. Iulius Leucadius is addressed as πρῶτονεσταντι γνωμωνερχήσαντι βουλευτήριος of Oxyrhynchus in 360. In 362–4 he was strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome (currently the last strategus known by name in the Oxyrhynchite); see LXVII 4607–13 with 4606–13 introd. At the date of 4753 he was still a minor and under the guardianship of Flavius Eusebius, a former λογετής (curator civitatis), and thus also a member of the local élite; see below, 4 n. In P. Mert. 36.3, Leucadius' father's name is presented as Ἰοκαλανος, for which P. J. Sijpesteijn, K. A. Worp, ΖΦΕ 25 (1976) 185 n. 1 (= BL VII 104) suggested Ἰοκαλάντος. 4753 settles the uncertainty: read Ἰοκαλάντος (RAC). For leases of land by minors at Oxyrhynchus, see Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 262–3.

4 Flavius Eusebius was λογετής of the Oxyrhynchite nome from 337 to 339; see LTV p. 228, with LX 4083–4.

5–6 Παπσωθέως. The nominative is probably Παπσωθέος. Two persons with this name from the Oxyrhynchite are attested in P. Mich. XI 614, where however the genitive is Παπσωθεόν. The feminine equivalent Ταποθέτους occurs in XIV 1631 4 and P. Mert. II 84.3 = C. Pap. Gr. II(1) 66; cf. P. Laur. IV 171.2 and PSI XIV 1499.1 (endings restored).

6–7 Παγκλέως. Pruneti, Ι centri abitati 129, records this in the spelling Παγγάλως, and it is so spelled in XIX 2243(a) 34. Elsewhere, however (IV 732 5, P. Alex. 13.3, PSI VIII 890.30, P. Mert. I 36.7, 24), it is spelled Παγγ- or Παγγ- as here. P. Mert. 36.7 as corrected (BL VIII 268) proves that it was situated in the 1st pagus; this was formed from the former Upper Teparchy to which Cercemunis (g) had also belonged (cf. Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 12). In P. Mert. 96 it is described as an ἐποίκιον that is part of the estate of C. Iulius Leucadius. See further S. Daris in S. F. Bondi et al. (edd.), Studi in onore di E. Bresciani (1985) 148–50.

9 Κερκέλων. See Pruneti, Ι centri abitati 80.

10 Φιλομος is the name of several κλήρου in the Oxyrhynchite; see P. Pruneti, Αργυρος 55 (1975) 204–5. The κλήρος attested in PSI IV 320.10 is the one attested here, since it is said to be near Cercemunis.
It is not easy to read Crpa voc. Crpa toc, omega being especially difficult. KXfjpoi of this name are attested for the Antinoopolite (P. Antin. II 89.8) and the Hermopolite (SB XVIII 13:76:32) nomes, but no such kleros has yet been attested for the Oxyrhynchite, unless the name should be read in P. Wisc. I 9.8-9: a kleros near Cerce- munis with a double name occurs there, which the editor reads {ek tov Ξένων καὶ Κτηλόδωνος, but the second name is doubtful.

11 If εξεί is correct, this would suggest εξ Απλιώντος, perhaps followed by μέρους καὶ: cf. P. Mert. I 17.16-18 εκ δὲ τοῦ Μεγάλου κλήρου εκ τοῦ ἀπὸ νόσου καὶ λυμέ μέρους πρὸς τὰς διαβολαῖς, also SB VIII 9918.4-6 and P. Fouad 43.19-20 (all Oxyrhynchite leases).

12 ὁμοί (ὁμοίρας) η (ήμικ). This exact wording, i.e. ὁμοί + the total of aruras, is found in SPP XX 142.14, a fourth-century Hermopolite lease. γίνονται ὁμοί + the total of aruras occurs in two 6th-cent. leases, PSI VIII 934.5-6 and CPR I 42.15. At least two Oxyrhynchite leases have at this point γίνονται without ὁμοί, PSI IX 1070.10 and LXIII 4390 15.

12-13 After ἅπετε 4747 10-11 has επίρα καὶ ξυλαμήσας κατ' έτος πυρὸ χίρτης εξ ήμικς, and we expect the same here (omitting κατ’ έτος); cf. also L 3591 14-16 and 3592 11-12 (both with χλωροῖς for χόρτω); but there is insufficient room for this.

13 τελέσας καὶ ύπερ φόρας. So, e.g., XLV 3257 9. It is normal for rent in both kind and money to be described as φόρος by the fourth century; see 4747 13 n.

14 Rent of 44 artabas on 4¼ aruras is very high (and there is an additional charge; see 23-5 n.): see fig. 4 in Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants 249.

15-16 This seems to be the first example from the Oxyrhynchite of rent on a fodder-crop being paid in barley; no instance is recorded in Rowlandson’s App. 2. P. Mich. III 185, a four-year lease from the Arsinote, requires payment each year in barley, although in the fourth year the land is to be sown εν χόρτη(ω) εἰς κατή ξηρασία (18-19); cf. P. Lond. III 1225 (p. 138; Hermopolite), rent in barley for land leased εἰς ξυλαμήν ἄρακο.

16-17 Several Oxyrhynchite leases from the fourth century and later indicate that the lessee(s) is/are to be responsible for naubia due (from the owner of the land); see the texts cited by N. Gonis, Tyche 15 (2000) 100. For dyke work falling to the lessee in earlier leases, see L 3589 10-11 with the texts cited in the note.

21 The phrase εις νέων (γενημάτων) usually occurs in repayment of loans of grain, especially loans of seed-corn (e.g. VII 1024 35). For its occurrence in a lease, see III 500 19 (from the Athribite nome). No doubt it is simply the equivalent of the usual νέος (cf. Henning, Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht 11 with n. 65).


23-3 For this phrase, see 4747 19-20 n. In effect the total rent is being increased by 52 1/2 x 4 choenices = 5 1/2 artabas (assuming an artaba of 40 choenices).25 Payment of rent in kind in Epeiph, instead of the usual month Payni, is regular in the Hermopolite nome (Herrmann, Studien zur Bodenpacht 107-8) but rare in the Oxyrhynchite (cf. Henning, Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht 115 n. 111). It is interesting that Epeiph is also the month specified for payment in P. Mert. I 36 (see above, 3 n.).

26 ὡς καθή. See 4747 21 n.

29-30 ἀπὸδόσις τὰ ἀδελφόλεμα πάντα πλήρης ὡς πρόκειται. This suggests that in LV 3800 43-4 we should correct ἀπὸδολέμα τὸ προκείμενον. The use of πλήρης (or ἄπληρους) with reference to payment of rent due for a lease seems to be very unusual. There is a parallel in P. Vindob. G 26249.17-18 (ed. ZPE 141 (2002) 191-8; Hermopolite; ι/ιι) and ἀποδόσις καὶ τῶν φόρων [sic] πλήρης ὡς πρόκειται; cf. also LXVII 4596 21-25 and CPR X 1074.27-8, where πλήρης occurs along with ἀποδόμως.

†D. MONTSERRAT
The upper part of a legal document addressed to an aristocratic landowning lady not known previously, the patricia Maria, daughter of the late patricius Ioannes. Maria may have been the sister of Flavia Christodote and Fl. Cometes, whose legal wrangle is known from PSI I 76 (cf. also P. Thomas 29); see below n. 5.

The nature of the document, called a ὀμολογία in the docket, can no longer be ascertained. Maria is addressed through her διοικητής and her ἐπικειμένος, which implies that the transaction concerned her Oxyrhynchite estate; see further 6-7 n.

† βασιλείας τοῦ θειωτάτου καὶ εὔσεβ(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπότου μεγίστου
eυεργέτου Φλ(αουνοῦ)
Ἰουστίνου τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγιοῦχουτού καὶ Αὐτόκρ(άτορος) ἔτους ζ, ὑπατίας τῆς
αὐτῶν γαληφ(ότητος)
tὸ δεύτερ(ον), (month) ἵ, ἱδ(ίκτιώνος) 5, ἔτους εμθ εἰς.
Φλαουνία Μαρία τῇ πανευφήμῳ πατρίκιᾳ, θυγατρὶ τοῦ τῆς
εὐκλεοῦς μνήμης Ἰωάννου γενομένου καὶ αὐτοῦ πατρικίου, γεουχούσῃ
καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νέᾳ Ἰουστίνου πόλει, δι’ ὑμῶν Φλ(αουνοῦ) Ἰουστίνου τοῦ
ἐυ[δο]κμ(ωτάτου)
αὐτῆς διοικητῶν καὶ Βίκτορος τοῦ θαυμ(ασιώτάτου) αὐτῆς ἐπικειμένον,
Αὐρ(ήλιος)
Ἱερημίας ὁ καὶ Παλ . . . . . [ . . . . ] . . .
Φ[οι]βάμμων[ε] . [ . . . . . . . . . . .]

Back:

† ὄμι[ολ] ἵπτια Ἱερ[ημίου]

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

1 εὔσεβ 2 αὐτοκρ 1. διοικήτης 3 δεύτερον ὑμ’ 6 Φλ 8[οίδα][κυ]μ 7 θαυμ

‘In the reign of our most godly and most pious master, greatest benefactor, Flavius Iustinus, the eternal Augustus and Imperator, year 7, in the consulship of his serenitas for the second time, (month) 13, indiction 6, year 249/218.

‘To Flavia Maria, the most renowned patricia, daughter of Ioannes of well-famed memory, who was a patricius too, landowner also in this New City of Iustinus, through you, Flavius Iustus, her most respected administrator, and Victor, her most admirable superintendent, Aurelius Ieremias alias Pal— . . . Phoebammon . . .’

Back: ‘Agreement of Ieremias . . .’
The month was to be added later, but this was not done. The possibilities are Thoth 13 (= io.ix), Phaophi 13 (= coterminous with indiction 6, ran from 29.viii.572 to 28.viii.573; thus the text cannot be later than November 572.
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*Cvv dew IXXovcTpla 4-5 n.*) does not appear to hold the patriciate: she calls herself in PSI I 76.2.


4—5 The father of Maria. (1) The father of Maria. (2) The father of Christodote and Cometes (the ending of the name after an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus, where he is addressed as *Kouµιτη*), referred to as deceased in PSI I 76.2 of 572 or 573 (Ioannes 52, PLRE IIIA 663; cf. BL VIII 393).

(3) A *dux* of the Thebaid in the 560s, who might have been dead by 572 (Ioannes 59, PLRE IIIA 664, apparently the same as Ioannes 83, PLRE IIIA 674, and probably Ioannes 52, PLRE IIIA 690; see J.-L. Fournet, *Hellenisme dans l’Egypte du VI siecle* (MIFAO 115: 1999) 332—6).

Given that very few *patricii* occur in the papyri (see below), it would be more economical to reckon with one or two rather than three *patricii* of this name. In view of the Oxyrhynchite provenance of the documents attesting (1) and (2), it is tempting to assume that Maria, Christodote, and Cometes were children of the same father (in PSI I 76-2, Christodote is said to be the brother of the two *patricii* or two rather than three *patricii* of this name: cf. the wording in *CSBF?* 10.1, 255; it has occurred exclusively in Oxyrhynchite documents.

