

LIBRARY

Brigham Young University


ut Studies

Acc.

196537

No.

A
315
28
01.15



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Brigham Young University

THE
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

PART XV

GRENFELL AND HUNT

A

THE
LITERATURE OF
THE
MIDDLE AGES
AND
THE RENAISSANCE

Ancient Studies

PA
3315
.08
vol. 15

EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY

THE
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
PART XV

EDITED WITH TRANSLATIONS AND NOTES

BY

BERNARD P. GRENFELL, D.LITT.

PROFESSOR OF PAPYROLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, AND FELLOW OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

AND

ARTHUR S. HUNT, D.LITT.

PROFESSOR OF PAPYROLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, AND FELLOW OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

WITH FIVE PLATES

196537

BRITISH
LIBRARY
PROVOST

LONDON

SOLD AT

THE OFFICES OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY, 13 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C. 1
AND 503 TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON, MASS., U.S.A.

BERNARD QUARITCH, 11 GRAFTON STREET, NEW BOND STREET, W. 1
HUMPHREY MILFORD, AMEN CORNER, E.C. 4, AND 29 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

C. F. CLAY, FETTER LANE, E.C. 4

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C. 4
GEORGE SALBY, 65 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C. 1

1922

All rights reserved

EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY

THE

OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

PART XV

EDITED BY FREDERICK HALL

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY FREDERICK HALL

LONDON: H. K. LEWIS, 15, BLENHEIM STREET, W. 1903

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PRINTED BY RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY, BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

100 100 100 100
100 100 100 100
100 100 100 100

100 100 100 100 100 100
100 100 100 100 100 100
100 100 100 100 100 100

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

PREFACE

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

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

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

ARTHUR S. HUNT.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD,
DECEMBER, 1921.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
LIST OF PLATES	vii
TABLE OF PAPYRI	viii
NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	x

TEXTS

I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS	1
II. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS	26
III. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS	172
IV. MINOR LITERARY FRAGMENTS	226

INDICES

I. 1787-9 (SAPPHO AND ALCAEUS)	231
II. OTHER NEW TEXTS	235
III. PASSAGES DISCUSSED	249

LIST OF PLATES

I. 1778 Fols. 1, 2, recto, 1786, 1813 recto	}	<i>at the end.</i>
II. 1787 Frs. 1, 2, 9, 1788 Fr. 15		
III. 1789 Fr. 1, Col. i, Frs. 2, 3, 1790 Frs. 2 + 3, Col. ii, 1791		
IV. 1806 Col. iv, 1808 Cols. i-iii, 1810 <i>Phil.</i> i, Fr. 15		
V. 1814 verso		

TABLE OF PAPYRI

		CENTURY	PAGE
1778.	Aristides, <i>Apology</i> (Plate I)	4th	1
1779.	Psalm i	4th	6
1780.	St. John's Gospel.viii	4th	7
1781.	St. John's Gospel xvi	3rd	8
1782.	<i>Didache</i> i-iii	Late 4th	12
1783.	Hermas, <i>Pastor, Mand.</i> ix	Early 4th	15
1784.	Constantinopolitan Creed	5th	17
1785.	Homilies?	5th	18
1786.	Christian Hymn with Musical Notation (Plate I)	Late 3rd	21
1787.	Sappho, Book iv (Plate II)	3rd	26
1788.	Alcaeus? (Plate II)	Late 2nd	46
1789.	Alcaeus (Plate III)	1st	60
1790.	Ibycus (Plate III)	1st B. C.	73
1791.	Pindar, <i>Paeon</i> (Plate III)	1st	84
1792.	Pindar, <i>Paeon</i> ?	2nd	86
1793.	Callimachus, <i>Sosibi Victoria</i>	Late 1st	98
1794.	Poem in Hexameters	Late 2nd	110
1795.	Acrostic Epigrams	1st	113
1796.	Hexameter Poem on Egyptian Botany	2nd	116
1797.	Antiphon Sophistes, <i>Περὶ Ἀληθείας, i?</i>	Early 3rd	119
1798.	Anonymous work on Alexander the Great	Late 2nd	122
1799.	Oratorical Fragment	2nd	135
1800.	Miscellaneous Biographies	Late 2nd or early 3rd	137
1801.	Glossary	1st	150
1802.	Glossary	Late 2nd or early 3rd	155
1803.	Glossary	6th	163
1804.	<i>Λέξεις Ῥητορικαί</i>	3rd	166
1805.	Sophocles, <i>Trachiniae</i>	Late 2nd	172
1806.	Theocritus, <i>Idyll</i> xxii (Plate IV)	Late 1st	180
1807.	Aratus, <i>Διοσημεία</i>	2nd	184
1808.	Plato, <i>Republic</i> viii (Plate IV)	Late 2nd	186
1809.	Plato, <i>Phaedo</i>	Early 2nd	191
1810.	Demosthenes, <i>Olynth.</i> i-iii, <i>Phil.</i> i, <i>De Pace</i> (Plate IV)	Early 2nd	194

TABLE OF PAPYRI

ix

	CENTURY	PAGE
1811. Demosthenes, <i>C. Timocratem</i>	3rd	209
1812. Isocrates, <i>Ad Demonicum</i>	5th or 6th	211
1813. Codex Theodosianus vii (Plate I)	Early 6th	214
1814. Index to Codex Iustinianus, First Edition (Plate V)	A. D. 529-535	217
1815. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> i	3rd	222
1816. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> xv	3rd	222
1817. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> xvii, xviii	6th	222
1818. Homer, <i>Iliad</i> xxii, xxiii	5th or 6th	223
1819. Homer, <i>Odyssey</i> x-xii	2nd	224
1820. Homer, <i>Odyssey</i> xviii	6th or 7th	225
1821. Hexameters or Elegiacs	3rd	226
1822. Hexameter Poem on Astronomy	2nd	226
1823. Fragment of a Tragedy	1st B. C.	226
1824. Fragment of a Comedy	3rd	227
1825. Fragment of a Comedy	5th	228
1826. Romance?	Late 3rd or 4th	228
1827. Oratorical Fragment	3rd	229
1828. Ethical Treatise	3rd	230

NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

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

- P. Amh. = The Amherst Papyri, Vols. I-II, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.
P. Grenf. = Greek Papyri, Series I-II, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.
P. Halle = Dikaiomata, &c., von der Graeca Halensis.
P. Oxy. = The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Parts I-XIV, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.
P. Rylands = Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Rylands Library, Vol. I, by A. S. Hunt.
P.S.I. = Papiri della Società italiana, Vols. I-VI, by G. Vitelli and others.

I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1778. ARISTIDES, *Apology*.

12 × 14.6 cm.

Fourth century. Plate I
(Fols. 1-2, recto).

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

The *Apology* is a recent addition to early Christian literature. The first step towards its recovery was made in 1878 with the publication of an Armenian translation of the first few chapters from two MSS. in the Lazarist monastery at Venice. This was followed eleven years later by Dr. Rendel Harris's find at Sinai of a complete version in Syriac; and shortly afterwards Dr. Armitage Robinson, who had seen Dr. Harris's work in proof, recognized that the *Apology* was actually already extant in Greek, having been embedded in the early mediaeval romance, the *History of Barlaam and Josaphat*. The outcome of these fortunate discoveries was the joint edition by the two scholars of the *Apology of Aristides in Texts and Studies*, I. i. (1891), containing the Syriac

text with an English translation, Latin and English versions of the Armenian fragment, and the Greek text from *Barlaam and Josaphat*.

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

With the welcome discovery of what is undoubtedly a fragment of the original text, the problem now reaches a new phase. The relation of the Greek of the fragment (P) to that of *Barlaam and Josaphat* (BJ) and to the Syriac version is discussed in detail in the notes below on ll. 8 sqq. and 26 sqq. In

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

Fol. 1, recto. Plate I.

6 lines lost

7] μαιροισ

Fol. 2, recto. Plate I.

ζοντες την τω[ν] α[νε
μων πνοην θν ειναι
10 [πλανω]νται φανερα
[γ]αρ εστιν ημιν οτι
[δο]υλευει ετερω ποτε
[μεν γαρ] α[ν]ξ[ε]ι[ποτ]ε δε
ληγει ουκουν αναγ
15 [κα]ζεται ὑπο τινος
. [.....]. [.....] ξει
. [.....] νωγα .. [.....] α
. [.....] λ..... [.....]
4 lines lost
[.....]. ελ..... ι
[.....] ντων των

Fol. 2, verso.

v. [ση]μ[ε]ιου εις σημειον vi.
καθ ημεραν φερομε
νον δυνοντα τε και
ανατελλοντα του
30 θερμαινειν τα βλα
στα και τα φυτα εις
την χρηση των αν
θρωπων επει και [] με
ρισμους εχ[οντα] μ[ε]
35 τα των λο[ιπων] ασ[τε]
ρων και ε[λαττων] α
οντα του [ουρανου]
π[ο]λυ αυξ[ει] δε και
μειουται [και εκλιψις

25 [.]νωγτ[.].

40 εχει και μ[η]δεμιαν
 αυτοκρα[τειαν] εχον
 τα διο ου υ[νενο]μισται
 [το]ν ηλιον [ειναι] θν

7. *μαιοις* is apparently a misspelling for *μαιοις*. This word does not occur in the extant Greek, and to what context it should be referred is not clear. There are several references to pollution in ch. iv and the preceding part of ch. v in connexion with γῆ and ὕδωρ, — *φυρομένην, αίμασι φονευομένων μιάνεται, μιάνεται καὶ φθείρεται, αίμασι μολυνόμενον καὶ εἰς πάντων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων πλύσιν ἀγόμενον*. The original form of one of these phrases may have included the adjective *μαιοις*, though there is nothing in the Syriac suggesting this. Possibly, again, the word was used later in reference to the Greek gods or their human imitators; cf. viii εἰς ζῶα μεταμορφουμένους ἐπὶ πονηραῖς καὶ αἰσχροῖς πράξεσιν, and τοὺς μὴ ὄντας προσαγορεύοντες θεούς, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν τὰς πονηράς, ἵνα τοὺτους συνηγόρους ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας μοιχεύσωσιν, ἀρπάξωσιν, φονεύωσι καὶ τὰ πάνθεινα ποιῶσιν. As mentioned in the introd., the relative positions of Fol. 1 and Fol. 2 are indeterminate.

8 sqq. The extant Greek of this passage is as follows: οἱ δὲ νομίζοντες τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων πνοὴν εἶναι θεῶν πλανῶνται. φανερόν γάρ ἐστιν ὅτι δουλεύει ἐτέρῳ, καὶ χάριν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατεσκευάσται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς μεταγωγὴν πλοίων καὶ συγκομιδὰς τῶν σιτικῶν, καὶ εἰς λοιπὰς αὐτῶν χρείας· αὔξει τε καὶ λήγει κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ. διὸ οὐ νενομίσται τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων πνοὴν εἶναι θεῶν, ἀλλ' ἔργον θεοῦ.

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

In ll. 8-12 the agreement with the extant Greek is close, the only discrepancies being θ(εὸν) εἶναι for εἶναι θεῶν, φανερά for φανερόν, and the addition of ἡμῖν after ἐστιν. In the Syriac the simple directness of the original is obscured by unnecessary verbiage: 'concerning the blast of winds, that it . . . these also . . . and this is evident . . . that these winds . . .' On the other hand 'to us', which the extant Greek has dropped after 'evident', is correctly retained; and the following clause 'Since sometimes their blast is increased and sometimes it is diminished and ceases' apart from the redundancy of 'their blast' and 'and ceases', corresponds faithfully to the original, whereas the extant Greek parts company, omitting the dependent clause and passing on to the next sentence. At this point, however, the Syriac too becomes faulty. After 'and ceases' it proceeds 'according to the commandment of him who subjects them' (cf. κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ in the extant Greek); whereas the original has an inferential sentence, apparently 'therefore it is under some compulsion . . .'. Further detailed comparison is precluded by the unfortunate mutilation of the

lower part of this page; but the scanty remains appear to support the fuller version of the Syriac as against the much shorter extant Greek, though no definite correspondence can be made out.

9. θ(εο)ν: so also the Syriac, 'that it is God'. The extant Greek has θεάν both here and elsewhere where the subject is feminine.

13. α[υ]ξ[ε]ι: the identification of the exiguous traces is confirmed by the collocation αὔξει τε καὶ λήγει farther on in BJ. Whether that is to be regarded as a transposition of ποτε μὲν . . . ληγει is doubtful, for the Syriac repeats 'Since then this wind is sometimes increased and sometimes diminished' at the corresponding point, and it is therefore quite possible that there was a similar repetition in the original. In that case BJ omitted ποτέ μὲν . . . λήγει here, and did not merely transfer it to a later position.

14. αναγκ[α]ζεται: cf. the references in BJ to ἀνάγκη in connexion with other elements, &c., e. g. iv κινείται δὲ οὐρανὸς κατ' ἀνάγκην, vi ὀρώμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν ἥλιον) κινούμενον κατ' ἀνάγκην, and the application of the same phrase to the moon and to man. To read αναγκ[η] εσται is less suitable, since of the doubtful letters before ται the second is the taller of the two, whereas if they are εσ the reverse would be expected. The top of the supposed ζ is not unlike that of ζουτες in l. 8.

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

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

18. The doubtful λ may be μ.

26 sqq. The opening sentence of this section may safely be restored from BJ on the analogy of ll. 8-10 οι δε νομιζουτες τον ηλιον θ(εο)ν ειναι πλανωνται. BJ continues: ὀρώμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν κινούμενον κατὰ ἀνάγκην καὶ τρεπόμενον καὶ μεταβαίνοντα ἀπὸ σημείου εἰς σημείον, δύνοντα καὶ ἀνατέλλοντα, τοῦ θερμαίνειν τὰ φυτὰ καὶ βλαστὰ εἰς χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἔτι δὲ καὶ μερισμὸν ἔχοντα μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀστέρων, καὶ ἐλάττονα ὄντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πολὺ, καὶ ἐκλείποντα τοῦ φωτός, καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοκράτειαν ἔχοντα. διὸ οὐ νεόμισται τὸν ἥλιον εἶναι θεόν, ἀλλ' ἔργον θεοῦ.

The Syriac is: 'So too those have erred who have thought concerning the sun that he is God. For lo! we see him, that by the necessity of another he is moved and turned and runs his course; and he proceeds from degree to degree, rising and setting every day, in order that he may warm the shoots of plants and shrubs and may bring forth in the air which is mingled with him every herb which is on the earth. And in calculation the sun has a part with the rest of the stars in his course, and although he is one in his nature he is mixed with many parts, according to the advantage of the needs of men: and that not according to his own will, but according to the will of Him that ruleth him. Wherefore it is not possible that the sun should be God but a work of God.'

Here the Greek of BJ is close to that of the papyrus throughout, especially when one or two necessary corrections have been made. φερομενον of l. 2 has disappeared and is more likely to have been simply dropped than to be represented by μεταβαίνοντα, since the Syriac has an equivalent for this as well as for φερομενον. καθ ημεραν, which the Syriac connects, probably rightly, with δυνοντα τε και ανατελλοντα, has also been discarded. The article has been omitted with βλαστὰ and χρῆσιν (confirmed against the v. l. χρείαν), and βλαστὰ and φυτὰ are transposed; which was the correct order may be questioned, but the papyrus seems on the whole to be supported by the Syriac. μερισμους (l. 33) was read by Boissonade, with some MSS. (μερισμόν W, *divisionem* Lat.; cf. Syr.). In ll. 38-40 αυξ[ε]ι δε και μεινται [και εκλειψεις (?)] εχει is represented by καὶ ἐκλείποντα τοῦ φωτός, and this or something like it is probably to be regarded as the correct text, since the indicatives αυξει, &c., interrupt the participial construction, which is carried on in ll. 40-1 by και μηδεμιαν αυτοκρατειαν εχοντα;

and though waxing and waning might be interpreted as referring to varying degrees of heat they are not terms ordinarily associated with the sun. It is then likely, as Dr. Rendel Harris suggests, that *αυξει, κτλ.*, has been brought in here from the succeeding paragraph concerning the moon, where BJ has *αὐξανομένην τε καὶ μειουμένην καὶ ἐκλείψεις ἔχουσαν*.

The Syriac has preserved *φερομενον* and *καθ ημεραν*, but in other respects does not compare favourably with BJ. 'Shoots of plants and shrubs' is a pointless change, and 'may bring forth . . . earth' and 'in his course . . . parts' are gratuitous amplifications. 'ἔτι is omitted, and the insertion of 'in calculation' is anything but a gain in clearness. 'According to the advantage of the needs of men' is displaced, and is besides a clumsy translation of *εις την χρησην των ανθρωπων*, though less verbose than 'and that not according to his own will', &c., as an equivalent of *και μηδεμιαν αυτοκρατειαν εχοντα*. The reference to eclipse has disappeared. Raabe, *l. c.*, was rightly critical of this passage.

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

38-40. Cf. n. on ll. 26 sqq. *εκλειψεις* is assured by the parallel there quoted from BJ and would not overload the lacuna if *εκλιψεις* or *εκλιψις* were written, as is quite possible.

1779. PSALM i.

11.5 × 7.7 cm.

Fourth century.

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

Recto.

Verso.

<i>ουχ' ουτω[s]</i>	i. 4	10 [σ]τησονται α	
<i>οι ασεβεις</i>		<i>σεβεις εν</i>	
<i>ουχ' ουτως</i>		<i>κρισει ουδε α</i>	
<i>αλλ η ως χρους</i>		<i>μαρτωλοι εν</i>	
5 <i>ο[ν] εκριπτει</i>		<i>βουλη δικαιων</i>	
<i>ο ανεμος</i>		15 <i>οτι γινωσκει</i>	6
<i>απο προσωπου</i>		<i>κ̄σ̄ οδον δικαι</i>	
<i>της γης δια</i>	5	<i>ων και οδος</i>	
<i>τουτο ουκ' ανα</i>			

4. *ως χρους*: so the cursive 281 (Laur. v. 18, 11th cent.); *ο χρους* other MSS.
10. *ασεβεις*: so N²AR^a and many cursives, including 281. *οι ασεβεις* others.

1780. ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL viii.

25.6 × 8 cm.

Fourth century.

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

Verso.		Recto.	
[]	οδ	
[και ειπεν] αυτοις	viii. 14	και μαρτυρει περι	
[καν εγω μ]αρτυρω		εμου [ο πεμφσας με	
[περι εμου]του η μαρ		πηρ ε[λεγον ουν	19
[τυρια μου] αληθης		αυτω [που εστιν ο	
5 [εστιν οτι ο]ιδα πο		30 πηρ σο[υ απεκριθη	
[θεν ηλθο]ν και που		Ιησ ου[τε εμε οida	
[υπαγω υ]μεις δε		τε ουτ[ε τον π̄ρα μου	
[ουκ οida]ε ποθεν		ει εμε [ηδείτε και	
[ερχομαι] η που υπα		τον π̄ρα μου αν η	
10 [γω υμεις] κατα τη̄	15	35 δειτε ταυτα τα ρη	20
[σαρκα κρ]ινετε εγω		ματα ελα[λησεν εν	
[ου κριν]ω ουδενα		τω γαρο[φυλακιω	
[και εαν κ]ρινω δε	16	διδασκω[ν εν τω	
[εγω η κρ]ισις η εμη		ιερω και ουδεις	
15 [αληθινη ε]στιν ο		40 επιασε[ν αυτον ο	
[τι μονος] ουκ ει		τι ουπ[ω εληλυθει	

[μι αλλ εγ]ω και ο		η ωρα α[υτου ειπεν	21
[πεμφτας] με πηρ		ουν πα[λιν αυτοις	
[και εν τω] νομω	17	εγω υπ[αγω και ζη	
20 [δε τω υμ]ετερω		45 τησετε μ[ε και εν	
[γεγραπτ]αι οτι δυ		τη αμαρτ[ια υμων	
[ο ανων η] μαρτυρι		αποθαι[εισθε ο	
[α αληθης] εστιν ε	18	που εγω [υπαγω	
[γω ειμι] ο μαρτυ		υμεις ου [δυνασθε	
25 [ρων περι] εμαυτου		50 ελθειν ε[λεγον ουν	22

3-5. η μαρ[τυρια μου] αληθης [εστιν]: this is the order of B. αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου W(estcoit)-H(ort) and T(extus)-R(eceptus) with most MSS.

7. δε: so BD, W-H, T-R; om. **Σ**.

9. η: so BD^{ex}, W-H; και **Σ**, T-R.

13. It is clear that the papyrus did not read και with **Σ** for και εαν.

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

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

18. π(α)τηρ: so **Σ**^cB, T-R; om. **Σ**^{*D}. W-H print πατήρ in brackets.

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

31. Ι(ησου)ς: so BD, W-H; ο Ι(ησου)ς **Σ**, T-R. **ΣD** further add και ειπεν (ειπ. αυτοις D).

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

αν η]δειτε: so B, W-H; ηδειτε αν **Σ**, T-R.

36. The line is sufficiently filled without the addition of ο Ι(ησου)ς, which is read after ελαλησεν by some of the later uncials and T-R; cf. l. 43, n.

42. ειπεν: **Σ** ελεγεν, which, though unlikely, can hardly be excluded; cf. l. 15, n.

43. The papyrus evidently agreed with the best MSS. in omitting ο Ι(ησου)ς which is added after αυτοις by T-R with inferior authority.

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

1781. ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL xvi.

24.5 × 6.8 cm.

Third century.

The following leaf from a papyrus codex evidently belonged to the same MS. from which 208 (now Brit. Mus. 782), a sheet containing portions of chaps. i and xx of St. John's Gospel, was derived. The character of the hand (both in the main text, which is written in an upright rather heavy script of semi-literary type, and in the corrections), length of lines and columns, method of punctuation by short blank spaces, occasional use of the rough breathing, and internal textual evidence, all combine in proving an identical origin. 208 was assigned to the

period between A. D. 200 and 300 (Part II, p. 2), and there is no reason to question that attribution, though the codex is perhaps more likely to date from the second half of the century than the first. With regard to the corrections and additions, which are in a small but very similar hand, the further specimens now available rather suggest that these are due to a *diorthotes* rather than to the original scribe, though they must in any case be practically contemporary.

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

Recto.

[οτι εκ του εμου λημψετ]αι και αναγ [xvi. 14
[γελει υμιν παντα οσ]α εχει ο $\overline{\pi\rho}$ ε	15
[μα εστιν δια τουτο ειπο]ν οτι εκ τ[ου	
[εμου λαμβανει κα]ι $\alpha\eta[\alpha]$ γγελει ὑμῶν	
5 [μεικρον και ουκετι θεωρειτε με κ]αι	16
[παλιν μεικρον κ]αι οψεσθε [με ειπα]ν	17
[ουν . . . εκ των μ]αθητων αυτου	
[προς αλληλους τι] εστιν τουτο ο λε	
[γει ημειν μεικρον και ου] θεωρει[τ]ε με	
10 [και παλιν μεικρον και οψ]εσθε με $\kappa\alpha\iota$ [οτ]ι	
[υπαγω προς τον] $\overline{\pi\rho\alpha}$ ελεγον ουν	18
[τι εστιν τουτο] μεικρον ουκ οίδα	
[μεν τι λαλει ε]γνω $\overline{\text{Ἰησ}}$ οτι ηθελον	19
[αυτον ερωταν] και ειπεν αυ[ο]ις	

- 15 [περι τουτου ζητ]ειτέ μετ αλληλω[ν
 [οτι ειπον μεικρ]ον και ου θεωρει[τε
 [με και παλιν μεικρο]ν και οψεσθε με [
 [αμην αμην λεγ]ω υμειν οτ[ι κ]λα[ν
 [σετε και θρηνησ]ετε υμεις. ο δε 20
 20 [κοσμος χαρησεται υμεις λ[[ο]]υπηθη
 [σεσθε αλλα η λυπ]η υμων εις χαραν
 [γενησεται η γυν]η οταν τικτη λοι 21
 [πην εχει οτι ηλθεν] η ωρα αυτης
 [οταν δε γεννηση το π]αιδιον ουκε
 25 [τι μνημονευει της θλ]ειψ[ε]ως δι
 [α την χαραν οτι εγενν]ηθη ανθρω
 [πος εις τον κοσμον] και υμεις ουν 22

Verso.

- υνν μεν [λυπην εχετε παλιν δε
 οψομαι υμ]ας και χαρησεται υμων
 30 η καρδια [και την χαραν υμων ου
 δεις αρει [αφ] υ]μων και εν εκεινη 23
 τη ημερ[α] ε[μ]ε [ουκ ερωτησετε
 ουδεν αμην α]μην λεγω υμειν
 αν τι αιτη[σ]ητε [τον π̄ρα δωσει υμειν
 35 εν τω ον[ο]ματ[ι μου αιτειτε και 24
 λημψεσθε ι]να η χαρα υμων η
 πεπληρω[μ]ε[ν]η [ταυτα εν παροι
 μiais λελ[α]ληκα [υμειν ερχεται 25
 ωρα οτε ουκετ[ι εν παροιμiais λα
 40 λησω υμειν αλ]λα παρρησια περι
 του π̄ρς απαγ'γε[λω υμειν εν ε 26
 κεινη τη ημερα [εν τω ονοματι
 μου αιτησεσθε [και ου λεγω υμειν
 [ο]τι εγω ερωτησ[ω του π̄ρα αυτος. 27
 45 [γ]αρ ο π̄ρ φιλει υμ]ας οτι υμεις εμε
 πεφιληκατε και [πεπιστευκατε

οτι παρα $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ εξηλθ[ον εξηλθον] 28
 παρα του $\overline{\pi\rho\varsigma}$ και ε[ληλυθα εις τον
 κοσμον παλιν α[φιημι τον κοσμον]
 50 και πορευομαι προ[ς τον $\overline{\pi\rho\alpha}$ λε 29
 $\overline{\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega}$
 γουσιν οι μ[αθηται αυτου ιδε νυν εν
 παρρησια λ[αλεις και παροιμιαν ου
 δεμιαν λ[εγεις νυν οίδαμεν] 30
 οτι οιδας πα[ντα και ου χρειαν εχεις
 εν τω ονοματι [μου εως αρτι ουκ ητησατε ουδεν εν
 τ[ω ονοματι μου αιτειτε και] 23-4

3. ε[πο]ν: to read ε[ιπον υμι]ν with \mathfrak{N}^c and others would overload the lacuna.

4. Whether λαμβανει (BDI^b, W-H) or λη(μ)ψεται (\mathfrak{N}^c A, T-R) was written cannot be determined.

5. On the basis of the preceding and following lines, ουκετι (\mathfrak{N} BDστI^b, W-H) suits the length of the lacuna better than ου (A, T-R).

6. T-R with AI^b and others adds οτι εγω υπαγω προς τον πατερα after οψεσθε με.

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

9. θεωρει[τ]ε: οψεσθε D.

10. The reading after οψ[ε]σθε is very uncertain; there was perhaps a correction.

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

12. τουτο] so \mathfrak{N}^*D^* ; for τουτο ο λεγει (\mathfrak{N}^c ABD²I^b, W-H, T-R) there is clearly no room. That το was omitted before] μεικρον (so B, W-H) is probable but hardly certain.

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

ε[γ]νω: so \mathfrak{N} BD, W-H; εγνω ουν A, T-R, εγνω δε and και εγνω being other variants.

Ιη(σου)ς: so B, W-H; ο Ι(ησου)ς \mathfrak{N} AD, T-R.

ηθελον: ημελλον \mathfrak{N} .

14. D's reading επερωτησαι περι τουτου is obviously excluded. A omits αυτοις.

20. υμεις: so \mathfrak{N} BD, W-H; υμεις δε A, T-R. υ of λυπηθη has been converted from an ι, i. e. λουπηθη was first written. The correction is perhaps due to the original scribe. Cf. l. 22.

21. Whether αλλα or αλλ was written cannot be ascertained.

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

23. ωρα: ημερα D.

25. θλ[ειψ[ε]ως: λυπης D.

26. ανθρωπος: ο ανθρωπος \mathfrak{N}^* .

27. ουν: \mathfrak{N}^* places this after νυν μεν.

28. νυν μεν [λυπην: so \mathfrak{N} BC*D, W-H; λυπην μεν νυν AC³, T-R.

31. αρει: so BD*, W-H; αρει \mathfrak{N} ACD², T-R.

33. οτι may have been added at the end of the line as in $\mathfrak{N}D^2$ (T-R).

34. αν τι is the reading of BCD, W-H; ο αν \mathfrak{N} , ο τι αν A, οσα (ε)αν some later MSS.,

T-R.

34-5. δώσει . . . ο[ο]μα[ι] μου : so NBC*, W-H ; εν τω ονομ. μου, δώσει υμιν AC³D, T-R.

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

38. The line is sufficiently filled without αλλα (AC³D²) before ερχεται, especially as a short blank space may well have been left after υμειν.

39. οτε : οπου N*.

41. απαγγε[λ]ω : so NABC*D, W-H ; αναγγελω C², T-R.

42-3. αυτ. εν τω ονομ. μου N.

44. The lacuna here is of practically the same length as in the immediately preceding and following lines, and it seems clear that either τον π(ατε)ρα ο[ι] περι υμων was omitted, and for the latter omission there is some authority (the cursive 36, *Itala* MSS. bce, Cyril *Acta* 49, Aug. *De Trin.*). D adds μου after πατερα, and this may have been written, though not required.

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

47. οτι : οτι εγω MSS.

θ(εο)υ : so N²A ; του θεου C³ and others, T-R ; του πατρος BC*D, W-H.

48. παρα : so NAC², T-R ; εκ BC*, W-H. D omits εξηλθον . . . πατρος.

ε[λ]ηλυθα : ηλθον D.

50-1. λε]γουσιν, the original reading, is that of NBC*D*, W-H ; αυτω, which has been inserted above the line, is added by AC³D², T-R.

51. εν may have been omitted, with A.

1782. DIDACHE i-iii.

Fol. 1 5·8 × 5, Fol. 2 5·7 × 4·8. Late fourth century.

Two vellum leaves, containing a few verses from the first three chapters of the *Διδαχή τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, supposed by some to be of Egyptian origin and now making its appearance for the first time in an Egyptian manuscript. The leaves, which are a good deal worn and discoloured, are detached, but originally may well have formed a single sheet, since the two interior edges follow roughly the same contour. In that case the quire included five sheets at least, eight leaves being required for the matter intervening between Fol. 1 verso and Fol. 2 recto, and would be more likely to have consisted of the unusual number of eight sheets, for the 3½ verses lost before Fol. 1 recto would occupy only three more leaves. This latter inference would of course be invalidated if the *Didache* was preceded by some other treatise, but the supposition of a large total number of leaves does not well accord with their proportions, which are remarkably small—smaller even than in 840. The book to which they belonged was one of the miniature volumes which seem to have been often preferred for theological works, though not limited to that class of literature (cf. e.g. P. Rylands I. 28). It may

perhaps date from the fourth century rather than the fifth. The hand is a medium-sized informal uncial, at its best somewhat similar to that e. g. of 1618 and the Cairo Menander; on Fol. 1 recto it is markedly larger and more irregular than on the other three pages. That the writer was a person of no great culture is clear also from his spelling and division of words (e. g. *επιθυμειών, υμ|εις*). *ν* at the end of a line is commonly represented by a horizontal stroke above the preceding vowel, and the usual abbreviation of *πνεῦμα* occurs. There is no punctuation, but the end of a chapter is marked by a row of wedge-shaped signs followed by horizontal dashes. The apparent absence of pagination may be due to the poor state of preservation of the upper margins.

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

In the existing paucity of evidence for the text, any addition is welcome, and a comparison of these early Oxyrhynchus fragments with M and with the corresponding passages of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is an interesting study. Separated as they are in date by some eight centuries, it is hardly surprising to find several variations between M and 1782, which offers one or two remarkable new readings. Of these the most striking is the insertion between the third and fourth verses of chap. i of the words *ἄκουε τί σε δεῖ ποιῶντα σώσαι σου τὸ πνεῦμα. πρῶτον πάντων*, which form a transition to the abrupt *ἀπέχου* of the accepted text. Other noteworthy variants are the omission of *καὶ σωματικῶν* (*καὶ κοσμικῶν Const. Apost.*) in i. 4, and of *ἀπὸ παντός* in iii. 1, the insertion of *πράγματος* in iii. 1, and the substitution of *ἐπειδὴ ὁδηγεῖ* for *ὁδηγεῖ γάρ* in iii. 2. How should these novelties be appraised? The two last are not very convincing, and *ἀπόσχου* for *ἀπέχου* in i. 4 certainly does not inspire confidence. On the other

hand the omission of a second adjective in i. 4 renders more intelligible the strange variation there between M and *Const. Apost.*, and ἄκουε . . . πάντων does not look like an interpolation. Perhaps, then, Harnack's statement (*op. cit.* p. 172) that there is not the slightest trace of any alteration in the *Didache* during the two centuries which elapsed between its composition and embodiment in the *Apostolic Constitutions* may now need some qualification. With regard to the relation of M to *Const. Apost.*, though in cases of divergence the former has generally the support of 1782, there are two unexpected agreements with the latter in i. 3, τούτο for τὸ αὐτό and φιλεῖτε for ἀγαπάτε. Similarly, one coincidence occurs with Καν. ἐκκλησιᾶς. (Hilgenfeld's *Duae Viae*) against M and *Const. Apost.*, ὦν δέ for δὲ ὦν, which may be correct; a reading which Hilgenfeld ventured to adopt from that source is not, however, confirmed.

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

Fol. 1.

Recto.		Verso.	
ουχι και τα ε	i. 3	θρον ακου	i. 4
θνη τουτο		ε τι σε δει ποι	
ποιουσιν υμ	10	ουντα σωσαι	
εις δε φιλειτ		σου το π̄να π[ρ]ω	
5 ε τους μισοῡ		τον παντω̄	
τας υμας και		αποσχου των	
ουχ εξετε εχ		σαρκε[ι]κων ε	
		15 πιθυμειων	

Fol. 2.

Recto.		Verso.	
ελεγξεις περι ω̄	ii. 7.	[[απο]] παντος	
δε προσευξει ους		πραγματος	
δε αγαπησεις	25	πονηρου και	
υπερ την ψυχῃ		ομοιου αυτου	
20 σου >>>>>>>>>>		μη γεινου οργει	iii. 2
==== 4 =====		λος επειδη οδη	
τεκνον μου	iii. 1	γει η οργη προς	
φευγε απο		30 τον φονον	

2. *τουτο*: τὸ αὐτό M; cf. Matt. v. 47 οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἔθνηκοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῶσιν; On the other hand *Const. Apost.* (vii. 1) have καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἔθνηκοὶ τοῦτο ποιῶσιν, and so Justin, *Apol.* i. 15 (with πόρνοι instead of ἔθνηκοί).

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

7. οὐχ ἐξετε ἐχθρόν is also the order of M. ἐχθ. οὐχ ἔξ. *Const. Apost.*

8-12 *ακουε* . . . παντῶ(ν): there is nothing corresponding to these words in M or *Const. Apost.*, which pass abruptly to ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν κτλ. For σῶσαι το πνευ(μ)α cf. e. g. 1 Cor. v. 5 ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῆ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου.

13. *αποσχου*: ἀπέχου M, *Const. Apost.* The present tense is expected.

14. *σαρκε[ι]κων επιθυμιων*: σαρκικῶν καὶ σωματικῶν ἐπιθ. M, *σαρκ. καὶ κοσμικῶν ἐπιθ. Const. Apost.* κοσμικῶν was adopted by Bryennios and preferred by Harnack (pp. 5, 172) who however hesitated to accept it in his text; cf. Titus ii. 12 ἀρνησάμενοι . . . τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας, 2 Clem. xvii. 3 μὴ ἀντιπαρελκώμεθα ἀπὸ τῶν κοσμικῶν ἐπιθ. The variation in M and *Const. Apost.* as to the second epithet may perhaps be regarded as an argument for its omission with 1782, which has also in its favour the analogy of 1 Pet. ii. 11 ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ . . . ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθ.

16. *ελεγεῖς*: so M. The ξ, though little of it remains, is practically certain, and οὐς δὲ ἐλεήσεις, which Hilgenfeld inserted after ἐλεγεῖς from *Καν. ἐκκλ.*, is therefore excluded. *Const. Apost.* (vii. 5), like M, make no reference to ἔλεος, but are here rather compressed.

16-17. ω(ν) δε: so *Καν. ἐκκλ.*: δὲ ὧν M. Both M and *Καν. ἐκκλ.* have προσεύξη.

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

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

25. *πονηρου*: so M, *Καν. ἐκκλ.*; *κακοῦ Const. Apost.*

26. ὅμοιον: ἀπὸ παντὸς ὁμοίου M, *Const. Apost.*, *Καν. ἐκκλ.*

αυτου: so M, *Καν. ἐκκλ.*; *αὐτῶ Const. Apost.*

28. *επειδη οδηγει*: so Lat. *quia* . . . *ducit*; ὁδηγεῖ γάρ M, *Καν. ἐκκλ.*; *Const. Apost.* omit the exegetic clause. *επειδη ὁδηγεῖ* occurs three times in verses 4-6 of this chapter.

1783. HERMAS, *Pastor*, *Mand ix.*

6 × 9.3 cm.

Early fourth century.

This fragment, the fourth from the *Shepherd* to be obtained from Oxyrhynchus (cf. 404, 1172, 1599), consists of the lower portion of a vellum leaf containing a few verses from *Mand ix.* Seven lines are missing at the top of the verso, and on the assumption that the upper margin was of the same depth as the lower the height of the leaf when complete may be estimated at 13 cm. The hand is a round upright uncial of medium size and rather graceful appearance, which may be referred to the earlier part of the fourth century. There is no trace of ruling. One instance occurs of a stop in l. 4. θεός and κύριος are contracted as usual, but not ἄνθρωπος (l. 5).

The leaf is a palimpsest, but the original text, which ran in the reverse direction, is so much obliterated that its identity has not yet been established. It was prose, written apparently in lines of much the same length as those of the *Shepherd*, and in a hand which looks very little earlier in date. Among the few words which have been recognized with the aid of a reagent are . . . του περιεσχισ[θη, ου μονον τω, και πληρω.

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

Verso.

Recto.

				παντων των αιτηματων σου Mand.	
πολυσπλ[α]γχνιαν αυτου οτι Mand.	15	ανυστερητος εση εαν αδιστα ix. 4		κτως αιτηση παρα του [κ]υ εαν	
ου μη σε [ε]γκαταλειψει αλλα το ix. 2		δε διστασης εν τη καρδια σου		ου μη λαβεις των αιτηματων	
αιτημα της ψυχης σου πληρο		σου οι γαρ δισταζοντες εις τον		20	θν ουτοι εισιν οι διψυχοι και
φορησει ουκ εστιν ο θς ως οι					
5 ανθρωποι μνησικακουντες					
αλλ αυτος αμνησικακητος εστιν					

1. την] πολυσπλ[α]γχνιαν: so recent edd. with Grabe's fragment; την πολλήν εὐσπλαγχνίαν ca, Ant(iochus), Athan(asius) Cod. Guelf. (τήν πολυεσπλ. Cod. Paris.).

2. [ε]γκαταλειψει: so Athan. Cod. Guelf., &c. ἐγκαταλίπη ca (ἐγκαταλείπη Grabe's fragment).

4. εστιν ο θεος: ἔστι γάρ ca, omitting ὁ θεός, which Hilgenfeld and Gebhardt-Harnack add from Grabe's fragment, Ant., Athan., both Latin versions, and the Aethiopic.

5. 1. οἱ μνησικ. with ca and Grabe's fragment; the omission of οἱ (due no doubt to the termination of ἀνθρωποι) is found also in Ant. and Athan. Grabe's fragment adds (εἰς) ἀλλήλους after μνησικ.

6. αμνησικακητος: ἀμνησικάκος ca, &c. ἀμνησικάκην occurs elsewhere only in Polyb. xl. 12. 5 in a passive sense.

15. ανυστερητος: so ca, Hilgenfeld, Gebhardt-Harnack; ἀστερητος Athan. Cod. Paris.

εαν: so Gebhardt-Harnack with Athan. Cod. Paris., the older Latin, and the Aethiopic ;
 ὅσα ἄν ca, Hilgenfeld.

16. αιτηση: αἰτήσεως ca, Athan. Cod. Paris.

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

18. ου μη λαβεις: οὐδὲν οὐ μὴ λήψη ca, Athan. Cod. Paris.

20. οι: so ca, Ant. ; ὡς Athan. Cod. Paris., om. Cod. Guelf.

1784. CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CREED.

6.5 × 19.8 cm.

Fifth century.

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

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

Ϟ πιστευωμεν ει[s] ενα θ̄ν πατερα παντοκρατορα [[τορα]] ποιητην [ο]ννου
 και γης ορατων τε παντων και αφρατων και ει[[ε]]ς ενα κ̄ν Ἰν̄ Χ̄ν
 των υἱον του θ̄ν των μονογενην τον εκ του πατρος γεννηθεν[τα προ]
 παντων των αιωνον φως εκ φωτος θ̄ν αληθι[νο]ν εκ θ̄ν [αληθινου
 5 γεννηθεντα ου ποιηθεντα ωμοουσιον τω [π]ατρι δι ου [τα παντα εγενε
 τω [τον] δι ημας τους ανθρω[πο]υς κ̄, δια την ημετ[ερ]αν σω[τη]ριαν

3. μονογενην: this form of the acc. is a vulgarism common from the Roman period.

4. θ(εο)ν: the ν has been written over an original s, which being in darker ink looks at first sight like the later letter, but that this appearance is deceptive is shown by αληθι[νο]ν.

1785. HOMILIES?

Frs. 2 + 3 6.6 × 13.8 cm.

Fifth century.

A fragmentary papyrus leaf, apparently from a collection of discourses which at present remain anonymous. The style of Frs. 2-4 recto, concerning concupiscence, of which a series of Biblical instances is cited, recalls that of 1603, now identified as (Pseudo-)Chrysostom *In decollationem Precursoris* (λόγ. 9θ), but efforts to trace 1785 among the works of that voluminous author have so far not been successful. Other fragments of homilies cast in a somewhat similar mould are 1601-2. That the several fragments, of which a few are too insignificant to be worth printing, are all from the same leaf is likely though not certain. Frs. 1-5 recto and Fr. 1 verso. 1-6 are written in fairly regular slightly sloping uncials of medium size; at Fr. 1 verso. 7 the hand changes, and from this point onwards approximates to cursive. Apparently ll. 5-6 are remains of a heading, and ll. 7 sqq., where the second hand begins, are a fresh discourse, which is of a hortatory description and relates to reverence and godly fear. A fifth-century date seems to be indicated, more especially by the second hand. The ink throughout is of the brown colour characteristic of the Byzantine period. A mark like an enlarged comma is employed with some freedom to divide words, and two or three instances of the rough breathing occur on the recto, where also a high stop is once found (Fr. 1 recto. 7).

Fr. 1 recto.

.
] . [.] . . [.
 θ]ανατος και [.
]αντων απο δικαιο[.
 δικ]αιων εντολων θ̄ν α[.
 5]ως αθεος εστιν, ο̄τι [.
] κατεφρονησα [.
 ? ο̄]δου . [.]ν̄ και α . [.
] θ̄ς κα[.
 ψ]υχης [.
 10 ο]ι οφθ[αλμοι ?

Frs. 2-4 recto.

[16 letters ενεκεν συνουσι[ασ]μ[ου]
 [κ]α[τ]εψευ[σαντο οι πρεσβυτεροι] κατα Σουσαν []
 [ν]α[ς] ενεκεν [συν]ου[σιασμου η γυ]νη του αρ[χι
 [μ]αγειρου κα[τ]εψευδομαρ[τηρησεν του Ιω
 5 [σ]ηφ ενεκεν [σ]υνουσιασμου [απωλο]ν[το πολ
 [λοι] απο της φυ[λη]ς Βενιαμιν [ο]λιγ[οι δε] ε[σ]ω[θη]
 [σα]ν ενεκεν [σ]υ[νο]σιασμου⁷ οι Σοδομειται
 [εν]εκεν συνουσιασμου δι απο του Κα
 [. . . .]μ[. .] ενεκεν συνουσιασμου οι εν τη
 10 [. . . ε]νεκεν συνουσιασμ[ο]ν, η γυνη [το]ν
 [.]σ[. .] ε-ξουσιαζει αυ[της?] αμηρ
 [.] ? υπ[ο] του ιδιου [. . . .] . ον[. . . .]
 [18 letters]σε[. . . .]ν σκυθ[ρω
 [π 25 ,,]ναν χ[ο]
 15 [27 ,,] . [.

Fr. 4

Fr. 5.

β]ασιλ[]
]οσ[]
]ρη[]

Fr. 1 verso.

] . . []
]οσιν εξ εναν[τι
]α ειπ[εν] ο θ[ς] και δια . []
]αι τουτ[.] []
 5 κατ]α τονδε νουν λογος, λογο[ς
]

2nd hand] . . ων ο[. .]σα[
]επεμπ[
]

Frs. 2-4 verso.

.
 . [.] . ιλ [.
 εξ αρχης οσ[17 letters]ου γαρ παν[. . .
 .]ε περιβο[.]ο . [.] . εις απα[σα]ν ευλαβει[αν . .
 α]νηρ ευλαβης κ, φ[ο]βουμενος . . [. .
 5 .] . [.] κν̄, . [.] . ι . [.] ευλαβης απο υ[.] . . τ . α εθνους [. . .
 .]δα αυτων υπο τον ουνον̄ α[. . .] . α φοβουμε[νος
 ε[.] . . τον κν̄, τω δε φοβω του θν̄ εκκλεισ[ας και
 αναρπαξ[ας απο κ[ακο]ν μη ισθι φρο[νη]ματ
 ξε[.] . . τω φοβου δε τον κν̄ και ευ καλ[.
 10 . . .] . ξε[. . .]κου τοτει'ασ[. . .]ν[
 . κ]ακος, εφ[. . .] ευ λε . . [. . .
 .] γενεσις [. . .
 . . .] φ[ο]βε[.] . [.

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

7. The first letter must be α, δ, or λ, and if, as seems probable, the vestiges above the line represent a rough breathing, δδοῦ or δλον is indicated, the word following perhaps being σου; otherwise δουλ[ο]ν could well be read.

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

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

2. Either [κ]ατεψευ[σαντο] or [κ]ατεψευ[δομαρτυρησαν] (cf. l. 4) is probable and the former must be preferred if οι πρεσβυτεροι is right. Σουσαννα is the spelling of BAQ; Σωσαννα B rescr.

3. αρ[χιμ]αγειρου: so the LXX in Gen. xxxix. 1.

5-6. The incident referred to is related in Judges xix-xx. At the end of l. 5 $\alpha\pi\omega\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau[\omicron\ \text{πολ}\lambda\omicron\iota$ is very conjectural, especially as there is barely room for $[\lambda\omicron\iota]$ before $\alpha\pi\omicron$ in l. 6.

7. $\omicron\iota$ $\Sigma\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ (Gen. xix) and the following nominatives lack a verb, e. g. $\delta\iota\epsilon\phi\theta\alpha\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, and the angular symbol preceding $\omicron\iota$ may be interpreted as referring to this loss, which was perhaps supplied in the margin.

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

11. The explanation of the dash between the ϵ and ξ of $\epsilon\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota$ is not evident. There is a hole in the papyrus immediately below it. υ of $\alpha\nu[\tau\eta\varsigma]$ may be λ , e. g. $\alpha\lambda[\lambda\alpha\ \omicron]$.

Fr. 5. 3. A combination with Frs. 2-4. l. 2 $[\kappa] \alpha\tau\epsilon\psi\epsilon\nu[\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\rho\tau]\upsilon\rho\eta[\sigma\alpha\nu]$ is possible, though unconvincing.

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

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

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

7. \omicron of $\tau\omicron\nu$ has been corrected, perhaps from η .

8. $\phi\rho\omicron[\nu\eta]\mu[\alpha\tau \dots]$ or possibly $\phi\rho\omicron[\nu\epsilon]\mu[\omega\delta\eta\varsigma]$, a form found in some MSS. of Philostratus 705, which would suit the space rather better than $\phi\rho\omicron[\nu\eta]\mu[\]$.

10-13. The letters] $\epsilon\xi$, κ] $\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\phi$ in ll. 10-11, and ll. 12-13 are on Fr. 4 which is doubtfully placed; cf. note on Frs. 2-4 recto. In l. 10 the signs resembling inverted commas above $\alpha\sigma$ (or μ ?) may perhaps be regarded as marks of cancellation.

1786. CHRISTIAN HYMN WITH MUSICAL NOTATION.

29.6 × 5 cm.

Late third century. Plate 1.

This interesting fragment of what is by far the most ancient piece of Church music extant, and may be placed among the earliest written relics of Christianity, is contained on the verso of a strip from an account of corn, mentioning several Oxyrhynchite villages and dating apparently from the first half of the third century, though later than the Constitutio Antoniniana, since some of the persons named are Aurelii. The text on the verso is written in long lines parallel with the fibres in a clear upright hand which approximates to the literary type but includes some cursive forms, e. g. the ϵ of $[\pi]\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$ in l. 4. Above each line of text the corresponding vocal notes have been added in a more cursive lettering, whether by the same hand or another is not easy to determine. The character of both scripts appears to point to a date in the latter part of the third century rather than the early decades of the fourth. This hymn was accordingly written before either P. Amh. 2 or *Berl. Klassikertexte* VI. vi. 8, which are both assigned

to the fourth century. Unfortunately only its conclusion is preserved, and that very imperfectly, four lines out of the five being disfigured by large initial lacunae. Nevertheless the general purport of what remains is fairly clear. Creation at large is called upon to join in a chorus of praise to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the concluding passage is the usual ascription of power and glory to the 'only giver of all good gifts'. The original extent of the hymn cannot be gauged from the recto, for though the strip evidently came from the latter part of the column of accounts, the breadth of this is unknown, and a second column, or more, may of course have followed.

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

The musical notation is generally similar to that found in the rather earlier papyrus published by Schubart in *Sitzungsber. preuss. Akad.* 1918, pp. 763 sqq., the text of which has been revised and discussed by Th. Reinach in *Revue Archéologique*, 1919, pp. 11-27, and has been arranged in modern style by Prof. A. Thierfelder.¹ The notes which can be recognized with certainty are eight, Ϟ ϕ σ ο ξ ι ζ ε. These all occur in the Diatonic Hypolydian key of Alypius, to which Reinach assigns also the Paeon of the Berlin papyrus; that, however, is more probably to be regarded as in the Iastian key. As for the mode, there can be little doubt that it is the Hypophrygian or Iastian, as in the Epitaph of Seikilos and the *Hymn to Nemesis* of Mesomedes; cf. Gevaert, *La mélodie antique*, pp. 48 sqq. With regard to the character of the syllables and the corresponding notes, Reinach has observed that in the Berlin Paeon a barytone syllable is always sung on a lower note than the succeeding accented final syllable, and that a circumflexed syllable has two notes at least. Neither of these observations holds in the case of 1786, and the former indeed can hardly be maintained of the Paeon either. On the other hand, two notes are assigned to a short syllable in one instance at least (l. 4).

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

¹ *Paeon* and *Tekmessä* (Leipzig), reviewed with severity by Schröder, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* xl. 351.

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

A transcription in modern notation has been kindly supplied by Professor H. Stuart Jones.

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

- 1 [31 letters] ομον πασαι τε θεου λογιμοι
 α . [. . .] . [. .] αρ[.]
- 2 [28 letters] ? πρ]υτανηω σιγατω μηδ' αστρα
 ξ̣ι̣ ι̣ φ̣ []̣
 φαεσφορα λ[ειπ]ε̣
- 3 [σ]θων [.] . λ̣ει̣ . [.] ρ[.] ποταμων ροθιων πασαι υμνου-
 φ̣ : οξ̣ ρ̣
 των δ' ημων
- 4 [π]ατερα χ' υιον χ' αγιον πνευμα πασαι δυναμεις επιφωνουτων αμην
 ζ̣ι̣ ξ̣ι̣ ξ̣ι̣ ξ̣ο̣ φ̣
 αμην κρατος αινοσ
- 5 [.] δ[ωτ]η[ρι] μω̣ω̣ παντων αγαθων αμην αμην

]υ ταν η ω σι - γά - τω μηδ' άσ - τρα φα -

- εσ - φό - ρα λ[ει-π]ε̣ - [σ]θων . . . πο - τα - μων ρο - θι - ων π̣α -

- σαι υμ - νούν - των δ' ή - μων πα - τέ - ρα χυί -

- όν χ̣ά - γι - ον πνευ - μα π̣α - σαι δυ - νά - μεις

έπι - φω - νούν - των ά - μην ά - μην κρά - τος αι̣ -

δω - τῆ - ρι μό - νοῦ

πάν - των ἁ - γα - θῶν ἁ - μὴν . . ἁ - μὴν.

1. Only slight vestiges of the musical notation are visible above this line.

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

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

λ[ειπ]ε[σ]θων is very doubtful; the initial letter may be *μ* or *χ*, and *θ* may be *β*, of which no other example occurs in the papyrus. *μηδ'* . . . *φαισφορα* can be constructed with *σιγατω*, and another *μ[ηδ]ε* might stand at the end of the line; or if . . . *ε[σ]θων* is rightly taken as an imperative, this may belong to what follows.

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

4. A dot is probably to be restored above the notes on *πνευ*, the papyrus having been rubbed here. The dots on the notes from *χ' υιον* to *πνευμα* are carried on in regular succession to those of the preceding words, as if there were no pause at [*π*]ατερα. Another dot is most probably lost above the second syllable of the first *αμην*. A dot above the *α* of *κρατος* (a little below the *υ* of *των* in l. 3) is ignored in the transcription, since it is more to the right of the note *ξ* than usual and would also interrupt the sequence. The note *ξ* above *α* of *δυναμεις* is very uncertain. *δυναμεις* is used of heavenly bodies (e. g. Matt. xxiv. 29 *αι δ. των ουρανων*: cf. also n. on l. 5) and sometimes of angels, but may here be quite general.

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

With regard to the text of l. 5, the scanty vestiges well suit *μονω*, but *δ[ωτ]η[ρ]* is highly doubtful, though some such word is demanded by the sense. In the preceding lacuna the musical notes indicate a loss of seven syllables, of which the last three were an anapaest. One more syllable at least, however, seems necessary for the metre, and it is perhaps just possible that a note is missing between: *σ* and *σ*, where there is a rather broad space and the surface is not well preserved. Something like *νυν κεις αιωνας* (or *δοξαν νυν και ει*) *διδομεν* is wanted; cf. e. g. the eleventh prayer in the Greek morning service (*Ευχολόγιον τὸ μέγα*) *οτι σε αινοουσι πασαι αι Δυναμεις των ουρανων και σοι την δοξαν αναπεμπομεν τῷ Πατρι και τῷ Υιῷ και τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι νυν και αιει και εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων*. Ἀμήν. The double *ἀμήν* at the end of the line appears to be *extra metrum*.

II. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1787. SAPPHO, BOOK iv.

Fr. I 15.9 × 9.4 cm.

Third century. Plate II
(Frs. 1 + 2, 9).

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

Like most of the papyri from this find, 1787 has suffered severely, having been torn into quite small pieces, which have not fitted together very well. The difficulty of the task of reconstruction, in which Mr. Lobel has rendered valuable assistance, is much increased by the fact that the remains of this roll were found

together with a quantity of other lyric fragments in an identical hand. There is a number of smaller pieces which cannot be assigned to one MS. or the other with any approach to security, and in these circumstances it seemed advisable to print here only such fragments as were shown by dialect or some other special indication to belong to the Sappho. A revised text of P. Halle 2, the source of which now becomes evident, is included for the sake of convenient reference. That fragment was no doubt abstracted and sold by a dishonest workman; script, metre, and date of acquisition all point to this conclusion.

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

Remains of eight poems at least can be distinguished, and the number represented is no doubt considerably larger than this. It is noticeable that three out of the four poems of which the initial letter has survived begin with E, but the fact that in Fr. 3. ii E is succeeded by O, while not definitely excluding an alphabetical arrangement, is certainly not in favour of it. Of the individual pieces there is not much to be said, since their severe mutilation, except in one or two cases, prevents the line of thought from being followed with precision, and restoration cannot be attempted with any real chance of success. Fr. 1 gives the ends of lines of a poem of some length in which Sappho dwells on the advance of age and the inevitable approach of death, passing on to a declaration, in two verses cited by Athenaeus, that to be desirable life must for her have the accompaniments of delicacy (*ἀβροσύνη*), splendour (*τὸ λαμπρόν*), and beauty (*τὸ καλόν*). The second column of Fr. 3 included two complete poems, of six and five couplets respectively, in the former of which several persons, perhaps the poet's companions, were addressed, the other being an invocation, tantalizingly mutilated, to sleep. In Fr. 4 Sappho herself is addressed by name, as in Sapph. 1 and 59 and *Berl. Klassikertexte*, V: xiii. 2. Fr. 6 is notable for a political reference, rare in Sappho as common in Alcaeus. Apparently some one is reproached for having chosen 'friendship with the daughters of the house of Penthilus', with

which the sweet song, the melody of birds, and the dewy leaves, spoken of in the following lines, are contrasted. The offender had perhaps been a member of the poet's circle, and is warned that she would no longer be welcome (l. 2, n.). Fr. 6

Fr. 2 (a).	Frs. 1 + 2.	Plate II.
.
]λεσσα[]ιδά[
] . πέρη[]
] . εικε . []γα
.]γοισα[. . .]
5]ιδάχθην
]αλλ[.]ύταν	
]ἄτίλ[. . . .]εισα	
]ένᾱταγ[. . . .]ἄνυμόνσ.	
10]νιθῆταιστ[.]μα[.]πρόκοψιν	
]πωνκάλαδωραπαίδεσ	
]φιλ'άοιδονλιγύρανχελύνην	
]νταχροαγήρασῆδη	
]ντοτρίχεσεκμελαιναν	
]ν'γοαδ[.]μφεροισι	
15]ησθ'ῆσανεβρίοισιν	
]λατίκενποίην	
]ουδυνατονγενεσθαι	
]βροδόπαχυνάνων	
20]καταγᾶσφεροισα[
]ονῦμωσέμαρψει	
]ἄτᾱνάκοιτιν	
] . μέναννομισδει	
]αισοπασδοι	
]τοῦτοκάμοι	
]λονλέ[.]ορχε	
25] . [. . .]νό . [
τολα[
επῖν[
φίλει . [
καιν[

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

Fr. 2 (a).	Frs. 1 + 2.	Plate II.
.
]λεσσα[]ιδ' ἀ[
] . πέρι []
] . εικε . []να
.		θ]ίγοισα[.]
5]ιδ' ἄχθην
]αλλ[. α]ύταν	
]α τί λ[. . . .]εισα	
]ένα τὰν [. . .]αν ὕμο . .	
10]μι θῆται στ[ύ]μα[σι] πρόκοψιν	
]πων κάλα δῶρα παῖδες	
	ᾧ] φίλ', ἄοιδον λιγύραν χελύνναν	
	πᾶ]ντα χροᾶ γῆρας ἤδη	
	λεῦ]καί τ' ἐγένο]ντο τρίχες ἐκ μελαίναν	
]ν γόνα δ' [ο]ύ φέροισι	
15] ἦσθ' ἴσα νεβρίοισιν	
	ἀ]λλὰ τί κεν ποεῖην ;	
] οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι	
] βροδόπαχυν αὔων	
] κατὰ γᾶς φέροισα	
20]ον ὕμως ἔμαρψε[ν	
]άταν ἄκοιτιν	
	φθ]ιμέναν νομίσδει	
]αῖς ὀπάσδοι	
	[ἔγω δὲ φίλημ' ἀβροσύναν] τοῦτο καὶ μοι	
25	τὸ λά]μπρον ἔρωσ ἀελίω καὶ τὸ κά]λον λέ[λ]ογχε	
	ἐπι]ν 23 letters] . [. . .]νό . [
	φί]λει . [
	καὶ ν[

[.]ρο . ἦννεμε[
 5 ψαπφοισεφιλ[
 κύπρωιβ[.]σίλ[
 κάιτοιμεγαδ[
 [.]σσοισφαεθων[
 πάντᾱικλεουσ[
 10 κάισενναχερ[
 . ρ[.]γπ[

Fr. 6.

]σεμικά
]ελα[. . . .]άσ'εγωκεᾶσω
]γφιλότ[. . .]ήλεοπενθιλήᾱγ[
]δακα[. . .]τροπε'αμμα[
 5]μελ[. . .]τιγλύκερον . [
]ᾱμελλιχοφων[
]δειλιγυραιδ'ᾶη[
]δροσ[.]εσσα[

Fr. 8.

]αθανα[
]ερα,σε[
 -]λον [
]εδοισιμ[
 5]ᾱθεισεν[
]αιγινη[
]γ ακ[

ουμανεφίλησ[
 5 νυνδ'εννεκα[.
 τοδ'άιτιονουτ[
 ουδενπόλυ[.]ε . [
 [.]νδ'ᾶ[

Fr. 7.

]ιγάρμ'απυτασ[
 ']μωσδ'[
 ']ισανθεοισιν [
]ασᾱναλίτρα[
 5]δρομεδαγ[.] . [
]τα . . . κᾶ[
]ρόπονα[
]ρορονουκατισ[
]τυνδαρίδαι[
 19]χαρίεντ'ᾶ . [
]ηκέτισυν[
 .β. κη.
] . α[. . .]α[

Fr. 9. Plate II.

]οδέρκενεπωμοσσ[
]νέτι·τανπαίδαδε[
]βρ[.]τανκᾶνχέρριθ[
]ει[.]παρε[

[.]ρο . ἦννεμε[
 5 Ψάπφοι, σὲ φίλ[
 Κύπρω β[α]σίλ[
 καίτοι μέγα δ[
 [ῶ]σσοις Φαέθων [
 πάντα κλέος [
 10 καί σ' ἐνν Ἀχέρ[οντος
 . ρ[.]νπ[

οὐ μὰν ἐφίλησ[
 5 νῦν δ' ἔννεκα [
 τὸ δ' αἴτιον οὐτ[
 οὐδὲν πόλυ [.]ε . [.
 [ο]ῦδ' ἄ[

Fr. 6.

] σε Μίκα
]ελα[. . ἀλλ]ά σ' ἔγωνκ ἔάσω
]ν φιλότ[ατ'] ἦλεο Πενθιλήαν
]δα κα[κό]τροπ'· ἄμμα[s
 5] μέλ[ος] τι γλύκερον . [.
]α μελλιχόφων[ος
 ἀεὶ]δει· λίγυραι δ' ἄη[δοι
] δροσ[ό]εσσα[
 10

Fr. 7.
 ? κα]ὶ γάρ μ' ἀπὸ τᾶς [.
 ὕ]μωσ δ' [.
] ἴσαν θέοισιν
] ἄσαν ἀλίτρα[
 5 Ἀν]δρομέδαν [.] . [.
]τα . . . κα[
 τ]ρόπον ἀ[
]ορον οὐ κατίσ[χ
] Τυνδαρίδαι[s
] χαρίεντ' α . [.
 μ]ηκέτι συν[
 β κη
] . ἀ[. . .]α[

Fr. 8.

] ἀθανα[τ
]έρα σε[
]λον
]έδοισιν [.
 5]αθεισεν[
]αιγινη[
]νακ[

Fr. 9.

]οδέρκεν ἐπώμοσσ[
]ν ἔτι· τὰν παῖδα δὲ [.
 ? ἀ]βρ[ό]ταν κὰν χερσ[
]εν[.] παρε[

Fr. 10.	Fr. 11.	Fr. 12.
] . οναυ[.
]ηνουδε[]ιβ[. .]ραι []αμπ[
]ησιμέρ[]α]λέσειεν[
]τᾱιδάμα[]αναφροδι[]ἰηλελά[
5] . αυθοσ[]δυλογοιδ'ερ[]εθελω[
]μερον[5]σαλλοι	5]εχηγ[
]ετερπ[]ἰσχοισα []ζ'έφᾱ . [
.] . εναθαᾱσ[]ᾱλίκ[
.]αλλει [.
.]ασεερσασ[.
.
Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.
.
]αμαλλ[]αμμ[]τοσεσ[[. [
]ναμ[]ικαι[]παντα[
]νδ'είμ'εί[]ποισαῖ[δ
]ρσομέν[]κληδον[] . ατέρα[
5]λικ'υπα[5] . πλοκαμ[]λοκα[
] . . [.]βα[]εσδάμα[5] [
]σγαρεπαν[]ανθρώπ[.
]μανκαπυγυε[]λυμαιν . [.
]αρμονίασβ[]τεκαιπ[Fr. 17.
10]αθηνχορον'ᾱα[.
]δελίγην[.] . θι . . . [
]ατόνσφι[Fr. 16.]νάισχο[
]παντεσσι[.]
]επ[.] . []βροδο[5]αμοι[
.]ενθ[]τε
.]ραιμ[]τι[
.

Fr. 10.	Fr. 11.	Fr. 12.
.
] . οναυ[]ιβ[. .]ραι []αμπ[
]ην ούδε[]α]λέσειεν [
]ης ἴμερ[ο]αν Ἀφροδί[τα]τή λελά[θ
]τα δάμα[ἀ]δύλογοι δ' ἔρ[ωτες ?]ε θέλω[
5] . ἀνθος . [5]ς ἄλλοι	5] ἔχην [
]ἴμερον [α]ις ἔχοισα]ς' ἔφα . [
]ετερπ[] . ενα θαάσ[σ] ἀλίκ[εσσι
.]άλλει
]ας ἔέρσας	
	
Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.
.
]αμαλλ[]αμμ[]τος ἔσ[
]ναμ[]ι καὶ [] πάντα[
]νδ' εἴμ' ἔ[]ποις αἰ[] . δ' ἀτέρα[
]ρσομέν[] κληθον[π]λοκαμ
5 ']λικ' ὑπα[5] . πλοκαμ[] [
] . . [-]βα[]εσ δ' ἀμα[.
]ς γὰρ ἔπαυ[] ἀνθρώπ[
]μαν κάπυυε[] λυμαιν . [Fr. 17.
] ἁρμονίας β[]τε καὶ π[.
10]άθην χόρον· ἄα[.] .
] δὲ λίγχαν [Fr. 16.] . θι . . [
]ατόν σφι [.]ν αἴσχωρ[
] πάντεσσι [] βροδο[] .
]επ[. .] . []ενθ[5]αμοι[
.]ραιμ[]τε τι[

Fr. 18.		Fr. 19.		Fr. 20.	
				Col. i.	Col. ii.
] . ουδε[] . . . φ[] . . .	
] ταυταλ[] . [.]'θύραγ[] . . .	
] λαισιμ[] . οιχάλέπ[] . . .	
] πλῆνον[] δεκύ[] . . .	
5] αμφ[5] τοπάληνό[] . . .	
] . σθεο . [] ε[] σην	
] έρωσ . [.	
Fr. 21.		Fr. 22.		Fr. 23.	
$\frac{\xi}{\theta}$ αλ[α[ου[
$\frac{\theta}{\theta}$ εγ[π[έμ[
φ[σν[σεδ[
ξα[κ[πα[
5	οπ[5	τ . [. . .	
ήλ[.	
τ[.	
.	
Fr. 24.		Fr. 25.		Fr. 26.	
.	
κατ[[.] . [] αι[
μήμ[κα[] σετα[
$\frac{\xi}{\theta}$ δώ . [τα[] υμαιν . [
. . .		τα[] έτεχα[.] ρσ[
.		5] ιδι'δός[
.] δενάμ'έσ[
.] οσσύγ'α[
.] ἄλωνα[
.] ιδαλ[
.	
Fr. 27.		Fr. 28.		Fr. 29.	
.	
] . [] αμο[] . . [.] . [
] μητ[] αμμα[] . σ'αδ[
] δ'αισ'α[] νπε[] λα[
] εσ'αλλ[] λην[] ν'ι'αν[
5] φρα[5] τ'ε'ε . [5] λυρ[
] [] μονω[] μεδ . [
. . .] μ'ω[] μ'αστε[
. . .] . [] . κ[
.	

Fr. 18.		Fr. 19.		Fr. 20.	
				Col. i.	Col. ii.
.	
] . οὐδε[] . . . φ[
] ταῦτα λ[] . [.] θύραν [
]λαισι μ[] . οι χάλεπ[
] πλήονι [] δὲ κύ[⊕ [
5] ἀμφ[5] τὸ πάλην οἴ[
] . σθεο . []ε[]σην
]έρωσ . [.	
Fr. 21.		Fr. 22.		Fr. 23.	
	ἀλ[ἀ[οὐ[
	Ἐγ[π[ἐμ[
	φ[συ[σὲ δ[
	ξά[5	κ[πα[
5	ὀπ[5 τ . [
	ἦλ[
	τ[
.	
Fr. 24.		Fr. 25.		Fr. 26.	
	κατ[[.] . []αι[
	μή μ[κα[]σετα[
	δῶ . [ται[]νμαιν . [
			τα[]έ τε χα[ι]ρο[
					5]ι διδοίσ[
]δεν ἀμεσ[
]ος σύ γα[
]αλον ἀ[
]ιδαλ[
.	
Fr. 27.		Fr. 28.		Fr. 29.	
] . []αμοι[] . . [.] .
] μητε[] ἄμμα[] . σαδ[
	? μει]δίαισα]νπε[]λα[
]εσ . ἀλλ[ἀ]λην []νίαν [
5]φρα[5]τεέ . [5] λύρ[
] []μονω[]μεδ . [
]μός[]μας τε[
] . [] . κ

Fr. 31.

Fr. 30.

]εριμνα[

]γην [

].. κο[

]αι [

. . .

Col. i.

]σθην

] . σ .

]

]

. . .

Col. ii.

ζα[

η . [

. . .

Fr. 32.

]ελ . [.] . εγαμ[

]ασαλίτρα[

]έτ' αυ[

. . .

Fr. 33.

]απύθεσθ[

]χιστάλ[

] . μ [[]] π [

]ερθεσ[

5] [.] αι σ [

. . .

Fr. 34.