4 *Φλωοίη Μαρία . . . πατρίκια*. Maria’s patriciate was probably not inherited from her father, but was due to marriage to a *patricius*; on the issue see J. Beaucamp, *Le Statut de la femme a Byzance (4e-7e siecle)* (1990) 271—8, ii (1992) 132—9, 310. It should be noted that Fl. Christodote, the (other?) daughter of the patricius Ioannes (see below, 4—5 n.) does not appear to hold the patriciate; she calls herself *εις θεὸν ἄλλου πατρίατριά* in PSI I 76-2.

It is unclear whether the *patricius* Maria has occurred in any other document. To judge from the predicate, she cannot be the same as the *μεγαλοπρεπεστάθη Μαρία* in XVI 2020 20, of the 580s (this Maria may have been the sister of Fl. Anastasia; see Beaucamp, *Le Statut de la femme a Byzance* ii 446 n. 25). Also, a different Maria should surely be recognised in 2020 30, of the *εὐδοκιο(το)ν(άτη)ς Μαρίας γαμε(τής) τοῦ εὐδοκιο(το)ν(άτου) Ἀστροδόρου*; even if it might be relevant that this Maria is described with reference to her husband, it would have been appropriate for a patrician’s wife, he is not said to be one (the rarity of her husband’s name might suggest an identification with the man whose heirs are mentioned in P. Sorb. II 69—71.Bg, 10.x), or Hathyr 13 (= c.xi); see CSBE? 151.

Only two other Egyptian *patricii* are known by name: Fl. Gabrieleia, who held the *logeusia*, *πατρίκια* καὶ προσδιορισμοί of Oxyrhynchus in 553 (XXXVI 2780); and Sophia, a great landowner in the Fayum (SPP VIII 1090—7), of Oxyrhynchus in 553 (XXXVI 2780); and Sophia, a great landowner in the Fayum (SPP VIII 1090—7), active in the later sixth century. For *patriciae* whose names are lost, see Beaucamp, op. cit. 407. For lists of *patriciae* in the empire at large, see PLRE IIIB 1466 (AD 395—527), 1472 (AD 572—641). On the patriciate in the period after Justinian see W. Heil, *Der konstantinische Patriziat* (1966) 61—7.

4—5 *τοῦ τῆς εὐδοκείου μνήμης Ἰωάννου γενομένου καὶ αὐτοῦ πατρικίου*. In theory, there could have been up to three *patricii* named Ioannes in sixth-century Egypt, and who were dead by 572:

(1) The father of Maria.

(2) The father of Christodote and Cometes (the ending of the name after an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus, where he is addressed as *Kouµιτη*), referred to as deceased in PSI I 76.2 of 572 or 573 (Ioannes 52, PLRE IIIA 663; cf. BL VIII 393).

(3) A *dux* of the Thebaid in the 560s, who might have been dead by 572 (Ioannes 59, PLRE IIIA 664, apparently the same as Ioannes 83, PLRE IIIA 674, and probably Ioannes 52, PLRE IIIA 690; see J.-L. Fournet, *Hellenisme dans l’Egypte du VI siecle* (MIFAO 115: 1999) 332—6).

Beaucamp, op. cit. 446 n. 26, has suggested that the father of Christodote and Cometes may have been the same as Ioannes son of Cometes, *dux* *Thebaidis*, referred to in Justinian’s Edict XIII 24, in 539 (Ioannes 25, PLRE IIIA 640); in that case, Cometes would have been named after his paternal grandfather. This *dux* cannot be identified with the *patricius* Ioannes who was *dux* *Thebaidis* in the late 560s, since the latter was the son of Sarapammon (see Dioscorus 11.31 Fournet). We do not know whether Ioannes son of Cometes became a *patricius*, but this need not be a problem. It is conceivable that there were two *duces* *Thebaidis* named Ioannes, and each one of them was a *patricius*.

(An interesting coincidence may be mentioned in this context. J. Gascou has suggested that the *dux* Ioannes of Edict XIII 24 is to be identified with an *ἀραβάρχης* attested in a document of 534; see R. Delmaire, *CRIPEL* 10 (1987) 133. The *dux* of the 560s probably held the office of *ἀραβάρχης* too; see Fournet, op. cit. 333.)
A further but tenuous indication that the father of Christodote and Cometes was different from the duces Ioannes son of Sarapammon may be furnished by PSI I 76.7–8, where Christodote describes her estate as ἵπποκέφαλος μοι | δίκαιος οδεία κατὰ τὴν Ἀρκαδίαν; that she refers to her possessions in the province of Arcadia and nowhere else might imply that she had no appreciable holdings in any other province. This is not what one would expect from a daughter of a native of the Thebaid (see Dioscorus 11.39–40 Fournet), who would have had, and apparently had, substantial landholdings there; cf. P. Ant. II 110.5 (VI) μεθ(ις) τοῦ ἱπποκέφαλος πατρί(κιος) Ἰωάννου.

There is no need to identify the late patricius Ioannes of 4754 and/or PSI 76 with the one described in XVI 1913 28 (557?) as ἴπποκέφαλος ἀδύνατος Ἰωάννου (Ioannes 56, PLRE IIIA 663), or the comes in XVI 1933 (Ioannes 159, PLRE IIIA 690).

The number of patricii attested in the papyri is very small. In Middle Egypt, apart from the Ioannes discussed above, only members of the Apion family (Apion i, Strategius ii, Apion iii, and the so-called Strategius Panephemnos) are known to have held this dignity. In Upper Egypt, besides the duces Ioannes, only one other patricius is known, viz. Athanasius, himself too a duces Thebaidis (see Fournet, op. cit. 390–2); we later find Senuthius, a duces Thebaidis immediately after the Islamic conquest (SPP III 271b.2–3, with BL VI 193, and J. Gascou, K. A. Worp, ZPE 49 (1982) 89). (The cases of the general Nicetas in SB I 5122.18 (618), or the Arab patricii in SB XVI 12585.1, are not comparable.) For lists of patricii in the Later Roman Empire see PLRE IIIB 1462–6 (AD 395–527), 1466–72 (AD 527–641).

I take the opportunity to note that no patricii occur in P. Lond. Copt. I 1075, ed. L. S. B. MacCoull, OCP 67/2 (2001) 385–436; in →2.12 and 45.16, instead of τοῦ πατρι[κίου] read ἵπποκέφαλος τοῦ πατρ[ίκιος], and similarly πατρι[κίος] πατρι[κίος] should be read in place of πατρι[κίου] ἵπποκέφαλος in →3.17; as for →2.21, πατρ[ίκιος], if correctly read, need not be resolved as πατρ[ικίος].

5–6 γενεισφέρεται καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ πτέλει. In place of ἐν ταύτῃ one would expect ἐνταθά: cf. also XVIII 2196 3 (596). The expression indicates landownership in places other than Oxyrhynchus. If Maria was the daughter of the duces Ioannes, she would have had possessions in the Thebaid too; see above, 4–5 n.

6 τῇ νείᾳ Τιοστίου πόλις. Some time after 9 June 569 (L 134), Oxyrhynchus assumed the name Ἦ νεια Τιοστίου πόλεις in honour of the emperor Iustinus II. The earliest instance comes from SB XII 11079.7 of 17 March 571 (not included in the references collected in LXII 4350 5 n.), and the latest from VII 1042 17–18 of 10 October 578. The city returned to its old name under Tiberius II.

6–7 I am not aware of any other text in which a great landowner is addressed through their διοικητὴς and their ἐπικείμενος. Only the leases VII 1038 (568) and SB VI 5950 (590), respectively addressed to Fl. Euphemia and Fl. Anastasia through their Τιοστίου and their Ἐκκαστρῖου, are somewhat comparable; there, the references to ἐνοικολόγοι may stem from the fact that these functionaries were directly responsible for the leases. One may thus conjecture that what is being agreed upon here falls in the sphere of duties of an ἐπικείμενος.

7 τοῦ ἐπικείμενος αὐτῆς ἐπικείμενος. The duties of an ἐπικείμενος are described in XIX 2239; he was 'a general supervisor of various agricultural activities and equipment' in an estate (LV 3805 35 n.). Other ἐπικείμενοι styled ἐνοικολόγος occur in XIX 2238 4 (551) and SPP XX 209.6–7, 32 (610?).

8–9 Ἐκκαστρῖου ... Φ[οί]βασιμων[ος]. Could it be that he is the same as the one described in XIX 2239 6–7 (598) as Ἐκκαστρῖου για[ρ] [ὁ] ἐπικείμενος τῆς ἄνω οἰκοδόμησθης | νόθος τοῦ θησαυρολόγου Φοίβασιμων[ος]? This 'old' Ieremias is in the employ of Fl. Ioannes, son and heir of Fl. Euphemia, while he may earlier have been an employee of Euphemia; see 4755 5 n. Fl. Ioannes recurs in 4755, which was apparently found together with 4754 (cf. their inventory numbers). This may be a coincidence, but one may query whether the estates of Maria and Ioannes were related (note that we have no information about the husbands of Euphemia and Maria).

N. GONIS
4755. Receipt for a Cogwheel

A fragment of a document of common type; for a list see L. E. Tacoma, ΞPE 120 (1998) 128-9 (the text edited there has been republished as SB XXIV 16312), to which LXVII 4615, LXVIII 4697, and LXIX 4755 are now to be added. It offers the earliest attestation of Fl. Ioannes, "vir gloriosissimus" (Fl. Ioannes 110, PLRE IIIA 683), son and heir of Fl. Euphemia, "gloriosissima femina" (Euphemia 3, PLRE IIIA 463); he was previously known from XIX 2239 of 598. His mother is somewhat better attested; this text offers a terminus ante quem for her death. For a brief comment on Ioannes, a representative of the 'substantial stratum of medium aristocrats' of Oxyrhynchus, 'unfortunately not attested [until now] in any other document from the Oxyrhynchite or elsewhere', see J. Banaji, Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity (2001) 151-2.

† βασιλείας το[υ] θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσέβ(εστάτου) ἡ[μῶν δεσπ(ότου)] μεγίστου
εὐεργέτου Φλ(αουίου)

Τιβερίου Μαυρικίου τοῦ αιωνίου Αὐγοῦ[στου Αὐστόρ(άτορος) ἔτους ἥ],
ὕπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ

eὐσέβ(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπ(ότου) ἔτους δ, Χαι[ατη ἑ, ἱδ(ικτίων) ἑ.
Φλ(αουίῳ) Ἰωάννη τῷ ἐνδοξ[ήτῳ, τέκνῳ καὶ κληρονόμῳ
τῆς ἐν ἐνδόξῳ τῇ μνήμῃ[η Ἐνδοξίαι, γεοχοιντί
κα[ί] ἐνταῦθα τῇ λαμπρᾷ Οξυρ[υχιτῶν πόλεων, διὰ σοῦ
τοῦ λαμπροτάτου Βικτόρου [διοικητοῦ αὐτοῦ,
Αὐρήλιου Ἀπολλώνιος νῦς [ - - μητρός - -
καὶ Βικτωρ νῦς Ἀνδρ[έου μητρός - -
ἀπὸ ἐποικίαν ᾿Ασπίδα [τοῦ Ὀξυρυχίτου
ν[ομοῦ, δι]αφέρ[ο]ντος τῷ ὑ[μῶν ἐνδοξώτητι, ἐναπόγρα-
φοι αὐτῆς γε[ωργοί, χαίρειν. χ[ρείας καὶ νόν γεναμένης
ἐις τὴν ὑπ’ ἑ] ἐμε γεοχίκη[ν μηχανήν καλομένην

c.9 ], ἀντλοῦσαν [εἰς ἀμπελον καὶ εἰς ἀρόσι-
μον γην (?) μεγά]λου ἐργάτου ἐν[ὸς ἀνελθόντες ἐπὶ
τῆς πόλεως] ἧ[ξιωσάμενη[ν τῆς ὑμῶν ἐνδοξώτητα
ὡς τε κελε[ύ]σαι ἡ[μῶν τῶν αὐτῶν μέγαν ἐρ-
γάτην παρ]αχεθῆ[ναι c.15

c.13 ] [ c.18

. . . . . . . .
In the reign of our most godly and most pious master, greatest benefactor, Flavius Tiberius Mauricius, the eternal Augustus (and) Imperator, year 5, in the consulship of our same most pious master, year 4, Choecn, indiction 5.