κάιτ' ε[

μηδεν[

νυνδ' α[

μηβολλε[

5 [.] μορφε[

. . .

Col. i.

]

]

] ν

]

]

. . .

Fr. 35.

Col. ii.

. [.]

όδ[

αι . [

ελ[

5 σ [

× ε[

. . .

Fr. 36.

] . αίτ[

] λ' αυθιμε[

] νόμεθ' δ[

] δηϋτ' επιτ[

5] έντηδεκ[

] αγαρεκά[

] εν[

. . .

Fr. 37.

]ωνκ[.] . [

] τονόνεσ[

. . .

Fr. 38.

]πάμενα[

] τ' ώστοπέλη[

. . .

Fr. 39.

] . οιπλυ . [

] τετοκω[

. . .

Fr. 40.

] . ε[

] λβον

. . .

Fr. 30.		Fr. 31.		Fr. 32.
	Col. i.		Col. ii.	
.....
μ]εριμνα[]σθην]ελ . [.] . εγαμ[
]γην] . σ']ας ἀλίτρα[
] . . κο[]		ζα[] ἔτ' αὐ[
]αι]		ἦ . [.....
.....

Fr. 33.

.....

] ἀπύθεσθ[αι
]χιστα λ[
] . μπ[

[σὺ δὲ στεφάνοις, ὦ Δίκα, π]ερθέσ[θ' ἐράταις φόβαισιν
 5 [ὄρπακας ἀνήτω (?) συναέρρ]αίσ' [ἀπάλαισι χέρσιν

Fr. 34.		Fr. 35.		Fr. 36.
	Col. i.		Col. ii.	
.....
καί τ' εἶ[.....] . αἰτ[
μηδεν[]		. []λ' αὐθι με[
νῦν δ' ἀ[]		ὄδ[]νώμεθ' ὄ[
μῆ βόλλε[ο]ν		αἰ . [] δηῦτ' ἐπιτ[
5 [εὐ]μορφο[τέρα κτλ. ?]			5 [έν τ' ἠδέ κ[
.....]		'Ελ[]α γὰρ ἐκά[
			5 σ[]εν[
			εἶ[.....
		

Fr. 37.	Fr. 38.	Fr. 39.	Fr. 40.
.....
]ων κ[. .] . [πε]πάμενα[ι] . οι πλυ . [] . ι [
]τον ὄνεσ[]τ' ὥστ' ὁ πέλλη[ος ?]τετοκω[ἀνο]λβον

]άβροισεπιχα[]ολκανε . []υπ'ά[]ακούην
]αναρτεμι[.]άυταν
]νάβλ[.

Fr. 41.

]λαισ[

]αικιπ[

]ίνα[

]δοσε[

5]ομ[

]

Fr. 42.

]κλα[

]ύσ . [

]έσ[

Fr. 43.

[.]δω . [

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

]τυχοισα

]θέλ'ώντᾱπίσιᾱν[

] . εσοννοημμα[

]ετωνκαλημι

5]πεδαθυμοναίψα[

]σατυχηνηεληση[

]ρεμοιμαχεσθα[

]λιδάναιπίθεισᾱ[

]ι'συδεύγαροισθα

10]έτειταίλλε . .

]ελασ[

Fr. 45.

. . .

σαπ[με[

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

] ἄβροισ ἐπιχα[] ὄλκανε . [] ὑπ' ἄ[] ἀκούην
]αν Ἄρτεμι[.] αὐταν
 5]ναβλ[.

Fr. 41.

]λαισ[
 ? γύν]αικι π[
]ίνα[
]δοσε[
 5]ομ[
]

Fr. 42.

]κλα[
]ύσ . [
]έσ[

Fr. 43.

 [.]δω . [
 τόλμ[

Fr. 44 = P. Halle 2.

] τύχοισα
] θέλ' ὦν τ' ἀπαίσαν
 τέ]λεσον νόημα
]ετων κάλημι
 5] πεδὰ θῦμον αἶψα
 ὄσ]σα τύχην θελήση[(s)
]ρ ἔμοι μάχεσθα[ι
 χ]λιδάνα πίθεισα[
]ι· σύ δ' εὖ γὰρ οἶσθα
 10]έτει τὰ ἴλλε . .
]ελασ[

Fr. 45.

Σαπ[φοῦς
 με[λῶν δ ?

with σ or θ. The division ?]άνυμόν σ is thus suggested, but neither σε nor σο[ι] is satisfactory, though perhaps there has been some alteration.

9. στ[ύ]μο[τι] or στ[ύ]μο[σι] appears inevitable; the latter suits the size of the lacuna the better of the two. *πρόκοψις* as a synonym of *προκοπή* has not occurred previously. Cf. Alc. 35. 2.

11. *χελύνων* is gen. plur.; cf. 1231. 14. 8, n. For *χελύνα* cf. Orion 28. 15 (Sapph. 169) *ὡς παρὰ Σαπφοῖ χελώνη χελύνη*, where *χελύνα* should now be restored. The doubled *ν* is perhaps to be recognized also in Babrius 115. 4.

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

13. Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1092 *λευκὴν ἐγὼ τήνδ' ἐκ μελαίνης ἀμφιβάλλομαι τρίχα*.

14. γόνα: cf. Alc. 39. 7 γόνα Σείριος ἄζει.

17. Cf. note on l. 12 above. With regard to the accent of *γένεσθαι*, the remark of Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides*, p. 99, is mistaken, the original edition of 7. 6 being correct, and the appearance in the facsimile of an accent on the second syllable being due, as stated by Mr. Lobel, who has recollated the original, to a displaced fibre. There is therefore no conflict with 1233. 8. 4 λάθε[σθ]αι, and the note on 1231. 1. i. 33-4 is to be amended accordingly.

18-19. The idea here may well be that old age follows youth as inevitably as night the dawn (? *νύξ*] *κατὰ γᾶς φέροισα*: the participial clause might be applied to *νύξ* as symbolizing death). *α* of *φεροισα* was probably the final letter of the line, but the surface of the papyrus is damaged.

21. Perhaps ἐρ]άταν, or a superlative, e. g. *κεδνοτ]άταν*. But the reference remains in doubt.

24-5. These two verses are quoted by Athen. xv. 687 A (= Sapph. 79) *καίτοι Σαπφώ, γυνὴ μὲν πρὸς ἀλήθειαν οὔσα καὶ ποιήτρια, ὅμως ἠδέσθη τὸ καλὸν τῆς ἀβρότητος ἀφελεῖν λέγουσα ἔδδ' ἐγὼ δὲ φίλημ' ἀβροσύναν καὶ μοι τὸ λάμπρον ἔρος (v. l. ἔρις) ἀελίω καὶ τὸ κάλον λελογχεν, φανερόν ποιοῦσα πᾶσιν ὡς ἡ τοῦ ζῆν ἐπιθυμία τὸ λαμπρὸν καὶ τὸ καλὸν εἶχεν (? εἶληχεν) αὐτῇ. ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶν οἰκεία τῆς ἀρετῆς*. Various attempts at restoration have been made, but, as is now seen, Blass alone was right in marking a lacuna after *ἀβροσύναν* and in taking τὸ λάμπρον . . . λελογχεν as a complete verse, in which the only alteration needed is *ἔρος ἀελίω* (so Blass: cf. Fr. 11. 4 ἀ]δύλογοι δ' ἔρ]ωτες (?)) or *ἔρος τῷ ἀελίω*. In the preceding verse there are five syllables to be supplied after *ἀβροσύναν*, of which the two last are *τοῦτο*. How the lacuna remaining, a dactyl of about 6 letters, should be filled is not obvious. If *τοῦτο* = τὸ ἀβρόν, this was perhaps preceded by an adverb qualifying *φίλημι*, e. g. *ἔξοχα, δὴ μάλα, πόλλ' ἔτι*, or a predicate of *τοῦτο*, as *ἀδύ γε*. The papyrus may of course have agreed with Athen. in the spelling *φίλημ'*, but *κάλημι* is written in Fr. 44. 4.

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

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

Fr. 3. ii. 4. *δάφνας*: or *Δάφνας*?

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

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

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

15. e. g. *μελαίνα[ς] διὰ νύκτος οἱ μελαίνα[ις] πετερύγεσιν*.

16. e. g. [καταχέυη βλεφάροισι λάθαν οἱ [βλέφαρ' ἄμμιν κατὰ δὴ καλύψη.

18. ζὰ χῶρις ἔχην: the tmesis is indicated in the papyrus by the accentuation.

20. υ[or χ[may be read in place of λ[.

21. ου is more suitable than ευ or αι. The accent on γάρ points to κ' ἔον, not κέον.

Fr. 4. 2. Possibly Ἄνδ]ρομέ[δα, whose name recurs again in Fr. 7. 5; as Lobel observes, Aristid. ii. 508 οἶμαι δέ σε καὶ Σαπφούς ἀκηκοέναι . . . λεγούσης, ὡς αὐτὴν αἱ Μοῦσαι τῶ ὄντι ὀλβίαν τε καὶ ζῆλωτὴν ἐποίησαν, καὶ ὡς οὐδ' ἀποθανούσης ἔσται λήθη might perhaps be brought into connexion with ll. 5 sqq.

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

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

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

10. For the doubled ν of ἐνν cf. e. g. 1233. 2. ii. 8, 1360. 1. 10. μελάθροισιν, . . . δόμοισιν or some synonym may be supplied.

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

7. ε . [: perhaps ε'.

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

2. εἰγωνκ is analogous to e. g. 1231. 1. i. 23 ἐμνάσθ' α[λλα], 1234. 1. 11 πῶσλον. The practice of making the written text represent the number of spoken syllables may be mistaken, but it is not 'modern' (Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides*, p. 82).

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

4. κα[κῆ]τροπ' seems probable, though the letters ακο must have been rather spread out to fill the lacuna. λ or χ might be read in place of α.

6. Cf. Aristaenus i. 10 (Sapph. 129) αἱ μουσικώτεροι τῶν παρθένων καὶ μελιχόφωνοι (l. μελλιχ.), τοῦτο δὴ Σαπφούς τὸ ἴδιον φθέγμα. The form μελίφωνος ascribed to Sappho in the similar passage Philostr. *Im.* ii. 1 should now disappear until otherwise attested.

7. ἄη[δοι]: cf. Schol. Soph. *Aj.* 628 ἡ ἀηδὼ δὲ κατὰ Μιτυληναίους. The form ἀήδων is given in Sapph. 39.

Fr. 7. 3. Cf. Sapph. 2. 1 ἴσος θέοισιν.

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

5. For Ἄν]δρομέαν cf. Sapph. 41, 58.

6. There are perhaps only two letters, e. g. $\mu\alpha$ or $\nu\alpha$, between $\tau\alpha$ and $\kappa\alpha$.

8. Not $\zeta\mu$]ερον.

12. Probably] $\mu\alpha$ or] $\nu\alpha$. The overwritten letters enclosed between dots are variants added by the original hand.

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

Fr. 9. This fragment is composed of two pieces, the combination of which seems certain, although l. 1 is difficult and l. 3 must be emended in order to scan. The points of junction are, l. 1 $\epsilon|\pi$, l. 2 $\pi|a$, l. 3 $\kappa\alpha|\nu$.

1.]οδέρκεν is puzzling. ρ is more probable than γ , which is the only alternative and also difficult to interpret. If $\epsilon\pi\omega$ is right, the ω was rather smaller than usual, but $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ is not more attractive.

3. $\acute{a}]βρ[ό]ταν$: or $\acute{a}\mu\phi\iota.]βρ[ό]ταν$.

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

Fr. 11. 4. $\acute{\epsilon}ρ[ωτες$: cf. Frs. 1 + 2. 24-5, n., and Himerius i. 4 $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\nu\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ (sc. $\Sigma\alpha\pi\phi\acute{\omega}$) $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\text{'Α}\phi\rho\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\nu$ (cf. l. 3) $\acute{\epsilon}\phi'$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\text{Χ}\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\chi\omicron\rho\acute{o}\nu$ $\text{'Ε}\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omega\nu$ $\sigma\mu\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\rho\alpha$. $\acute{\epsilon}ρ[ασται$ or $\acute{\epsilon}ρ[αντες$ are other possibilities.

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

Fr. 13. 4. The first letter may be \omicron or ω instead of ρ .

8. The letter before the lacuna was apparently either ϵ or σ , not α .

10. $\acute{a}\alpha$]: $\acute{a}\delta$] seems to be excluded.

Fr. 14. 4. If $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\eta\delta\omicron\nu$] is one word, the fragment must be from near the ends of lines; but the division $\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\eta$ $\delta\omicron\nu$] (δ' $\omicron\nu$]?) is possible.

5. e. g.] ι ,] ν .

Fr. 15. 1. ι , ρ , ν may be read in place of τ .

3. $\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ had already occurred in 424. 9. The interlinear insertion may be by the original scribe.

Fr. 18. 2. λ before the lacuna is only one of several possibilities, e. g. δ , ν .

4. An acute has been substituted for a circumflex accent; cf. e. g. Frs. 5. 3, 19. 3.

Fr. 19. 2. The mark like a sign of elision is possibly a diastol $\acute{\epsilon}$, which is sometimes (e. g. 1789), though not elsewhere in 1787, placed above the line.

4. Though the papyrus is partially preserved after $\kappa\nu$, all trace of writing has disappeared.

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

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

Fr. 26. 3. ι or ρ can be read in place of ν ; ν also is very uncertain.

5. For the alteration of accent cf. e. g. Fr. 18. 4. The second acute could be read as a circumflex.

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

Fr. 27. 3. There is a short blank space after $\bar{\alpha}$, which perhaps ended the line.
6. The accent is very doubtful.

Fr. 29. 4.] $\nu\bar{\iota}\bar{\alpha}\nu$ is a gen. plur.; cf. Frs. 1 + 2. 11, n.

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

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

Fr. 33. 4-5. The identification of these two verses with Sapph. 78. 1-2, though probable, is in consequence of the damaged condition of l. 5 hardly certain; however, the remains suit] $\alpha\sigma$ quite well, and the preceding acute accent is just in the right place if $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\alpha\sigma$ was written.

Fr. 34. 1. $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ τ' : οἱ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ τ' (οἱ).

5, if rightly read, probably = Sapph. 76, from Hephaest. 64, *Εὐμορφότερα Μνασιδῖκα τῆς ἀπάλας Γυρίνωος*. Unfortunately the letters are broken, the first and fifth especially being doubtful; the latter might well be ε, ο in this hand being generally, though not always, smaller. Since the margin is lost it remains possible that, as maintained by Bergk, the line was the first of a poem (it is perhaps worth noting that the initial letter is again Ε; cf. int., p. 27). There is also a possibility, so far as the papyrus is concerned, that P. Halle 2. 1, which may = Sapph. 77, immediately succeeded.

Fr. 36. 4. It is not clear whether the accent on $\delta\eta\nu\tau'$ is circumflex or acute, but the former is in accordance with 1231. 15. 3.

5. For $\acute{\eta}\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ cf. 1233. 4. 2; this in conjunction with the accented ε makes τ(ε) likely.

6. $\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}$] : οἱ $\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}$].

Fr. 38. 2. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta$]ος is possibly for $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$, 'dark'; cf. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$.

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

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

2. A compound is indicated by the grave accent, and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron$]λβον by the metre.

4. $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\alpha\nu$ or τ]αῦταν.

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

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

1. This line, which is the first of a column, may possibly, as the edd. say, = Sapph. 77, but apart from the doubt as to the reading there, $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\alpha$ is hardly enough for an identifica-

tion; cf. n. on Frs. 1+2. 12 above. Moreover, ll. 2-6 rather suggest an invocation to a deity.

2.]θέλωντᾶπαῖσαν,]θέλων τὰ παισῶν edd.; but the facsimile shows clearly an acute accent on ε and suggests an elision mark after λ. θέλ' thus seems assured, and ὄντ can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as ὦν τ', the retracted accent replacing the circumflex, as elsewhere in papyri (cf. e. g. 223. int.). Hence the last word will be either ἄπαισαν or ἀπαῖσαν, according as the accent or the mark of quantity on the final α is accepted; ἀπαῖσαν acc. fem. would conflict with other evidence.

3.]εσον edd. If, however, the facsimile may be trusted, a vestige of the letter preceding ε is visible, indicating δ or λ. For τέ]λεσον cf. Sapph. 1. 26-7 ὄσσα δέ μοι τελέσαι θυμός ἡμέρρει τέλεσον, 7. 3-4, Alc. 77 Ζεὺς τελέσῃ νόημα.

6. ὄσ]σα: cf. e. g. Sapph. 1. 26 quoted in the preceding note;]σα edd.

7.]ρ (γά]ρ?):]' edd., who note that ρ is possible.

8. πίθεισα: cf. 1233. 2. ii. 20 πίθει[s.]πιθεῖσα edd.

9.]. συδέυπεφουσα, σὺ δ' εὖ πέφουσα edd., suggesting that πέποιστα was meant. The facsimile indicates the expected circumflex over εν, and hardly justifies πεφ, the letters being too small and crowded. Apparently γαρ οισθα is quite possible, as well as]ρ in front of σν.

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

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

1788. ALCAEUS?

Fr. 4 18.6 × 5.8 cm. Late second century.
Plate II (Fr. 15).

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

are guaranteed by the dialect have as a rule been printed. The non-Aeolic pieces probably come from the same roll as 1604, and are reserved for a future volume; they are much broken and of no great extent.

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

Fr. 1.

. . .]λεξάνθιδοσιππ[
 [. .] . ιθεσσ'απυλίμνασπολ[
 [. .]ανεκκορύφᾶνοπποθενε[
 [.]άνκᾶνψύχρονύδωραμπελ[
 5 [.]ᾶνκαλαμοσχλῶρ[
 [.]λάδεισηρινον,ον . [
 [.]ηλεφάνην·καδδ . [
 [18 letters][

Fr. 2.

.
]μωισι[
 'ίτατε . [
]·
]πυέιπη[
 5]αδανδρ[
]αν·αιδεκ[
 'τ'ωμε[.] . . . [.]λαί[
 σ
]τῶγα[[ρ]]α . οτρώμμε[
]υντογενηγονμελανεμ[
 10]μυριαπαντα αυτηαποτου . [
] . [.]ελίτωσ
]όλβῶνδρ[
]ο[.] . γ
]τ/κα[

Fr. 3.

.
]χει[
] . ευετω ταυτασ[
]α ενδετωαδειν[
]σεται
 5]λευθεραισ^α[
]μεναι·
]γυναι·επε[.]σο[

Fr. 4.

.
]·,ετυ[
]τασεπη[
]ιμερτονορη[

Fr. 1.

[. . ? π]λεξάνθιδος ἱππ[
 [ὄρ]νίθεσσο' ἀπὸ λίμνας πολ[
 [ἄκρ]αν ἐκ κορύφαν ὀππόθεν ἐ[
 [γλ]αύκαν ψῦχρον ὕδωρ ἀμπελ[
 5 [. ' . . .]αν κάλαμος χλωρ[ος
 [. κε]λάδεις ἥρινον ὄν . [
 [. τ]ηλεφάνην· καδδ . [
 [18 letters] [

Fr. 2.

]μφ σι[
 'ἴ τὰ τε . [
]·
 ἀ]πυείπη[
 5]αδανδρ[
]αν· αἰ δὲ κ[
 'τ'· ὦ με[.] . . . [.]λαι[
] τῷ γὰρ (?) ἀροτρώμμε[
 ν]ῶν τὸ γένηον μέλαν ἔμ[μεναι·
 10] μύρια πάντα αὐτὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ . [
] . [.]ε λίτως
]όλβων δρ[
]ο[.] . ν
]τ() (ἔστι?) κα[

Fr. 3.

]χεῖ[
]· εὐέτω ταῦτα σ[
 γῆ κατὰ το[
]α ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄδειν [
]σεται
 5 ἐ]λευθέραις α[
]μεναι·
] γυναικὸ(s) ἐπε[τ] οσ[

Fr. 4.

] . ἐτυ[
]τας ἐπή[
] ἡμερτον ὄρη[

- κ]ούφω δ' ὑπίησιν
 5]δα[. . .]εσ π[αῖ]δας ἀπ[
] . αις κολοκύνταις ὑπα[
]στασδ[. .]εο[. .]α]ις ἀπαλ[
] αι' [. . . .]δ' ὑπ[
]αναφα . . [
 10] . s ἄγαθος τα . [
]δάμα πω [. .] . [
] . ἐν με [. .] . η . . [
]α' [
]λιον αἶμ[
 15] . νίω κερρ[
] γὰρ [']σ[.]αισε . [
] . ο[.]εν ἄς τ' ὦ[
] . τε[.] . χ . . [
]ς νᾶα ποή[σ
 20] . υ . ασδ' οὐ γὰρ ἔγω [
 ἐ]πόνησας κατὰ [
] . ις καὶ πόλλα χαρισ[
]δοις, τοῖς δ' ὑπίσω [
]ται· π[ι]σύνα δ' ὄκ . [
 25] πολίας κῦμ' ἄλ[ο]ς ἐ . . [
] . ις τοῦτ' οὐκ οἶδεν, ἔνοιπ[
]αῖσιν ὀμίλλει τὰ δέην θ[
] αὔτω . [.]ο χρήματος [
]κός[. .]τ' ὠλομέν[
 30]των· τευ . ηδε[
] κάκων ἐσχατ[Fr. 5.
]λη ψύχαν ἀκατ[. . . .
]ν· ἄ δ' οὐ[κ] ἐσσ . []
] . δ' ἄλλος [. . .]εδ[]
 35]εραι, γα[]λα[
] ψύχρ[ο]ν [] . α . [.] . ι [.]οι[
]μμεν[.] . []θαδ[.]το δοκ[

]ατον[.]ά[
] . ελιδ[
 40] . ελκεα[

] . ναέρραυ[
 5]ερα·θυ[. . .]δα . [·
]ίμ[. . .]ηνμ[

Fr. 6.

.
 4]πει[
]σπ[
]δευσ[.]μά[
]ισχοσκα[
 5]πολλᾶν . [·
]αι[.]λέ . [·
]νδ[
]αιειδ[
] . [. . .]αι[
 10]ττισδεγ[
] . ρεικυμ[
]χωρέοντ[
]περσισυφο[
]ταμ[
 15]ίόν[

Fr. 7.

.
]ι . [·
] . [.] . [.] . [·
]πυτοξω
]καταγρε[.]
 5] . ρονᾶπυσ[
]ρατρύ[
] . βιαζω
]ουσαι
]δνη[
 10] . [·

Fr. 8.

.
] . [·
]δια . [·
]ἀγιβό[
]ἴλον[
]δυ·π[
]ρεξέ[
]βρόδ[
]αρει[
]ολπ[
]τοκ[

Fr. 9.

]κθαλα[
]πέδιο[
]πολυ[

Fr. 10.

.
]όμεν[
]ντῶ[
]νκαταη[
]τουτομε . [·
 5]τ'ομάγυ[
]αι·καδδε[
]άσαν[

Fr. 11.

.
]μενοι [·
]σέχω ^{κτ·} [·
 _{οιπ[}
]αμενᾶ . [·
]τισδα[
 5]λην· . [·
]θην
] . [·

Fr. 12.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

.
 [. . .] . . .]σε[
 [. . .] τετᾶιβ[
 αγεδήμ'α[
 αἰτακην . [·
 5 τᾶσδενό . [·
 εἰπέμ[
 μῆνκο . [·
 τουτ'εγω[

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.
.
]ίοισ . []σσεται δ[
]μιονα[]τατοσ
]νονα[] . πάθηγ
]έποτ'α[]άίσομεν[
.] . [

πόλλακ[
 10 πόλλύμ[
] [

Fr. 15. Col. i. Plate II.

.

]]

]]

]]

]]

] . ε .

]εσσινουσιαζοντες

]νουσιαζοντεσσοιε

5]ερεανανγω

]ναυξεσ

]αγορα

]ωγγι^ο

]λων

10]νιζειν

]ο^υδιδ^υ

]]

]]

] . γε^ωκ . ε . ελωσεπαν^ω

15]αντιτουτουτουστικει^η

]]

]ν' α^υειουσπερο[.]

]]

20]σαι

]]

]τιωφ[

.

Fr. 15 Col. ii. Plate II.

λ[
 σ'ή[
 δμά . [
 ἀσιμ[
 5 αἰθέι . [
 ταναίο[
 ὄμπαν[
 $\frac{\xi}{\frac{1}{2}}$ ν[.]κα[
 $\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}$ τίστ' ὄποιν[
 10 εἴπη[
 παρέσκεθ' ὀ[
 δάιμον' ἀνάιτιο[
 δευοντοσουδεπ[. . . .] ρανοιτ[
 τασσᾶσεγ[. .] υφ[.] σ[. . . .] θενσδ[
 15 παυσαι·κάκων[.] ὄντω[
 ἀιτιδύναικατεχ[.] σ[
 σοιμεν[.] ἀρή[. .] . περβέβα[.] αιχρο[
 α[. . .]
 [.] αικαρποσοσσ[.] σησσυαιρετ[
 τολκᾶμμαδ' ελπῶρᾶ[[παλαον[]]
 20 [.] υκολ[.] γαισταφυλαισενέικη[
 [. . .] ψ[.] τοιαυτασγααραπαμπε[
 [. . .] υ . . σ [.] . ισ . επιᾶμ[
 [.] ρ . ημ . . ηδρό . [.] σιν' ἀνταισ[
 [.] ακασωμοτέραισεείσαισ[
 25 [.] τοιγαροिताπροσθεπονήμ[
 [.] εσκ[.] νουδέ . [.] τ . [.] υτ[
 [.] ηκε·καρτε . [.] [.] . . [
 [.] ασιανπαρεχε[

Fr. 1. 1. The length of the initial lacuna in this and the following lines is determined by l. 4, where [γλ]αύκαν is evidently to be restored. Neither *πλεξάνθης* nor *λεξάνθης* (or *-θις*) occurs elsewhere.

Fr. 15. Col. ii.

λ[
 σ' ἤ[
 δμά . [
 $\bar{\alpha}$ s ἴμ[εν ?
 5 αἰθεί . [
 ταναίο[
 ὄμπαυ[ε
 υ[ί]κα[

Τίς τ', ὦ πον[
 10 εἶπη[ν
 παρέσκεθ' ὄ[
 δαίμον' ἀναίτιο[ν
 δεύοντος οὐδὲ π[.]ρανοίτ[
 τᾶς σᾶς ἐγ[. .]υσ[.']σ[.]θεν σὺ [
 15 παύσαι· κάκων [.]όντω[ν
 αἴ τι δύνα· κατεχ[.]ο·
 σοὶ μὲν [γ]ᾶρ ἤ[δη] ὑπερβέβα[τ]αι χρό[νος,
 [κ]αὶ κάρπος ὅσο[ο]ς ἦς συνα[γέρ]ρετ[αι] (?),
 τὸ κλᾶμμα δ' ἐλπώρα, κάλον γᾶρ,
 20 [ο]ὐκ ὀλ[ί]γαις σταφύλαις ἐνείκη[ν.
 [. . . δ]ψ[ι,] τοιαύτας γὰρ ἀπ' ἀμπέ[λω
 [. . . .]ν . . . σ [.] . ισ . ἐπιάμ[
 [. .]ρ . ημ . μὴ δρόπ[ω]σιν αὐταῖς
 [ὄμφ]ακας ὠμοτέραις εἰοίσαις.
 25 [οὔ] τοι γὰρ οἱ τὰ πρόσθ' ἐπονήμ[ενοι
 [. .]εσκ[ο]ν· οὐδέ . [.]τ . [.]ντ[
 [. . .]ηκε· καρτε . [.] [.] . . [
 [διπλ]ασίαν παρεχε[

2. The first σ, though rubbed, is practically certain.

3. [ᾶκ]αν is perhaps not too much for the lacuna, ρ being a narrow letter.

4. [γλ]αύκαν is gen. plur. fem., as shown by the mark of length on αν; . . .]αν in l. 5 was

another word of the same kind. The language here is close to that of Sapph. 4 ἀμφὶ δὲ (ὑδωρ) ψῦχρον κελάδει (cf. l. 6) δι' ὑσδων μαλίνων, but the present passage can hardly have been the source of that fragment.

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

7. τ]ηλεφάνην: it is unlucky that the initial letter is missing, as in 1231. I. i. 27 [τῆ]λε (?), 1233. 4. 10 [τ]ήλοθεν. πήλυι rests on the evidence of grammarians.

Fr. 2. 7. Not ὦ Μελάνιππ' (cf. 1233. I. ii. 8).

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

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

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

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

Fr. 4. 3. e. g. ὄρη[μ', ὄρη[ν.

6. The second ο of κολοκυνταις has apparently been converted from υ.

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

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

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

19.]ϕ:]ε is rather suggested by the remains, but seems excluded by the metre.

20. σὺ τάσδ', θύρασδ' are possibilities, neither very satisfactory.

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

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

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

27. ηνθ]: γινε[is hardly possible.

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

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

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

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

6. Cf. Fr. 4. 22, n.; but ζμ[έρρ]ην hardly fills the lacuna.

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

4. ἰσ: or ἰισ.

13. Σίσυφο]: cf. 1233. I. ii. 12.

Fr. 7. 4. *κατάγει* recurs at the end of a line in **1233. 11. 9**; cf. Sapph. 43.
8. *υ* is a correction from *ι*. If *υ* is right, *σαι* is presumably the possessive pronoun.

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

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

Fr. 12. ii. 3. There is no paragraphus below this line.

11. The supposed coronis is uncertain, being represented only by part of a thin vertical stroke immediately in front of l. 10.

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

Fr. 15. i. 4.]*ερεαν*: or perhaps]*ερε[ι]αν*.

10. Didymus is known to have written a book *περὶ λυρικών ποιητῶν*, but this seems to have been of a historico-literary nature rather than a critical *ὑπόμνημα* of the kind indicated by the present passage. It is, however, likely enough that his voluminous commentaries included a treatise on the Lesbian poets, as well as on Pindar and Bacchylides.

ii. 3. Either *δμάτ[* or *δμάθ[* can be read.

9. As in **1787. 34. 1**, τ' may represent either *τε* or *τοι*.

11. *παρέσκεθ'* here provides a parallel for Powell's admissible suggestion *περσκέθοισα* in **1231. 1. i. 18**.

13. *ιτ*: or *ι'* . [.

14. *εγ[*: or *επ[*. The letter following]*υ* may well be *ο*.

16. The accent on *α* might be taken for a mark of short quantity. λ[is possible in place of χ[.

18. For the (Doric) form *ῆς* for *ῆν* cf. **1360. 1. 9**, where *ῆς* is better taken as 3rd person, and **1231. 55. 4**, where *ῆς* is probably to be recognized; *ῆν*, which is read in Sapph. 106, may now well be emended. The following word as originally written was apparently *συναρετ[αι* (*-αγρ-* is possible), which was amended in some way, perhaps by the substitution of *α[ερ]* or *α[γερ]* for *αι*, but there has been no deletion.

19. For the doubled *μ* in *κλάμμα* cf. e. g. Sapph. 1. 16 *κάλημι*, 14. 1 and the Halle fragment *νόμημα*, **1231. 13. 4** *ἐ]πόημεν*. *κάλον γάρ* is evidently parenthetical. *παλαον* which was first written = *πάλαιον* (adv.), *πάλαος* being the Aeolic form according to Eust. 28. 33. Whether the correction is due to the original hand or to a *diorthotes* is not evident.

21. Vestiges above the line suggest *ψ* rather than *τ*, and e. g. *δ]ψ[ι]* well suits the conditions; but *τ* is possible, if some interlinear addition is supposed. What has been taken for a high stop in front of *τοιαντας* may be part of the preceding letter.

22. The letter after]*υ* has been corrected, but what was intended is hardly determinable as the line stands. Apparently *ο* was first written, and through this there is a vertical stroke (*ι?*), with a vestige of ink close by on the edge of a hole in front of *σ*. Perhaps]*υος* was altered to]*υιος*. Further on, if *σ* and *ε* are rightly read, the intervening letter, which had a vertical stroke, was presumably *γ* or *τ*.

23. For the interpretation of this line much depends on the identity of the letter printed as *η* before *δρ*. The first stroke of the *η* has the form of a narrow oval, and it is therefore questionable whether *θι* should be read instead of *η*. But the oval is considerably narrower, and the cross-stroke longer, than in a normal *θ*, and *θι* is, moreover, intractable metrically. Perhaps then the scribe began to write *ε* and converted this to *η*. If *η* is right, *-ημι μη* would be suitable enough. The first visible letter must be either *β*, *ο*, *ρ*, or *φ*, and next to this the slight remains suit the upper part of a *β* better than anything else. [*τ*ά]ρβημι

would sufficiently satisfy the conditions, if that word were likely. For $\delta\rho\acute{o}$. [.] $\sigma\iota\nu$, $\delta\rho\acute{o}\sigma[\sigma\iota]\sigma\iota\nu$ naturally suggests itself but is difficult in the context. Possibly $\delta\rho\acute{o}\pi[\omega]\sigma\iota\nu$ or $\delta\rho\acute{o}\pi[\sigma\iota]\sigma\iota\nu$ may be restored on the analogy of 1234. 2. i. 9 $\tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\eta\nu$, ii. 7 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omicron\pi\epsilon$. The high stop after this word seems superfluous in any case.

25. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\eta\mu[\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota]$: cf. 1789. i. i. 5 (v.l. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\mu$., probably correct) and Alc. 46 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, which has been gratuitously altered to $\acute{\epsilon}\pi'$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$. There is more to be said for the correction $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota\gamma\epsilon$ $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

26.] τ : or γ or σ .

27. e. g. $\kappa\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\iota$], $\kappa\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\rho$].

28. [$\delta\iota\pi\lambda$] $\alpha\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is perhaps not too much for the lacuna when allowance is made for the slope of the column.

1789. ALCAEUS.

FR. I 11.7 x 15.2 cm.

First century. Plate III
(Frs. 1-3, Col. i).

The authorship of these fragments, consisting of parts of two columns and a number of disconnected pieces, would have been sufficiently clear even without the occurrence in them of Alcaeus 19, part of an Alcaic stanza cited by Heraclides Ponticus, whereby their source is definitely proved. This coincidence is found in Fr. I. i. 15-18, and it becomes plain that the lines quoted by Heraclides were the beginning of a poem, of which we now recover the continuation in the following column, where Alcaeus' favourite metaphor of a storm-tossed ship is carried on for a further two lines. Since the height of the column is unknown, the extent of the lacuna between Col. i. 19 and Col. ii. 1 cannot be determined, but it may be only one line and is hardly likely to have exceeded five lines, which would give three stanzas for the development of the metaphor. Six more stanzas at least followed, of which however only one and a half are sufficiently well preserved to be intelligible and capable of restoration. In these the poet passes from allegory to precept, and urges his fellow-citizens to courage and endurance and to emulation of their ancestors. The subject of the preceding poem, the conclusion of which survives in a mutilated form in the upper portion of Col. i, is obscure. It presumably belonged, like the other, to the class of $\Sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\omega\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$; there are references to marriage (ll. 7, 14), but whether these have anything to do with the marriage of Pittacus, to which allusion is made in 1234. 2. i. 6, remains doubtful. As the text stands its chief point of interest lies in the metrical scheme, which seems clearly to be a stanza of four lines, the first three being lesser Asclepiads and the fourth a Glyconic. This stanza was used repeatedly by Horace (i. 6, 15, 24, 33, ii. 12, iii. 10, 16, iv. 5, 12) who has commonly been credited with its invention, but his debt now becomes evident. That the similar stanza with a Pherecratic for the third verse (e.g. Horace i. 5,

14, &c.) was borrowed from Alcaeus had already been suspected on the ground of Alc. 43; another (previously unknown) form of Asclepiad stanza is exemplified in 1234. 2. i. From the remaining fragments not much can be extracted. In Fr. 6, which is in Alcaics, a mention of the Pelasgi is noticeable, and there seem to be other historical references. The character of Fr. 12, in the same metre, is indicated by the occurrence of the word *μοναρχία* as well as by a reference to Myrsilus in a marginal note. Alcaics are perhaps also to be recognized in Frs. 24 and 25. Fr. 13 may be in the Sapphic stanza, and Fr. 29 possibly in Asclepiads.