To Flavius Ioannes, virgloriosissimus, child and heir of Euphemia of glorious memory, landowner here also in the splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, through you, the most splendid Victor, his administrator, Aurelii Apollos son of . . . , mother . . . , and Victor son of Andreas, mother . . . , from the hamlet of Aspidas of the Oxyrhynchite nome, a possession of your glory, registered farmers of yours, greetings. Since now too a need for one large cog-wheel has arisen in the estate irrigator under my (sic) charge, called . . . , which irrigates vine-land and arable land (?), we came up to the city and asked your glory to order that the same large cog-wheel be provided to us . . .

Back: 'Chirograph of Apollos and Victor . . .'

1-3 The full dating clause may be reconstructed on the basis of the reference to Mauricius' 4th consular year (1. 3), which ran from 586 to 587 (use of postconsular reckoning is not likely; μετά τῆς ύπαρξεως would be too long for the space in 1. 2), and corresponded to his 5th regnal year; in Oxyrhynchus, this year was co-extensive with indiction 5. For the regnal and consular years of Mauricius in the papyri, see LVIII 3933-3962 ‘General Introduction’, pp. 52-7, esp. p. 55 (Table III), and now CSBE 2 261-4, for the regnal and consular formulas, see CSBE 2 260-1.

Ioannes may have taken over one of his mother's employees: Euphemia's evoiKioXoyoc in 1038 is called ἔφεσεν τῇ τέκνῃ καὶ κληρονόμῳ, while ἔφεσεν τῇ τέκνῃ καὶ κληρονόμῳ is Ioannes' ἐπικεφαλής in 2239 (cf. 4754 8-9 n.; cf. R. Mazza, L'archivio degli Apioni (2001) 144 n. 78.izia. The addition of καὶ indicates that Ioannes, like his mother (cf. 1038 9–10), owned land also outside the province of Oxyrhynchus. The extent of his landholdings is unknown, though it may be surmised from 2239 13–14, ἐν κάτω κόσμῳ καὶ ἐν κάτω κτίματι τῇ σε αὑτής οἰκίας, that there were a plurality of rural settlements in his estate. But apparently he employed only one ἐπικεφαλής, since the latter undertakes to fulfil his duties ἐν πάσῃ τῇ προστάσει τῆς υἱῶν ἐνδοξοτήτος (11), which suggests that the territory under Ioannes'
control cannot have been very large. (On the face of it, Ioannes’ estate was organised into a single προστασία, which is also relevant.)


Another λαμπροτάτος διοικητὴς occurs in XLI 3204 6 (588); cf. also LVIII 3954 8 (611), and XVI 2033 ii 17 (VII) (the appellation τὰ πάντα λαμπροτάτον, applied to the διοικητὴς Georgius in XVI 1844 6, 1846 5, 1847 6, and other letters of the ‘Victor–George correspondence’, may be a mere Hällichkeitformel; note that in XVI 1860 iii Georgius is addressed as τὰ πάντα περὶβλητὰ πλῆθος—but this could also denote a promotion). Several other διοικηταὶ of Oxyrhynchite magnates at that time were spectabiles comites, see below, 4756 n. (Naturally, one cannot rule out the possibility that Victor was not a διοικητὴς.)

10 ἐποικίαν Ἀκηδ. This settlement appears as part of the Apion estate in XVIII 2204 5 of ε.566; cf. also XVI 2029 2, XVIII 2207 12, XIX 2244 15, and P. land. III 31.4, with Mazza, L’archivio degli Apioni 180. It may well have passed to the control of Fl. Ioannes at this time; for comparable cases, see LXVII 4694 7 n.

The line as restored seems short, even if we take into account that letter size is variable. In theory, there could have been an adjective after Ἀκηδ. and before τῶν ὀξύρυνχων.

11—12 ἀναπόγραφος αὐτῆς γεωργι. The other document concerning Fl. Ioannes mentions τοὺς πάντας γεωργίου τῆς μετέρας ἐνδιάσπαστος (2239 13). There is no need to assume that these γεωργίοι were not ἀναπόγραφοι; the term ἀναπόγραφος occurs in very specific contexts (see I. F. Fikman, ‘Esclaves et colons en Egypte byzantine’, AnPap 3 (1991) 10; also A. Jordens, ‘Die Agrarverhältnisse im spätaufkantischen Ägypten’, Laverna 10 (1999) 140–1, with references), and this is not one of them.

13 γεωργίας ἐν χώρᾳ. There were several γεωργίαι in Ioannes’ estate; cf. 2239 14.

14—15 εἰς ὄμπληλον καὶ εἰς ἀρόμους γῆς. The restored sequence suits the space very well.

15 μεγίστα ἐγκαταστάτοι. On the term, see LXVIII 4697 11 n.

16 After παρκύρημα[ν], the text may have continued καὶ εὐθείας ἡ ὁμών ἕνδοξής πρὸνοιαν ποιομένη τῆς εὐστάκεως τῶν ἑαυτῆς πραγμάτων τούτων παρέχετο ἡμῖν; cf. e.g. P. Select. 20.11 ff.

N. GONIS

4756–4758. DOCUMENTS FROM THE ARCHIVE OF FLAVIA ANASTASIA

Flavia Anastasia was a middle-ranking aristocratic landowner who flourished at Oxyrhynchus in the later sixth century. Several papyri relating to her estate have come down to us. The bulk of what may be called the archive of Anastasia was acquired on the antiquities market by the Papyrusskartenll, and reached the Giessen University Library in 1910 (two papyri ended up at Erlangen and another at Louvain at a later time); see A. Martin, ‘Les Papyrus d’Oxyrhynchus et le marché des antiquités (à la lumière des papiers du ‘Deutsches Papyrusskartenll’), in Oxyrhynchus: A City and its Texts (forthcoming 2005), and T. M. Hickey, ‘Reuniting Anastasia: P. Bibl. univ. Giss. inv. 56 + P. Ertl. 87’, APF 49/2 (2003) 199–201. The archive has remained largely unpublished (but is being prepared for publication by Hickey). For a brief description of some of its contents see J. van Haelst, ‘Des nouvelles archives: Anastasia, propriétaire à Oxyrhynchus’, Pop. Congr. XI (1966) 586–90; a recent addition to Anastasia’s dossier (not ‘archive’) is SB XXII 15723. On Anastasia, see further J. Beau-camp, Le Statut de la femme à Byzance (4e–7e siècle) ii (1992) 11, 13, 404–6, and J. Banaji, Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity (2001) 150–1.
Three new items are published below. Only one other papyrus in the collection of the Egypt Exploration Society is known to be part of the archive, viz. XLIV 3204, a deed of surety dated to 588 (see BL VIII 267). The inventory numbers of these four papyri suggest that they lay close to each other in the same rubbish heap until they were unearthed in Grenfell and Hunt's first excavation season at al-Bahnasa, in 1896/7. None of these pieces appears to be part of a papyrus acquired through the Papyruskartei (information kindly supplied by T. M. Hickey). This latter lot probably came to light after the end of the British excavation activity at al-Bahnasa. The nature of the documents of the archive suggests that they originate from the headquarters of Anastasia's estate in the city of Oxyrhynchus. Thus the papyri acquired on the antiquities market conceivably stem from the same mound as the Anastasia papyri in the collection of the EES, a mound not thoroughly dug by Grenfell and Hunt. But this is not necessary; the bulk of the Apion papers were found together, but a large number come from pockets that yielded very miscellaneous material. (This dispersion may in part have been due to the wind.)

4756. Deed of Surety

2: B.95/C(b)+H(b)  
fr. 1 14.5 x 18 cm  
10 March 590

The upper right part of a deed of surety, a type of document well represented among Anastasia's papers; cf. also 4757-8. Many of the details are lost, but enough survives to tell us that the person under surety was apparently not an ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός (cf. XLIV 3204), was released from the public prison of Oxyrhynchus, and his obligation was to remain in his village. Anastasia's διοικητής, Flavius Victor, a comes of the rank of vir spectabilis, has apparently not been recorded previously. Another διοικητής of Anastasia, Fl. Phocabamon, is attested in texts dating from before and after the date of 4756. It would thus seem that Anastasia employed two (or more) διοικηταί at a time, which suggests that her estate was of some size; see further 7-8 n.

For the latest update on this type of document, see B. Palme, *Symposion* 1999 (2003) 531 n. 1; add now LXVIII 4688, 4703, and LXIX 4756-7.

The back is blank, so far as it is preserved.

† βασιλεύας τοῦ θειστάτου καὶ εὐλεβής(επτάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπότου μεγίστου εὐφρέγετον Φλαουύντον Ἐνιρκίου νέου Τιβέριου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγουστοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος ἑτούς η, ὑπατίας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐαλεβής(επτάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπότου ἑτούς ζ, Φαμενωθ ἤδ, ἵνα ἐκτίθη(νος) ὁγιάδης.

5 Φλ(αουύντο) Αναστάσα τῆς ἐν[δοξάτῃ ἕλλυτερίᾳ θυγατρὶ τοῦ τῆς ἑνδόξου μνήμης Μην]ᾶ Εὐδαίμονος, γεουχούσῃ ἑνταῦθα τῇ λαμπρῇ Ὁξυνύχ(ετών) πόλει, διὰ σοῦ Φλαουύντον Βίκτορος 79[0] περιβλέπτου κάμετος καὶ διοικητοῦ αὐτῆς, Α]υρήλιος Α[β][ρ]αμίῳ νίος Παύλου μητρὸς Θέκλας,
In the reign of our most godly and most pious master, greatest benefactor, Flavius Mauricius new Tiberius, the eternal Augustus, year 8, in the consulship of our same most pious master, year 7, Phamenoth 14, indiction eighth.

To Flavia Anastasia, gloriosissima illustria, daughter of Menas, son of Eudaemon, of glorious memory, land-owner here in the splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, through you, Flavius Victor, spectabilis comes and administrator of hers, Aurelius Abraam, son of Paulus, mother Thecla, originating from the village ... of the Oxvrhynchite nome. I acknowledge by willing resolve and voluntary choice, swearing the divine and august oath, that I guarantee and receive from your glory through your dependants Aurelius Elias son of Phib, mother . . . , from the same village, on condition that he shall remain continuously and abide in the same village, and he shall on no account abandon it nor transfer to a another place ... in the place where I have also received him, in the prison of this city. Or if I fail to do this, I acknowledge myself accountable to answer for all that is required of him. This deed of surety, written in a single copy, is binding, and in reply to the formal question I gave my assent. (2nd hand) I, Aurelius Abraam, son of Paulus, . . .