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

Fr. I. Col. i. Plate III.

- [.] [
- [.] ραισεχην^τ [12 letters] μη
- [.] εὐπροσκακα[] νευ^ρ
- [.] νοι[. .] τοισ[. .] θα . οσκ . []
- 5 [.] ενέτωμηδε' πονήμε[. .] ρι[. .]
- [.] ν' αείκεα^{ζαμεύόντων ζαμευετωσαν} [[]] τ . . α . . εσ
- [.] τι[. .] κεκρ[. .] μενοσγάμει
- [.] κεξυστοφο[. .] με[.]
- [.] τακ' άντανγλυκεωσ[.] .ταντα[. .] ωσ^ε
- 10 [.] σίλευσεχην. Fr. 2.
- [.] εκα:πόλλασ[. .] πα | . αμη . α[. . |] ταμέ[
- [.] μένηννα[. .] ρε | μοιτοτα[
- [.] νοιτ' όπποταλ | .] μέ . . υ[
- [.] ηιγάμου[] Fr. 3. Col. i.
- 15 [.] τεκυματοπ[. .] οτε[.]
- [.] παρεξείδα[.] ολυν^η
- [.] εικέ' να[.]
- [.] όμεθε[.]
- [.] σ . [. .] . [
-

Fr. I. Col. ii.

- φαρξώμεθ' ωσωκιστ[
- εσδ' έχυρονλίμεναδρο[
- καιμητινόκνοσμολθ^α[
- λαχη^βπροδηλονγαρμεγ[
- 5 μνασθητετδ' παροιθαμ^ε[
- νυντισάνηρδοκιμοσγε[

Fr. 1. Col. i.

-
 [.....]..... [
 [.....] .. ραις ἔχῃ τ[12 letters]... μη
 [.....] εὖ πρὸς κάκα []νευο().
 [.....]νον [..]τοις[.]θα . ος κ . []
 5 [.....]ενέτω μηδ' ἐπονήμε[ν]οι
 [ζαμευόντο]ν αἰέκκα. ζαμευόντον ζαμευέτωσαν.
 [.....]τι[ς] κεκρ[ί]μενος γάμει
 [.....] κεν ξυστοφο[ρή]με[ν]ος
 [.....]τα κ' αὐταν γλυκέως [.....] ταν τα[.]ωσε().
 10 [.....]βα]σίλευς ἔχην. Fr. 2.
 [.....]εκα πόλλας πα . αμη . α[. . ταμέ[
 [.....]μὲνην· ἀ[ί] γὰρ ἔμοι τότα
 [.....]γέ]νοιτ' ὅπποτα λ[.]μέ . . ν
 [.....] . η γάμον.

Fr. 3 Col. i

- 15 [Τὸ δηῦ]τε κῦμα τῷ π[ρ]οτέ[ρω] 'νέμω]
 [στείχει] παρέξει δ' ἄ[μμι] πόνον π[ό]λυν
 [ἀντλην, ἐπ]εί κε νᾶ[ος] ἐμβᾶ
 [.....]όμεθ' εἶ[
 [.....]σ . [.] . [

Fr. 1. Col. ii.

- φαρξώμεθ' ὡς ὄκιστ[α —
 εἰς δ' ἔχυρον λίμενα δρό[μω]μεν.
 καὶ μή τιν' ὄκνος μόλθ[ακος] ἀμμέων?
 λάβῃ, πρόδηλον γὰρ μέγ[α] συμφέρον·?
 5 μνάσθητε τῷ πάροιθα μ[ώ]μω·?
 νῦν τις ἄνηρ δόκιμος γε[νέ]σθω.

		καιμηκαταισχνωμεν[
		έσλοιστόκησγᾶσῦπακ[
		[.]τανδ[
10		τανπο[
		έοντε[Fr. 4.		Fr. 5.
		τωνσφ[.
		εσικε[]]ετ[
		ται[]οτε[. . . .
15		αλλ . []ιον[
		[. .] . [. . . .		
		[
Fr. 3.	Col. ii.	π[Fr. 6.		Fr. 7.
		μ[.]ταδεωσ.
20		γξ[]ωφι[]
		ι[]αΐδρεΐα . []γ . τανδᾶ . [
		[] . [. .] . . . αΐπαν[βαρηαιρουσ[
		[] . καιμάΐέωνα[]νον.
		5]νάντΐιδροσπολ[απολελειμ[
]πελάσγωναιολ[μενον
		
]ποκΐεξεπει[
]ναξγλαφύρα[Fr. 8.
]έΐκΐρσαησ . [.
		
			10]ηαισιγ[]εποτ . . ᾗη[
]σισφάλ[]μάδε . [.]ν
		]
]ννεχει
					ν
				5]ωνυμον.
					α.
]άψετ[ΐ
]
]άρον
					α[
]τό[. .]
				

καὶ μὴ καταισχύνωμεν [ἀνανδρία?
 ἔσλοισ τόκης γὰς ὕπα κ[ειμένο]ς,
 [οἶ?] τάνδ[ε]?

10 τὰν πόλιν

ἔοντε[ς	Fr. 4.	Fr. 5.
τῶν σφ[.
εἴσικέ []]ετι[
ταῖ[ς]οτε[. . .

15 ἀλλ. []ιον[

[. . .]

[

Fr. 3. Col. ii.

π[Fr. 6.

Fr. 7.

μ[.

? ἐπι]ταδέως.

20 γε[] ὦ φίλ[

ι[] α ἰδρεῖα . [

]ν τὰν δα-
βάρη αἴρουσ[

[] . [. . .] α πάν[

-με]νον.

. [] . καὶ μάλ' ἔων ἀ[

ἀπολελειμ[μένον . . .
μένον.

. . 5]νάντ' αἰδρος πόλ[λ

5] .

] Πελάσγων Αἰολ[ιδ

] .

] ποτ' ἐξ 'Επεῖ[ων?

.

ἄ]ναξ γλαφύρα[

]ε Κίρσα ησ . [

Fr. 8.

10]ηαισιν [

]σι σφάλ[

.
]ε ποτ . . . αη[

]μάδε . [.]ν

] .

]ννέχει

5]ώνυμον.

]άψρετ' ['

] .

]άρων α[

]τό[. .] α . [

.

	Fr. 9.		Fr. 10.		Fr. 11.

]νδετω[] . ρματ[]
]σινποησ[]δην'ω[]λιασ[
]αρεσσετ'α[] . μη[]σκάκοι[
] . οσουδε[.
				
	Fr. 12.	Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.		Fr. 15.

] . []]]ορου[
]δαμμ[.]ν[]] . ωφ[]ονψ[
]οσμενετ[] . γνυμα[.
]οναρχιανδε[]οπρινθα[
5]ηδεδεκωμ[]άην .	Fr. 16.		Fr. 17.
] . ιδημφο[.
] . οισίτ'ύπο . []αυατ[]στε[
]αινων'εκ[]αταισ []
]
] . [.]μυρσιλου				
10] . . . εφ . . υ[.] . δε . . α[Fr. 18.			Fr. 19.
] . α . . ν
]σε . [] . νδεφο[
]αντ[]τίναπροφ[
	
	Fr. 20.	Fr. 21.	Fr. 22.		Fr. 23.

]λλιπω[]κρακαμ[]παρμέν[] . . ισ . . [
]ψεκαι]γαμεγαλ[.]νοντ'αϊ[
]] . αι . σ . []τοταδήπ[] . [
]
]δικωσ . [
]σ				
				

Fr. 9.	Fr. 10.	Fr. 11.	
.	
]ν δὲ τῶ [] . ρματ[] [
]σιν ποησ[]δην ὦ[]λιασ[
γ]ὰρ ἔσσειτ' ἀ[] . μη[]s κάκον [
] . os οὐδέ[.	
.			
Fr. 12.	Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.
.
] . [] [] []ορου[
]δ' ἄμμ[ι]ν [] [] . ωφ[]ον ψ[
]os μενετ[] . νῦν μα[.
μ]οναρχίαν δὲ [γὰ]ρ πρὶν θα[
5 μ]ηδὲ δεκῶμ[εθ']αύην.	Fr. 16.	Fr. 17.
] . ιδημφο[.
] . οισί τ' ὕπο . [] αὐάτ[αισι]στε[
]αίνων· ἐκ[] ἄταιs [] [
] [.
] . [.] Μυρσίλου			
10] . . . εφ . . υ[.] . δε . . α[Fr. 18.		Fr. 19.
] . α . . ν
]σε . [] . ν δὲ φοί[
]αντ[] τινὰ προφ[

Fr. 20.	Fr. 21.	Fr. 22.	Fr. 23.
.
ἐ]λλίπω[ν]κρα καμ[] παρμέν[] . . . ισ . . [
]ψε καὶ]τα μεγαλ[] τότε δὴ π[ο]νοντ' αἰ[
] [] . αἰs· σ . [.]· [
] [.
5 ?έν]δίκως· [
]s			
.			

Fr. 24.	Fr. 25.	Fr. 26.	Fr. 27.
·	·	·	·
]νπανταδε'να[]ο[]φρο[]αλι . [
]απολλυταιν[]ομαι[]αλαι· []λίπ[
]ι. ταιπο[]ιπτονφ[]αρετεσ[]μφ[
]τι[]δεξεταιιδ[]ιραπει . [·
·	5]ντακ'ακ[5]ε'μέ[·
]ν'ω[·	
	·		
Fr. 28.	Fr. 29.	Fr. 30.	Fr. 31.
·	·	·	·
εσ[] . κατ[]αδ[]κακοσ[
κα[] . . σπάισ[]άνδρ[]ε·
]δομονο[]τημ[]τοπον[
Fr. 32.]ειμοροσαίστ[·]γαράγη[
·	5]οσονίατον[Fr. 33.	5]φ[
εξί[]βρομοσενσ[·	·
καιγ[]νωδη]αν'αδ . [
ώτα[]αινομεν[]αμη· [Fr. 34.
·	·] . . [·
		·]σικαισ[
			·
Fr. 35.	Fr. 36.	Fr. 37.	Fr. 38.
·	·	·	·
]ον[] . []ερω . [] . αλ[
]εροιγ[] . ξεν[] . []μεγα. σο[
·	·	·	γαμ[
]
Fr. 39.	Fr. 40.	Fr. 41.	
·	·	·	
] .]νωκ[] .	

Fr. 24.	Fr. 25.	Fr. 26.	Fr. 27.
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
]ν πάντα δὲ να[]ο[]φρο[]αλι . [
] ἀπόλλυται· ν[]ομαι []αλαι . []λίπ[
] . ται πο[]ιπτονω[]αρετεσ[ἀ]μφι[
]τι[] δέξεται δι[]ιρα πει . [· · · · ·
· · · · ·	5]ντα κακ[5]ε μέ[
]ν ᾧ[· · · · ·	
	· · · · ·		
Fr. 28.	Fr. 29.	Fr. 30.	Fr. 31.
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
εσ[] . κατ[]αδ[] κάκος [
κα[] . . s παῖσ[αν ?] ἄνδρ[]ε τόπον [
] δόμον δ[]τημ[] γὰρ ἄγη[
Fr. 32.]ει μόρος αἴστ[· · · · ·] . . εγων[
· · · · ·	5 ν]όσον ἴατον [Fr. 33.	5]ω[
ἔξι[]βρομος ἐν σ[· · · · ·	· · · · ·
καὶ γ[μα]νώδη]αναδ . [Fr. 34.
ᾧ τα[μ]αινόμεν[ον]αμη . [· · · · ·
· · · · ·	· · · · ·] . . []σι καὶ σ[
		· · · · ·	· · · · ·
Fr. 35.	Fr. 36.	Fr. 37.	Fr. 38.
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
]ον[] . []ερω . [] . αλ[
]εροι ν[] . ξεν[] . [] μέγα. ^{σο} [γαμ[
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·]
			· · · · ·
Fr. 39.	Fr. 40.	Fr. 41.	
· · · · ·	· · · · ·	· · · · ·	
] .]νωκ[] .	

].ε.]γ'εξίσ[]λ.
]νοσ[]νιχθυ[]ναπε[
]]]
]νέστ[] . ηπεριπρο[]
5]σ	5]...ν[]οπόλλα[
]	5] δην.

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

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

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

3.]νευ : or perhaps νευ.

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

5. μ]ενέτω, σθ]ενέτω, στ]ενέτω? For ἐπονήμε[ν]οι cf. 1788. 15. ii. 25, n.: 'let them not return evil for good'; the *diastolé* was wrongly placed. The interlinear variant ἐπονάμε[ν]οι supports the form ἐπόνασιν in Alc. 46.

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

8. ξυστοφο[ρή]με[νος] : the verb was apparently not previously attested.

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

11-13. Fr. 2, which was found with Fr. 1, has been assigned to the ends of these lines with considerable hesitation. Its external appearance is favourable to the combination, and the resulting reading in ll. 12-13 ἀ'ι γὰρ ἔμοι τότα . . . γέ]νοιτ' ὅπποτα runs well, but the ends of ll. 11 and 13, especially the former, are difficult. In l. 11 a letter is desirable, though perhaps not absolutely essential, between σ and π, after which either *α* or *λ* can be read. Earlier in the line the small colon before πᾶλλασ is possibly a stop, such double dots being sometimes used for punctuation, even in company with single dots (cf. e. g. 1809-10); or it may be connected with the marginal adscript. In Fr. 2 the letter before αμ is represented by a mere speck, which is capable of many interpretations; that before the final *α* was γ, *ι*, *ρ*, or τ. In the marginal note opposite it is not clear whether the mark above the last letter denotes an abbreviation. In l. 13 on the edge of the papyrus above the left-hand upright of μ there is a small semicircular mark which might be e. g. the remains of a dot enclosing an over-written letter. In l. 12 αἰθ]ι μένην may be suggested (cf. 1787. 36. 2).

	ε]γ' ἐξίο[]λ
]νοσ[]ν ἰχθυ[]ναπε[
]]]
]ιν ἔστ[]·η περιπρο[]
5]s	5]... νν[]ο πόλλα[
]		· . . .	5] δῆν
	· . .			· . . .

14. ε]χηι or λα]χηι would suit the vestiges. The first letter may be α, κ, λ, or χ, the second, η, μ, ν, π; and γόμον, -οι or -ει are equally possible.

15-18 = Alc. 19, from Heraclid. *Alleg. Homer.* 5 ὁμοίως δὲ τὰ ὑπὸ τούτου (sc. Μυρσίλου) αἰνιττόμενος ἐτέρωθί που λέγει· Τὸ κτλ. How the end of l. 15 should be restored is still uncertain. The MSS. of Heraclides give τῶ προτέρῳ νεομω or (AB) τω προτέρω νέμω, for which τῶν προτέρων ὄμω has been conjectured by Seidler, τῶν π. ὄνω by Bergk, τῶ π. νέον by Hermann, τῶ π. 'νέμω by Gaisford, and τῶ π. 'νέμω by Blass. Of these the last alone is consistent with the papyrus, though 'νέμω is not of course necessarily right. Fr. 37, which possibly belongs here, does not help.

16. The v. l. παρεξῆι is abnormal.

17. ἐμβαίνει Heraclid., ἔμβα Seidler, ἐμβᾶ νή(α)τα, i. e. νείατα, Bergk, who also suggests ἐμβαί|νη κάτα, τετραέλικτος ἄλμα, a restoration which is now put out of court by the papyrus, though the true version of the fourth line of the stanza is not yet within reach.

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

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

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

3. For μόλθικος, which seems to be novel, cf. 1233. i. 2. 10 κόθαρων, &c.; the super-scribed variant would eliminate the Aeolism, as in l. 5 below and Fr. 22. 2. ὄκνος μόλθικος is comparable to e. g. χλωρὸν δέος. As an alternative to ἀμμέων or ὑμμέων a participle like εἰσβάλων or ἐμπέσων may be suggested.

4. The v. l. λαβη seems preferable to λαχη. συμφέρον is highly conjectural; the clause may alternatively be regarded as giving the reason for the warning, e. g. μέγ[α χεῖμ' ὄρην, as Lobel suggests.

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

8. ἔσλοισ τόκῆς: cf. 1234. 2. ii. 12 ἔσλων ἔοντες ἐκ τόκῆς.

13. εἰσικε: or εἰσικε|τ? Cf. n. on l. 2. But εs may be the termination of a divided word.

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

Frs. 4-5. These two small fragments were found, like Fr. 2, with the bulk of Fr. 1.

somewhat apart from the rest, but it does not of course necessarily follow that they belong to that column.

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

5. *ἄδρος* occurs in Ion 34, and cf. Etym. Magn. *ἄδρυσίγη*, Pindar, *Nem.* 1. 63 *ἀδροδίκας*.

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

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

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

1. *ἐπι]ταδέως*, like *τᾶν δα-* in l. 3, is a v. l., as is indicated by the enclosing dots.

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

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

4. *δ]νέχει, συ]νέχει*?

5. e. g. *ἀν]ώνυμον, ἐπώνυμον*. The corrector wished to double the *ν*.

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

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

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

3. *γ]ὰρ ἔσσετ'*: or *π]αρέσσετ'*? A small curved mark above the *τ* appears to be part of a sign of elision.

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

6. *ο*[: or *ε*[:.

7. *ἔπο* . [: or *ἔπ'* *ὀ* . [. As the last letter *μ, ν, or π* is probable.

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

10-11. The ink here is much effaced.

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

3. Perhaps *ἰ]αύην*, with *θα]νατ* . . in the previous line; but *ἰ]άχην* is possible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fr. 29. 4. Possibly $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau[os$ or $-ov$, as in Aesch. *Eum.* 565. π may be read instead of τ , but not ι or another vowel, apparently. ais cannot be Acc. Plur. Fem. unless the accent was mistaken.

7. $\mu\alpha[\nu\acute{\omega}\delta\eta$ is a gloss on $\mu]αινώμεν[ov$.

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

Fr. 32. 3. $\acute{\omega}$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}[lais$?

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

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

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

Fr. 41. 1.] λ is an interlinear v. l.

5. The variant $\delta\eta\nu$ implies $\delta\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon$ in the text.

1790. IBYCUS.

Height 20 cm.

First century B. C. Plate III
(Frs. 2 + 3, Col. ii).

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

The short third column, besides having a blank space below it, is succeeded by a complete width of 13 centimetres of papyrus, but unfortunately this contains no title and the identification of the poet is left to conjecture. Internal evidence, however, so narrows the choice that only one name seems

practically possible, that of Ibycus of Rhegium. In the penultimate line the author addresses Polycrates, to whom he ascribes imperishable fame. This can hardly be other than the well-known tyrant of Samos, who became a patron of the arts, and to whose court went Anacreon and, according to the common acceptance of a rather confused note in Suidas, also Ibycus.¹ Anacreon is excluded at once by the dialect, which however is entirely suitable to Ibycus. A further argument in favour of the identification is provided by the metre, in which among some less expected features the dactylic sequences frequent in the extant fragments of both Ibycus and Stesichorus are prominent.

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

Metrically the piece is of much interest. Though, as in 1361, the copyist contrary to the usual practice has not indicated the main divisions by paragraphi, the strophic respension is evident. A short strophe and antistrophe of four lines is followed by an epode of five lines, the scheme being as follows:—

Strophe.

— uu — uu — uu — uu,
 — uu — uu — uu — uu
 — uu — uu —,
uu — uu — uu — —

¹ Suidas, s.v. Ἴβυκος, says . . . γένει Ἑγγίνος ἐνθένδε εἰς Σάμον ἦλθεν, ὅτε αὐτῆς ἦρχε Πολυκράτης, ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ. χρόνος δὲ οὗτος ὁ ἐπὶ Κροίσου, Ὀλυμπιάς νδ'. Maas (Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencycl.*) regards this visit to Polycrates as uncertain, on account of the confused dating—an inadequate reason, since the main fact would no doubt be attested by the poems themselves while the dates would be added by the commentators. ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ is a riddle. Schneidewin's suggested solution ὁ τοῦ τυραννικοῦ or τῶν τυράννων πρῶτος, is unconvincing.

Epode.

---υ---υ---
 ---υ---υ---
υ---υ---υ---υ
 ---υ---υ---υ---υ---
 5 ---υ---υ---υ---υ

It was maintained by Schneidewin (*Ibyci Reliqu.* p. 78) that Ibycus like Stesichorus used lengthy strophes similar in compass to those of Pindar. We now see that this is not true of all his poems at any rate, if indeed of any; and the more cautious judgement of Maas (Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencycl.*) is well justified. Of the individual verses employed several have parallels in the existing fragments, scanty as they are. The dactylic dimeter of the strophe occurs repeatedly; see Ibyc. 1. 5-6, 5. 1-2, 16. 4, and cf. Stesichorus 2. For Strophe 1. 3, cf. Ibyc. 1. 8, 9. 2, for Epode 1-2, Ibyc. 15, 18, 27, Stesich. 10, 48, and for Ep. 3, Ibyc. 26. 1, Stesich. 48.

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

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. i.

]αιδαρδανιδαπριαμοιομε
]τυπερικλεεσολβιονηγάρο[]
]οθενορνυμενοι
]γοςμεγαλοιοβουλαισ
 5]νθᾶσελεναςπεριείδει
]ρινπολυμνονεχ[.]ντες
]λεμονκαταδακρ[.]εντα[]
]γαμονδαν[.]αταλαπειριο[]τα
]σοθειρανδ[.]ακυπριδά·
 10]νδεμοιούτεξειναπάτανπ[]ν
]επιθυμιονουτετανι[.]υρ[]
]νῆγκασσανδραν
]αμοιοτεπαιδασαλλου[
]ιασθυψιπυλοιοαλωσι[. . .]· [
 15]αρανώννυμον·ουδεπ[
]ωναρεταν
]εραφανονῶσ τεκίλα[
]πολυγόμοφοιελύσα[
]ᾱικακονηρωασεσθ[
 20]· ενκρειωναγαμε[

Frs. 2 + 3. Col. i.

[.]ρχεπλεισθ[. . .]δασβασιλ[.]σαγοσανδρωι
 ατρεοσεσ[. . .]· αῖσεκπ[. . .]σ·
 καιταμε[. . .]μόισαισεσοφ[.]έναι
 εὐέλικωνίδ[.]εμβάϊενλογ[.]·
 25 θνατοσδοκ[.]γανηρ
 διερο[. . . .]ταεκασταιπει
 ναῶν· [. . . .]ελαοσαπαυλίδοσ
 αιγαῖονδι[. . .]γτοναπαργεοσ
 ηλύθε[.]ν
 30 [.]πποτροφο[. . . .]εφωτεσ
 [.]αλκασπ[. . . .]εσαχαιων

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. i.

- 1 [οὐ καὶ Δαρδανίδα Πριάμοιο μέ- ἀντιστρ.
 2 [γ' ἄσ]τυ περικλεῆς ὄλβιον ἠνάρων
 3 [Ἄργ]οθεν ὄρνυμένοι
 4 [Ζη]νὸς μεγάλοιο βουλαῖς
 5 1 [ξ]ανθᾶς Ἑλένας περὶ εἶδει ἐπ.
 2 [δῆ]ριν πολύμνον ἔχ[ο]ντες
 3 [πό]λεμον κατὰ δακρ[υ]όντα,
 4 [Πέρ]γαμον δ' ἀνέ[β]α ταλαπείριο[ν] ἄ]τα
 5 [χρυσ]οέθειραν δι[ι]ὰ Κυπρίδα.
 10 1 [νῦ]ν δέ μοι οὔτε ξειναπάταν Π[ά]ρι]ν στρ.
 2 [ῆ]ν ἐπιθύμιον οὔτε τανί[σφ]υρ[ο]ν
 3 [ύμ]νῆν Κασσάνδραν
 4 [Πρι]άμοιό τε παῖδας ἄλλου[ς]
 1 [Τρο]ίας θ' ὑψιπέλοιο ἄλωσι[ν, ὄ]γ' ἀντιστρ.
 15 2 [οὐκ] ἄρ' ἀνώνυμον· οὐδ' ἐπ[ανέρ]χομαι? ἐπ.
 3 [ῆρ]ῶων ἀρετὰν
 4 [ύπ]εράφανον οὔστε κοίλα[ι]
 1 [νάες] πολυγόμοφοι ἐλεύσα[ν]
 2 [Τροί]α κακὸν ἥρωας ἐσθ[λο]ύς·
 20 3 [τῶν] μὲν κρείων Ἀγαμέ[μνων]

Frs. 2-3. Col. i.

- 4 [ῆ]ρχε Πλεισθ[ενί]δας βασιλ[εὺς] ἄγος ἀνδρῶν
 5 Ἄτρεος ἐσ[θλοῦ] πάις ἐκ πα[τρό]ς.
 1 καὶ τὰ μὲν ἂν Μοῖσαι σεσοφ[ισμ]έναι στρ.
 2 εὖ Ἑλικωνίδ[ες] ἐμβαίειν †λόγ[φ]
 25 3 θνατὸς δ' οὐ κ[ε]ν ἀνῆρ
 4 διερὸ[ς] τὰ ἕκαστα εἶποι
 1 ναῶν, ὡ[ς] Μεν[έ]λαος ἀπ' Αὐλίδος ἀντιστρ.
 2 Αἰγαῖον δι[ὰ] πό[ν]τον ἀπ' Ἄργεος
 3 ἤλυθε [Δαρδανία]ν
 30 4 [ἴ]πποτρόφου, ὡς δ' ἐφώτες
 1 [χ]αλκάσπ[ιδες, υἱ]ῆς Ἀχα[ι]ῶν. ἐπ.

- [.]ωνμενπρ[. .]ερεστατοσα[.]χμαι[
 [. . .] . ποδ[. . .]κυσαχιλλευσ
 [. . . .]γαστ[. . .]ωνιοσαλκι[
 35. [.] . ατ[.]γυροσ·
 [.]οσαπαργεοσ[
 [.]σεσιλιον
 [.]
 [.] . [.] .
 ε^α
 40 [.]αχρυσοστροφ[

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

- υλλισεγῆματοτωιδ[.]ρατρωιλον
 ὡσειχρυσονδρῆι
 χάλκωιτρισᾶπεφθο[.]ῆδη
 τρωεσδ[.]ναίιτ'ερό[.]σσαν
 45 μορφανμάλεισκονομιοιον·
 τοισμενπέδακαλλεοσαιεν·
 καισυπολύκρατεσκληοσαφθιτονεξείσ
 ωσκατ[. .]οιδανκαιεμονκλεοσ
 50

- [. . . .]ιμαχοσεντωιπεριτευκρουφησι/πα[. . . .]ν X
 50 [. . . .]γτοुक'λαβιππουσουσμετατογ . [. . . .]σχα
 [. . . .] . τουτηγγεσιντεν . . . αγαπεπλ[. . . .]αιωσ
 [. . . .]θαιτιαλ . . . τουλαομε[.]γτοσμε[. . . .]εστρα
 [. . . .]γισε . [.] . ε . [.]

Fr. 4.

Col. i.	Col. ii.	Fr. 5.	Fr. 6.
.
]	σο[δασε[]σι[
]	α[[.]ένθ[]
]	ε . [[.]χνια[[]
]	νυσσον[ἄιθόια[]δ[
]	5 ασπιδα[5 αιτελυ[5]κέ[
]	τοιδαύχα[πα[]νη[

	2	[τ]ῶν μὲν προ[οφ]ερέστατος α[ί]χμῶ	
	3	[βαίν]ε[ι] πόδ[ας] ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς	
	4	[καὶ μέ]γας Τ[ε]λαμῶνιος ἄλκιμος Αἴας	
35	5	[.]. ατ[.] ἄρ]γυρος.	
	1	[15 letters]ος ἀπ' Ἄργεος	στρ.
	2	[16 ,,]s ἐς Ἴλιον	
	3	[,, ,,]	
	4	[15 ,,]·[.]·	
40	1	[14 ,,] ἄ χρυσεόστροφος	ἀντιστρ.

Frs. 2 + 3. Col. ii.

	2	Ἕλλῆς ἐγήνατο, τῷ δ' [ἄ]ρα Τρωῖλον	
	3	ὥσει χρυσὸν ὄρει-	
	4	χάλκῳ τρις ἀπεφθο[ν] ἤδη	
	1	Τρώες Δ[α]ναοὶ τ' ἐρό[ε]σαν	ἐπ.
45	2	μορφὰν μάλ' εἴσκον ὅμοιον.	
	3	τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰέν·	
	4	καὶ σύ, Πρ(υ)λύκρατες, κλέος ἀφθιτον ἐξείς,	
	5	ὡς κατ' [ἀ]οιδὰν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.	

[?Καλλ]ίμαχος ἐν τῷ περὶ Τεύκρου φησί· πα[.]ν
 50 [.]ν τοῦ καταλαβ(εῖν) ἵππους οὐς μετὰ τὸν [.]σχα-
 [.] του τὴν γένεσιν Τευκρ. . ἀναπεπ[ηρω. .]αι ὡς
 [.]θαι τι ἀλ. . . . τοῦ Λαομέ[δο]ντος με[.] ἐστρά-
 [τευσε]ν ἰς ἐ[. . .]· ἐ[. . .]·

Fr. 4.

Col. i.	Col. ii.	Fr. 5.	Fr. 6.
.
]	σο[.	δάσε[.]σι[.
]	α[.	[.]ενθ[.]
]	ε·[.	[ί]χνια[.	[.
]	νυsson[.	αἶθ' οἴα[.]δ[.
]	5 ἀσπίδα[.	5 αἶτε λυ[.	5 κέ[.
]	τοὶ δ' αὖ χα[.	πα[.]νη[.

οισ·	τυπτ[φραδ[νοσα[
]	εγ[ναιο[]φά[
· · ·	· · ·	εξάπ[· · ·	
		10 [.ατα[
		[.]·[
		· · ·		
Fr. 7.	Fr. 8.	Fr. 9.	Fr. 10.	
· · ·	· · ·	· · ·	· ·	
]·]··[]δ'αρ[]λο[
]κτυ]σινπ[· · ·]στ[
]νητηριγα[]ηοσδ·[]ππ[
]λισπρε[]ιλο[Fr. 11.]··[
· · ·	5]ευμ[· ·	· ·	
	· · ·]ου[
]ρέα[
		· ·		
Fr. 12.	Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.
· ·	· · ·	· · ·	· ·	· · ·
]νοσ[]ιφα[]]ώσ[]χλαγ[
]·[]]]]
]μ[]]ωτδ[]λέ[]
[]]π·[· · ·]ο·	· · ·
5 []	· · ·		5]οσ[
]·[]ρχ[
· ·			· ·	

‘ . . . who destroyed the famed great and wealthy town of Priam son of Dardanus, setting out from Argos by decree of mighty Zeus and ensuing an oft-sung strife for fair-haired Helen’s form, in tear-stained war; and vengeance overtook miserable Pergamon because of golden-tressed Cypris. But it is not now my desire to sing of cheating Paris or slender-ankled Cassandra and the rest of the children of Priam or the capture of lofty-gated Troy, which is no unfamed theme; nor do I tell again of the supreme prowess of the heroes whom the hollow well-nailed ships brought, a freight of noble heroes fatal to Troy; whose captain was lord Agamemnon of the race of Pleisthenes, king and leader of men, the son of noble Atreus. Such things might the Muses of Helicon, versed in wisdom, well essay, but a living mortal man could not tell all the tale of the ships, how that Menelaus went from

οις:	τυπτ[ον	φραδ[νοσα[
]	έγ[ναιο[φά[
.	έξ[απ[. . . .	
		10 [.]ατα[
		[.]·[
			
Fr. 7.	Fr. 8.	Fr. 9.	Fr. 10.	
.	
].]··[]δ' άρε[]λο[
]κτυ-]σιν π[.]στ[
? κυβε[ρ]νητῆρι γα[]ηος δ·[]ππ[
]λις πρε[]ιλο[Fr. 11.]··[
.] εύμ[.	
]ου[
]ρέα[
			
Fr. 12.	Fr. 13.	Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.
.
]νοσ[]ιφα[]] σ[]χλα γ[
]·[]]]]
]μ[]]ωτο[]λέ[]
[]]τι·[. . . .]ο·
5 []		5]οσ[
]·[]ρχ[
.	

Aulis over the Aegean sea from Argos to Dardania rich in horses, and with him the men of brazen shields, sons of the Achaeans. Foremost of them in battle came swift-footed Achilles, and great Aias doughty son of Telamon . . . and he whom gold-girt Hyllis bare, to whom Trojans and Danaï likened Troilus in loveliness of form, even as thrice-refined gold to copper. Beauty imperishable is theirs; and thou too, Polycrates, shall have undying glory, such as is my glory in song.

1. [οἱ κ]αί (Murray) is a likely restoration. For Πριάμοιο μέ[γ' ἄσ]τυ cf. e. g. Homer B 332 ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμοιο. Other Homeric phrases are 1. 7 [πό]λεμον δακρ[υό]εντα (E 737), 14 [Τρο]ίας ἰπιψύλοιο (Π 698), 20 κρείων Ἀγαμέ[μνων] (A 130 &c.), 21 ἄγος ἀνδρῶν (Δ 519

&c.), 33 πόδ[ας ὠ]κὺς Ἀχιλλεύς, 34 μέγας Τ[ελαμ]ώνιος ἄλκιμος Αἴας (cf. e. g. M 362, 364), 47 κλέος ἄφθιτον (I 413).

4. [Ζη]νὸς . . . βουλαῖς: cf. Homer A 5 Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή.

5. The diaeresis on εἶδει is evidently mistaken; cf. ll. 18, 31, 44.

8. The letters]τα, l. 10]ν, and the vestige at the end of l. 14 are in Fr. 2. i, which is separated from Fr. 1 by a short lacuna.

10. The term ξεναπάτης is applied to Paris in Eurip. *Troad.* 866.

11-12. ταν[σφ]υρ[ον]: so e. g. Bacchyl. iii. 60, v. 69. Cassandra occurs also in Ibyc. 9.

14-15. ε]γ' seems to be the easiest connecting link between these two lines, and the vestige, though very small and ambiguous, is consistent with γ. [οὐ γ]άρ in l. 15 is excluded by the difficulty of completing the preceding verse; the plural ἀλώσει[ας] is not at all probable, especially with ἀώνυμον following. At the end of l. 15 γ is an alternative to π; a new verb seems wanted here in any case.

18. πολύγομφος is an epithet of νῆες in Hesiod, *Op.* 658. For ελεύσα[ν] cf. ἐπελεύθω in Cretan inscriptions, e. g. Collitz-Bechtel, *Dialektinschr.* 4998. I. 9-10 αἰ δὲ . . . μὴ ἐπελεύσει τὸ τετρακόσ.

19. ἐσθ[λοὺς], which was suggested by Lobel, and makes an effective contrast to [Τροί]α κακόν, is a doubtful but quite possible reading, the papyrus at the top of the σ being defective so that there is an appearance of two strokes. The form ἐσθλός is indicated also in l. 22 and recurs in Ibyc. 19. ἥρωος is read by Ludwich and others in Homer ζ 303.

21. Πλεισθ[ενί]δας: cf. Stesichorus 42 βασιλεὺς Πλεισθενίδας. It would follow from the present passage, if Murray's π[ατρός] in l. 22 is right, that Ibycus regarded Agamemnon as the son of Atreus (cf. e. g. Eurip. *Hel.* 390-2) and Pleisthenes as a more remote ancestor (grandfather?). According to Apollodorus iii. 2. 2 Pleisthenes was the father of Agamemnon, and it would be possible to make our poet an exponent of that view by reading ἐκ γ[ένου], which is palaeographically admissible, in place of ἐκ π[ατρός]. That, however, would be questionable on metrical grounds, since the corresponding syllable, as Housman observes, is short wherever preserved (ll. 9, 35, 45). The statement of Tzetzes in *II.* p. 68 that the sons of Pleisthenes, who died young, were brought up by Atreus represents an endeavour to harmonize the conflicting genealogies.

24. The end of this verse seems to be corrupt, since two short syllables are necessary for the metre, and a heteroclite form λόγα is incredible. ι or π can be read in place of γ, but these do not help. Murray proposes to emend to πόδα, but the pleonasm is not attractive in a metaphorical passage. ἐμβαίνειν is commonly used with the dative or a preposition, but Euripides has ἐμβαίνουσα κέλευθον in *Suppl.* 989.

25. οὐ κ[ε]ν is more euphonious than οὐκ [ᾗ]ν, with ἀνὴρ following.

26. For διερό[ς] after θνατός . . . ἀνὴρ cf. e. g. Homer ζ 201 ἀνὴρ διερὸς βροτός: the vestige of the ο is slight but suitable. Unless there was a flaw in the papyrus, something else besides διερος must have been originally written, but sense and metre are complete as the verse stands. κα]τα for κα]θ' would not nearly fill the space.

27. A slight vestige after ναὼν suits a round letter and is inconsistent with α, so that αῖς is excluded.

29. If ἡλύθε is right, [Δαρδανία]ν (Murray) is the natural restoration, but the accent on ἡλύθε must apparently be corrected (cf. Apollon. *De Synt.* iii. 7. 33 (p. 213 Bekker) and Corinna i. 18 (*Berl. Klassikertexte*, V. ii, p. 20) ἐμελψεν), and e. g. ἡλύθο[ν] ἐς Τροία]ν might be read; the plural, however, is less natural.

30. [ἰ]πποτρόφο[ν] (cf. the Homeric Ἰλιον εὐπωλον &c.) suits the space better than [ἰ]πποτρόφο[ι].

31. [χ]αλκίασπ[ιδες, νί]ες Housman.

33. [βαίν]ε[ι] or [χωρ]ε[ι] is unconvincing, though palaeographically possible; [ἰξε]ν seems

objectionable on account of the hiatus, unless this could be excused by the original digamma; cf. l. 5.

36. Perhaps Τυδέος υἱ]ος, as Lobel suggests. There should be a mention hereabouts of Teucer, to whom the note at the foot of the column refers. Line 35 would be the natural place for him, but ἀργυρος is a difficulty.

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

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

44. Cf. Theognis 449 ἀπέφθον χρυσόν.

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

Πο(ν)λύκρατες is necessary if the metre is to correspond; cf. Pindar, *Nem.* vi. 70 Πουλυτιμίδαν.

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

50. κ(ατα)λαβ(εῖν) is very uncertain, especially as other abbreviations do not occur in this note, but is not unsuited to the remains, and an infinitive is apparently wanted. Perhaps χάρι]ν preceded τοῦ.

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

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

Fr. 4. ii. 6. ἀνχα[is possible.

8. εγ[: or επ[.

Fr. 5. This fragment and Fr. 7 differ rather from the rest in appearance, Fr. 5 being dirty and rubbed, and Fr. 7 very dark-coloured. That Fr. 5 contains the beginnings of

lines is not certain, since the margin is lost, but if a letter had preceded ϕ in l. 7 some portion of it should be visible. In l. 2, if ϵ was the second letter in the line, the first was a narrow one.

4-5. $\acute{\alpha}\theta . . . \alpha\iota\epsilon$ apparently correspond, whether $\alpha\acute{\iota}$ or $\alpha\grave{\iota}$ is written. $\acute{\omicron}\mu$ can be read in l. 4.

Fr. 7. 2. $\kappa\tau\nu|\pi . . , \delta\epsilon|\kappa\tau\nu . . . ?$

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

1791. PINDAR, *Paeon*.

9.9 × 4.1 cm.

First century. Plate III.

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

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

ναον τον μεν Υπερβορ[εοις ?
 λυ . . . σε . . . μενησεμιξ[
 ω μοισαι τον δε παντεχ[νοις
 Αφαιστου παλαμαις και Αθα[νας ?

κερανω χθονα νο[
 εκρ[.]ψ . ν . . [.]αντω[
 γλυκειαι Αιος αγλα
 οτι ξενο . φ . υνον[

5 τις ο ρυθμος φαινετο . . . 15 ατερθεν τε . . . αυ[
χαλκεοι μεν τοιχοι χαλκ[εαι δε . . . λο . . . τε μεν φ[
ουτω κιονες εστασ[αν . . . μοναυα . κημναν[
χρυσεαι δ εξ υπερ αετου . . . λυσιμβροτον π[
αιιδον Κηληδου[ες . . . [α]κηρατων δαιδα[λ
10 αλλα γιν ηρον ετη . [. . . 20 [.]νελ[

1-2. Cf. Pausan. x. 5. 9 δεύτερα δὲ λέγουσιν οἱ Δελφοὶ γενέσθαι ὑπὸ μελισσῶν τὸν ναόν, ἀπὸ τοῦ τε κηροῦ τῶν μελισσῶν καὶ ἐκ πετρῶν πεμφθῆναι δὲ ἐς Ὑπερβορέους φασὶν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. In l. 1 the papyrus strongly suggests *του*, but the *ν* is not impossible and seems essential for the construction. In l. 2 ζαμενης εμιξ[or εξαμενησε μιξ[could be read, but the vestiges between *ε* and *μ* are extremely slight; *ευμενης*, however, appears unsuitable. The first letter of the line is either *α*, *δ*, or *λ*, and the third may well be *ρ*; the fifth looks at first sight like *ε*, but this is not convincing, and a crossed out *ι* might have a similar effect. Ὑπερβορ[οισιν εν-| λυρα[ι]s εξαμενησε μιξ[as would be consistent with the remains. The subject in any case is presumably Apollo.

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

4 sqq. Cf. Pausan. x. 5. 11-12 τὰ δὲ ἐς τὸν τρίτον τῶν ναῶν, ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐκ χαλκοῦ, θαῦμα οὐδέν . . . τὰ μέντοι ἄλλα με οὐκ ἔπειθεν ὁ λόγος, ἢ Ἡφαίστου τὸν ναὸν τέχνην εἶναι, ἢ τὰ ἐς τὰς ἄδοὺς τὰς χρυσᾶς, ἃ δὴ Πίνδαρος ἤσεν ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ τῷ ναῷ, χρύσεια κτλ. (ll. 8-9, Pindar Fr. 53). The two verses are also quoted by Galen on Hippocr. *De artic.* 18. 1, p. 519 Kühn. Scholars have successfully treated the corruptions found in Pausanias and Galen, and the fragment as printed by Schröder corresponds with the text here, except that he has mistakenly preferred Bergk's *ἐξυπερθ'* to Schneidewin's *ἐξ ὑπέρ*, which the papyrus now confirms. *ρυθμος* in l. 5 = *σχῆμα*; the word does not occur elsewhere in Pindar.

10-12. Cf. Pausan. x. 5. 12 οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τρόπον ὄντινα ἀφανισθῆναι συνέπεσε τῷ ναῷ κατὰ ταῦτα εἰρημένα εὔρισκον· καὶ γὰρ ἐς χύσμα γῆς ἐκπεσεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ ὑπὸ πυρὸς τακῆναι λέγουσιν. Pindar's version does not seem to agree closely with either of these, but the reading is uncertain in several places. In l. 10 the letter before *ρ* looks more like *η* than anything else, though the space is rather narrow. *ι* is hardly possible. *σ* could be read in place of *ε* before *τη*. In l. 11 we may divide *χθον αν ο[* or *χθονα νο[*, and the last letter may be either *ο* or *ω*. In l. 12 the space is indecisive between *εκρ[ι]ψ* and *εκρ[υ]ψ*, and the termination can be *-αν* or *-εν*. The following vestiges are ambiguous, but those of the second letter rather suggest *π* or *τ*, and with the former there need be no letter before the doubtful *α*, e. g. *ἀπάντω[ς]* is possible; *αφαντω[ς]* is clearly excluded.

13. The slight vestiges are consistent with *Διος*, after which either *αγο[* or *αγλ[* may be read. The latter seems the more likely here, whether written with a capital or not. For *Αγλαία* cf. *Ol.* xiv. 19 πότνι' Ἄ. φιλησιμολπέ τ' Εὐφροσύνα and Fr. 199 Μόισα καὶ Ἄ.; but *ἀγλ[α-* may of course be another adjective, e. g. *ἀγλ[αθρανοι* (κόραι?), for which cf. *Ol.* xiii. 96 Μόισαις ἀγλαοθρόνοις.

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

15. *τεαν αυ[* or *τεχαν[* looks likely.

16. What has been taken for the upper part of a *φ* is possibly the base of a letter

following ν at the end of the preceding line, in which case o ($\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu o[us?$) would be probable in place of ϕ .

17. This is another rather puzzling line. Either $\mu\omicron\nu$ or $\omega\nu$ is possible, and if any letter stood between a and κ , it is likely to be ι ; there seems hardly room for σ or γ , and $\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\eta$ would of course be a false form. At the end of the line $\mu\nu\alpha\nu$ appears inevitable, $\mu\nu\alpha\mu$ being unsuitable.

18. For $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota\mu\beta\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$, which occurs only here, cf. $\delta\lambda\epsilon\sigma\iota\mu\beta\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\phi\theta\iota\sigma\iota\mu\beta\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$, &c.; in Tryphiod. 437 $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\eta\gamma\omega\rho$ is an epithet of $\omicron\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$.

19. Cf. *Pyth.* v. 32 $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma$.
 $\delta\alpha\iota\delta\alpha[\lambda : \text{or } \delta \text{ } \Lambda\iota\delta\alpha?$

1792. PINDAR, *Paeān* ?.

FR. I 16.9 × 13.7 cm.

Second century.

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

FR. I.

.
 [.] μ ε [
 [. . .] ο ι σ ι ν έ ν ε [
 [. .] α λ α δ α ρ τ ε μ ι δ [. . . .] ο ν α σ [
 [. .] χ ο σ α μ φ ε π ο [.] α τ δ ι á [
 5 [.] γ μ ν η σ ι ο σ δ ρ ε π [. .] α μ α δ ε φ [
 [. .] ξ ο θ ε ν λ ι π α ρ ο τ ρ ο φ ω ν θ υ σ ι [
 [. .] λ ω ν χ α ρ ι τ ε σ σ ι μ ι γ δ α ν
 [. .] γ θ ι ο ν π α ρ α κ ρ η μ ν ο ν ε ν θ α [
 κ ε λ α ι ν ε φ ε α ρ γ ι β ρ ε ν τ α ν λ ε γ ο [
 10 ζ η ν α κ α θ ε ζ ο μ έ ν ο ν
 κ ο ρ υ φ α ι σ ι ν υ π ε ρ θ ε φ υ λ α ξ [. . .] ο ν ο . [
 α ν ι κ ' α γ α ν ο φ ρ ω ν

That the author is Pindar is not definitely ascertained, but style and vocabulary seem sufficiently characteristic to justify that ascription. *ἰπ]ποσόα* *θυ[γάτηρ* in Fr. 51 is a remarkable coincidence with a Pindaric collocation, and other linguistic parallels are pointed out in the notes; the reference to the Boeotian *Πτῶον* in Fr. 47 is also not without significance. The class of poem represented is still less certain; the passage in Fr. 1 describing the birth of the twin offspring of Zeus and Leto would be appropriate in a Paean for the Delians, but other categories are by no means excluded. As for the metre, whether the verses in Fr. 1 belong to one or more systems is not clear; a paragraphus occurs in Fr. 35, but no strophic division is marked in Fr. 1 among the few lines of which the beginnings are preserved.

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

<p>[. . . .]—υ—υ[. . . [. . .]υ—υ—υυ[.]υυ[. . . [υ]υ—υυ[—.]υυ[— . . . 5 —υ—υ—υ[—]υυυ[υ . . . —υ—υ—υυ—υ—υυ[— [—]—υ—υ—υ— [—]υ—υ—υ—υ—υ υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—[— 10 —υ—υ—υ—υ— υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—[—]υυ[</p>	<p>—υ—υ—υ— —υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— —υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— 15 —υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ— —υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ[υ— υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—υ—[. . . υ—υ—υ—υ—[. . .] [.]—υ—υ—υ—υ— 20 [—]υ—υ—υ—υ—[.] . . . [</p>
---	--

Fr. 1.

[.]με[
 [. . .]οισιν ἐν νε[
 [.]αλα δ' Ἀρτέμιδ[. . . .]ονασ[
 [λέ]χος ἀμφεπέβ[λει . . .]α τοια[ύτ
 5 [.]νμνήσιος δρέπ[.] ἄμα δὲ φ[ερ
 [Νά]ξοθεν λιπαροτρόφων θυσί[ας
 [μή]λων Χάριτεσσι μίγδαν
 [Κύ]νθιον παρὰ κρημνὸν ἔνθα
 κελαινέφε' ἀργιβρένταν λέγο[υσι
 10 Ζῆνα καθεζόμενον
 κορυφαῖσιν ὑπερθε φυλάξ[αι χρ]όνον
 ἀνίκ' ἀγανόφρων

Κοίου θυγάτηρ λύετο τερπνᾶς
 ὠδίνος· ἔλαμψαν δ' ἀελίου δέμας ὀπὸ[τ']
 15 ἀγλαὸν ἐς φάος ἰόντες δίδυμοι
 παῖδες, πολὺν βόθ[ο]ν ἴεσαν ἀπὸ στομ[άτων
 [Ἐ]λείθυιά τε καὶ Λά[χ]εσις· τέλε[ι]αι δ' ολ[
 [κα]τελάμβανον . [. . .]
 [. . .] ἐφθέγγαντο δ' ἐγχώριαι
 20 [ἀγ]λαὸς ἄς ἀν' ἐρκε[.] . . . [. . .]
 [.]το γὰρ ἀκ . . . ιν . ατοι[
 [.] . . ρ . γονατ[
 [.]ηρας (v. l. -ες) ορ . [. . .]
 [.] . . . [. . .]

Fr. 2.

Fr. 3.

Fr. 4.

. . . .
]ραι[
]ανευ . εἰ[
]ωλοισα[
] []

. . . .
]
] . [.] . [.
]δρα[
]

.
]
] πολλάκις [.
]
]
]τιν
] .

Fr. 5.

Fr. 6.

Fr. 7.

Fr. 8.

. . . .
 . β[
 πω[
 ἐκ[

. . . .
 ὕ . [.
 θα[
 πο[

. . . .
 κοι[
 . . [.

.
 γλ[
 μῆ φ[
 ἤλυθο[ν
 ὄς ετ[

Fr. 9.

Fr. 10.

Fr. 11.

Fr. 12.

Fr. 13.

. . . .
]μεν

. . . .
]

. . . .
]

. . . .
] . χυτα[

. . . .
]νπ[


THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

]]σεβ[]τεσι[]]
]]ον[[]]]
]ν]ω]σφρασ[]]
]]]μενοι[]]
]
. . .				
Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.	Fr. 17.	Fr. 18.
.
]]]]]ε . [
]]λαν[]ασωπο[]]
]μαιο[]]εψατο[]ωνιο[]νο[
]ταφω[]] . []σαιο] . ο[
.
Fr. 19.	Fr. 20.	Fr. 21.	Fr. 22.	Fr. 23.
.
]]]]]στον[
]εχρ[]και]νο[]σιόν[]
] . . []σοιχν[]νο[.
. . .]εμ[. . .		
.			
Fr. 24.	Fr. 25.	Fr. 26.	Fr. 27.	Fr. 28.
.
]]]μαιο[]ονε[]
]λειανολυ[]]ρυσο[]νοι]
]ναριστοπ . []ρονων]στω . []μαιο[ρ[]
]ατοδαμ[]]αισα[] . []ποδ[
.]
.		
Fr. 29.	Fr. 30.	Fr. 31.	Fr. 32.	
.	
]δων .]] . [. . .]π[]ια	
]]ερι[]ανεπι[]μαιο[
	. . .			

]]σεβι[]τες υ[]]
]]ον[[]]]
]ν]ω]ς φρασ[]]
]]]μενοι[]]
]
.
Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.	Fr. 17.	Fr. 18.
.
]]]]]ι . [
]]λαν[]’Ασωπο[]]
]μαιο[]]εψατοτ[]ωνιο[]ιο[
]ταφω[]] . []σαις] . ο[
.
Fr. 19.	Fr. 20.	Fr. 21.	Fr. 22.	Fr. 23.
.
]]]]]στον[
]ιχρ[]και]νο[]σιόν[τ]
] . []ς οίχν[]νο[.
. . .]εμ[.
.
Fr. 24.	Fr. 25.	Fr. 26.	Fr. 27.	Fr. 28.
.
]]]αι δ[]ονε[]
]λειαν ’Ολυ[μπ]	χ]ρυσσο[]νοι]
]ν άριστοπ . []ρόνων]στω . []μαιοσιρ[]
]ατο δαμ[]]αις . α[] . []ποδ[
.]
.
Fr. 29.	Fr. 30.	Fr. 31.	Fr. 32.	
.	
]δων.]] . [. . .]π[]ια	
]]τερι[]αν επι[]μαιοι[
.	

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

			ωιπ[
		ουδιο[ατο·
		5 γαρ[5 ορον[
Fr. 33.	Fr. 34.	αγο[
.		ηα·[
ογκυ[ρ[Fr. 36.	τευδ[
]	α·	νμ[
.	καιτοθιν[μαι[.
	ναλιου	ελπι[
Fr. 35.	5 πατροσεχ[εξεν[
.	δικαδασ[αλα[
ερι[ακέλευσι[5 γον[
ευθ[[]		
μα[]·[
εί		
.			
Fr. 37.	Fr. 38.	Fr. 39.	Fr. 40.
.
ωπο[ιδω[εικερ[ρυ[
εινοτοιτι[ελιναν·[οσευχομ[χρυσ[
προσοδο·[τεμενειτ[απιεριδεσ[νο[
τεχορο[· αμειναι[νωιτ[· αισ[
5 χαρινλ[5 ταιστερ[.	5 ρια[
εμπειλ[παισιτε·[.
οντα[ντιαδε[
.	μμελε[Fr. 41.
	ειρανεκ·[.
	10]·[·]·[·]·[·]·α·[νατοιινυ·[
	λ·[·]·[ευφρωνγαρ[
		εβόαμε·[
		
Fr. 42.	Fr. 43.	Fr. 44.	Fr. 45.
.
γαρ[εξια[σ·ισ[οτ[

] <td>]δαγ . [</td> <td>]περτατ[</td> <td>]εμ[</td>]δαγ . []περτατ[]εμ[
] . []μοσ[]σεκ[] . [
.] . . [.	.	
.	.	.	.	
Fr. 46.	Fr. 47.	Fr. 48.	Fr. 49.	
.	.	.	.	
] . []ριαйна[]ναισ[] . ειταγ[
]ωρθυποκρ[]εμπτωιω[]αριντ[]ναυλιδ[
]ωσομενγ[ []μονπ[]νενᾱ[
]εθνοσαιδ[]ενσοφ[] . . τ[]νε . [
5]μεχρ[. .] . ε[.	.	.	
.	.	.	.	
Fr. 50.	Fr. 51.	Fr. 52.	Fr. 53.	
.	.	.	.	
] . ερι[]β . ι . [. .] . []σ . [] . [
]υμον[]μφιπολει[] : αραντ[]μᾱν[
]σσαλο[]ποσόαθυ[]σ[]νμ . [
]γγον[.	.	.	
.	.	.	.	
Fr. 54.	Fr. 55.	Fr. 56.	Fr. 57.	Fr. 58.
.
]ατεφ[]σιμ[]μαλα[]ανα[]ν[
]οναμ[]ᾱνα[]τεδε[]μ[]σα[
.
Fr. 59.	Fr. 60.	Fr. 61.	Fr. 62.	Fr. 63.
.
]νενθα[]ναμ[]φοι[]ρον[]δ[
]νπεφ[]σ[.	.]λα[
.
Fr. 64.	Fr. 65.	Fr. 66.	Fr. 67.	
.	.	.	.	
]οεθ[]δρ[]σειν[]προ[
.	.	.	.	

]ωζω[]ατι[.]ορ[Fr. 68.]στε . [
]οναν[.]ετ[]αθανατ[. . . .] . [
]μενανι . []οσάγον[]κινδυν[]ξεστον[
5]κατα[5]τερω[]νεφελα[5]ταιν[
]τροπ[. καταε[]κετ[
. . . .] . . . []ων[
		

Fr. 1. 2. ἐν νε[: ἐννε[α, ἐννε[π . . ?

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

4-5. If the subject is singular, ἀμφεπό[λει . . . δρέπ[ων] or -π[ουσ'] seems likely; cf. *Nem.* viii. 10 λέκτρον . . . ἀμφεπόλησαν. But the verb in l. 4 may be ἀμφέπειν, which is combined with δρέπειν in *Ol.* i. 19-20 ἀμφέπει σκάπτρον . . . , δρέπων μὲν κορυφάς. Whether the word preceding δρέπ[is an adjective (Γυμνήσιος, πρυμνήσιος) or a substantive (ὑμνησις, γύμνησις (?), μνήσις) is not clear. The remains of the first letter are slight, and ε or σ is also possible.

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

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

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

12. ἀγανόφρων, like κελαινέφης in l. 9, is Homeric (Υ 467).

13. Κοίου θυγάτηρ at the beginning of a line occurs also in 841. 19. 22 (meaning Asteria). For τερπνᾶς ὠδίνος cf. *Ol.* vi. 43 ὠδίνος ἐρατᾶς.

14. The v. l. (τερπνᾶς) ὠδίνας does not commend itself. ἔλαμψαν . . . ὀπότε is a rather awkward inversion and the corruption ἔλαμψε is hardly surprising, though it leaves δίδυμοι παῖδες without a verb.

15. Cf. e. g. *Ol.* vi. 43-4 ἦλθεν δ' ὑπὸ σπλάγχμων . . . ἐς φάος, *Nem.* i. 35-6 σπλάγχμων ὕπο . . . θαητᾶν ἐς αἴγλαν . . . μόλεν.

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

17-18. Either τέλει[ι]αι or τέλειαι is possible, presumably referring to the two deities (cf. e. g. *Ol.* xiii. 115 Ζεὺ τέλει', *Nem.* x. 18 Ἥβα τέλεια παρὰ μητέρι), but θεαί[ι] is inadmissible in l. 18, where the slight remains would be consistent with e. g. an α followed by a letter with a vertical first stroke.

19. Perhaps [ἀν]εφθ.

?	σ]ώζω[]ατι[.]ορ[Fr. 68.]στε[
]οναν[.]ετ[] ἀθανατ[.] . [
]μενανι . []οσάγον[τ] κινδυν[]τεστον[
5] κατα[5]τερω[] νεφέλα[5]ταιν[
]τροπ[.] . κατε[]κετ[
.] . . . []ιων[
			

21. Possibly *ακται*, but the *ι* is joined by a ligature which is too low for the normal *αι* of this hand, and suggests rather *δ*, *κ*, or *χ*. The preceding letter might well be *ν* or *υ*, besides *τ*.

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

23. *ορ* was followed by some round letter.

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

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

Fr. 6. 1. *υμ*], *υλ*] would be suitable.

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

Fr. 16. Cf. 841. vi. 134-6 [έ]π' Ἀσ[ώ]που . . . ἀ[να]ρέψατο παρθένον. In l. 2 here the doubtful *τ*' can be *π*, but of course this may be quite fortuitous and e. g. *έθρ*]έψατο is an obvious alternative.

Fr. 24. 2. *ἀριστοπο*]ν . . (cf. *Ol.* vii. 51) would be suitable.

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

Fr. 31. 4. Perhaps *]ον Διδ*]ς; but the letters can be variously interpreted.

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

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

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

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

8. έ]μμελε[, πλη]μμελε[?

Fr. 41. 1. e. g. *ἀθά*]νατοι, *]να* τοι.

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

2. *θ* may be the particle and *έποκρ*] may of course be divided *έπὸ κρ*].

Fr. 47. 2. Cf. Pindar Fr. 51 b, d *τρικάρανον Πρωϊόν κευθμῶνα*. There was a shrine of Dionysus here, and a temple of Apollo close by (Pausan. ix. 23. 6). The large asterisk below this line apparently takes the place of or supplements a marginal coronis in marking the commencement of a new poem.

Fr. 50. 1. *αι]θερι[* or *]αερι[* could be read.

3. *πα]σσαλο[* is rather suggested by *φθο]γγον* in the following line; cf. *Ol. i. 17 ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου λάμβαν'*, 1361. i. 1-2 *ὦ βάρβιτε, μηκέτι πάσσαλον φυλάσ[σων] ἐπτάτονον λιγυρὰν κάππαε γάρην*; but *Θε]σσαλο[* is of course possible.

51. 3. The coincidence with *Ol. iii. 26 Λατοῦς ἵπποσῶα θυγ.* was observed by Lobel.

Fr. 52. 2. The first letter is probably δ, λ, or μ.

Fr. 55. 2. The supposed mark of quantity is very doubtful, and may equally well be a breathing or a vestige of an interlinear letter. The second α may be δ.

Fr. 67. Either there is a junction of *selides* in this fragment, which in appearance resembles Frs. 32 and 36, or the papyrus has been strengthened by a strip gummed on the back. Fr. 68 is rather similar, though less worn.

3. It is not clear that any trace of writing is to be recognized in this line.

1793. CALLIMACHUS, *Sosibi Victoria*.

Height 10 cm.

Late first century.

Callimachus after a long period of neglect has latterly been much in evidence in the papyri (cf. 1362 int.),¹ and a further considerable addition is made by the present papyrus, which introduces us to a poem of which but three words were known (see vi. 7, n.), though one or two lines, cited without specification of their source and now shown to belong to it, were in fact already extant. This, as first perceived by Mr. Lobel, who has contributed much to the elucidation of the text, is the elegiac poem in honour of the victory of Sosibius alluded to in Athen. iv, p. 144 ε *Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Κάσανδρον περὶ βασιλείας (εἰ γνήσιον τὸ σύγγραμμα πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτό φασιν εἶναι Σωσιβίου, εἰς δὲν Καλλίμαχος ὁ ποιητῆς ἐπιπέτικον ἐλεγειακὸν ἐποίησε), τοὺς Περσῶν φησὶ βασιλεῖς κτλ.* and called in Schol. Lycophr. *Alex. 522* (ed. Scheer) *Σωσιβίου νίκη*. The identification seems sufficiently established by the occurrence of the name Sosibius in v. 1, and the general tenor of the piece, which is full of references to games, prizes, victories, and dedications; see vi. 1-3, vii. 2, 7, viii. 1-5, ix. 4-7, x. 1. Who Sosibius was is not agreed. He has commonly been thought to be the same as the Lacedaemonian grammarian designated *λυτικός* or *ἐπιλύτικός* (Athen. xi. 493 c, Suid. s. v.), who was attached to the Alexandrian Museum under Philadelphus and wrote treatises on Spartan rites, on chronology, the poet Alcman, &c. (so e.g. Hecker, *Com. Call.* p. 66).

¹ A convenient edition of the new fragments is now available in Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*, 145.

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

As now reconstituted the papyrus consists of the tops of ten columns, of which the last eight, and perhaps all ten, were consecutive, the tenth being also the last of the roll. A few small fragments, also from the tops of columns, are unplaced; they presumably belonged to the much broken first two, or to an intermediate column, if there was one, between Cols. ii and iii. The roll has evidently been subjected to severe pressure, causing the layers sometimes to adhere tightly and the ink to leave more or less legible impressions on the back of adjacent portions; by this means the order of some fragments, which could otherwise not have been certainly placed, has been fixed, and some missing letters have been supplied. With regard to the original compass of the roll, and the length of the poem on Sosibius, these are problems which depend on the view taken as to the number of poems represented in the present remnants. Col. iii happens to include (l. 2) the half line *πρὶν ἀστέρη τῷ Βερενίκης*

cited from Callimachus by Achilles Staius and assigned by Schneider and others to the poem on the Lock of Berenice which was translated by Catullus. That attribution, however, is by no means certain; it was rejected by Valckenaer, who first drew attention to the fragment, on the ground that the version of Catullus shows no corresponding phrase. Schneider evaded the objection by the argument that ἀστέρι Βερενίκης was a periphrasis for ἐμοί and was simplified by Catullus to *mihī* [(l. 83; cf. n. on iii. 2, where the passage is quoted). Unfortunately Col. iii is badly mutilated, and what remains of the context of l. 2 is indecisive; it is, however, noteworthy that the preceding verse ends with a feminine plural participle -άμεναι, which might well correspond to *nudantes* in Catullus (l. 81), and that if κλέι . . . in l. 3 is κλίνη, that too, though not translated literally, could be interpreted in a sense conforming to the Latin. A mention of the ἀστήρ Βερενίκης in an epinician poem to Sosibius is, at the least, unexpected; moreover, there is a second reference to Berenice in v. 6, and another to her father, Magas, king of Cyrene, in v. 2. Perhaps, then, Col. iii contained the conclusion of the Βερενίκης πλόκαμος, and the poem on Sosibius did not begin till after v. 6, being separated from the πλόκαμος by a shorter elegiac piece. On the other hand, it may be argued that the praises of Sosibius may easily have been coupled with those of more important personages, and that if the poem addressed to him included a passage referring to the king (viii. 5 sqq.) it may equally have included others relating to the

Col. i.

] . . . ξὺν
 λ . . . τ . . . [
] . [.] τ

Col. ii.

] ηπριναναξ . [. .] . . ιγατ . . [
] τρυ [. . .] . . [

Col. iii.

] . . . κα . . . ὦ . . . ἐ . [. . .] ὁ . [.] άμεναι
] . . . μισκλέι . . . πριγ [. .] ωιβερενικησ[
] ἰδαβου[.] . μ ! π[.] ε[. . .] ν .
] . . . [.] τα . α . . . [. . .] . εθήσειν[

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

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

Col. i.

] . . . ξυν
 λ . . . τ . . . [
] . [.] τ

.

Col. ii.

] η πριν ἀναξ . [. . .] . . ινατ . . [
] τρυ [. . . .] . . [

Col. iii.

] . . . κα . . . ω . . . έ . [. . .] . . [.] ἀμεναι
] . . . μισ κλει . . . πριν ἀστέ[ρι τ]ῶ Βερενίκης
] ἰδα βου[.] . μ' π[.] ε . [. . .] ν'
] . . . [.] τα . α . . . [. . . .] . εθήσειν

Col. iv.

]ιδιονπολυπαλτονυπερ . αλ^ο . ασυγαμοσητ . . .
] . τηκαομηνευ . . . σ . . . ειριτι|αι
] . νηβασιληασε . . πρ . [.] . δακρω[.]
] . . παντωνπα[.]τατελειοτατ^ε[
 5]ουμετ[.] . νου . . []χιστον

Col. v.

2 τοσσαμαγαβασιληατ . . ενλ [. .] . . . [.]
 [. .] . τ ανω
 1 [. .]μμαμεναιδ[.] . αυταπ . . . [. . .]ια
 [. .]σσατονενμη . [.] . τευ . [.]υνναγετι
 φωκαεωνμεχρισκεμενη[.]ιναλιμυδροσ
 5 [. . .]ριτεκηπαλλα[.]αρ[.]εμιδι
 [. . .]σαειπαναριστ[.]βερενικη

Fr. I, to l. 6?

. . .
]γεινα[
 . . .

Col. vi.

αξονοσασβυσ . η[ι]σιππ . σέναυλόνεχει
 σημερίνονδώσειπερ[.]μονπέριχειλοσα[[γ]στει^{ί[.]σει}
 τουτ'εποσηδειηιλεχθενεπαγγελιη
 δαίμον,δσαμφοτερωθεν[.]ωνοιοκαθηται
 5 [.]τέινεοσαρχαιοισορ . [. .] . [.]υφίδαισ
 [.]τ . [.] . [.]γου[.]εσπελοπη[.]μιερονισθμον
 [.]τηνητη[.] . . [.]
 [.]έι[.]οσι[.]

Col. vii.

οφρακεσωσιβιοντισαλεξανδρουτεπτυθηται
 τηνεπικαιναιωνκινυφιδιστεφεα
 αμφοτερωπαρapaiδεκασιγνητωιτελεαρχου
 καιτομυρνιαιοντωιγαλαθησομενω
 5 θηλυτατονκαινειλωτωνενιασιονυδωρ
 ωδειπ[.]καλαμοι . [. . .]τισετεισε[. . . .]
 ιστ[.]γαρπωτ[.]ν[. . . .]αεθλα
 [.]φιωντ[18 letters]

Col. viii.

καλπιδεσουκορσμουσυμβολοαλλαπατησ
 ανδραστουδειςαντεσεδωκαμενηδυβοησαι
 νηονεπιγλαυκησκωμοναγοντιχορωι
 αρχιλοχουνικαιονεφυμνιονεκδεδιαυλου
 5 λαγειδηπαραιοιπρωτοναεθλοφορειν
 ειλामεθαπτολεμ[. .]ετεηιπ[. .]ρηνικελεγχ[. .]
 [. . .]τετισελαιη[.]ουκοινη
 [.]ωβασιλ[.]αχθει[

Col. ix.

αμφοτερωνοξεινοσεπηβολοσουκετιγυμνασ
 παιδασενηραιωιστησομενευρνομησ
 ωσφμενωιδωσειτισανηρομοφρονοσαιοιδην
 τουτομενεξαλλωνεκλυονιερονεγω
 5 κεινογεμηνιδοναυτοσοπαρποδικαθθετονειλου
 νειταιτωικασιονεισεπηικωμοσαλα
 κυπροθενειδονδια[. .]εκατηγαγενεθδεγα[. .]οσ
 [. . .]ωεκκε[.]ωσα[[ν]]θ . φν
 [23 letters]φν[

Col. vii.