1-4 Under Mauricius, a date to Phamenoth 14, indiction 8, falls in his regnal year 8 = consular year 7, and corresponds to 10 March 590; see CSBE² 153, 162.

2 Φλαυσίου Μ]αυρικοῦ νεόν Τιβερίου. This is the form of the emperor’s name that was most popular with Oxyrhynchite scribes from 590 until the end of his reign; see CSBE² 261, 265 (but there correct ‘600’ to ‘601’).

5-6 The restorations are after SB VIII 9561.7-8; cf. also XLIV 3204 4-5 (with BL VIII 267), and P. Erl. 87.7-8 (with BL X 67 — the correction should be credited to Beaucamp, Le Statut de la femme à Byzance ii 379; on this text see now T. M. Hickey, APF 49/2 (2003) 199–203).
5 ἀνθρωπία. The only other ἀνθρωπία attested in the papyri is Flavia Christodote; see PSI I 76.2 (572/3).

The title ἀνθρωπία first occurs in PSI IV 283.5 of 550, and continued to be in use well into the Arab period. Its exact purport is unclear; see Beaucamp, op. cit. 12 n. 46. Though apparently not equivalent to vir / femina illustrius, it is always found with persons of this particular senatorial rank (εἰσαγόντατος, As. J. Gascou, P. Sorb. II p. 62, put it, 'Ἀνθρωπία, καθώς λαμπρότατος, n’est pas associé chez [P. Sorb. II 69] à une fonction et marque donc le statut social'; cf. already O. Hornnickel, Ehen- und Rangniederlätter in den Papyruskundenden (1930) 11, 17 (‘die Bezeichnung einer Würde wie etwa auch patricius und comes’). Hornnickel, op. cit. 17, further suggested that ἀνθρωπία describes ‘die illustres honorarii, die letzte Gruppe der Illustres’, an attractive hypothesis but not easy to prove. The title is often associated with pagarchs, and it has been thought that the term denotes the function of the pagarch (thus J. Gascou, ‘La Détention collégiale de l’autorité pagarchique dans l’Égypte byzantine’, Byzantion 42 (1972) 69 n. 2: ‘le mot ἀνθρωπία nous apparaît clairement comme synonyme de pagarche’; but the statement, ‘Peut-être était-ce même le nom officiel de la “fonction” pagarchique après les réformes justiniennes’, probably goes too far). I am grateful to B. Palmé for his reaction to some earlier thoughts of mine on this issue.


7 Φίλαδηππος Βίκτωρος. This person is apparently not known from elsewhere. (There is no reason to identify him with the διοικητής of Fl. Ioannes in 4755 7 of 586.) The other known διοικητής of Anastasia are Fl. Phoebammon, attested in SB V 9561.11 (25/590), SB VI 9561.1 (592/3 or, less likely, 577/8), and some Giessen inédita, and Fl. Ioannes (name restored by T. M. Hickey), recorded in the undated P. Erd. 37.4–5. Another διοικητής may occur in XLIV 3204 6 (2.598), α irresponsible des διοικητής διοικηταῖος, T. M. Hickey, ‘Les Grands Domaines, la cité et l’état en Égypte byzantine’, T&MByz 9 (1985) 78 (= BL VIII 267), suggested reading Φοίβομαμοι, but noted that the use of the epithet λαμπροτάτος casts some doubt on the restoration: SB VIII 9561.11 calls Phoebammon τὸν περιβλέπτον κόμην καὶ διοικητῆς. SB 9560 dates from two years later than 3204, and one could think that Phoebammon was promoted from εἰσαγόντατος to εἰσαγόντατος second 588 and 590. But T. M. Hickey has kindly informed me that Phoebammon recurs in P. bibl. univ. Giss. inv. 44, which predates 3204, and in that text he is already a εἰσαγόντατος.

Assuming that the restored διοικητῆς in 8 is correct, it appears that Anastasia employed at least two διοικητῆς at the same time. There were several διοικητῆς in the service of the Apions (see R. Mazza, L’archivio degli Apioni (2001) 137–8), and this was the case with the Arismone estate of the so-called Strategios Panepheimos too; see B. Palmé, ‘Die domus gloriosa des Flavius Strategius Panepheimos’, Chiron 27 (1997) 109–17.

Another person who acts as Anastasia’s representative occurs in P. Erd. 87.11–12 διὰ τοῦ Φίλαδηππου τοῦ ἐν διοικητῆς, l. d–. Hickey, APF 49/2 (2003) 203, notes that this was a person of the same status as Anastasia, and thus probably not an employee of hers.

8 περιβλέπτον κόμης καὶ διοικητῆς. Several of the διοικητῆς employed by great landowners in this period have the same title: besides the διοικητῆς of Anastasia in SB V 9561.12 (590) and P. Erd. 37.5–6 (s.d.), cf. VII 1038 11 (558), LVIII 3936 10–11 (598), XVI 1991 11 (601), and especially I 138 23 (610/1) τῶν περιβλέπτων διοικητῶν καὶ λαμπρότατος χαρτουλαρίου (sim. 31–2), which shows that the term περιβλέπτον (vīr spectabilis) and λαμπρότατος (vīr clarissimus) reflected a given hierarchy. Such comites were comites sacri consistorii; cf. LXVI 4353 10–12 (600), where Fl. Apollon, a δικαιμονής of the estate of Strategios ‘Panepheimos’, is addressed as τῶν περιβλέπτων κόμης τοῦ θεωρίου κοσμεταρίου καὶ διοικητῆς, whereas elsewhere he is called a μεγαλοπρεπετάτος οριστός περιβλέπτων κόμης (see 4353 10 n.)

The comites sacri consistorii was an honorary title that conferred on the holder the rank of vīr spectabilis. Writing on the comites of Egyptian διοικητῆς, A. H. M. Jones, The Late Roman Empire ii 790, asserted: ‘This in sixth-century Egypt does not mean very much, for such titles seem to have been given by courtesy to any person of standing, but indicates that they were gentlemen of some substance. ’ But even if the title and rank were much debased at that time, it is doubtful that they were mere formalities; cf. I 138, cited above.

9 ἀπὸ κόμης εἰς ἀρχηγόν [cf. 4757 14] would have the right length. κόμης is restored from ἀρχηγοῦ (cf. 3204 12) or an οὐκοτος said to be her ‘possession’. 4756. DEED OF SURETY
DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

This might account for the fact that we apparently do not have an ἐναπόγραφος χειρόγραφος here. In 3204 the person under surety is not explicitly called an ἐναπόγραφος, but when his duties and rights are enumerated mention is made of the τύχη of the ἐναπόγραφος; this may be the case with 4757 too, which has lost its upper part.

12 The line as restored seems rather long; perhaps ἀδιάβολην was abbreviated.

15 There is not enough space to restore καταλείψαι τὴν αὐτῆν κόμην, with 3204 16–17 and 4757 i. For the use of ἀπολεομενάται in similar documents, cf. P. Wash. Univ. I 25.14 (530), VI 996 = SB XVI 1248.14 (584), PSI I 61.24 (509), XXIV 2420 14 (614; see BL X 148), etc.

16–19 For the text missing between the two fragments, cf. 4757 2–6.


21–2 See 4757 7–8 n.

24 I have not been able to find a known formula in the traces. ([ο[ς[1–2]τ[ε] | might conceal τῆν παρ[ο[δ[α]:] 

4757. Deed of Surety

2 iB.95/C(c)

Late sixth century

The lower part of a deed of surety for an ἐναπόγραφος χειρόγραφος, who was obliged to remain in his village. The guarantor, a comarch, undertook to return the χειρόγραφος to the public prison of Oxyrhynchus whenever this was required of him; if that failed, he would have to forfeit the sum of twelve solidi.

The ascription of the text to the archive of Fl. Anastasia relies on its inventory number and the close verbal affinities with XLIV 3204. In fact, 4757 is the work of the same scribe as 3204, who also penned P. bibl. univ. Giss. inv. 45, another deed of surety (information supplied by T. M. Hickey).

εναπόγραφος εν τῇ καταλαίπατος τῆς αὐτῆς κόμην 

μήπως μὲν μεθιστεαθαί εἰς ἔτερου τῆς ἅπαν τὰ, άλλα καὶ ἐπιζητούμενον αὐτὸν πρὸς ἑμέρας παρὰ τῆς ἑμεῖς ἰδίος ἐνδοικτὴς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῆς προσηκόντων ἐν οἰκῆ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑµέρας, άλλος ἀσθητοῦν ἐνεκεν προφάσεως, τούτον

παροίκοι καὶ τὰ. ο[σα]δ[όω] ε[ν] δημοσίων τόσιον, ἐκέκατε παντὸς τῷ προσδοκῆς καὶ λόγου, ἐνομισά ἀπότελον τῷ προσδοκῆς εἰς δημοσία φυλακῆς τῆς αὐτῆς Ὀξυρυχιτῶν πόλεως. ηι εἱ μὴ τούτο ποιής ὀμολογήσεις καταβαλείς ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπολειψέως χρυσοῦ νομίζωμα τα ὀδόθηκα ἑρωίς καὶ δυνάμει

ἀπαίτωμαν.
κυρία ἐγγύη ἀπλὴ γραφε[ία]α καὶ ἐπερωτηθεῖς ὁμολογεῖα. (m. 2) Διορθόλοις
Φοιβάμμον κωμ[ὴ]ρχής υἱός Πιενούτος ὁ προγεγραμμένος πεποίημα αὐτὴν
tὴν ἐγγύην καὶ ἀναδεχομαι τὸν εἰρήμενον Ἱακάριου κυβύν ἐμφώ ὡς
πρόκειται.

Ἀναστάσιος εὐμβόλαιογράφος ἀξιωθεῖτε ἐγγραφᾶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀγραμμάτου

συντος.†

Back, downwards, along the fibres:
† ἐγγύη Φοιβάμμονος υἱὸς Πιενούτος ἀπὸ κώμης Εἰεμή
ἀναδεχομένων Μακάριου ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης

10 προγεγραμμένας 11 εἰγένεται ἀναδεχομένας εἰρήματος προκήρυξις 12 εὐμβόλαιοι ἀγραμματοὶ

...the condition of the adscripticus. And he shall on no account leave the same village nor transfer to another
place, but if he is required of me by your glory through your subordinates on any day, for any reason whatsoever,
I shall bring him forward and deliver him up in a public place without recourse to any place of refuge or letter of
safe-conduct, in the place where I have also received him, in the public prison of the same city of the Oxyrhyn-
chites. Or if I fail to do this, I acknowledge that I shall pay for his non-appearance twelve solidi of gold, actual
payment of which is to be enforced. This deed of surety, written in a single copy, is binding, and in reply to the
formal question I gave my assent. (2nd hand) I, Aurelius Phoebammon, comarch, son of Pieus, the aforesaid,
have made this surety and undertake responsibility for the same Macarius at my risk, as aforesaid. I, Anastasius,
contract writer, wrote on his behalf, as requested, because he is illiterate.'

'Through me, Anastasius, the composition was made.'

Back: 'Surety of Phoebammon, son of Pieus, from the village of (E)ieme, undertaking responsibility for
Macarius from the same village.'