ὄφρα κε Σωσίβιον τις Ἀλεξάνδρου τε πύθηται
 (γ)ῆν ἐπὶ καὶ ναίων Κίνυφι διστεφέα
 ἀμφοτέρω παρὰ παιδ(ί), κασιγνήτῳ τε Δεάρχου
 καὶ τὸ Μυριναῖον τῷ γάλα θησ(α)μένω,
 5 θηλύτατον καὶ Νειλωτῶν ἐνιαύσιον ὕδωρ
 ὦδ' εἴπ[η] καλάμοις (?) [. . .]τισετεισε[. . .]
 ιστ[. . . οὐ] γάρ πω τ[.]ν[. . .] ἄεθλα
 [.]φίωv τ[18 letters]

 [καὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις γὰρ ἐπὶ στέγος ἱερὸν ἦνται]

Col. viii.

κάλπιδες, οὐ κόσμου σύμβολον ἀλλὰ πά(λ)ης·
 ἄνδρας ὅτ' οὐ δείσαντες ἐδώκαμεν ἠδὲ βοῆσαι
 νηὸν ἐπι Γλαύκης κῶμον ἄγοντι χορῶ
 Ἀρχιλόχου νικαῖον ἐφύμνιον· ἐκ δὲ διαύλου,
 5 Λαγείδη, παρὰ σοὶ πρῶτον ἀεθλοφορεῖν
 εἰλάμεθα, Πτολεμ[αῖ]ε, τεῆ, π[ά]τε[ρ], ἠνικ' ἔλεγχ[. . .]
 [. . .]τε τις †ἐλαίη[.]ου κούη
 [.]ω βασιλ[.]αχθει[

Col. ix.

ἀμφοτέρων ὁ ξείνος ἐπήβολος· οὐκέτι γυμνὰς
 παῖδας ἐν Ἡραίῳ στήσομεν Εὐρυνόμης.
 ὡς φαμένω δώσει τις ἀνὴρ ὀμόφ(ω)νο(ν?) ἀοιδήν.
 τοῦτο μὲν ἐξ ἄλλων ἔκλυον ἱρὸν ἐγώ,
 5 κείνῳ γε μὴν ἴδον αὐτὸς ὃ παρ' ποδὶ κάτθετο Νείλου
 νεῖται τῷ Κασίου φεις ἐπίκωμος ἄλλα·
 Κύπροθε <Σ>ιδόνι[σ μ]ε κατήγαγεν ἐνθάδε γα[ῦλ]ος
 [. . .] ω ἐκ κε[.]ωσα θεῶν
 [23 letters]φν[

Col. x.

και τον εφουνικαισιναιδομεναρθμιαδημωι
 ειδοτα ουκεπιμικρωνουκεπιληθωμενον
 παυριστοντοκενανδριπααραφνωτισιδουτο
 ωτινιμηκρε[.]σσωνητινοσσευτυχησ
 5 ουτε τοναινησωτοσσοναξ[.]ονουτελαθωμαι
 διδιαγαρδηδημουγλωσσανεπαμφοτεροισ
 μ . [.]ομενωιδ[.]πησιυ[.] . ουδεπ[.]σθλονε . εξεν
 ερ[. .]ψ[.] . δησα[. .] . καπ[.]
 [. 35 letters]ν

Fragments.

2.	3.	4.	5.
[]ουσακ . [] . . β ^σ οεέντ[]σμενε . . . [
τα[]γέπω[]ν' ρ . [] . εγν . [
ς[.
.

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

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

2. The end of this line coincides with Callim. Fr. 35 d from Achill. Stat. *Isag. in Arat. Phaen.* p. 134 ὅταν (sic) μένοι ὁ Καλλιμαχος Πριν ἀστέρι τῷ Βερενίκης ἐπὶ τοῦ πλοκάμου φησὶν, ὃς ἐξ ἑπτὰ καταφανῶν σύγκειται, (ἡμάρτηται?); cf. int. p. 100. The passage in Catullus to which Schneider supposes the fragment to correspond is (lxvi. 79-83)

*nunc, vos optato quom iunxit lumine taeda,
 non prius unanimis corpora coniugibus
 tradite, nudantes reiecta veste papillas,
 quam iucunda mihi munera libet onyx,
 vester onyx, casto colitis quae iura cubili.*

prius quam mihi is regarded as a translation of πριν ἀστέρι τῷ Β. If that is correct, it seems

Magas, whose enmity to Philadelphus terminated with the betrothal of his daughter to the Egyptian crown prince, is commonly supposed to have died in or about B.C. 258.

3.]υνηαν, to which the insertion above the line apparently refers, remains obscure. ετι may be sound, though ετη would give a suitable substantive for the repeated τόσσα.

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

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

6. Fr. 1, containing the letters]νεινα[(a very uncertain: δ, λ, μ, χ are equally possible), was adhering to the lower part of the verso of a fragment which higher up has impressions of the middles of ll. 1 and 3-4. It will not combine readily with l. 5 and so has been assigned to l. 6, where it seems suitable.

Col. vi. 1. The Ἀσβύσται belonged to the Cyrenaica (cf. Callim. *Hymn. Apoll.* 76 Ἀσβυστιδί . . . γαίη), but the word may be loosely used as an equivalent of Λίβυς, as in Fr. 13 Τρίτωνος ἐφ' Ἰδασιον Ἀσβύσταο. Libyan horses were noted for their speed (Ael. *Nat. An.* iii. 2, xiv. 10), and according to Hdt. iv. 189 τέσσερας ἵππους συζευγύναι παρὰ Λιβύων οἱ Ἕλληνες μεμαθήκασι: cf. e. g. Soph. *El.* 702, 727. ἔναυλον ἔχει is capable of two interpretations, either 'is in its stall', ἄξονος depending on some phrase equivalent to λυθείς ἀπό, or 'has fresh in its ears', sc. the sound of the wheels. The letters σέ are derived from an impression which also gives the doubtful μ in l. 2, and the rough breathing (also doubtful) on α in l. 4.

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

3. The ἡδέια ἀγγελίη is presumably the news of the victory of Sosibius.

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

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

6-7. [γ]εω[ρ]γοῦ[ντ]ες is very doubtful, but the letter before ου, if not γ, can only be ξ or τ, so that e. g. οἰκόντες is excluded. [τῆ μὲν Κρωμν(ε)ίτην (sc. καλοῦσι or sim.) may be suitably restored from Schol. Lycophr. *Alex.* 522 (Scheer) Κρῶμνα . . . Παφλαγονίας πόλις ἐν ἧ Ποσειδῶνος ἱερόν ἐστιν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ Κορίνθου τόπος, ὡς καὶ Καλλιμάχος ἐν Σωσιβίου νίκη, τῆ μὲν Κρ.

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

Col. vii. 1-2. This couplet is rendered intelligible by the slight alteration suggested by Housman of τ to γ at the beginning of l. 2: 'that even one dwelling on the Cinypts may learn that Sosibius and Alexandria have won a double crown'. For γῆ instead of πόλις cf. e. g. Eurip. *Trō.* 868 γῆ δορὶ πεσοῦσα, and for the order in l. 2 Callim. Fr. 530 ἐπὶ τρύγα δ' εἶχεν ἐδάωδῃ.

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

5. For θηλίτατον cf. Eustath. *ad Hom.* θ p. 1599. 25 θῆλυς ἔερση, ἡ τοῦ εὐκαρπεῖν καὶ

πολυφορεῖν αἰτία. ὄθεν καὶ Καλλίμαχος θηλύτατον πεδίον λέγει, τὸ πολύγονον (Fr. 296). ἐνιαύσιον of course refers to the annual inundation. What has been regarded as the top of the τ in νειλῶτων may belong to the ω, which is sometimes written in this hand with a little hook at the top of the first stroke.

6. A vestige of the letter after οἱ would suit e. g. σ, and possibly [ῶσ]τις (ἔτ' εἶσε . . . ?) followed, though a rather longer supplement is desirable. Or was the Nile personified?

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

Col. viii. 1 = Callim. Fr. 122, from Schol. Pindar, *Nem.* x. 64 διὰ τούτου σημαίνει τοὺς τὰ Παναθήναια νενικηκότας· τίθενται γὰρ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐν ἐπάθλων τάξει ὑδρίαὶ πλήρεις ἐλαίου. διὸ καὶ Καλλίμαχος, καὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίους κτλ., with ἀλλὰ πάλης, instead of which the papyrus mistakenly gives ἀλλ' ἀπάτης, at the end of the second line. Schneider proposed to assign this fragment to *Ael.* i. 6; Bergk was no happier in suggesting that the source was the Ἄργουσι οἰκισμοί.

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

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

5. ἀεθλοφορεῖν: the verb occurs only here.

6. π[άτε]ρ was suggested by Lobel: π[ι] is much more probable than το[υ].

7. ελαιη does not scan, and the right emendation is not obvious.

8.]ω:]οι or]ωι are possible alternatives.

Col. ix. 1-2. The παῖδες Εὐρυνόμης are no doubt the Graces, who are commonly called her children by Zeus; cf. Callim. Fr. 471 οἱ δ' ἐνεκ' Εὐρυνόμῃ Τιτυμῆς εἶπον ἔτικτε (sc. τὰς Χάριτας), and for γυμνάς Callim. Fr. 266 ἀσταλέων Χαρίτων λόφον. αἱ Χάριτες γυμναί became a proverbial expression, as in Aristaen. ii. 21 αἱ γὰρ χάριτές σου . . . ἀληθῶς κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν γυμναί; cf. Suidas s. v. καὶ παροιμία αἱ χάριτες γυμναί, ἦτοι ὅτι δεῖ ἀφελῶς καὶ φανερῶς χαρίζεσθαι, ἢ ὅτι αἱ χάριτες τὸν ἑαυτῶν κόσμον ἀφῆρηται . . . χάριτας γυμνάς ἰστοροῦσι, διότι δωρεὰν δεῖ χάριτας τίθεσθαι: but the point in the present passage is not very clear. The Ἡραῖον may be that near Mycenae, which had ancient statues of the Χάριτες in its πρόναος (Pausan. ii. 17. 4) and was not far from Nemea.

3. ὁμοφρονος is evidently an error for ὁμόφωνος or -ον; Lobel's suggested correction of ἀοιδὴν τὸ ἀμοιβήν is also plausible, though for δῶσει . . . ἀοιδὴν cf. Callim. Fr. 310 ἀλλάγαμα νόμιον δοῦναι.

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

6. This verse, in which apparently the ποὺς Νεῖλου was more closely defined, is obscured by corruption. εἰς is open to suspicion on account of the hiatus. The Κάσιον ὄρος was near Pelusium and the Serbonian Lake, παρ' ἣν δὴ τὸ Κ. ὄρος τείνει ἐς θάλασσαν (Hdt. iii. 5), and there was a temple of Zeus there. κασιουεῖς might conceal Κάσιος Ζεὺς, but the rest of the line is incongruous. νεῖται τῇ Κασίᾳ ναῦς would give a possible sense, but is far from being convincing. With regard to the concluding words, a similar collocation is noticeable in Callim. Fr. 373 (Tzetz. *ad Lycophr.* 139) ἔθος εἶχον οἱ παλαιοί, ὡς καὶ Καλλίμαχος

ιστορεῖ, μετὰ κιθάρας περὶ τοῦς ἄλλας ἴεναι καὶ ἀνυμνεῖν καὶ ἐγκωμιάζειν. As Schneider remarks, *ιστορεῖ* does not exclude a poem, but that the present passage is the source of the citation is unlikely.

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

8. The letter before the first ω was probably γ , π , or τ , and the doubtful ϵ after κ may equally well be \omicron . At the end of the line $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ is not excluded.

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

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

8. ψ [ϵ]υδής or α] ψ [ϵ]υδής accords with the context, but is very doubtfully read, the ψ being represented only by the top of a stroke above the line equally consistent with ϕ ; λ is possible in place of δ . The next word is perhaps α [$\acute{\upsilon}$]ϊκα, as Lobel suggests; the first α may be δ .

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

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

1794. POEM IN HEXAMETERS.

19 × 12.9 cm.

Late second century.

This papyrus contains on the recto the ends and beginnings of lines of two partially effaced columns from an annotated list of property-holders, drawn up perhaps early in the second century. The Oxyrhynchite village *Κερκε(ῶ)ρα*

φηδεοιασσογ[.]κοστεκ[. .] . σεεοικε
 δενομενοντ[.]τροσονπαρ[. .]αιδανεσθαι
 τωιουχειρο[. .]ε[.]αρκεε[. .]ου[. .]εμεναυδη
 οι . . αυ[. .]ε[.]μο . [. . .]τ[. .]κεδοιησ
 5 τουδευε[. .]ε[.] . ομενθανενοςμινεφυ . [.]ν
 ενμενοιτεν . [.]ηρπρωιζονοδεων
 αυτηδου . [.]μ[. .]ρ[.]ελπωραιδεαγησαυ
 ημετερησβιοτη[. . . .]ονδεμοιοικοσαυτει
 αλλοτεγαραλλο[. .]σολβ[. .]υλαχοσανθρωποισιν
 10 οιητοιπεσσοιοδικητο[. .]ηδεκαιολβου
 πεσσο[. .]σαμειβομενοσ[. .]οτεμεντο[. .]λλοτετοισ[. .]
 εισαγαθονπιπ[. .]καιαφνεοναιψατι[. .]θησι

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

φῆ δέ οἱ ἄσσον [ἰούσα, τέ]κος, τέκο[ς, ο]ὔ σε ἔοικε
 δευόμενον τ . [. . . .] τόσον παρ[ὰ π]αῖδα νέεσθαι,
 τῶ οὐ χεῖρ ὄ[ρ]έ[γειν? σίτ'] ἀρκέε[ι] οὐ[δ]ὲ μὲν αὐδῆ
 οἰ . . . αν[. . .]ε[.]μο . [. . .]τ[ί] κε δοίης
 5 τὸν δὲ γε[.]εν . [.] . ὁ μὲν θάνεν ὅς μιν ἔφυσ[ε]ν
 εν μενοιτεν . [. . . .] ἀν[.]ῆρ πρωιζὸν ὀδεύων·
 αὐτῇ δ' οὐ . [.]μ[.]ρ[ι]] ἐλπωραὶ δ' ἐάγησαν
 ἡμετέρης βιοτή[ς, αὐ]ον δέ μοι οἶκος αὐτεῖ.
 ἄλλοτε γὰρ ἄλλο[ι]ς ὄλβ[ο]ν λάχος ἀνθρώποισιν·
 10 οἷη τοι πεσσοῖο δίκη, το[ι]ήδε καὶ ὄλβου·
 πεσσο[δ]ς ἀμειβόμενος [π]οτὲ μὲν το[ί]ς, ἄ]λλοτε τοῖσι[ν]
 εἰς ἀγαθὸν πίπτει καὶ ἀφνεδὸν αἶψα τίθησι

προσθενανολβειοντ[.]εφηνεοντ[.]δανολβον
 τοιοσδεινωτησιπερ[.] . .]ρεφεταιιπτερυγεςσιν
 15 [.]λβοσεπανθρωπουσ[.] .]λονδεξαλ[.] .]μοφελλει
 ηδαν[.]ηπολεεσσιπ[.] . .]γκαισειτονορεξα
 τηνορααισεπιουτιλιπ[.] .]ητισπαροσηα
 εσκεδεμοινειοσβαθυλ[.] .]ιοσεσκενα[.]ωηι
 πολλαδεμοιμηλεσκε[.]αμενδιαπαντακεδασεν
 20 ηδοληβουβρωστισεγαδακομιστο[.] .]λητισ
 [.] . εποθιπληθουσαναναπτολινε[.] . .]ρωι

1-21. 'She went up to him and said "My son, my son, being so much in want of . . . you should not go to a child, whose hand cannot proffer food, nor his voice . . . I myself am not . . ., but the hopes of my life are broken, and my house gives a dry sound. Sometimes to one man, sometimes to another falls the lot of wealth. The way of wealth is as the way of a die, which in turn brings a lucky throw now to one now to another, suddenly making rich the man who was before poor, and making poor the man who was enriched. Even so on wheeling wings goes wealth up and down among men, prospering first one, and then another. I whom you see have given drink and food to many, for formerly I was no outcast, nay, I had fields where the crops stood deep, I had a threshing-floor, and sheep in plenty; but they were all made havoc of by this baneful famine (?), and I, an uncared for wanderer, creep thus about the crowded city."

1. Of the letter before *σε* there is only a very small vestige, and e. g. $\tilde{\eta}$ could equally well be read, but *οὐ* seems required by the sense.

3. The restoration of $\delta[\rho] \epsilon[\gamma \epsilon \omega \sigma \tau]$, for which cf. l. 16, was suggested by Housman.

4. *κε*: or perhaps *σε*.

5. *του* is possible in place of *των*.

6. If *οιτ* is rightly read there must be some error. *σιτ* is an alternative, perhaps also *ση* though the latter is less suitable.

7. There may have been only one letter (*υ*?) between *ου* and *μ*; at any rate there is no room for *οὐκ* [$\epsilon \zeta$] μ . *ι*, ϕ , or ψ may be read in place of the following doubtful ρ .

8. $\alpha \nu \lambda \omicron \nu$. . . $\acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \acute{\epsilon} \iota$: the Homeric phrase, which is used of metallic sounds, has here a rather different but quite intelligible sense. There is not room for $\kappa \epsilon \nu \epsilon \lambda \omicron \nu$.

9. *γάρ* might be altered to $\tau \acute{\alpha} \rho$, but the *α* is perhaps lengthened as e. g. in Homer B 39 $\theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu \gamma \acute{\alpha} \rho \acute{\epsilon} \tau' \acute{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \nu$, *H. Dem.* 57 $\phi \omega \nu \eta \varsigma \gamma \acute{\alpha} \rho \eta \kappa \omicron \upsilon \sigma \alpha$. Cf. l. 12, where *καὶ ἀφνεόν*, as Housman observes, also has Homeric analogy (e. g. Ω 641, *H. Dem.* 424), though the loss of *τε* after *πίπτει* would be easy.

13. $\acute{\alpha} \nu \omicron \lambda \beta \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\epsilon \upsilon \eta \phi \epsilon \nu \acute{\epsilon} \omega$ are apparently unattested. The latter can of course be eliminated by writing $\epsilon \upsilon \eta \phi \epsilon \nu \acute{\epsilon} \delta \nu \tau [a]$.

14. $\delta \epsilon \omega \nu \eta \tau \eta \sigma \iota$ must be corrected to $\delta \iota \nu \eta \tau \eta \sigma \iota$ or $\delta \iota \nu \acute{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \iota$. The ω is broken, but η cannot be read.

17. Cf. Callim. Fr. 66 e $\omicron \upsilon \gamma \acute{\alpha} \rho \mu \omicron \iota \pi \epsilon \nu \acute{\eta} \pi \alpha \tau \rho \acute{\omega} \iota \omicron \varsigma$, $\omicron \delta \delta' \acute{\alpha} \nu \theta \acute{\omicron} \pi \acute{\alpha} \pi \pi \omega \nu \epsilon \iota \mu \iota \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \rho \nu \eta \tau \iota \varsigma$.

19. The verb presumably refers to the substantives of the preceding line as well as to $\alpha \tilde{\eta} \lambda \alpha$, to which it is more strictly suitable. Cf. Soph. *Antig.* 287, where Jebb's assertion that $\delta \iota \alpha \sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta \acute{\alpha} \nu$ 'could not possibly be joined with $\gamma \eta \nu$ ' is unconvincing.

πρόσθεν ἀνολβείοντ', εὐηφενέοντ[α] δ' ἀνολβον
 τοῖος διν(η)τῆσι περ[ιστ]ρέφεται πτερύγεσσι
 15 [ὄ]λβος ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, [ἀλ]λον δ' ἐξ ἀλ[λο]υ ὀφέλλει.
 ἢ δ' αὐ[τ]ῆ πολέεσσι π[οτὸ]ν καὶ σῖτον ὄρεξα
 τὴν ὄραας, ἐπεὶ οὔτι λιπ[ερ]νῆτις πάρος ἦα,
 ἔσκε δέ μοι νειὸς βαθυλ[ή]ιος, ἔσκεν ἀ[λ]ωή,
 πολλὰ δέ μοι μῆλ' ἔσκε, [τ]ὰ μὲν διὰ πάντα κέδασσεν
 20 ἧδ' ὀλοή βούβρωστις, ἐγὼ δ' ἀκόμιστο[ς] ἀ[λ]ῆτις
 [ᾧ]δέ ποθι πλήθουσαν ἀνὰ πτόλιν ε[. . .] ἔ]ρω

1795. ACROSTIC EPIGRAMS.

Col. ii 22.3 × 17.8 cm.

First century.

Three fragments from two columns, one of which is practically complete, containing epigrams of precisely the same kind as those in 15, and perhaps belonging to the same collection. Each epigram consists of four hexameters in which the final foot is an iambus instead of a spondee or trochee (ἐξάμετροι μείουροι), and, as also in 15, each is followed by the words αὐ(ε)ι μοι.¹ Another feature common to the two papyri escaped notice when 15 was edited, and seems not to have been observed since. The initial letters of the successive quatrains are in alphabetical order, Col. ii including the letters [Θ] to Ξ, while 15. ii includes X, Ψ, Ω, and so terminates the series. Whether the two papyri preserve different portions of the same collection is an open question. The absence of any coincidence in 15. i with 1795. ii is no argument against identity, since 35 lines would intervene between 1795. ii. 27 and 15. ii. 1, so that, unless the column in 15 exceeded 40 lines, no overlapping would occur. But of course the number of such collections current at Oxyrhynchus need not be limited to one. The epigrams, which are well turned and include some memorable lines, are on a variety of topics without logical sequence. Some have a hedonistic tendency, others contain moral reflections or maxims of conduct. Similar subjects occurred in the specimen previously discovered; cf. ii. 12-15 with 15. i. 7-10, ii. 1-4 (music), ii. 24-7 with 15. ii. 6-9 (instability of wealth).

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

¹ That αὐλεμοι in 15 is probably to be regarded as two words, not one, was pointed out by Wilamowitz, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1898, p. 695.

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

Col. i?

Fr. 1.	Fr. 2.
] κεφαλη στεφανω[]ν
]ν μετα του μελαν[ος]
]κω και κλωνια []νω
]ω μετα μου δυο κ[]υς αυλι μο[ι
5]οις φανερω γαρ ε . [5]ω[. . . .]ου
] . οι και σισατε τω[] . [.]
]κων ανεμων ι . []εσας
]ς περι δακτυλον []ης αυλι μο[ι
π]λοκαμους λευκ[ου	.
10] θανειν οτι πα[.
]ε γουνατα ν . [.
]σσοθε[.
] . [.

Col. ii.

μηδ αδικιν ζητει μηδ αν αδι[κη προ]σεριση
 φευγε φονους και φευγε μαχας φ[ι]σαι διαφρονε[ι]ν []
 εις δ' ολιγον πονεσεις και δευτερον ου μεταμελη αυ[λι μοι
 [ι]δ[ι]εσ εαρ χειμωνά θερος ταυτ εστι διολου
 5 ηλιος αυτος [εδν] και νυξ τα τεταγμεν απεχει
 μη κόπια ζητειν ποθεν ηλιος η ποθε[ν] υδρ
 αλλα π[ο]θεν τ[ο] μυρον και τους στεφανου[ς] αγορασης αυλι μο[ι]
 κρηνας αυτουρ[το]υς μελ[ιτ]ος τρις ηθελον εχειν

- πεντ^ε[η]] γαλακτορυτους οινου δεκα δ[ωδε]κα μυρου
 10 και δυο πηγαιων υδατων και τρις χιονε[[ν]]ων
 παιδα κατα κρηνην και παρθενον ηθελον εχειν αυλι μοι
 Λυδιος αυλος εμοι τα δε Λυδια παιγματα λυρας
 κα[ι] Φρυγ[ιο]ς καλαμος τα δε ταυρεα τυμπανα πονει
 ταυτα ζων ασαι τ ερομαι και οταν αποθανω
 15 αυλον υπερ κεφαλης θετε μοι παρα ποσ(σ)ι δε λυρη[ν αυλι μοι
 μετρα τι[ς] αν πλουτου παλι ανευρατο μετρα πεντας
 η τις εν ανθρωποις χρουσου παλιν ευρατο μετρον
 νυν γαρ ο χρηματ εχων ετι πλε[ι]ονα χρηματα θελει
 πλουσιος ων δ ο ταλας βασανισ[δ]εται ωσπερ ο πενης αυλι μοι
 20 νεκρον εαν ποθ ιδης και μνηματα κωφα παραγησ
 κοινον εσοπτρον ορα(ς) ο θανων ουτως προσεδοκα
 ο χρου[ν]ος εστι δανος το ζην πικρος εσθ ο δανισας
 καν τοτ απαιτησαι σε θελη κλαιων [α]ποδοιδοις αυλι μοι
 Ξερξης ην βασιλε[υ]ς ο λεγων Διι παντα μερισαι
 25 ος δυσ(ι) πηδαλ[ι]ο[ι]ς μονος εσχισε Αημνιον υδωρ
 ολβι(ο)ς ην ο Μιδας τρις δ ολβιος ην ο [Κ]ιυυρ[α]ς
 αλλα τις εις Αιδα οβολου πλεον ηλυθεν εχων αυλι μοι

Fr. 1. 4. 1. μετ' έμοῦ.

6. e. g.]λοι,]μοι.

9. This quatrain evidently deals with old age and the approach of death ; cf. ii. 20-3.

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

Col. ii.

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

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

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

'A Lydian flute serves me, and Lydian strains of the lyre, and Phrygian pipe, and drum of oxbide. While I live I long for these to play, and when I die, put a flute above my head and at my feet a lyre. *Pipe me a tune.*

‘Who has found the limits of wealth, who the limits of poverty, or who has found the limit of gold among men? For now he who has money wishes for still more money, and the rich man, poor wretch, is tormented like the poor. *Pipe me a tune.*

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

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

1. *πρ]οσερισης*: the remains of the termination are scanty, but seem too much for *-σαι*.
2. For *διαφρονε[ι]ν* cf. Hesych. *διαφρονέων· διανοούμενος. καὶ ὁ ἐν διαφορᾷ τινι γεγονώς*. The reading, however, is far from certain, *a* being especially doubtful; the letter after *δ* may well be *υ*.
3. *μεταμελή* as an irregular future form would balance *πονέσεις* better than *μεταμέλη*.
6. *1. ὕδωρ*.
7. The first *σ* of *στεφανου[ς]* is a correction, perhaps from a partially formed *τ*. Cf. l. 15, where there is an unnoticed lipography.
13. *ταυρεία* is a drum or something of the kind in *Geop.* xv. 25. 3.
14. *ζων* provides a good antithesis, but the *ζ* is not altogether satisfactory and the other remains are very scanty. *1. ἔραμαι*.
15. *1. λύραν*: the correct form was written in l. 12.
16. *1. τίς* for *παλι*, which has come in from the next line. For the tmesis cf. e.g. Eurip. *H. F.* 1055–6 *ἀπολεῖ πόλιν, ἀπὸ δὲ πατέρα*.
18. Cf. Eurip. *Suppl.* 238–9 *οἱ μὲν ἄλβιοι . . . πλειόνων τ’ ἐρῶσ’ αἰί*.
19. *1. βασανίζεται*. Perhaps *βασανισ[ε]ται* was written.
20. *1. ποτ’*. *ἰδεῖν* is one of the words often wrongly aspirated, being influenced no doubt by *ὄραν*, e.g. Philipp. ii. 23 *ἕως ἂν ἀφίδω*; cf. Mayser, *Grammatik*, p. 201.
22. Cf. Anth. Pal. App. 252 *πνεῦμα λαβῶν δάνος οὐρανόθεν τελίστας χρόνον ἀνταπέδωκα*, and for *δαισας* e.g. Anth. Pal. xi. 309 *φεισάμενος δανίσας*.
23. *1. κᾶν ποτ’*. The (Ionic) forms *διδοῖς, διδοί* occur e.g. in the LXX, Ps. xxxvi. 21, Job xxxiv. 11.
26. *ς* of *ὀλβις* was converted from *ο*. *-ις* for *-ιος* is a common vulgarism.
27. *τις* seems inevitable here, but the remains suggest *ε* rather than *ς*. This may be deceptive, but possibly *ε* was written twice by mistake instead of *σε*.

1796. HEXAMETER POEM ON EGYPTIAN BOTANY.

21 × 35 cm.

Second century.

The recto of this papyrus contains remains of three columns, the second of which is nearly complete, from a list of abstracts of contracts or other transactions concerning property, drawn up in the first half of the second century. The verso is inscribed with two columns of a hexameter poem dealing with Egyptian plants or trees. Col. i, besides lacking the beginnings of lines, is in bad condition, and does not seem worth reproduction; the second column, which is in much better case, is printed, and will probably be found a sufficient sample. Apparently the upper half of the column relates to the cyclamen, which was also the subject of

at any rate the greater part of the preceding column (πολυλαγέων κυκ[λα]μείνων l. 9, κυκλάμεινος l. 12; the form θέρμεται in l. 19 deserves to be noticed). At l. 12 of Col. ii the writer turns to the perseae tree, to which the rest of the column is devoted. The style is diffuse, and the poem must have been of considerable length if many subjects were treated on a similar scale. Its author is hardly likely to be identified, nor need the loss of his name be regretted; his work seems to have been of small merit, whether from the literary or scientific point of view.

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

[α]ι
 εσθανετα[ι] ποταμου γαρ επηλυσιν ην δ απολειπηι
 ριξησιν μεγαλησιν ατε φρονεοντι λογισμωι
 πλειον υδωρ ε[[μι]]ουσα πολυπληθι τοτε καρπω
 αλλ ουκ εσθ οτε καρπον εφεδρευουσι λαβεσθαι
 5 ανθρωποι χαοντες ε[υ]τραφεων κυκλαμεινων
 πολλη γαρ Νειλοιο χυσις πολλη δ επι σιτω . επ[
 αφθονη τετανυσται εποιεξεν δε γελωσα
 ευθενην ου καρπος επι χθονα πασαν οδευει δαλ[
 ωγυγιος νομος ουτος απ αρχαιων ετ ανακτων
 10 θεσθαι δενδρεα κεινα παρ αλληλοισι κολωναισ
 χωματος ευ[[α]]δρ[[οι]]ο πεδην αλκτηρα τε λειμου ευν
 περση δ ακμητος υπο χλοερο[[ισι των]] πετηλοισ δροιο
 ευφορει καρπω περικαλλει μηδε πεπ[[αι]]νοι χλοερισ[ι
 μεχρις επανθησ[[ου]]σι κλαδοι προτεροι {δε} περι καρπον
 15 πειπτοι μηδ αρα νυκτος οτ ενυθεν ορνυται υδωρ

περσιης απο καρπος ατερ βαρυηχειος αυρης λφ[
 συμφερεται μοννη γαρ αθωπευτωι δε γεγηθεν περιη[
 αδροσιη καρπον γαρ υπ αδροσιησι πεπαινει την
 σημα και ημεριης ευειδε[.]ς εγγυς {ε}ιδεσθαι
 20 Νειλου πλημυροντος υδωρ νεον ευτε πiousα
 καρπον απ οφαλμοιο ν[ε]ωι συνανηκατο βλαστω ετ
 ηeros ακρισησι προσ . φι . [.]ει δ επι κηπωι

1. There is not enough to show whether the initial ε written by a common confusion in εσθανετα[ι] was deleted. The subject of απολειπηι is ο ποταμός.

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

5. χαοντες is perhaps for χατέοντες.

6. σειτω, if that is right word, is for σίτου. επ[(?) in the margin looks like a correction of or variant on επι σειτω.

7. 1. έποίησεν? εν . might be read instead of επ, but seems no easier.

9. αγγυιον was apparently written originally. To what δαλ[in the margin refers is not clear; the letters are slightly above l. 9, but nearer to it than to l. 8.

10. δένδρεα is unexpected, since the subject under discussion both here and in the previous column appears to be the κυκλάμινος; cf. int. Perhaps, however, this was a digression; Dioscorides describes one variety of κυκλάμινος as growing in shady places, μάλιστα δέ υπό τὰ δένδρα, and another as having κανλους παχείς, γονατώδεις, περιελισσομένους τοῖς παρακειμένοις δένδρεσιν ελικοειδῶς (ii. 193-4). The cyclamen then may have been brought in here in connexion with some tree, to which δένδρεα κείνα goes back. The tree, as Housman remarks, might be the άκανθα, which is planted on modern embankments because the roots bind the soil.

12. περσ(ε)γη: cf. e. g. Nicander, *Al.* 99 περσειῆς κάρνα, 53. 7. The persea, which was an exclusively Egyptian tree (Strabo xvii, p. 823, includes it among the ιδιάζοντα of the country), is described at length by Theophrastus, *H. P.* iv. 2-5, who says that it κάρπον φέρε πολὺν καὶ πᾶσαν ἄραν· περικαταλαμβάνει γὰρ ὁ νέος· αἰεὶ τὸν ἔνον: this illustrates the epithet άκμητος here. It seems to have become a rarity by the fourth century (53; cf. Wilcken, *Archiv* i, p. 127) and was protected by an edict of Arcadius (Cod. Iust. xi. 77).

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

13-14. According to Theophrastus, l. c., the fruit πέττει υπό τοὺς ἔτησιás. 1. πρότερον?

15. 1. έγγυθεν. σ was written over ν by mistake for γ.

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

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

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

22. ακρισησι = 'fluctuations'? The next word is puzzling. If φ is right, the letter between this and σ was quite narrow (? ι). The penultimate letter seems to have been corrected, and ε is very uncertain.

1797. ANTIPHON SOPHISTES, Περὶ Ἀληθείας, i?

22.4 × 16.3 cm.

Early third century.

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

same roll as 1364, which is shown by a stichometrical figure to have belonged to the earlier portion of the book; or alternatively 1797 may be supposed to be from another treatise of Antiphon, the Πολιτικός or the Περὶ Ὁμονοίας, this copy being more or less uniform with that of the Περὶ Ἀληθείας (1364) and belonging to the same owner.

Col. i.

[.] του δικαιου
 [σπουδ]αιου δοκουν
 [τος το] μαρτυρειν
 [εν αλ]ληλοις ταληθη
 5 [δικαιο]ν νομιζεται
 [ειναι] και χρησιμον
 [ουδεν] ηττον εις
 [τα των] ανθρωπων
 [επιτ]ηδευματα·
 10 [τουτο] τοιουν ου δι
 [καιος] εσται ο ποιων·
 [και γα]ρ το μη αδικειν
 [μηδ]ενα μη αδι
 [κου]μενον αυτον
 15 [δικ]αιον εστιν· αναγ
 [κη] γαρ τον μαρτυ
 [ρου]ντα καν αλη

 [θη μ]αρτυρη· ομως
 [αλλον] πως αδικειν·
 20 [εικος δε?] αυτον α [
 [δι]κεισθαι [εις υστε
 [ρο]ν· ενε[στι γε
 [εν] ωι δια τ[α υ]π εκει
 [ν]ου μαρτ[υρη]θεν
 25 τα αλισκ[ε]ται ο κα
 ταμαρτυρουμενος·
 και απολλυσιν η

Col. ii.

ληθη μαρτυρ[η
 40 σας· και ου μον[ον
 τωι μ]ίσει· αλλα κ[αι
 οτι δει αυτον το[ν
 αιωνα παντα φυ
 λαττεσθαι τουτο[ν
 45 ὄν] κατεμαρτυρ[η
 σεν· ως ὑ]παρχει
 γ αυτωι εχθρος τοιο[υ
 τος οιος και λεγειν [
 και δρᾶν ει τι δυν[αι
 50 το] κακον αυτον· κα[ι
 τοι τα]ντα φαίνεται
 ου σμικρα οντα τα
 δικηματα· ουτε
 ἄ αυτος αδικειται·
 55 ουτε α αδικει· ου γαρ
 χοιον τε ταυτα τε δι
 καια ειναι και το μη
 [δ]εν αδικειν μη
 [δε] αυτον αδικεισθαι·
 60 [αλ]λ αναγκη εστιν
 [η] τα ετερα αυτων
 [δ]ικαια ειναι· η αμ
 φοτερα αδικα· φαι
 νεται δε και το δικα
 65 ζειν και το κρινειν
 και το διαταν οπως

	χρηματα η αυτον		αν περαινηται ου
	[δ]ια τουτον ον ουδεν		[δ]ικαια οντα· το γαρ
30	[α]δικει· εν μεν ουν		[α]λλους ωφελουν αλ
	τουτωι τον κατα	70	[λο]υς βλαπτει· εν δε
	[μ]αρτυρουμενον		[του]τωι οι μεν ωφελου
	[α]δικει οτι ουκ αδι		[μενο]ι ουκ αδικου[ν
	[κο]νυτα εαυτον α		[ται οι] δε βλαπτομέ[νοι
35	[δι]κει· αυτος δ αδικει		[αδικο]νυτα[ι
	[ται υ]πο του καταμαρ	75	[. . . .]μην[.
	[τυρηθ]εντος οτι μι		[. . . .]· ινου[.
	[σειται] υ̅π αυτου τ̅α [α		

Fr.

.
] τους νομ[ους

‘. . . justice is regarded as virtuous and at the same time to testify to the truth concerning one another is considered just and equally useful for human pursuits. The man who does so however is not just. For it is just to wrong no one when one is not oneself wronged; and he who gives testimony, even if it is true, cannot help to some extent doing a wrong; and there is a probability that he may himself subsequently be wronged: this is at any rate possible, in so far as the man against whom he testifies is convicted in consequence of his testimony, and loses either money or life owing to a person whom he is in no way wronging. Herein therefore he wrongs the man against whom testimony is given, that he wrongs some one who is not wronging him; and he is himself wronged by such a person, because he is hated by him although he testified to the truth, and wronged not by his hatred only but also because he must always be on his guard against this man against whom he testified, regarding him as an enemy prepared to do what damage he can, either in word or deed. These wrongs do not seem inconsiderable, either those received or those inflicted. For it is not possible that these acts should be just and that not to do or receive a wrong should also be just, but either one of them must be just or both must be unjust. Condemnation, judgement, and arbitration, whatever their upshot, are therefore seen not to be just; for what benefits some injures others; and in this those who are benefitted are not wronged, but those who are injured . . .’

2. [σπουδ]αιου : αι is rather more probable than υ, but e. g. [αξιεπαι]νου, which is suggested by Murray, is not impossible.

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

28. αυτον απολλύναι is an intelligible expression, but with χρηματα preceding it seems more likely than not that αυτον (των βιου) should be read.

34. *εαυτον* appears to have been written, not *αδι[κο]υνητα[s] αυτον*.

56. *ταυτα*: i. e. *ταυτά*, but *ταυτα* is wanted; cf. 1364. 194, where the same accent is given, though there perhaps correctly. Whether the marginal symbol, for which cf. e. g. 16. ii. 3, &c., has anything to do with the accentuation is doubtful.

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

1798. ANONYMOUS WORK ON ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

Fr. 44 14.3 × 34.3 cm.

Late second century.

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

The text on the verso proceeds in the opposite direction to that on the recto, and did not extend over the whole of the roll, many of the smaller pieces (Frs. 1-43) having the verso blank. Since some of these clearly refer to a period prior to that covered by the fragments of which the verso is inscribed, they have all been placed in a group before the latter. Presumably the lexicon, which was of no small compass, was not completed. Of this group only two or three pieces are sufficiently well preserved to afford a clear clue to their subject. Fr. 1 apparently describes the circumstances of the death of Philip, of which an account is given differing somewhat from what is found in other sources; cf. the commentary. In Fr. 2 some hexameter lines are quoted evidently in connexion with the destruction of Thebes, which was 'left without a habitation among men'. Frs. 5-6 mention Spithridates, who was one of the Persian satraps opposed to Alexander in the battle of the Granicus.

The main fragment is No. 44, in which are preserved the upper parts of five successive columns, the fifth, however, represented by the beginnings of the lines only; on the verso of this fragment are two columns of the lexicon, containing words beginning with M (1802. 3). Col. i repeats the well-known story of the physician Philip who, after having undertaken to prescribe for Alexander when suffering from fever at Tarsus in the summer of B. C. 333, was accused by Parmenion in a letter to the king of being in the pay of Darius. Cols. ii-iv are concerned with the battle of Issus, which took place in the autumn of the same year. A large lacuna intervenes between this and Fr. 45, which mentions Alexander's passage of the Euphrates preparatory to the battle of Arbela in September, 331 B. C. In the interval occurred the capture of Damascus, the sieges of Tyre and Gaza, and the expedition into Egypt, to the last three of which twelve chapters were given by Diodorus; an allowance of as many columns in the papyrus would certainly not be disproportionately large. The remaining fragments are insignificant.

To the identity of the writer a clue remains to be found. Since these fragments, so far as their contents are recognizable, are all directly concerned with Alexander, it is a natural assumption that they come from one of the many chronicles, historical or romantic, devoted to the career of that striking personality rather than from a history of wider scope. The main Greek authorities for Alexander are of course Diodorus, Arrian, and Plutarch, and on the battle of Issus, with which the principal fragment of the papyrus is mostly concerned, we have also the statements of Callisthenes which are criticized by Polybius xii. 17 sqq.; but with none of these are any marks of affinity discoverable. On the other hand, there are two clear coincidences with the Roman Quintus Curtius Rufus, an obscure personality whose monograph on Alexander is commonly attributed to the first century A. D. The papyrus agrees precisely with Curtius against Arrian and Plutarch as to the terms of the bribe said to have been offered to the physician Philip by Darius, and, what is more interesting, reaffirms more circumstantially the statement that Alexander on the eve of the battle of Issus was overcome by an attack of nerves (see nn. on Fr. 44. i. 8-10, ii. 6 sqq., 15). A reason given in Fr. 44. iii. 18-19 for abandoning the pursuit of Darius but not elsewhere recorded, may also be glanced at by Curtius; cf. n. *ad loc.* These coincidences imply either that our author was known to Curtius or that they had a common source; the supposition that the papyrus drew on Curtius is too improbable to need consideration. Curtius' sources have been discussed at length by J. Kaerst in *Beitr. z. Quellenkritik des Q. Curtius Rufus* and *Forschungen z. Gesch. Alexanders*, and more recently by E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencycl.* iv. 1871 sqq., and Rüegg, *Beitr. z. Erforschung der*

Quellenverhältnisse in d. Alexandergesch. des Curtius. The authority on whom Curtius principally depended, according to the current view, was Clitarchus, but since the same authority was closely followed by Diodorus, with whom no connexion is traceable in 1798, this clearly cannot be the connecting link between 1798 and Curtius. It is, however, recognized that Curtius employed other sources, which as distinguished from those of Arrian and Plutarch are considered to be secondary and comparatively late (cf. Schwartz, *op. cit.* 1876); but what precisely they were is not known.

Curtius, then, is not rated as high-class company, and agreement with him against others will not establish a prejudice in favour of such statements as are peculiar to the papyrus. Of these the most significant is the estimate given of the numbers slain in the battle of Issus; this more than doubles the highest total found elsewhere for the Macedonian and approximately halves that for the Persian side; cf. n. on Fr. 44. iv. 9 sqq. Whatever may be thought of the historical value of these figures, they serve, like the description of Alexander's state of mind before the battle, to throw some light on the author's standpoint: the tendency to depreciate Alexander is less definitely affirmable than of Curtius, but evidently the aim was not glorification. Their claim to attention, however, is increased by the fact that the papyrus, alone among ancient authorities, estimates separately the loss of the mercenaries in the Persian service. It has been suggested by Kaerst (*Gesch. des Hellenismus*, i, p. 522), in agreement with Ranke, that the sources of Diodorus included information derived from Darius' Greek mercenaries. That theory now finds in 1798, which might here have the same source behind it, a certain support. Other points elsewhere unrecorded in connexion with the battle are the preliminary prayers and sacrifices to Poseidon, Thetis, Nereus, and the Nereids (Fr. 44. ii; see n. on ll. 9-11), and the anecdote about the slice of bread with which the conqueror had to satisfy his hunger next day (*ibid.* iv). The story of Philip the physician follows familiar lines, but no other account attributes to the incriminating letter of Parmenion the unworthy motive of private hostility, a statement pointing to an anti-Parmenion bias, which is traceable also in Diodorus and Curtius and goes back not improbably to Clitarchus. The fragment (1) referring apparently to the death of Philip of Macedon shows a marked divergence from the ordinary version of that episode, and it is highly unfortunate that more of the narrative is not preserved.

In form this writer is clear and straightforward, if somewhat monotonous. $\delta\epsilon$ is his favourite connecting particle, and there is but one instance of the genitive absolute; a certain partiality to the historic present is noticeable (Fr. 44. i. 5, 16, Fr. 45. 6). To hiatus he is indifferent. Some eccentricities like the poetical

spelling ἀποτυπάζειν may be due to copyists, but the form ἀνελεῖ (Fr. 44. i. 12) is not without significance, suggesting that the date of composition, though it may well be posterior to the Augustan age, was at any rate little in advance of it.

Fr. 1.

[.]τους μ[.] . [.] .
 [.] θ[ε]ατ[ρ]ωι κα[.] .
 [.]ους απε[.] . . .
 [.]ε περι θρον[ον]
 5 [.]ιν τοῖς μ[.] .
 [.]π]αρεδωκε []
 [.] απετυπαι[ι
 [σαν αυτο]ν το δε σωμ[α
 [του Φιλ]ιππου θερα []
 10 [πουσι θαψ]αι παρεδωκ[ε
 [.]π]ερι την [.] .
 [.]σκλη[.] . . .

Fr. 3.

γονμ[]
 εισιγ [] ? Θη
 βαιων []
 ω[]

Col. i.

Fr. 2.

[.] . [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] .
 [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] .
 [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] .
 [Κα]δμου . [.] . β . [.] .
 5 [το]σουτο κακον δι[.] .
 [.]εκυλισε[ν] Θηβα[ι]ς
 [κ]αι δη Θηβ[α]ι εν αν []
 [θρ]ωποισιν αικοι []
 [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] .
 10 [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] .
 [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] .
 [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] .

Fr. 4.

[.] . [.] . [.] . [.] . [.] .
] . ! [.] η[]
]ομην τε[]
] δημοσ[]
]τουργο[]
 5]μον[]
] δια[]

Frs. 5-6.

Col. ii.

κατα την []
 ης εβασ[ι]λευε ?
 ου και α[]
 στ[]
 5 δ [.] . [.] . []

		τε και Σπιθα[ραδατ .
		βαρβαροι κα[
		[ε]γοπλοι πρ[
		[τ]ην του σωμ[ατος . .
. . .	10	λᾱ γαρ μου[
]οι		των ειχο[ν εκ?
]ι		πληξιν [. πλη?
]]		θος τ[
]σ		παρει[
]]	15	οντε[
. . .		τραι και αν[. α?
		ψ̄ γωνας εχ[
		Μακεδον[
	

Fr. 7.	Fr. 8.	Fr. 9.	Fr. 10.
.
επος ε[ιπειν?	αι[]πι[]λλη[
εξελιπ[ε	θη[] . ακ[] περιο[
τον ιπ[πον?	κλ[]μουμ[πε]πτωκ[
πρωτο[νη[] . ι παρατ[]ται αλ[
5 δ̄ αυτο[5 του[5]ντων ου[5]τερον τ[
[. . .]τ[[.] . ε[]μολα[]ε̄ς̄ γλυκ[
.

Fr. 11.	Fr. 12.	Col. i.	Fr. 13.	Col. ii.
.
[.]ντι[]αγ[]λον	ι . [παρθε[ν
χον μ[] μεγα[] μαχης	η εκα[αλλοι[
περιδ[]αι κυαν[]πη		
[.]ρου[? αλη]θινου[]ε		
.	5] . ν[.

Fr. 14.	Fr. 15.	Fr. 16.	Fr. 17.
.
κ . μ[] . ρω[] . . [] . ντα[
δειν[μέ]γαλη[]ιμ[σκε]υαζε[
^μ [[ν]]ουσ[Αλε]ξανδρο[]γειν[]νης δε
ραν . []αρα[]ταδ[]ν ελατι
5 [. .] . [.
.
Fr. 18.	Fr. 19.	Fr. 20.	
.
] . [.] . . . [] . []ολ[. .	
] Περσικ[] . [Α]λεξαν	
] μεικρ[]αι . []λον	
πολ]λακισ λ[] . []ε παραω[
5]λλα γα[ρ	5]ιμο[]φι[. .	
] . αλε[]εστε[]κγ[.	
? δ]ικαιωσ[]ος λει[. . . .	
] επει κ[]ταισν . [. . . .	
]αμμιον []οσα[Fr. 21.	Fr. 22.
- 10]γου κει[10]ξε τσ[.
]αραμει[]ου . []ευστ[] . . . εμ[
]ομεγα[. . . .]εδε[]γενσ[
] . εδια[. . . .]ημ[]μαιο[
] : μεντ[. . . .]λιν π[. . . .
.
Fr. 23.	Fr. 24.	Fr. 25.	Fr. 26.
.
]ορι[]ειδ[]γος ἰ . [] . . [
] . ου . []ωι τι[]μει[]τασ[
] . το γε[]ν ολν[]δο[]δοι[
]οδη[.
.

Fr. 27.	Fr. 28.	Fr. 29.	Fr. 30.	Fr. 31.
.
λιπ[]ησ[]εις σ[]αιδ[]δακ[
τομ[] . νπ[]ε εστ[]μειν[] . ειδ[
[.]ηι[]νε . []ειτ[]νθ . []ταδ[
.
Fr. 32.	Fr. 33.	Fr. 34.	Fr. 35.	Fr. 36.
.
]ου[] . . α[]ουπ[]ναι[? π]αυσα
]α . []ευη[]αμ . []τρια[]ωνος
]ψ[]πο[.
.
Fr. 37.	Fr. 38.	Fr. 39.	Fr. 40.	Fr. 41.
.
]ου ωσ[]υσα[]ιθ[] . σι[] .
] . κσ[]εντ[]εχ[]βε[]αβοι[
.

Fr. 42.	Fr. 43.
.
]ρ[]δε[
]θεια[. . .

Fr. 44.

Col. i.

[? επιχειρ]ησειν αυτον φαρ
 [μα]κωι μελλοντος δ
 [αυτ]ου διδοιαι Παρμε
 [νι]ων διαφορος ων τωι
 5 [Φι]λιππωι γραφει προς
 [Αλ]εξανδρον κελευων
 φυλαξασθαι τουτον α
 κουειν γαρ χειλια τα
 λαντα Δαρειων αυτωι

Col. ii.

ειχε τους Μακεδονας
 εξηκοντα γαρ των βαρ
 βαρων μυριαδε[ς] ησαν
 οι δε Περσαι των Μακε
 5 δωνων κατεφρονουν
 Αλεξανδρος δε πλησι
 ον ορων την κρισιν
 εν αγωνι(αι) ην και προς
 ευχας ετραπη Θετιν

10 δίδοναι και την αδελ
 φην γυναικα εφ ωι αυ
 τον ανελοι Αλεξαν
 δρος δε λαβων την ε
 πιστολην και ουδενι
 15 προσποιησαμ[ε]νος
 πειν[ει].
 τ!α[

Col. iii.

σαν οι Περσαι ειτα το
 λοιπον των βαρβαρων
 πληθος μεθ ους οι ξενοι
 οι δε περι τον Αλεξαν
 5 δρον ιππεις μεν ιππευ
 σιν πεζοι δε πεζοις
 επηκολουθουν και το
 πεδιον πληρες ην νε
 κρων πολυ δε μερος
 10 των Μακεδωνων επι
 τας σκηνας των βαρβα
 [ρ]ων ωρμησεν εις δι
 [α]ρπαγην των εν αυταις
 [π]ληρεις δ ησαν ποικι
 15 [λ]ης γαζης Αλεξανδρος
 [δ] επιθυμων λαβειν
 [Δαρ]ειον εδιωκεν με
 [τα δρ]ομου πυθομε
 [νος δε ηδη αυτον α[.] . []

10 και Νηρηϊδας και Νηρεα
 και Ποσειδωνα επικα
 λουμενος ωι και τετρω
 ρον αρμα εκελευσεν
 εις το πελαγος ανα[γα
 15 γοντας ρειψαι εσφ[αγια
 ζετο δε και νυκτι κ[. . .

Col. iv.

εχοντι υπ αθεραπ[ε]ν
 σιας τη εξης προσ[η]
 νεγκε τις των υπασπ[ι]
 στων λαβων παρα [βου]
 5 κολου αρτου τρυφος [ο]
 δε δια την ενδ[εια]ν
 φαγων ασμενωσ παν
 τες αρα ειπεν ανθρω
 ποι ζωσιν ηδεωσ α
 10 πεθανον δε των μεν
 Μακεδωνων πεζοι
 χειλιοι και ιππεις δια
 κοσιοι των δε βαρβα
 ρων πεζοι μεν ουκ ε
 15 λαττους πεντε μυρια
 δων ιππεις δε τρισχι
 λιοι των δε ξ[ε]νων πε
 [ρι]ε . η

Col. v.

λα[
 ω . [? Αλεξαν
 δρο[

15 ρα και [
 κοι[.]α . [
 επο[

και [εν ι[
5 λου[βολ[
επι[20 παιδ[
5 lines lost	κεδ[
α . [αλλο[
ναθ[επε[
σεσθ[αι	σι πα[
	. . .

Fr. 45.

.
 [.]ο[.]
 [.]ασκ[.]
 λυσας απαντας α[. . . ε
 βαινειν επι Δαρξ[ιον
 5 διαβας τον Ευφρ[ατην
 και μαχην αυτω[ι συν
 απτει δευτεραν [.
 [.] γ[. . .]θα . [.

Fr. 46.

.
]ου[
]οσμ[
]υτοτ[
]ντο[ι
 5] . . τ[
] . κυ[
]εσα[
]λεπ . [
]ροστ[
 10] . τ[

Fr. 47.

μ[
 π[
 φα[
 και ομ[
 5 νος κ[
 τεμ[
 την [
 ριμ[

Fr. 48.

]μηθη τι π[
]σαν [κ]ατα . ρ[
 τ]ο σωμα [
]ν αλλα τ[
 5]θεν αλ[
]βαλων [
]αι πυθο[μεν
]ντων [

]ς οτι . [

Fr. 49.

.
] . [
]αν[
]υσα[
 ? Αλεξαν]δρου [
 5]υς το[
]εξι[
] . [

Fr. 50.	Fr. 51.	Fr. 52.	Fr. 53.	Fr. 54.
.
] . . []να[]υ[]με[]ειο[
Ελ]λαδα π[]οιη[]κο[] . αυ]πτο[
] παλιw ε[ι]ε[]υ[]ως
.

Fr. 1. The mention of a theatre in l. 2, in conjunction with the burial of]ιππου in ll. 8-10, leaves little room for doubt that this fragment refers to the death of Philip, but the details are unfamiliar. Philip's assassin was Pausanias (Diodor. xvi. 94, Justin ix. 6), for whose name there seems to be here no place; moreover, according to Diodorus he was pursued and killed forthwith by οἱ περὶ τὸν Περδίκκων who συγκεντήσαντες ἀνέϊλον. Apparently, then, the object of ἀπετυπαν]ισαν is some other person, whose identity is obscure; cf. Justin xi. 2. 1 *Prima illi cura paternarum exsequiarum fuit; in quibus ante omnia caedis conscios ad tumulum patris occidi iussit.*

1 sqq. The length of the lacunae is estimated on the basis of ll. 8-10, which can be restored with probability. In ll. 1-4 τους μ[ε]ν | [εν τωι θ]εατρ[ο]ωι κα[[θημεν]ους απε[λυ][σε τους (or τοις) δ]ε may be suggested.

5.]ν :]ων is not possible, and]αν is unlikely. The doubtful μ may be λ.

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

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

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

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

4. β is preceded by a vertical stroke consistent with η, ι, ν, and is followed by the base of another short vertical stroke; Θ]ηβη[would be quite suitable.

6. Cf. Homer P 688 πῆμα θεὸς Δαναοῖσι κυλίνδει, C. I. G. 6280 A 35 στυγερὴν δὲ κυλιδήσει κακότῃα.

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

10. No compound -οιμοαρος (e. g. κυδοιμόαρος) is known.

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

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

Frs. 5-6. These fragments were combined after the text was in type, and the numeration was therefore retained.

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

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

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

Fr. 7. 3. τον ιπ[πον: perhaps a reference to Bucephalus, but the fragment is too small to be understood.

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

Fr. 12. 4. αλη]θινου is suggested by κταν[in the preceding line, but λι]θινου would also be suitable.

Fr. 17. 4. Some case of ελατι]νος presumably.

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

6. Αλε[ξανδρ . . is one of many possibilities.

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

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

Fr. 24. 3. Perhaps Ολυ]μπιαδα, either as the mother of Alexander or a date.

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

Fr. 36. 1. π]ανσα: or possibly Π]ανσα]μιας; cf. n. on Fr. 1.

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

1 sqq. Cf. Plutarch, *Alex.* 19, Arrian ii. 4. 12, Curtius iii. 6, Justin xi. 8; Diodorus xvii. 31 is more concise and does not mention the letter of Parmenion. For [επιχειρ]ησειν cf. Plutarch, *l. c.* ἐπεχείρησε φαρμακεία, but αυτον may mean Alexander (cf. Arrian, *l. c.* καθήραι ἐθέλειν Ἀλέξανδρον φαρμάκῳ), in which case another infinitive may have preceded, e. g. ἐπηγγειλατο θεραπεύσαι ἐπιχειρ]ησειν, or]ησειν may be differently restored, e. g. ωφέλ]ησειν.

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

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

8-10. χειλια ταλαντα . . . και την αδελφην: so Curt. *mille talentis* . . . *et spe nuptiarum sororis eius*. Plutarch says δωραῖς μεγάλας καὶ γάμῳ θυγατρὸς, Arrian χρήμασιν only.

12. The form ελω occurs in Aristoph. *Eq.* 290 (περιελω), but otherwise belongs to a much later period, e. g. D. Hal. xi. 18.

14-15. ουδενι seems to be an error for ουδεν, the meaning being similar to e. g. that in Polyb. v. 25. 7 σαφῶς εἰδὼς . . . οὐ προσποιηθεὶς δέ. A use of προσποιεῖσθαι with the dative in the sense of κωνανεῖν does not occur.

ii. 1-16. ' . . . The Macedonians were seized by dismay, for there were 600,000 of the barbarians, while the Persians held the Macedonians in contempt. When he saw that the decision was imminent Alexander was in a torment of suspense and had recourse

to prayer, calling on Thetis and the Nereids and Nereus and Poseidon, for the last of whom he ordered that a four-horse chariot should be brought and cast into the sea; and he offered sacrifices by night . . .

i. εἶχε: sc. φόβος or some synonym. For the confidence of the Persians cf. Arrian ii. 6. 8 καταπατήσειν τε τῇ ὑπῶ τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν στρατιὰν ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν αὐτῶ (sc. Δαρείῳ) ἐπαίροντες ἔλεγον, Plutarch, *Alex.* 20 ἀποκρωμένου δὲ Δαρείου δεδιέναι μὴ φθάσωσιν αὐτὸν ἀποδράντες οἱ πολέμιοι. Diodor. xvii. 32 describes the effect of the disparity in numbers on the local population, τῆς μὲν τῶν Μακεδ. ὀλιγότητος καταφρονήσαντες, τὸ δὲ πλῆθος τῆς τῶν Περσ. στρατιᾶς καταπεπληγμένοι. Panic is not, however, attributed to the Macedonians in other Greek sources; as Kaerst remarks (*Gesch. des Hellenismus*, p. 364²), it cannot be inferred from Arrian ii. 7. 5 παρεκαλεῖ θαρρεῖν, though it may be hinted at by Diodor. xvii. 33. 1 τῶν δὲ κατασκόπων ἀπαγγειλάντων . . . τὸν Δαρείον . . . τῇ δυνάμει προσιέναι καταπληκτικῶς: cf. Justin xi. 9. 3 *periculosius differre bellum ratus, ne desperatio suis cresceret*.

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

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

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

9-11. Cf. e. g. Plutarch, *Alex.* 33 παρεκαλεῖ τοὺς θεοὺς, ὡς Καλλισθένης φησίν, ἐπευχόμενος . . . ἀμύναι. The choice of deities on the present occasion is somewhat surprising, even when allowance is made for the proximity of the sea (cf. Curt. *l. c. dis praesidibus loci*) and the legendary descent of Alexander from Thetis and Nereus. As Mr. Tarn observes, this story looks like an adaptation from another occasion when the invocation of marine gods is recorded in a more appropriate setting; cf. Nearchus *ap.* Arrian, *Ind.* 18. 11, where when starting down the Hydaspes Alexander sacrifices to Poseidon, Amphitrite, the Nereids, &c. (this no doubt is a genuine instance), and *Anab.* i. 11. 10, where he is said to have made libations to Poseidon and the Nereids when crossing the Hellespont.

15. εὐφ[αγια]ζετο δὲ καὶ νυκτι: cf. the passage of Curtius cited in the n. on ll. 6 sqq. Sacrifice is repeatedly mentioned by the historians of Alexander, and according to Arrian vii. 25. 2 it was his daily habit.

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

1-3. l. e. g. εἰς φνῆν ὠρμη]σαν, which happens to be the phrase of Diodorus at this

point (xvii. 34. 7). The statement here is in substantial agreement with the account of Arrian ii. 10-11, who says that Darius fled as soon as he saw his left wing giving way, but that the Greek mercenaries in the centre stood their ground and fought well until attacked on their exposed left flank.

7-8. Cf. Diodor. xvii. 34. 9 *πᾶς ὁ συνεχῆς τόπος νεκρῶν ἐπληρώθη*, but this was a conventional phrase which reappears e. g. xvii. 61. 2.

9-15. Cf. Diodor. xvii. 35. 1-2 *οἱ δὲ Μακεδόνες παυσάμενοι τοῦ διωγμοῦ πρὸς ἀρπαγὴν ὤρμησαν καὶ μάλιστα περὶ τὰς βασιλικὰς σκηνὰς διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς πολυτελείας ἡσχολοῦντο, κτλ.*, Plutarch, *Alex.* 20 *κατέλαβε τοὺς Μακεδόνας τὸν μὲν ἄλλον πλοῦτον ἐκ τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ στρατοπέδου φέροντας καὶ ἄγοντας ὑπερβάλλοντα πλῆθει*, Curtius iii. 11. 20.

18. *δρ|μου*: the vestiges do not suggest *ο*, but are not inconsistent with the irregular formation of that letter as sometimes found in this text. *με|χρi .]* *λλου* could be read.

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

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

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

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

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

v. The remains of this column are insufficient to afford a clear clue to its subject. In l. 19 *εν ι|σσω* seems not unlikely.

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

3. Perhaps *α|νω*.

Fr. 46. Since the verso of this fragment contains words beginning with *κ* (1802. 1) it came later in the roll than Fr. 45.

Frs. 47-54 = 1802. 4-11. The character of the writing on the verso suggests that Fr. 50 came from the neighbourhood of Fr. 48, and Fr. 53 from that of Fr. 49.

Fr. 49. 5. ο of το has apparently been converted from ε.

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

1799. ORATORICAL FRAGMENT.

9.9 × 9 cm.

Second century.

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

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

Col. i.	Col. ii.
	[.]εσ[.]
	[.]. γα[.]
	[.]τι[.]
	[.]πρ[.]
]	5 [.]. νησε[.]
]. . .	[.]βετα τοτ[.]
]να	[.]ς δη τα πρ[.]
]ασ	[.] εις οπερ το[.]
]ν	[Δημ]οσθενης τι δει κ[αθ] εκα
5]ε	10 στον λεγειν των ν[.]
]α	προειρημενων η[.]
? απ]αξ	τετολμημενων [επειδη?
]ει	τα μεν παρ α(ν)του λ[εχ]θεν
]. α	τα αληθη και συμ[φε]ροντα

10]τον	15 δια τελους φαιν[ε]τ[αι] τη
] επει	πολει καν ει καθ εκα[στον
]ειμι .	αυτω μονω προσεσχομε̄
]ο[. .]	παντ αν εσωζετο ει δ ανα
] . . .	τετροφο{ν}τες απαντα και
15]ο	20 λελυμασμεν[οι] ητ]ε <αναιτιος ?>
]ν	ουτ[ο]σι ου γαρ . . [. .] παλιw Φι
]τα	[λι]ππος ουδ αι τολ[μα]ι Μακε
] .	δωνων ουδ ανδραγαθια
]	των εκεινου στρατηγων ου
20]ε	25 δ η των ημετερων ολιγωρι
]το	α ουδ ως η δυναμις η των
]	εκεινου θαυμαστη τις η
]ν	δε της πολεως ασθeneης
]	αυτη γαρ εστιν η και τον Περ
. . .	30 σην εξελεσασα βασιλεα
	γης και θαλαττης αλλ ει δει
	[το α]ληθ[ε]ς ειπειν το παν τ[ου
	[τ ε]γειν[ε]τ]ο δη μονον τ . [. .
	[.]γε . [. .]αχ[. . .] . . ε[. . .
	35 [. .]ε . [

9-10. κ[αθ εκα]στον is very uncertain, but seems to suit the construction. υ[might be e. g. υ[εον.

11. Not η τ[ων] nor, apparently, η κ[αι].

20-1. A blank space sufficient for four or five letters has been left at the end of l. 20, and the sentence is apparently incomplete. If ουτ[ο]σι ου γαρ is right, the apodosis may be completed in some such way as suggested in the text; but there is barely room for the second ο of ουτ[ο]σι, which, however, is sometimes written very small in this hand. At the end of l. 21 φι is not satisfactory, since more of the vertical stroke of φ would be expected to be visible, though the surface of the papyrus is damaged here; moreover, λι can barely be got into the lacuna at the beginning of the following line (the division Φι|ππος would be contrary to rule). But εκεινου in ll. 24 and 27 clearly point to a mention of the Macedonian king earlier in the context. With regard to the word after γαρ, the ink in the first letter has run somewhat and the reading is doubtful; ην[is perhaps more suitable than υμ[but neither is convincing.

27. η at the end of the line has been corrected from ου, whether by the original or a subsequent hand is difficult to say.

1800. MISCELLANEOUS BIOGRAPHIES.

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

The handwriting of the following fragments, from a roll containing various biographies, is a fine specimen of the common oval type, and may be referred to the latter part of the second century more probably perhaps than the beginning of the third. The columns as usual are inclined slightly to the right. One apparent instance of a high stop, probably a later insertion, occurs in Fr. 1. 40. Short lines are filled up by means of the angular sign commonly used for that purpose. Whether the few small corrections are by the original or a later hand is doubtful. A small coronis marks the conclusion of sections. The titles prefixed to the biographies are sometimes enclosed by the short slightly curved strokes often employed in the colophons of literary papyri.

As at present reconstituted the papyrus consists of 30 fragments, of which a few are fairly substantial, but their relative position, except in a few instances, is uncertain. If, as is possible, the top of Fr. 3. i is concerned with Thucydides (cf. note *ad loc.*), that fragment must have followed Fr. 2, and there is no doubt about the order of Frs. 4-7; but otherwise the arrangement adopted is often more or less arbitrary. The biographies which can be identified are of Sappho (Fr. 1. i, ii), Simonides (Fr. 1. ii), Aesop (Fr. 2. i, ii), Thucydides (Fr. 2. ii, Fr. 3. i?), Demosthenes (Fr. 3. i, ii), Aeschines (Fr. 3. ii), Thrasybulus (Frs. 4-7), Hyperides (Fr. 8. ii), Leucocomas (Fr. 8. ii), and Abderus (Fr. 11). This is a strange medley, and no intelligible principle seems to have guided the compiler either in the choice of his characters or their grouping. They are mainly literary, but the soldier-politician Thrasybulus does not come under that category, and Leucocomas and Abderus are entirely mythical. The inclusion of the former, whose name will not be familiar to many, is singular; Abderus was at least the eponymous hero of a considerable town. As for the disposition of the Lives, like sometimes consorts with like: two lyric poets, both beginning with the same letter, figure in Fr. 1, and in Fr. 3 Aeschines is appropriately placed next to Demosthenes. But a reason why Thucydides should have been sandwiched between Demosthenes and Aesop, or Leucocomas should rub shoulders with Hyperides, is not easy to imagine. Nor are the biographies themselves, so far as they go, of much moment. Concerning Sappho there is nothing new beyond a variant of her father's name, and the statement that Charaxus was her eldest brother. The aspersion on her character, mentioned also, among Greek authorities, by Suidas, reappears here at a much earlier date. Reference is made in this section to the Grammarian Chameleon, the only citation in 1800 of a definite authority;

elsewhere the compiler contents himself with the vague 'some say' or the like. A mutilated passage referring to Simonides' reputed innovation in the alphabet apparently has the negative merit of differing from the statement in Suidas (cf. A. Kirchoff, *Gesch. des Griech. Alphabets*, p. 1). Of the death of Aesop, who was a favourite subject for biography (fragments of three Lives of Aesop have already been found in papyri, of the 4th-7th centuries; cf. Collart, *Rev. de Philol.* xliii, pp. 38 sqq.), there is a circumstantial account, including some new but not very valuable details. The Lives of Thucydides and of Hyperides are too fragmentary to be informative; of Demosthenes little that is fresh could be expected, and the only novelty is a blunder, on a par with the statement that Aeschines was the eldest of his father's sons, which Aeschines himself refutes. An anecdote, found also in Plutarch, about the generosity of Demosthenes to his defeated rival is given with greater elaboration in the account of the latter. One would gladly have had more of the section concerning Thrasybulus, which included some details not otherwise known, although errors like those just noticed do not give a good impression of the accuracy of the writer,—regarding whose identity we are entirely in the dark.

Fr. 1.

Col. i.

.]

περι Σαπφ[ους

[Σαπφω το μεν γενος] ην Δε
[σβια πολεως δε Μιτ]υληνης

5 [πατρος δε Σκαμ]ανδρου κα
[τα δε τινας Σκα]μανδρων
[μου αδελφους δ] εσχε τρεις
[Ερ]ι[γνιον και Λα]ριχον πρε
σβυ[τατον δε Χαρ]αξον ος πλεν

10 σασ ε[ις Αιγυπτον] Δωριχαι τι
νι προσο[μλητ]ης κατεδα
πανησεν εις ταυτην πλει
στα του δε Λαριχον (νεον) οντα μαλ
λον ηγαπησεν θυγατερα δ ε

15 σχε Κλειν ομωνυμον τη ε
αυτης μητρι κ[α]τηγορηται

Col. ii.