1 ἐπαργόντας τῆς χώρας. On the meaning of the clause, see I. F. Fikhman, 'Les Cautonnement pour les
καταλείπων τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης. The implication is that this ἐπαργόντας had his legal domicile in a village (cf.
the docket). Other ἐπαργόντας stated to originate from κώμης occur in 3204 and P. Mert. II 98 (VII), but the
great majority of ἐπαργόντας are associated with ἐποῖοι. Yet the presence of ἐπαργόντας in κώμης need not
cause surprise, if we bear in mind the fiscal character of the adscripticus, and that these κώμαι were in the administrativ-
or fiscal control (παραχώρημα) of those great landlords who also controlled ἐποῖοι. On an empirical level,
one may cite I. F. Fikhman, 'De nouveau sur le colonat du Bas Empire', in Miscellanea Papyrologica . . . Borgiana (Pap.
Flor. XIX: 1990) 168 n. 49: 'tenant compte de l'interchangeabilité des désignations epoikion, ktema, kýma, kóma le nombre
des enapographoi dans les komai serait plus grand que l'attestent les sources'.

3 ἡ ὑπερβολή ἠθοποιεῖ τὸ ἔνδοξον τοῦ ἱεροῦ. This appellation is common with other 'medium aristocrats' of Oxyrhynchus
at that time, including Anastasia. However, 3204 i8 refers to ή ὑπερβολή ἱεροῦ, a term normally applied to
persons of higher standing than Anastasia (consulares or patricii); it would seem that the scribe was used to writing
such documents for the Apions (but contrast 10 and 12, where reference is made to Anastasia's ἐνδοξία).
5 παραρέως. παραρέως is much more common in this context; παραφέρω has occurred only here, in XLVI 3204
20 (398), also signed by Papnuthius, and in XXVII 2478 23 (505). On the use of this verb in this context, typical
of Oxyrhynchus, see CPR XXII 4.14-16 n. (Contrary to what was previously thought, παραφέρειν does not occur

6— 7 ἐν τῇ δημοσίᾳ φιλακτῇ τῆς αὐτῆς Οὐσιονυχτῶν πόλεως. See 4756 20 n.

7— 8 In most deeds of surety, the guarantors pledge that they would perform the duties of the person under surety in the event that the terms of the deed were breached; references to financial penalties are less frequent. The sum to be exacted varied considerably: 8 solidi in I 135 (579), 2 ounces of gold (= 12 solidi) in XLIV 3204 (588), 1 pound of gold (= 72 solidi) in XXIV 2420 (614), 20 solidi in SB XVIII 14006 (635). A money payment may be alluded to in XXVII 2478 26— 7 (595) ὁμολογοῦ ἀκοθεῖν [ὑπ]·ερ αὐτοῦ πληρώσαι | τὰ ἐκφορὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γεων- 

10 Φοιβάμενον κοµ[ή]4[α]χες. This is the first time a comarch appears in a document of this kind. He was presumably the comarch of the village where the person under surety was to remain. That he was illiterate need cause no surprise. For a sketch of village administration in this period, see G. Schmelz, Kirchliche Amtsträger im spätantiken Ägypten (APF Blatt. 13: 2002) 296—318.

11 καθεδροῦ ἔμω is added to concluding guarantee clauses here, in XXVII 2478 27 (595), and LXVIII 3952 56 (610); cf. also SPP XX 126.6 (Ars.; 487) and P. Stras. VIII 799.6 (Herm.; vi).

12— 13 The notary Anastasius is attested between 579 and 595; see J. M. Diethart, K. A. Worp, Notarsunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten (1986) 78. Cf. also 4758 11. In some of the texts he signed, including two other (unpublished) items of the Anastasia archive, Anastasius wrote on behalf of illiterates; see Tyche 15 (2000) 99 (n. 1 12) for references.

14 κοµ[ή]ς Εὐκαθη. The same spelling in XVI 2040 18; ἔκαθη everywhere else.

15 Μακαρίας. Rho is extremely doubtful; it is also possible that after the break we have the remains of the last letters of Macarius' patronymic.

N. GONIS

4758. Deed of Surety

2 τΒ.93/h 9 x 10 cm Late sixth century

Only the lower right part of this deed of surety has survived. Though virtually all the important details of the document are lost, it is published in case it belongs to the archive of Anastasia. The attribution relies on the verbal affinities with 3204 and 4757; the use of a formula not found in documents from the Apion archive (see 7 n.), in theory the other main contender for the allegiance of texts of this kind; and the inventory number, indicative of the archaeological context, which aligns it with 3204 and 4756—7.

The back is blank so far as it is preserved.

... c.30 [ ... ] ... ν. [ ... ]...

μεθίστασθαι εἰς ἔτερον τόπον ἄλλα] καὶ ἐπιζητοῦμεν αὐτόν πρὸς ἐμὲ παρὰ τῆς ύποτήρας ἐνδοξ[ότητος] διὰ τῶν αὐτῆς προσηκόντων

...
4758. DEED OF SURETY

\[\text{εν οιαδηποτε ημερα, οιαδηποτοου} \\] ένεκεν προφάεως,

\[\text{τούτων παροίκω και παραδώκα} \\] \[\text{δημοσίως τόπων και λόγων}, \\]

\[\text{τούτων προφυγής και λόγων}, \\]

\[\text{τής φυλακῆς αυτῆς πόλεως}. \\]

\[\text{οί έμε, τό ου συνής όμολογος} \\]

\[\text{υπεύθυνος είναι πάσιν τοίς πρός αυτῷ} \\]

\[\text{απειζητουμένους ἀποκρίνας[θα]i} \\]

\[\text{κυρίῳ] ή ἐγγύῃ ἀπλῇ γραφῇ(εις) κ[α]i} \\]

\[\text{ἐπερ(οφηθὲίς) \] \[\text{όμολος(άγνησα). (name) }] \[\text{ζτοιχεῖ μοι αὐτῇ ἡ ἐγγύῃ [ός π]ρόκ(ειταί).} \\]

\[\text{Χι αναστάσιας εις[ε]θελ[θή]} \]

\[\text{κυρίῳ γραφῇ} \] \[\text{ἐπερ \] \[\text{προκ} \]

\[\text{. . . transfer to another place, but if he is required of me by your glory through your representatives on any} \]

\[\text{. . . day, for any reason whatsoever, I shall bring him forward and deliver him up in a public place without recourse to} \]

\[\text{. . . any place of refuge or letter of safe-conduct, in the place where I have also received him, in the public prison of} \]

\[\text{. . . the same city. Or if I fail to do this, I acknowledge myself accountable to answer for all that is required of him. . . .} \]

\[\text{This deed of surety, written in a single copy, is binding, and in reply to the formal question I gave my assent. (2nd} \]

\[\text{hand) I . . . this surety satisfies me as aforesaid. . . .} \]

\[\text{‘Through me, Anastasius, the completion was made.’} \]

1 Presumably κυρίῳ μηδὲ μήρ, but I cannot confirm any text at the end of the line.


7 έν τή φυλακή τῆς αὐτῆς (οι τάστης τῆς πόλεως). There is not enough space to restore εν τῇ φυλακῇ τοῦ

ένδών ομοί οἴκων, a recurrent phrase in Apian documents.

9 I do not see how to restore the lost part of the line convincingly. In all other deeds of surety, the υπεύθυνος-

clause is followed immediately by the κυρία-clause. A reference to the κύρια of the guarantor would not have

been out of place (cf. XIX 2238 26–7 (551), XXIV 2420 19 (614; see Bl. X 148), and XXVII 2478 27–8 (595)),

but these texts offer no clue to the wording of the text lost here. κυρία τοῦ ενδών ὁμοί ὑπαρχόντων has the right length,

but has not occurred in any other document of this kind. Cf. also 4757 11 n.

11 For the notary Anastasius, see 4757 12–13 n.
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Figures in small raised type refer to fragments, small roman numerals to columns. Square brackets indicate that a word is wholly or substantially restored by conjecture or from other sources, round brackets that it is expanded from an abbreviation or a symbol. An asterisk denotes a word not recorded in *LSJ* or its Revised Supplement. The article has been indexed only for 4708; και has not been indexed in the documentary section.

I. NEW LITERARY TEXTS

a. 4708 (Archilochus, *Elegies*)

Δάιος 4 n., 23
Δαναοί 24 n.
δε 4 n., 6 n., 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 21, 22 n. §2;
δε και 4 n. §3
δειν 3 n.
δη 7
δήδος 4 n.

eίναι (pple.) 5 n., 8
ει[ 20 (ει[αναβαίνει] 20 n., 21 n. §3;
ει[αφικερείθαι] 20 n.)
eι[ 15
eι[αναβαίνει] 13
εκκίντει 17 n.
ἐν 23, 2 n.
ἐναίρει (pple.) 11
ἐνθα 18
ἐνωσώμενος 11
ἐξοχέλλευς 11 n.
ἐξω 1 n.
ἐπί 10
ἐρατής 17
ἐρέιδειν 25 n.
ἐκ 13
eκλό[ 4 n.
ἐπι 3
ἐυονήμες 12
eύφρεσττης 4 n.

γ' 7
Ἡρακλῆς 22

θα[ 28 n.
θάλασσα 10]
INDEXES

piai 1 14
paro 1 16 n.
paraph [ 1 16]
πάς 1 3, [1 11 n.]
patev 1 21
πατήρ 1 25, 2 14
πέδαον [1 9 n.]
per 1 8
πίπτειν 1 9
πνεύμα (pple.) 1 18
πόλεμος 1 23
πόλες 1 20, 1 17
πολίς 1 6
πολιδάκτυλος 1 10
ποτε 1 5 n.
πρός 1 17
προστραπάδην 1 12
πρωτ [ 6 8
πυροφόρος 1 21
ψη 1 3 n.
εκπαρπον 2 1 3
εκπη 1 3 n.
ετέχειν 1 9
ετρατός 1 6 n.
talakárdoς 1 22
tε 1 14
Τέθρας 1 17
tiλε [1 22 n. §2], [1 22 n. §4]
Τήλεφος 1 5, 24
tic 1 4 n.
tόκος 1 7
tότε 1 16, [1 24 n.]
tρέπειν 1 4 n.
τρωτής 1 20
tέκτη [1 11 n.]
νίσ [1 22]
νπό [1 2], 1 11
υφέτυλος 1 20
φέβεκται [1 6 n.]
φεγένειν 1 4 (δί), [1 13 n.]
φημε 1 20 n., [1 21 n. §3]
φοβεῖν 1 6, 7
φόδα [1 24 n.]
φῶς 1 11
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221

\( \text{\textbf{Xapi\£ec0ai (pple.)}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{25 n.}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{xRepl}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{23 n.}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{yeipcuv}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{24 n.}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{55}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 30 3}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 13}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{(-)ayeiv}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 36 3}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{(-)ayeiv}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4710 2}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{ayeXpa}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{25 n.}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{vXacroc}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{aXxap}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{1 2}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{dA}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{k-q}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{dAcoc}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 5 2}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apfipocioc}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 4}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apfiporoc}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 6}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{aXacroc}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{d^i(-)}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 4}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{d^i(-)}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 3 3}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apLtfxj}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4709 15}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apLCTOC}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4713 4}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apu/ypaSric}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4713 9}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apLCTOC}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 2 5}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apu/ypaSric}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4713 9}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apu/ypaSric}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apu/ypaSric}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apLCTOC}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4713 9}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apa}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 15}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{apacOai}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 1 5}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{aprjyeLV}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 2 9}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4713 4}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4713 9}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 3 3}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 3 5}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4710 4 2 4713 4}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4710 1 4712 2 15 4714 11 4}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 2, (5) - 5}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 3 5}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4714 1 2}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4712 1 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4713 6}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{471 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)

\( \text{\textbf{4711 1 \rightarrow 14}} \)
INDEXES

Ἡρακλ. 4714 2 3 (ής?), ημέρα 4712 1 8
ηρώς 4714 2 2, 31, 3 4
ήστε 4711 1 12
θαλασ.- 4714 9, 7?
θάλλεν [4711 1 16]
θεσείκλος 4711 1 8
θέος 4713 5, 8
θέττε 4714 9, 9 4
θωρήσεων 4714 9, 4

ἐχειν 4714 9, 2?

καθιστασιών 4712 1, 10
καὶ 4709 ii 14 4711 1 7, 13 4712 1 13 4713 8 4714 1 14
καίνεθαι 4714 2, 14?
κακοτέχνες [4712 2, 3]
καλὸς 4711 1 6, 14
κάμινι 4712 1 6
Κακιστέπες 4714 2 6
κατά 4712 1 8?
καταστάσεως 4712 1 7
κατάσχετος 4712 1 8?
κατευνάζειν 4714 3 1?
κενὴ [4712 42 2]
Κένταυρος 4714 1 9
κεφαλή [4712 2, 14]
κείσιν 4713 6
κλαίειν 4711 1 13 4712 1 7 4714 1 14?
κλύνει 4714 1 7 4714 1 14?
κλάνος 4714 1 5?
Κόλος 4711 1 7
Καλχίς 4712 1 5
κόπτειν 4714 1 3?
κορενίναι 4714 1 8
κόρος 4714 1 10
κοίρη 4712 23, 7
κραδίῇ 4712 1 10
κρύπτειν 4714 9, 7?
κρακοῖς [4712 2, 18]
κτεῖνειν [4714 4 2]
κτύπος [4714 1 4, 22]
κύδιμος [4714 2 2, 22]
kýκαὶ 4712 1 16?
Κύπρις [4711 1 4 4]

Λάδος 4710 4?
Λαπίθαι 4714 1 9, 6 4, 4?
1. NEW LITERARY TEXTS
II. RULERS

Hadrian

Ἄδριανος Καῖσαρ ὁ κύριος 4739 5 (year 12)

Ἀυτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Τραϊάνος Ἀδριανὸς Σεβαστός 4739 29–30 (year 11)

Commodus

Μάρκος Ἀὐρήλιος Κάμμαδος Ἀντωνῖνος ὁ κύριος 4740 15–18 (year 23)

Pescennius Niger

Ἀυτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Γαῖος Πεσκέννιος 4736 introd.
II. RULERS

Severus, Caracalla, and Geta

AvTOKparopec Kaicapcc Aovkioc Ccirrlp.Loc Ceovrjpoc Evcc^t/c Flcprival 'ApafiiKoc 'ASta/S^vt/coc IlapOiKoc

Miyicroc Kai MapKoc Avp-qXioc 'AvtojvIvoc Euccfi-qc CcjSacToi ICToufiXioc Ce-mlpuoc AVa Kalcap

Diocletian and Maximian Augusti, Constantius and Maximian Caesars

oι κύριοι ήμων Διοκλητιανός και Μαξιμιανός Σεβαστοί και oι κύριοι ήμων Κωνστάντιος και Μαξιμιανός επιφανέστατοι Καίσαρες Σεβαστοί 4747 23–6 (year 13, 12 and 5)

Maximian and Severus Augusti, Maximinus and Constantius Caesars

oι κύριοι ήμων Μαξιμιανός και Σεβαστός Κεστός και oι κύριοι ήμων Κωνσταντίνος ο επιφανέστατοι Καίσαρες 4748 18–21 (year 15, 3 and 1) 4750 20–2 (year 15, 3 and 1)

Constantine I (deceased), Constantius II, Constans

(no titulature) 4753 8 (year 36, 18 and 9)

Iustinus II

4754 1–2 (year 7)

Mauricius

4755 1–2 (year 5)

4756 1–3 (year 8)

III. CONSULS

AD 296 ἐτί ὑπάτων τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Διοκλητιανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ τὸ 5' καὶ Κωνσταντίου Καίσαρος τὸ β' 4747 1–2

AD 307 ἐτί ὑπάτων τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Σεβαστοῦ τὸ 5' καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τὸ επιφανεστάτου Καίσαρος 4748 1–2 4749 1–2 (omits τοῦ) 4750 1–2 (omits τοῦ επιφανεστάτου Καίσαρος)

AD 310 ὑπάτειας Τατιάνου Ἀνδρονίκου καὶ Πομπηίου Πρόβου τῶν λαμπροτάτων ἐπάρχων 4751 16–17

AD 311 ὑπάτειας τῶν διεσπαρτῶν ἡμῶν Μαξιμιανοῦ τὸ 5' καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τὸ β' 4752 19–20

AD 341 ὑπάτειας Ἀντωνίου Μαρκελλίου καὶ Πετρούνιου Προβών τῶν λαμπροτάτων 4753 1–2

AD 572 ὑπάτειας τῆς αὐτῶν (Iustinus II) γαληνοτήτου τοῦ διήκερον 4754 2–3

AD 586 ὑπάτειας τοῦ αὐτοῦ (Mauricius) εὐεξίβεστατοῦ ἡμῶν διεσπαρτοῦ ἐτῶς δ' 4755 2–3

AD 590 ὑπάτειας τοῦ αὐτοῦ (Mauricius) εὐεξίβεστατοῦ ἡμῶν διεσπαρτοῦ ἐτῶς ζ' 4756 3–4

IV. INDICATIONS AND ERAS

(a) Indictions

5th indiction [4755 3] (= 586/7)
6th indiction 4754 3 (= 572/3)
8th indiction 4756 7 (= 589/90)

(b) Eras

249/218 4754 3 (= 572/3)
INDEXES

V. MONTHS

Φανθέ 4743 4745 4747 27 4753 2 4744
Χολέ 4755 3
Μεσέρ 4748 21
Φαν δεθ 4756 4
Πανέ 4739 19 4745 32 4747 16 4751 17

"Επέκ 4753 25
Μεσορ 4739 30 4740 19 4741 6 4742 6 4743 6-7
4744 6
ἐπαγγέλματα 4740 19
Ἰονίος 4751 17

VI. DATES

15 August 127 4739 29-30
25 August 183 4740 19
31 July 193, 217 or 222 4741 6-7 4742 6-7
2 August 193, 217 or 222 4743 6-7 4744 6-7
25 September or 17 October 202 4745 48-54
26 October 296 4747 1-2
12 February 307 4748 18-21 4749 1-2
4750 1-2

VII. PERSONAL NAMES

Ἀβραὰμ, Aur., s. of Paulus and Thecla 4756 8, 23
Ἀμαράδος; see Index II s.v. Hadrian
Ἀφροδίτηος, Aur. 4751 23
Ἀμίαος; see s.v. "Ἀμιάος"
Ἀλέξανδρος, f. of Diogenes 4739 32
Ἀμοιον: Τιτσ ᾼμοιον Ἀμιοιον, eques imaginifer alae
Ἀρισταινας Φιλιππιανον 4746 6
Ἀμιωνίλλα, Aur., d. of Dionysius 4747 3
Ἀνακράτηα, Fl., gloriosissima Illustria, d. of Menas, s. of
Ευδαμον 4756 5
Ἀνακράτσιος, contract writer 4757 12, 13 (Anastasia)
4758 11 (Anastasia)
Ἀνδρέας, f. of Aur. Victor 4755 9
Ἀνδρόφινχυς: Ταῖυς Ανδρόφινχυς, tjr clariiximus, consul
310 4751 16; see also Index III s.v. 310
Ἀνασβίλλος, f. of Aur. Isidorus 4750 3
Ἀντώνιος; see Index II s.v. Commodus; Severus,
Caracalla, and Geta
Ἀντώνιος; see s.v. Μαρκελλίος
Ἀπολλόρος, s. of Plutogenes 4745 4, 55
Ἀπολλόρος, Aur. 4755 8, 20
Ἀρτοκρατίους, f. of Aur. Theodorus 4748 5-6 4749 5
4752 4
Ἀβγονετος; see Index II s.v. Iustinus II; Mauricius
Ἀβραὰμ; see s.v. "Ἀμιωνίλλα"

Ἀδρήλιος; see s.vv. Αβραὰμ, 'Απολλόρος, 'Απολλόρος,
Βάσσος, Βίκτωρ, Ἡλίας, Ἠρακλάμμων, Ἑρακλῆς,
Θεόδωρος, Τεόδωρος, Μάρκος, Πάγκος, Παπωνθῆς,
Σαραπάμμων, Σεούρης, Φοιβάμμων, Φρόντως,
Ῥώκος, Ῥοκς, Ῥθέλως; see also Index II s.v.
Commodus; Severus, Caracalla, and Geta

Βάσσος, Aur. 4751 1, 18
Βίκτωρ, superintendent of patricia Fl. Maria 4754 7
Βίκτωρ, administrator of Fl. Ioannes, tjr
gloriosissimus 4755 7
Βίκτωρ, Aur., s. of Andreas 4755 9, 20
Βίκτωρ, Fl., spectabilis Comes, administrator of Fl.
Anastasia, d. of Menas 4756 7

Γάιος, s. of Paesis 4745 5, 56
Γάιος; see Γενοὺς
Γέτα; see Index II s.v. Severus, Caracalla, and Geta

Διδύμων, f. of Aur. Heraclemon 4750 5
Диоγέ́н, s. of Alexander 4739 22
Διοκλήτιανος; see Index II s.v. Diocletian and
Maximian Augusti, Constantius and Maximian
Ceasars; Index III s.v. 296
Διονύσιος, s. of Dionysius 4739 2, 31
AevKaiScoc, f. of Dionysius 4739 2, 31
AevKaiScoc, s. of Dionysius, ex-gymnasiarch, former
councillor of Oxyrhynchus 4747 3
AevKaiScoc, f. of Dionysius 4747 3-4

Eitdaffiov, s. of Eucaemon 4739 1
Eitdaffiov, f. of Eucaemon 4739 1
Eitdaffiov, f. of Menas, f. of Fl. Anastasia 4756 6
Esecfio, Fl., former curator civilis, guardian of C.
Iulius Leucadius 4753 4

Eovaffiia, m. of Fl. Ioannes, vir gloriosissimus [4755 5]

Idivac, Aur., son of Phib 4756 12
Ipevdlaivuov, Aur., s. of Didymion 4750 5
Ipevdlaivuov, f. of Aur. Paesis 4747 6
Iperelkewov, f. of C. Iulius Leucadius, 4753 3
Iperelkew, Aur. 4748 25

Oado, m. of Dionysius 4739 3
Oapo, m. of Aur. Abraam 4756 8
Oeovddnov, Aur., s. of Harpocrateion 4748 5 4749 4
4752 4
Oeovdov 4741 3 4742 2 4743 3 4744 3

Ipevoiav, Aur., alias Pal— 4754 8, 10 (back)
Oovfiv, see AevKaiScoc
Ovouivov, see Index II s.v. Iustinus II
Ovov, Fl., administrator of Fl. Maria, patria 4754 6
Oeovddnov, see Pae
Oeovddnov, Aur., s. of Anubion and Plusta 4750 3, [23]
Oeovddnov, Aur. 4752 24
Ovovvov, patria, f. of Fl. Maria, patria 4754 5
Ovovvov, Fl., vir gloriosissimus, s. of Euphemia 4755 4

Kołów, see Index II s.v. Hadrian; Commodus; Seve-
rus, Caracalla, and Geta; Diocletian and Maximian
Augusti, Constantius and Maximian Caesars; Maxi-
imian and Severus Augusti, Maximinus and Con-
stantius Caesars; Index III s.v. 296, 307
Kappadoc 4745 39
Kóymiiov, see Index II s.v. Commodus
Koovavov, see Index II s.v. Maximian and Severus
Augusti, Maximinius and Constantius Caesars
Koovavov, see Index II s.v. Diocletian and Maxi-
imian Augusti, Constantius and Maximian Caesars;
Index III s.v. 296

Koovavov, see Index II s.v. Commodus
Koovavov, see Index II s.v. Maximian and Severus
Augusti, Maximinus and Constantius Caesars
Koovavov, see Index II s.v. Diocletian and Maxi-
imian Augusti, Constantius and Maximian Caesars;
Index III s.v. 296

AovKaiScoc: C. Iulius Leucadius, s. of
Heraclianus 4753 3

AovKaiScoc; see Index II s.v. Severus, Caracalla and Geta

Makáram, colonus adscripticus 4757 11, 15
Makáram, see Index II s.v. Diocletian and Maximian
Augusti, Constantius and Maximian Caesars; Maxi-
imian and Severus Augusti, Maximinus and Con-
stantius Caesars; Index III s.v. 311
Makáram, see Index II s.v. Maximian and Severus
Augusti, Maximinus and Constantius Caesars;
Index III s.v. 307, 311

Iovla, m. of Aur. Horion 4752 2
Iovla, Fl., patria, d. of patria Ioannes 4754 4

Mákellvov, Antonius Marcellinus, vir clarissimus,
consul 341 4753 1; see also Index III s.v. 341
Márov, see Index II s.v. Commodus; Severus,
Caracalla, and Geta

Márop, see Index II s.v. Mauritius

Mép, s. of Eucaemon, f. of Fl. Anastasia,
gloriosissima illustria 4756 6

Oovdlov, f. of Aur. Severus 4749 3

Pádvoc, f. of Gaius 4745 5, 36
Pádvoc alias Isidorus, f. of Pasion 4745 59
Pádvoc, Aur., s. of Heraclius and Thamais 4747 6, 27
Pá, —, see Ërelov
Pánkov, f. of Aur. Horus 4753 5, 28
Pápov, Aur., s. of —is 4753 5-6
Pápov, f. of Sarapax 4740 4-5
Pálovus, s. of Paesis alias Isidorus 4745 58
Pálovus, f. of Aur. Ophelius 4748 3
Pálovus, f. of Aur. Abraam 4756 8, 23
Pérovus, see Index II s.v. Severus, Caracalla, and
Geta

Pérovus; see s.v. Párovus

Pérovus, f. of comarch Aur. Theobommon 4757 10, 14
Plóvia, m. of Aur. Isidorus 4750 3
Plóvia, f. of Plution 4745 1
Plóvia, f. of Plution 4745 1-2
Plóvia, f. of Apollinaris 4745 4-5
Plóvia, see s.v. Párovus

Plóvia, see Index II s.v. Severus, Caracalla, and
Geta

Párovus; Petronius Probus, vir clarissimus, consul
341 4753 1-2; see also Index III s.v. 341
Párovus; Pompeius Probus, vir clarissimus, consul
310 4751 16; see also Index III s.v. 310

Sovdvlaiov, Aur. 4747 29-30
INDEXES

INDEX OF PLACES

Capa-rrac, s. of Papontos 4740 4
Ceflac/Toct; see Index II s. w. Hadrian; Severus, Caracalla, and Geta; Diocletian and Maximian Augusti, Constantius and Maximian Caesars; Maximian and Severus Augusti, Maximinus and Constantius Caesars; Index III s. n. 296 307
Ceyrou; see Index II s. w. Severus, Caracalla, and Geta; Maximian and Severus Augusti, Maximinus and Constantius Caesars; Maximian and Severus Augusti, Maximinus and Constantius Caesars; Index III s. n. 307
Ceyrou, Aur., s. of Valerius 4749 3
Ceympioc, see Index II s. w. Severus, Caracalla, and Geta

INDEX OF PERSONS

Tađmoc, m. of Aur. Paesis 4747 6
Tađtic; see s. n. 'Andrónico
Tiébrico; see Index II s. n. Mauricius
Técæt, m. of Aur. Ophelius 4748 3

INDEX OF FAMILIES

'Ammoëa (kłoro) 4745 9-10
'Ano Kusapoléctas 4748 8 4750 4, 9 4752 8
'Arctoost (nouë) 4740 7-8
'Eptidà (èpoioè) 4755 10

INDEX OF NAMES

Δionæoc 4740 2

Εισαυ (kóym) 4757 14
'Ermospoléctas (nouë) 4752 3
'Hy lapripotatà i megàly Êrhoù pólic 4749 4
'Hy elègcëes (pòlic) 4750 4

Τếiæo Katæo (kóym) 4748 4
Kerkełucæ (kóym) 4747 6-7
Kerkełúocæ 4753 9

Δηνo 4739 3, 19
Néa Τousteiòu pólic 4754 6

INDEX OF PLACES

'Hy erłowgítës (nouë) 4748 3-5 4755 10-11 4756 9
'Hy erłowgítëw pólic 4748 6 [4749 4] 4757 7;
'Hy laprip' 'Hy erłowgítëw pólic 4755 6 4756 6-7;
'Hy laprip' kai lapripotatà 'Hy erłowgítëw pólic 4747 5 4750 6-7 4752 5-6
'Hy erłowgíçn pólic 4739 1-2 4740 5-6 4745 3

Πáeïos 4739 6
Pákoles (èpoioè) 4753 6-7
Πéla 4739 3, 23
Pérpe 4739 3
Π. laðræos (èpoioè) 4752 2

Cérvios 4745 9, 33 4747 8
Stræo, n. o. (kłoro) 4753 10

Teβtowego 4741 1-2 4742 1 4743 1-2 4744 1-2
'Hy laðwos (kłoro) 4753 10
'Hy onìca 4751 2

INDEX OF PERSONS

ekebétatoc 4754 1 4755 1, 3 4756 1, 3
'thìcos 4756 10

INDEX OF NAMES

VIII. GEOGRAPHICAL

IX. RELIGION
X. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS AND TITLES

Αρμανός 4746 8
βουλευτής 4747 4
γυμνασιαρχείν 4747 4
δεξιότης 4752 1υ 4754 1 4755 1, 3 4756 1, 3
ἐναπόγραφος [4755 11-12] 4757 1
ἐνδοθέως 4755 3 4756 6
ἐνδοξότατος 4755 4 4756 5
ἐνδοξότης [4755 11, 16] [4756 12] 4757 3 [4758 3]
ἐπαρχός 4751 17
ἐπιφανέστατος 4747 26 4748 2, 20 4749 2 [4750 22]
ἐυκριότης 4754 1 4755 1 [4756 2]
ἐυκλείς 4754 5

Νεη 4746 8

XII. MEASURES

(a) Weights and Measures

δραμα 4739 6, 10 4745 10 4747 9 4753 10, 11, (12), (15)
ἀρνάθη 4739 10-11 4745 17 4747 11-12, 20 4753 14, 15-16, 24
ημιαριθμόν 4739 22
τετραγωνικόν (μετρών) 4745 37-8
χαίνεξ 4747 20 4753 24

(b) Money

δραχμή 4740 12 4745 14 (4748 12) 4750 13, (14)
4752 12, (13)
νομισματίων 4748 11 4750 13 4751 9 4752 11 4757 8
τάλους (4748 12) 4750 13, (14) 4751 9, 20-1
4752 12, (13)
τετραμύδιον 4740 14

XIII. TAXES

Έκαστοτική καὶ πεντηκοστή (ῥ καὶ ν) 4740 2-3 4742 2

See also Index VIII s.v. Severus, Caracalla, and Geta

XI. PROFESSIONS AND OCCUPATIONS

διακητής 4754 7 [4755 7] [4756 8]
ἐπικείμενος 4754 7
### XIV. GENERAL INDEX OF WORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αδαλός</td>
<td>4748 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αδραχως</td>
<td>4739 12 4745 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αδαλός</td>
<td>4745 35 4747 18 4752 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αγωρά</td>
<td>4748 8 4750 8 4752 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αγριμίατος</td>
<td>4757 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αδελφός</td>
<td>4745 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδαμπυνικός; see Index II s.v. Severus, Caracalla, and Geta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αδαλείπτως</td>
<td>4756 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αδαλός</td>
<td>4739 20 4745 34-5 4747 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αεί</td>
<td>4739 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αφέν</td>
<td>4745 45 4753 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αιώνιος</td>
<td>4754 2 4755 2 4756 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ακίνμυνος</td>
<td>4739 11 4745 18 4747 12 4753 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκρίμος</td>
<td>4739 20 4745 35 4747 18 4753 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλά</td>
<td>4757 2 [4758 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλληλγιγύνη</td>
<td>4745 57-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλληλεγγυνος</td>
<td>4745 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλήλως</td>
<td>4747 22, 23 4748 10 4750 11-12 [4751 8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4752 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλος</td>
<td>4750 16 4752 15 4753 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλως</td>
<td>4739 10 4747 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμέλες [4755 14]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμφίδρος</td>
<td>4745 5 4753 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνά</td>
<td>4753 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναβόλη</td>
<td>4753 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάδεχονται</td>
<td>4756 11 4757 11, [15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπειθεῖν</td>
<td>[4755 15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπειδεύον</td>
<td>4755 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπεκρήθητος</td>
<td>4753 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρω</td>
<td>4748 8 4750 4, 9 4752 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπεικόνισις</td>
<td>4755 16 4757 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπετέρω</td>
<td>4757 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπείρω</td>
<td>4746 2 4748 12, 23 4750 15 4751 10, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4752 13, 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπείδεια</td>
<td>4750 19 4751 15 4752 18 [4756 23] 4757 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4758 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπί</td>
<td>4739 1, 3, 14, 23 4740 5 4745 3, 6, 7, 8 4747 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4748 1, 15 4749 4 4750 4, 6, 18 4751 3 4752 2, 5, 17 4753 4, 8 4755 10 [4756 9, 13] 4757 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπειδοποιῶν</td>
<td>4739 17 4745 29 4747 15, 28 4753 21, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποκρόνων</td>
<td>4756 22 4758 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπολυμπάνων</td>
<td>4747 14 4753 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπολύσσεις</td>
<td>4758 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπολυμπάντων [4756 15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπόστακτον</td>
<td>4739 18 4747 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπόστατος</td>
<td>4739 9-10 4745 13, 17 4747 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποτίκες</td>
<td>4739 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀπριανός; see Index X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀραβικός; see Index II s.v. Severus, Caracalla, and Geta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀργύρων</td>
<td>4745 14 4748 11 4750 12 4751 8, 20 4752 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρέθης</td>
<td>4751 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρετερός</td>
<td>4752 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρέσμον</td>
<td>[4755 14-15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρουρα; see Index XII(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρρη</td>
<td>4748 9 4750 9 4751 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρράτης; see Index XII(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀράδηρος [4756 10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστολόθ</td>
<td>4748 12 4750 14 4751 9 4752 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀστοκράτωρ; see Index II s.v. Hadrian; Severus, Caracalla, and Geta; Iustinus II; Mauricius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτός</td>
<td>4739 6, 26 4745 6, 8, 45, 46, 60 4746 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4747 8, 30 4748 26 4751 11, 13 (bii), 24 (4752 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4753 25, 31 4754 2, 5, 7 (bii) 4755 2, [7], [12], [17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4756 3, [8], [12], [13], (bii), 14 (bii), [20], [22] 4757 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bii), 2, 3, 6 (bii), 8, 12, 15 4758 2, 3, 6, [7], 8, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστοργόνη</td>
<td>4739 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδύνημι</td>
<td>4751 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεία</td>
<td>4754 1 4755 1 [4756 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βεβαιών</td>
<td>4739 16 4745 28 4746 3 4747 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4751 11-12, 21 4753 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βεβαιώσεις</td>
<td>4748 13, 14 4750 16, 16-17 4751 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4752 14-15, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουλευτής; see Index X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βρόις</td>
<td>4739 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γαληρήτης</td>
<td>4754 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γέγομα</td>
<td>4753 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεουχές</td>
<td>4754 5 [4755 5] 4756 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεοχώρος</td>
<td>4755 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεώνυς</td>
<td>4747 13, 19 4753 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεωμετρία</td>
<td>4739 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεωργός</td>
<td>4755 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>4739 13 4745 20, 57 4747 13, 28 4753 18, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4755 15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γῆγερχές</td>
<td>4739 7, 12 4745 26 4747 4, 26 4750 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4752 13 4753 26 4754 5 [4755 12]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεωμή</td>
<td>[4756 10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεώμετρα</td>
<td>4745 61 4747 30 4746 41-4748 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4751 24-5 4752 24 4753 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIV. GENERAL INDEX OF WORDS

μήν 4756 15 4757 2
μήτε 4756 15 4757 2
μητρό 4739 2 4747 6 4748 3 4750 3 4752 2
[4755 8, 9] 4756 8, 12
μηχανή [4755 13]
μεθάνω 4739 1, 13, 14-15, 17, 18, 24-5, 25, 26-7,
31-2 4745 1, 11, 21-2, 27, 29-30, 30, 40, 42-3, 50-7
4747 3, 15, 16, 21, 27 4753 7-8, 28-9
μεθοδεύς 4739 17, 29 4745 28-9, 47 4747 15, 22
μέγιστη 4754 5 4755 5 4756 6
μέσον 4753 8

ναβίδων 4753 16
νέος 4739 19 4745 34 4747 17 4753 21 4754 6 4756 2
νομός 4740 4 4745 3 4752 3 4756 9
νομιμότροπος; see Index XII(δ)
νῦν [4755 12]

ξυλαμάν 4739 9, 12 4747 10

οδόθηκοντα 4740 12-13
οδόσις 4747 9
οδός 4756 4
οἰσιδήποτε 4757 4 [4758 4]
οἰσιδηποτούγει 4757 4 [4758 4]
οἴκτω 4740 13-14 4745 17, 18 4751 9, 21
δόσις 4739 10

ομαλογεῖν 4747 23, 29 4746 3 4748 7 [16] 4750 7,
(19) 4751 4, 11, 15, 22-3 4752 6, 18 4753 27 4756 9,
21, 23 4757 7, 9 4758 7, 10
ομαλογία 4754 10 (back)

ομοίοι 4753 12

νοσοί 4740 10-13 4745 5 4747 3 4744 5 4746 1,
4748 9, 22 4750 9, 23 4751 11, 13, 19

ομοίοι [4756 11]
ομοίων [4756 9]

dc 4739 15, 23 4745 22, 45 4747 22 4751 10 4752 13

οσεπε 4748 12 4750 14 4751 9

οτετε 4756 13 (ἐφ' ὅτε)

οὐδέ 4739 27, 28

οὐτερανός; see Index X

οὐκ 4739 26

οὐλή 4750 10 4752 21

οὐκέ 4753 23

οὖτος 4754 6 4756 20, [21] 4757 4, 7, 10 4758 [5], 7

οὔελεν 4745 24, 31 4747 14 4753 29-30

πανεφίημος; see Index X

παρά 4745 39 4747 21 4748 12 4750 15 4751 10

4752 14 4753 5, 26 4756 11 4757 3 [4758 3]

παραδέχεσθαι 4739 12-13 4745 26-7

παραδίδοναι 4748 7-8 4745 8 4752 7 4757 5

[4758 3]

παραλαμβάνει 4756 20 4757 6 4758 6

παραληπτικός 4745 30-9 4747 19

παραμένει 4756 14

παραφέρειν 4757 5 [4758 5]

παραχώμα 4751 14

παράγειν 4755 18

Παρθικὸς; see Index II s.v. Severus, Caracalla, and Geta

πάς 4739 19, 26 4740 8 4745 2-3, 18, 19, 47
4747 12 4748 14, 15, 16 4750 16, [18], 18 4751
12, 15 4752 17 (bis) 4753 17, 30 4756 21 4757 5

[4758 6, 8]

πατρίδα; see Index X

πατρίδος; see Index X

πέπτε 4750 13

πεντηκοστή; see Index XIII

περὶ 4739 3, 6 4745 9 4747 8, 22 4751 10 4753 9

περίβλεπτος; see Index X

πιπράδεκτες 4746 1 4748 7, 15, 22 4750 7-8, 17, [23]
4751 18 4752 7, 16, 22

πλήρες 4748 13, 24 4750 15 4751 10 4752 14, 24
4753 30

ποιεῖ 4753 17 [4756 21] 4757 7, 10 4758 7

πόλις 4739 2 4740 6 4745 3, 6 4747 5 [4748 6]
4749 4, 5 4750 4, 7 4752 6 4754 6 [4756 16]

4756 [7], 20 4757 7 [4758 7]; see also Index VIII
s.v. Ἐρμός π.; Νέα Υουστύνου π.; Οἰκουμενικός π.;

Οἰκουμήνων π.

πούς 4750 11

πράξεσ 4739 24 4745 41-2 4747 21 4753 26

πράξεις 4748 17 4750 19 4751 15 4752 18, 26

προαίρεσις 4756 10

προαγωγεῖν 4747 9

προγορᾶσα 4757 10

πρός 4739 14 4740 8 4745 21 4747 13 4748 10,
14 4750 11, 16 [4751 8] 4752 10, 15 4753 8, 18

[4756 22] 4757 3 [4758 3, 8]

προσήκειν 4756 12 4757 3 4758 3

προσμετρεῖν 4747 16-20 4753 23-4

προσοφελεῖν 4739 23

προσφυγή 4757 5 [4758 6]

προστίθασαι 4745 5 4746 4 4747 29 4748 24

4751 18-19, 21-2 4752 24 4753 30 4757 11 4758 10

πράγματα 4757 4 4758 4

πόλη 4740 1 4741 1 4742 2 4743 1 4744 1
INDEXES

τοῦτο ἢ 4739 8, 10, 19 4745 16, 17, 32, {34}, 4747 10, 11, 17 4753 12, 13, 14, 22
tῶλος 4752 9, 23, 26

ἐκθέμεν 4756 11
cτέρως 4739 8 4745 16 4747 10
cτοχέν 4758 10
cό 4747 13, 19 4748 8, {12} 4750 8, 13 4751 10, 11, 12 4752 7, 14 4753 9, 13, 18, 26 4755 6 4756 7
cεμβολιαγράφος; see Index XI
cεμφανεῖν 4748 10-11 4750 12 4752 10-11
cχόνος (?) 4741 4, 4742 6 4743 4, 4744 4
tόλαστον; see Index XII(b)
tέ 4739 25, 4745 42 4753 26
tέκον 4754 4
tελείω 4753 13
tελειον 4757 13 4758 11 (both ἐτελειοθέν)
tελειονέν 4740 1 4741 1 4742 1 4743 1 4744 1
tετερακόστα 4753 14
tέεραπος 4740 11-12 4745 15 4753 10, 11, 14, 24-5
tετεραικύλιον 4750 14
tετεραζώνιοι; see Index XII(d)
tετεράδολον; see Index XII(b)
tυπή 4746 2-3 4748 9, 11, 23 4750 [10], 11 4751 8, 20 4752 10, 23
tις 4739 12 4745 23
tόπος 4756 15 4757 2, 5 (bis) 4758 2, 5, [6]
tρεχόμεν 4752 13
tρεῖός 4740 15
tρένον 4739 6
tτύχη 4757 1

υόκ 4753 3 4758 8, 9 4756 8, 12, 23 4757 10, 14
tμείκ 4754 6 4755 11, 16
tμέτρος 4756 11 4757 3 4758 3
tόπαρχων 4739 5, 23-6 4745 8, 46 4747 8 4753 9

υπατεία; see Index III s.vv. 310, 311, 341, 572, 586, 590
υπατος; see Index III s.vv. 296, 307
υπέρ 4740 9 4745 60 4746 10 4747 30 4748 6 4751 24 4752 24 4753 13, 31 4757 7, 12
υπερβάλλων 4739 27
υπεδόνως 4756 21 [4758 8]
υπό 4747 9 4751 11 4755 13

φάναι 4753 31
Φιλιππαίοι; see Index X
φόρος 4745 13 4747 16, 28 4753 13, 17, 19, 21
φιλακτη 4756 20 4757 6 [4758 7]

χαῖρεν 4748 7 4750 7 4752 6 4755 12
χαρακτήρ 4741 8 4742 8 4743 8 4744 8
χάρις 4751 13
χείρ 4748 13 4750 13 4751 10 4752 14, 22
χειρογραφία 4755 20
χλωρά 4739 9 4745 13
χούια; see Index XII(d)
χόρτος 4747 10 4753 12, 15
χρέα 4755 12
χρόνος 4739 29 4747 7
χρυσός 4757 8
χρυσί 4741 8 4742 8 [4743 8] [4744 8]

ὁς 4739 21 4745 36, 58 4746 4 4747 21, 28 4748 24 4751 21 4752 24 4753 26, 30 4757 11 [4758 10]
ὁπτε 4739 7 4745 10 4747 10 4753 12 [4755 17]

ἐξει[ 4753 11
παρ[ 4751 7

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XLIV 3204 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV 3800 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lond. Copt. I 1075 2-12, 21, 23, 17, 18, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Mert. I 36, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Mert. II 76, 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Rain. Cent. 69, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB VIII 9833-23-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB VIII 9919, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4756 7 n.
4753 29-30 n.
4754 4-5 n. (p. 206)
4753 3 n.
4739 6-9 n.
4746 9 n.
4747 27-30 n.
4747 19-20 n.
Plate XVI

4751 (reduced)