.

περιτ[13 letters ωσ?

περ Χαμαιλεω[ν

30 τιος επλανηθ[η

απ αυτου λεγει [. . . Αιολιδι?

διαλεκτωι κεχρ[η γε

γραφεν δε βυβλ[ια εννεα μεν

λυρικα ελεγειω[ν δε και αλλων?

35 εν

>—

περι Σιμ[ωνιδου]

Σιμωνιδης το μεν [γενος ην

Κειος πολεως δε Ιου]λιδος

πατρος δε Λεοπρεπο[υς γεγο

40 νεν δε φιλαργυρος' τ[ινες

δ αυτωι την των μυ[ημο

νικων ευρεσιν προσ[τιθεα

δ υπ εν[ι]ω[ν] ως ατακτος ου
 [σα] τον τροπον και γυναικε
 [ρασ]τρια την δε μορφην
 20 [εν]καταφρονητος δοκει γε
 [γον]ε[να]ι κα[ι] δυσειδεστατη[[ν]]
 [τ]ην μεν γαρ οψιν φαιωδης
 [ν]πηρχεν το δε μεγεθος >
 μεικρα παντεως το δ αυτο
 25 [συ]μβεβηκε και περι του
 [. . . .]ν ελαττω [. .] γεγωνα
 [15 letters] . ην

σιν· και αυτος δε που [τουτο
 φαινει δια των επιγ[ραμ
 45 μα[τ]ων προσευρε[ν] δε φα
 σιν [αυ]τον τινες και δ . [. . .
 κε[. . .]στον των κδ απ[. .
 τ . [. . .] . εν . [.]ησασ[.]εν[. .

Fr. 2.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

Col. iii.

	30	[. . . .] των Δελ[φων	
		[. . . .] ενωνυμ . [. . . .] .	
		[εστ]ιν δ αιτια τοια[υτη]{ι} ει	
		ρ[η]μενη{ι} επαν [εισε]λθη	
		τ[ις] τωι θεωι θυσιασ[ων] ο[ι] Δελ	
	35	φ[ο]ι περι[ι]εστηκασι τον βω	
		μ[ο]ν υφ εαυτοις μαχαιρας	
5		κ[ο]μιζοντες σφαγιασα	75 . [
		μενου δε του ιερειου και	. [
		δειραντος το ιερειον και	.
	40	τα σπλαγχνα περιεξελο	
		μενου οι περιεστωτες ε	
10		καστος ην αν ισχυση	
		μοιραν αποτεμνομενος	
		απεισιν ως πολλακισ τον	
	45	θυσιασαντα αυτον αμοι	
		ρ[ο]ν απι(ε)ναι τουτο ουν Αι	
15		[σ]ωπ[ο]ς Δελφους ονιδ[ι]ζων	
		επεσκωψεν εφ οις διοργι	

	υτοις	σθεντες οι πολλοι λιθοις	
	ον μυ	50 αυτον βαλλοντες κατα	
[θ?	υσας δε	κρημνου εωσαν μετ ου	
20	λογων	πολυ δε λοιμικον παθος	
	? αποκριματων	επεσκηψε τη πολει χρη	
] εαυ	στηριαζομενοις δ αυτοις	
[τ	μενοι	55 ο θεος ανειπεν ου προτε >	
	σοφι	ρον [ληξ]ειν τον νοσ[ον με	
25]ε φιλοσο	χρισ [αν Α]ισωπον εξ[ι]λαο	
[φ] . προς	[κωντ]αι οι δε περιτει [>	
]σεν	[χισ]αντες τον τοπον [εν	
]ηι	60 [ωι κ]ατεπεσεν βωμο[ν θ]ι	
]ν	δ[ρυσα]μενοι λυτηρ[ι]ο[υ]ς	
		της νοσου ως ηρωι θ[υσιας	
		προ[σ]ηνεγκαν	

>

	περι Θουκνδι[δου	
65	Θουκνδιδης το μεν γε[νος	
	ην Αθηναιος παι[ς δ Ο]λο	σθ[ι]
	ρου διαβαλλουσι δε τον πα	αν[ι]
	τερα αυτου Θραικα οντα	κα[ι]
	εις Αθηνας μετοικισθη	80 θ .
70	ναι δυνατος δε εν λογοις α	γ[ι]
	νηρ γ[εν]αμενος ανεγρα	μ[ι]
	ψεν το[ν] γενομενον Αθη	τ[ι]
	ναιοις [και] Πελοποννη >	
	[σιοις πολεμον	

Fr. 3.

Col. i.

[
 [.....]. εν[...
 [.....]. ετων [..

Col. ii.

25 [γε]υσαμενος του φ[αρμα
 [κ]ου συντομῶς εξε[πνευ
 [σε] μεχρι τελ[ο]υς το της [ε

[.....]. υπ[...]
 5 [.....]σα .. [.]..... [.....
 [.....]υ επι της α .. [.....
 [Αθη]γαιοι κενοταφ[ιον εστη
 σαν δημοσια εν Α .. [.....
 σι των δημων

> —
 10 περι Δημοσθεν[ο]υ[ς]
 Δημοσθενης ο ρητωρ Αθη
 ναιος μεν ην το γενος
 παις δε Δημοσθενου[ς] Παι
 ανιευς δε των δημων
 15 κομιδη δε νηπιος υπο >
 του πατρος απειλειφθη υ
 πο επιτροπ[οις] Ογητορι
 και Αφοβωι γεν[ομεν]ος
 δ εφ ηλικιας επ[ε]δ[ε]ι[ξ]ατ[ο]
 20 την εν λογοις δεινοτητα
 κρινα[ς] του[ς] επιτροπ[ου]ς
 ων ε[νοσφισ]αντο χρημα [
 των [αυτου ει]ς δε το βη [
 μα [παρελθων] αριστ[α

[λε]υθεριας [αξ]ιωμα δι[α
 [φ]υλαξας Αθ[η]ναιοι δε πα [
 30 [λι]ν την ελευθεριαν α
 νακτησαμενοι ετιμη
 σαν αυτου εικονα χαλκη[ν
 αναστησαντες εν Κερα [
 μικωι επιγραμμα τε [εν
 35 στηληι ενεκολαψαν το[ι
 ονδε ειπερ ισαν γνωμα[ι
 ρωμαν Δημοσθενες εσχες
 ουποτ αν Ελληνων ηρ >
 ξεν Αρης Μακεδων

> —
 40 περι Αισχινου
 Αισχινης ο ρητωρ το μεν γε
 νος ην [Αθ]ηναιος παις δε
 Ατρομητου και μητρος
 Γλαυκοθεας πρεσβυτατος
 45 των αδελφων Φιλοχαρους
 και Λαοφο[β]ου κατ αρχας δε
 ετριταγωνιστει τραγωιδιοις
 ὑποκρινομενος ευφυης
 δ εν λογοις γενομενος
 50 αντι της σκηνης το των
 Αθηναιων βημα διεδε
 ξατο γραφομενος δε Κτη
 σιφοντα παρανομων
 οτι μη δεοντως εστεφα
 55 νωσε Δημοσθενη χρυ
 σωι στεφανωι καινοις
 τραγωιδιοις ου μεταλα
 βων δε το πεμπτον με
 ρος των ψήφων φυγας
 60 εξηει των Αθηνων
 Δημοσθενης δε ου μνη

σικακησας επι τοις γεγε
 νημενοις το δε αστατον
 της τυχης ευλαβηθεις ε
 65 [φοδ]ιον αυτωι αργυριου
 [ταλ]αντον προσεπεμψεν
 [ο δε] ου δεξαμενος εδα
 [κρυ]σεν πυνθανομενου
 [δε τ]ινος επι τινη δακρυοι
 70 [ειπ]ε οτι τοιαυτης πολεως
 [απα]λλαττομαι εν ηι και
 [εχθρο]ι συνπαθε[σ]τεροι
 [φιλω]ν ευρισκ[οντα]ι γενο
 [μενος δε εν] Ρ[οδωι] σχολην
 75 [.] Αττικον
 [.] Ροδιοις

Frs. 4 + 5.

ναιοι[
 μητ[
 δε τ[
 κτο[
 5 λει[
 οπε[.] . α[
 > [περι] Θρασυβ[ουλου]
 Θρ[ασυβο]υλος παι[ς μεν ην Λυκου
 [το δε γ]εν[ο]ς Αθη[ναιο]ς Στει
 10 [ριευς] δε των δ[ημων]
 [.] . λε πατ[

Frs. 6 + 7.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

.
 [.]ρα[. . .] . . . [. . .] . . .
 [. . . ? συ]ν αυτωι απο Φυλης
 [? καταγο]υσι τον δημον ως
 [δε κατε]λυθησαν οι τρια
 5 [κοντα] εγραψεν ψηφισμα
 [Θρασυβ]ουλος μεταδιδους
 [αυτοις ?] της πολιτειας α
 [προβου]λευτου δε του ψη
 [φισματος] γεναμενου ου
 10 [κ ετυχον ? τ]ης τιμης ο δε παν
 [.] . νας αγαπη . . .
 [σα]ς ελη[. . .] εν τοις δικα > δ[
 [στ]ηριο[ις . . .]ς κινδυνευ α[
 [. . .] . . . [.] ως δ εκωλυ . . .
 15 [θη ?] ψηφ[.]

Fr. 8.

Col. i.

]μη
]ηδε
]σθετα
]οισιν
 5] απο
]οσχα
]τους
]σπερ αυ
 τω]ν Αθηναι
 10 [ων] αναχθ[ει]ς
]ιαν προσ
] μετα τον
 θ]ανατον
 απ]ωλεσ[. .]
 15]ροσ
]ν
]τα
]τε
]>

Col. ii.

20 αθεως [ευγενεια[επει δε ?
 η Αθηναι[ων στρατεια ? περι
 Λαμιαν της [Θεσσαλιας
 συνητυχησ[εν ως συνερ
 25 γος τωι Δημο[σθενει ων
 ὑπο Αντιπατ[ρου εν τοις
 δεκα ρητορσι]ητηθη και παν ?
 των ατυχησ[ας
 αυτος εν Μακ[εδονιαι α
 30 πωλετο Αθη]ναιοι δε πα
 [λ]ιν την ελευθ[εριαν ανακο
 μισαμενοι κα[. αυ
 [τ]ον ανδριασιν ε[τιμησαν
 > [περι] Λευκοκ[ομα
 35 Λευκ[οκομ]ας το γε[νος μεν
 ην Κρη[s] πολεω[s δε Κνω
 σου μιρ[ακισ]κος [δε ων ευ
 πρεπη[s]

Fr. 9.

. λ]ογος αυ[. . .
] πολιτευσ[α
 [.]υσι και ιδι[ω
 [των ου]δευι της ελευ[θε
 5 [ριας]στη ως δε τοτε
 []ανα
 []>

Fr. 10.

.] . [. . . .
]εδιδου
]ανον της
]ς θανων
 5]ς παρα
]υς γ . [.

Fr. 11.

[.] . υδ[
 [περι Αβδηρου
 Α]βδη[ρος εν Θρα?
 κηι τ[
 5 εν Ἰω[νιαι
 καμ . [
 ανα[
 τρεφ[
 γης α[

Fr. 12.

.
 [.]σ[
 γενεσ[θα]ι απ[
 εχοντων πρα[ε
 ρωτησιυ αυτος [
 5 ψαμ[ε]νο[
 πεν[.] . [
 τωι [.]αθειν [
 τρο[ι]ς χρησα[η
 μαρτεν σεσ[
 10 [γ]αρ θεασαμ[εν
 [.]ν προβατο[
 [ε]υξαμενο[ε
 [χ]θρον καθη[
 παι μη σαλ[
 15 . υτη[
 ωνε[
 [.]γ[

Fr. 13.

]σενια[
]οτατο[

Fr. 15.

.
]υτω[
]πα[
]θου[
]γετο[
 5]αρτ . [
]υσιασ[
]λων[
]νεπε[
]κωι ι[

Fr. 14.

.
]υσια[
]ρμεν[
]ητηι . [
]ο δε την [
 5] . εσων [
]γτ[

Fr. 16.

.
] . [
]ωρι[
]ομενο . [
]ν . [
 5]δημ[
]νγνω[
] . ησας ου[

Fr. 17.

.
 [.] . . [
 πυλ[

Fr. 18.

.
 . [.] . .
 σαντ[

Fr. 19.

.
 . ιταγ[
 ων και μ[

Fr. 20.

.
]ασ[
]γενο[

Inscr. Gr. 191) but is not attributed to Sappho's father elsewhere. Charaxus is called the son of Scamandronymus by Hdt. *l. c.*, and this is one of the several alternatives in Suidas to Simon, which he considered correct.

8. [Ερ]ι[γνιον : in Suidas s. v. Σαπφώ, where alone this brother is mentioned, the name is spelled Εύρύγιος, and [Ε]υ[ρ. could equally well be read here, but cf. Arrian iii. 6. 8 Ἐρίγιος ὁ Λαρίχου, Diod. xvii. 81, 83; moreover in Suidas, *l. c.*, the name of Sappho's father was according to some authorities Ἡερίγνος, which is no doubt a corruption of Ἐρίγ.

Λαρίχον : cf. Suidas, *l. c.*, Athen. x. 424 f.

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

10. Αἴγυπτον suits the space better than Ναυκρατιν (Strab. xvii. 808, Athen. 596 b). Δωρίχα occurs in 1231. 1. 11; cf. Strab. *l. c.* τῆς εταίρας . . . ἦν Σαπφὼ μὲν . . . καλεῖ Δωρίχαν . . . ἄλλοι δ' ὀνομάζουσι Ῥοδῶπιν (ἄλλοι include Hdt. ii. 135; cf. Athen. 596 c).

11. προσο[μ(ε)ιλησ]as, which would be expected, cannot be read, the letter preceding s having a vertical stroke consistent with η or ι, but neither προσο[μιλητ]ης nor προς ο[μιλια]ς is satisfactory with the dative Δωριχαι. Possibly a verb has dropped out, or προσομιλησης may have been written in error.

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

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

16-18. Cf. Suid. *l. c.* εταῖραι δὲ αὐτῆς καὶ φίλαι γεγόνασι γ' . . . , πρὸς ἅς καὶ διαβολὴν ἔσχεν αἰσχρᾶς φιλίας.

19-24. Cf. Max. Tyr. 24. 10 Σαπφὼ . . . καίτοι μικρὰν καὶ μέλαιναν.

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

γεγονα is probably for γεγονοτα, since there is not room for ελαττω[ν γαρ] γεγον(ε). Perhaps τε stood in the lacuna.

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

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

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

33-5. Cf. Suid. s. v. Σαπφώ ἔγραψε δὲ μελῶν λυρικῶν βιβλία θ' . . . καὶ ἐπιγράμματα καὶ ἐλεγεία καὶ ἰάμβους καὶ μονοδίας. The suggested restoration assumes what is quite uncertain, that the non-lyrical poems were included in a single book. ω of ἐλεγειω[ν is very doubtful, only a very small vestige remaining which would also suit α, but ἐλεγεια[κον δε would not fill the line, and the epigrams &c. ought not to have been ignored.

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

39. 1. Λεωπρ.

40. φιλάργυρος : cf. Pindar, *Isthm.* ii. 6 ἁ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδῆς κτλ., and Schol. νῦν,

φησί, μισθοῦ συντάττουσι τοὺς ἐπινικίους πρώτου Σιμωνίδου προκαταρξαμένου . . . ἔνθεν καὶ Καλλίμαχος. οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω τὴν Μοῦσαν, ὡς ὁ Κείος Ὑλλίχου νέπους. λέγει δὲ (sc. Πίνδαρος) ταῦτα πρὸς Σιμ., ὡς φιλάργυρον διασύρων τὸν ἄνδρα, Athen. 656 d ὄντως ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς κίμβιξ ὁ Σιμ. καὶ αἰσχροκερδῆς, ὡς Χαμαιλέον φησίν, Schol. Aristoph. *Pax* 691, Suid. s. v. Σιμ. &c.

40-5. Cf. *Marm. Par.* 54 Σιμ. . . ὁ τὸ μνημονικὸν εὐρών, Suid. s. v. Σιμ., καὶ τὴν μνημονικὴν δὲ τέχνην εὐρεν οὗτος, Pliny, *H. N.* vii. 24, &c., and Simonid. Fr. 146 μνήμην δ' οὐτινά φημι Σιμωνίδῃ ἰσοφαρίζειν ὀγδωκονταῖται παιδι Λεωπρέπεος, which is presumably the epigram referred to.

45 sqq. From the number 24 in l. 47 it is evident that this passage describes an invention concerning the alphabet, which is also attributed to Simonides by Suidas, *l. c.* προσεξεῦρε δὲ καὶ τὰ μακρὰ τῶν στοιχείων καὶ διπλᾶ, but the statement in the papyrus does not coincide and a suitable restoration remains to be found. At the beginning of l. 47 either κε[or χε[may be read, and στοι|χε[ια suggests itself, but δι|πλα στοι|χεια would be too long and does not well accord with the rest of the line. The letter before στ is either ο or ω, and απ[may be αγ[.

48. ευ : ορ σν ; σσς[τ]ησας is possible.

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

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

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

33 sqq. Cf. Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1446 ὄν φασιν ἐλθόντα ποτὲ εἰς τοὺς Δελφοὺς ἀποσκῶψαι αὐτοῦς, ὅτι μὴ ἔχοιεν γῆν ἀφ' ἧς ἐργαζόμενοι διατρέφονται ἀλλὰ περιμένειν ἀπὸ τῶν θεοῦ θυμιαμάτων διαζῆν.

38. 1. ιερεις : ιερειου has come in from the next line.

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

51. κρημονου : the πέτρα Ὑάμπεια according to Plutarch, *l. c.*

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

64-74. 'Concerning Thucydides. Thucydides was by birth an Athenian, and the son of Olorus; his father is maligned as being a Thracian who migrated to Athens. Having literary skill he wrote the history of the war between the Athenians and Peloponnesians.'

67-9. Cf. the anonymous Life Γ Θράκιον δὲ αὐτῶ τὸ γένος· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῶ Ὀλορος ἐκ Θράκης εἶχε τοῦνομα.

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

Fr. 3. 1-9. If these lines relate to Thucydides, Fr. 3. i may be supposed to follow immediately Fr. 2. iii. Those two columns cannot be combined into one on account of the vestiges in Fr. 2. 75-6, which do not suit the beginnings of Fr. 3. 8-9. Whether the historian died abroad or at Athens was disputed. For the tradition of a cenotaph cf. Marcellinus, *Vita Thuc.* 31 ἕκριν γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ τάφου κείσθαι, τοῦ κενοταφίου δὲ τοῦτο γνώρισμα εἶναι. But according to the same authority, 17 (cf. 32 and 55), the tomb was among the *Κιμόνια μνήματα πρὸς ταῖς Μελιτίσι πύλαις ἐν Κοίλῃ*, which does not suit the deme-name in ll. 8-9, and the reference of this passage to Thucydides is therefore very questionable. The letter after a in l. 8 seems to be μ or λ, pointing to Ἀμαξαντεύσι, Ἀλαιεύσι or Ἀλωπεκεύσι: Ἀλιμουντι (Thucydides' deme) can certainly not be read. In l. 6 αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀττ[ικῆς] suggests itself, and Ἀττ[ικῆς] is not inconsistent with the scanty remains. In l. 7 αἰοι or λιοι is more suitable than νοι.

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

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

22. [νοσφισ]αυτο: cf. Plutarch, *Dem.* 4 τὰ μὲν νοσφισαμένων, τὰ δ' ἀμελησάντων.

24. *παρελθων* suits the space better than *αναστας*.

25-6. Cf. Plutarch, *X Oral. Vit.* 847 a ἀποθανεῖν δ' αὐτὸν Φιλόχορος μὲν φησι φάρμακον πιόντα, Σάτυρος δ' ὁ συγγραφεὺς τὸν κάλαμον πεφαρμάχθαι . . . οὐ γενεσάμενον ἀποθανεῖν, Ἐρατοσθένης δὲ . . . περὶ τῷ βραχίονι κρίκον περικεῖσθαι πεφαρμαγμένον. . . οἱ δ' εἶπον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν σφραγίδα φαρμάκου γενεσάμενον (sc. ἀποθανεῖν).

32-3. Cf. Plutarch, *Dem.* 30 ὁ τῶν Ἀθ. δῆμος . . . εἰκόνα τε χαλκῆν ἀνέστησε. According to Plutarch, *X Oral. Vit.* 847 a, the statue was πλεσιόν τοῦ περισχουίσματος καὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν: Suidas says ἐν ἀγορᾷ. αὐτον rather than αὐτου is expected.

34-9. The epigram is quoted also by Plutarch, *ll. cc.*, and Suidas, who rightly give ἕσσην ῥώμην γνώμη. Plutarch, *Dem.* 30, and Suidas say that it was on the base of the statue.

40-74. 'Concerning Aeschines. Aeschines the orator was an Athenian by birth, the son of Atrometus and Glaucothea, and the eldest of the family, his brothers being Philochares and Laophobus. At first he was a tragic actor in minor parts, but being a naturally clever speaker exchanged the stage for the tribune at Athens. He indicted Ctesiphon for unconstitutional action in wrongly crowning Demosthenes with a gold crown when the new tragedies were brought out, but failing to get a fifth part of the votes he left Athens as an exile. Demosthenes, however, bearing no malice for what had taken place and taking heed of the fickleness of fortune sent him a talent of silver for the expenses of

his journey; but he refused it and wept. When he was asked why he wept he said "Because I am leaving a city where even enemies are found more sympathetic than friends". He went to Rhodes and kept a school . . .

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

46. Λαοφο[β]ου: l. Αφοβητου; cf. Aeschin. *l. c.*

56-7. καινους τραγωιδους: i. e. at the Dionysia.

61-73. This story is not mentioned in the biographies of Aeschines, but is given by Plutarch, *X Orat. Vit.* 845 e, though apart from the amount the details are quite different. The passage is:—φεύγοντος δ' Αισχίνου μετά την καταδίκην, ἵππῳ κατεδίωξεν αὐτόν (sc. Δημοσθένης): τοῦ δ' οἰηθέντος αὐτὸν συλλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ προσπεσόντος καὶ συγκαλυψαμένου, ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν παρεμβήσατο καὶ τάλαντον ἔδωκεν ἀργυρίου.

72-3. [εχθρο]ι and [φιλω]ν Murray.

74. Cf. Plutarch, *X Orat. Vit.* 840 d ἀπάρας εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον ἐνταῦθα σχολὴν καταστησάμενος ἐδίδασκειν . . . σχολὴν τ' ἐκεῖ προσκατέλιπε τὸ Ῥοδιακὸν διδασκαλεῖον κληθέν.

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

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

1. Possibly Πει[ρα]ι . . ., but the doubtful ρ may be any long letter—ν, φ, ψ.

2. συ]ν: the doubtful ν may equally be ι.

5 sqq. Cf. Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 40. 2 καὶ δοκεῖ τοῦτό τε πολιτεύεσθαι καλῶς Ἀρχίνος καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα γραφάμενος τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ Θρασυβούλου παρανόμων, ἐν ᾧ μετεδίδου τῆς πολιτείας πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ Πειραιέως συγκατελθοῦσι, ὧν ἔνιοι φανερώς ἦσαν δοῦλοι. A comparison of that passage suggests that δοῦλοι were mentioned in the lacuna preceding l. 2 αὐται ἀπο Φυλῆς, and that αὐτοῖς or πασιν should be restored in l. 7; but ll. 11-15 are more difficult.

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

11. νας is preceded by the base of a vertical stroke (η or ι).

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

Fr. 8. ii. 20-33. The references in this passage indicate that the subject is Hyperides, who took an active part in the Lamian war (l. 23; cf. Plutarch, *X Orat. Vit.* 849 f, *Phocion* 23), was one of the orators whose surrender was demanded by Antipater after the battle of Crannon (l. 26), and according to some accounts was put to death in Macedonia (l. 29; cf. Plutarch, *X Orat. Vit.* 849 b Ἐρμιππος δὲ φησιν αὐτὸν γλωττίομηθῆναι εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἐλθόντα).

22-3. For the loose reference to Lamia cf. e. g. Pausan. vii. 10. 4 ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ ἐν Λαμῖα πταῖσμα ἐγένετο.

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

30-3. Cf. Fr. 3. 29-31. Perhaps κα[λλι]στοις in l. 32.

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

34 sqq. The story of Leucocomas and Promachus is known only from Canon 16. The passage is: τὰ περὶ Προμάχου καὶ Λευκοκόμα τῶν Γνωσσίων . . . διέξεισιν' ὡς ἦρα Πρόμαχος νεανίου καλοῦ τοῦ Λευκοκόμα' ὡς ἄλλα αὐτῷ μεγάλα προὔτεινε καὶ κινδύνων μεστά' ὡς πάντα ὑπέστη Πρόμαχος ἐλπίδι τοῦ τυχεῖν' ὡς δὲ οὐχ οὕτω τυγχάνει, καὶ ἀντιλυπεῖ Λευκοκόμαν τὸ τελευταῖον τῶν ἄθλων (κράνος δ' ἦν περιβόητον) ἐν ἑτέρῳ καλῷ νεανία ὄρωντος περιθεῖς τοῦ Λευκοκόμα' καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἐνεγκὼν τὴν ζηλοτυπίαν ξίφει ἑαυτὸν διεχρήσατο.

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

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

4. κηι: or ληι, but Θρα|κηι suits the context.

5. For Ιω[μαι cf. 841. II. 1-3 [Ναῦ]δος Θρονίας "Αβδηρε . . . [σέθ]εν 'Ιάονι τόνδε λαῶ [παι]ᾶνα [δι]ώξω and the Schol. ἄποικοι γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ 'Αβδηρίται [Τηίων, Τέως] δ' ἐστὶ τῆς 'Ιωνίας πόλις.

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

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

Fr. 21. 2. ? δη]μεσας was probably the end of the line, as is indicated by the diminution in size of the three last letters, as well as by a short blank space after φυ in l. 4.

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

1801. GLOSSARY.

13 x 10.6 cm.

First century.

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

margin, and are also followed by short blank spaces; similar spaces are used to indicate a pause in the body of the note, and in one instance (l. 21) an oblique dash fulfils the same purpose.

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

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

On the verso of the papyrus are remains of two columns, written in a small upright hand dating perhaps from about the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, from a treatise on grammar. In Col. ii, after referring to the declension [Δ]ρακωνος Δρακωνι (cf. Choerob. *In Theod. Can.* p. 79, Gaisf.), a new section begins ¹² Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀστὴρ βατῆρ κ[αὶ τῶν ὁμοι ¹³ ὦν ἐπιλαμβάνεται Κ[. ¹⁴ λεγῶν μὴ εἶσθαι [τῶν τούτων ἀριθ ¹⁵ μὸν μῆδε δύνασθαι τ[. ¹⁶ τῆς (ἠ corr.) ἀναλογίας Ἑλλην[ισμὸν ? οὐκ ὀρ ¹⁷ θῶς ἐπειδὴ τὰ ὁμοία οὐ[τα ο ¹⁸ μοῖως σχηματίζεται [οὕτω γὰρ ἀν ¹⁹ λεγοῖτο πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι . . .

Col. i.

- [.....]με . [
 [.....]αν ε[
 [.....]υτον λ[
 [.....] τετταρα[. . .]τα ι
 5 [.....] . ωλιβαμ . [.]κευτ[.]
 [.....]
 [βειρακες ι]ερακες αι γλαυκε(s) παρα
 [.....]
 [β.....]εις και στρατον π[.] . .]
 10 [..... Σοφοκ]λης δε εν Σαλ[μ]φ[νει]
 [.....] . προστασιμον της
 [.....] συμπ . . . γ πα[.]
 [.....] . [.]ον λο . [.....]
 [.....]
 15 [β.....] και Ευπολις εν
 [.....]μας ουτι που πολ
 [λ.....] εν Σατυροις αλλ οταν
 [.....]ς σαφ ιστε και σοφοις
 [.....] . εκανον αρσεμονον
 20 [.....]αι
 [βελεκος Αριστοφανη]ς εν Πολυιδωι / και
 [των βελεκων λεγ]ει δε περι αυτων
 [..... ? λογον] τουτον εστιν
 [.....] . . . [.]ες πᾱρα τοις την
 25 [.....] . [ωσ]περ ο πισος και λα
 [θυρος ομοιος?]ι κριωπωι το μεγε
 [θος 15 letters βελε]κον καλουσιν
 [.....] . [.....]

Col. ii.

- [.....]ν η[
 30 [.....]ην[

Fr.

. . .
 61] β[. .]τ[
]διδο[
] . [

4. There seems to have been no other letter in front of the doubtful ι, which might also be a dash like that in l. 21.

7. Cf. Hesych. βείρακες· ἰέρακες. It is not possible to read η or και before γλαυκε(ς), though one of those words should perhaps be restored. ο could well be read in place of αι but would be unintelligible. The similar gloss of Hesychius βάραξ· ἰέραξ παρὰ Λίβυσι suggests that Λίβυσι may be the name in the lacuna after παρα; but the name may also have been that of the author who used the form.

10. Σαλ[μ]ω[ρει] is consistent with the remains, which do not suit Σαυροῖς (cf. l. 17).

11. προστασιμον is apparently novel.

13. ον: perhaps σω.

16.]μας ουτι: or]μα σου τι.

19. The first letter may be e. g. β, δ, ρ. Neither αρσε for αρσαι nor ἄρ σε is attractive in this context.

21-7. Cf. Etym. Magn. βελέκκοι· ὄσπριαι· καὶ τῶν βελέκκων, Ἄριστοφάνης, Hesych. βέλεκος· ὄσπριον τι ἐμφερές λαθύρω μέγεθος ἐρεβίνθου ἔχον. The papyrus, besides giving the name of the play of Aristophanes, confirms the view of earlier editors that καὶ τῶν was part of the citation; Kock prints βελέκκων only (Fr. 755). Lines 23 sqq. are an excerpt from a prose writer who described the βέλεκος. κριωπός from κρίς (vetch) is unattested.

34 sqq. Cf. Hesych. s. v. δίλογχον, τὴν Βενδίν οὕτω Κρατίνος ἐν Θράτταις ἐκάλεσεν, ἦτοι ὅτι δύο τιμάς ἐκληρώσατο, οὐρανίαν τε καὶ χθονίαν . . . ἢ ὅτι δύο λόγχασι φέροι κτλ. From this it is plain that ll. 34-5 at any rate are part of a note on Βενδίν, of whom Hesych. says s. v., ἢ Ἄρτεμις, Θρακιστί· παρὰ δὲ Ἀθηναίους ἐορτὴ Βενδιδαία. How many of the preceding lines were included in the note (to which the small fragment, ll. 61-3, perhaps belongs) is, however, uncertain, nor is it clear whether ll. 36-9 are all part of the same excerpt from Cratinus.]ιμην in l. 36 is possibly τ]ιμην (cf. Hesych. δύο τιμάς). In l. 37 κωμικαί is apparently not to be read, unless ω was here written differently from those elsewhere. In l. 38 τινασ[σ]ει is not impossible.

40. Cf. Hesych. βέμβιξ . . . δίνη. If, however, αρ[is Ἄριστοφάνης, as is natural to suppose, the name of the play seems to have been omitted, contrary to the compiler's usual practice. βεμβικες εγ|χ|ενεσ]θων (Vesp. 1530) suggests itself, and might not be too long if Ἀριστοφ(ανης) were written; πε|ρ|ι ορυ]θων (Av. 1461) is a not very satisfactory alternative.

42. Cf. Hesych. Βελβίνα· κόμη Λακωνική.

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

45. l. [B]ερεσχεθοι. Cf. Schol. Aristoph. Eq. 635 B. δὲ οἱ ἀνόητοι πέπλασται δὲ ἡ λέξις, and the similar note in Suidas.

46-7. Ach. 345.

48-9. Cf. Hesych. βεβυσμένον· πλήρες. Suidas cites Aristoph. Ach. 463, but γη (πυγή?) βεβυσμένη is from a non-extant play.

50-5. Antiphanes of Berga was a byword for his mendacity, and hence Βεργαῖος acquired a similar connotation; cf. e. g. Strabo ii. 100 τὸ δὲ Βεργαῖον διήγημα τοῦτο ἐν πίστει μέρει τιθείς. Steph. Byz. says that a verb βεργαΐζειν was also coined.

55. Βεργη: so Strabo vii. 331, Steph. Byz.; Βέργα Ptol. iii. 13, &c.

56. Cf. Eustath. 632. 8 ἐν δὲ ῥητορικῷ Λεξικῷ εὔρηται καὶ Βέλλερος λεγόμενος, Hesych. Βέλλερος ὑπὸ Βελλεροφόντου κτανθείς. ἡ δὲ Βελλεροφόντης.

57-8. Cf. Hesych. βερβίνια· ξύλα καθλωμένα, ἐξ ὧν τὰς ληκύθους ἐκρέμων. The Στρατιῶται is the only known play of Hermippus beginning with Σ. As to the following words, the restoration depends on whether they are taken as a quotation (e. g. βερβινίων τας λ. κατι[γαγον]) or as explanatory (e. g. ξύλα ἐξ | ὦν, on the lines of Hesych.).

59-60. Cf. Hesych. βήρηκες· μᾶζαι ὄρθαι. οἱ δὲ ἀπλῶς μᾶζας. ἄλλοι μᾶζας ἄνωθεν κέρατα ἐχούσας, and βάραξ· . . . καὶ φύραμα στρογγύλον ἀφ' οὗ αἱ μᾶζαι, Eustath. 1414. 29.

62. Possibly Βεν]διδο[ς, in which case the fragment would come from the neighbourhood of ll. 34-5.

1802. GLOSSARY.

Fr. 3 14.3 × 34.3 cm.

Late second or early
third century.

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

As explained in the introd. to 1798, the two texts proceed in opposite directions and the glossary did not occupy the entire roll, many of the minor fragments of 1798 being blank on the verso. Since those fragments, so far as their contents are recognizable, are not separated from the rest by any wide interval, and the remains of the lexicon, which was on a considerable scale, include words beginning with *κ* to *μ*, the copy of this seems not to have been finished. Fr. 3 is the only substantial piece, containing the upper portions of three consecutive columns, the two latter of which are sufficiently well preserved to give some idea of the scope and method of the compiler, at whose identity it is hardly worth while to guess. His alphabetical arrangement is more strict than that of 1801 or of ancient lexica generally, and is indeed remarkably correct, so far as it can be followed. He confines himself to uncommon words, or words used in

an uncommon sense. Besides Greek local peculiarities, several terms from non-Hellenic speech are included—Persian (Fr. 3. 45, 64, Fr. 6. 13), Lydian (Fr. 3. 46), Chaldaean (Fr. 3. 63, 67, 72, Fr. 6. 6), Albanian (Fr. 3. 65); in the last instance the authority quoted is a work in two or more books on *Ξένη φωνή*, by a certain Heraclides. The writer's interest in foreign countries is further shown by references to e.g. writers on Scythia (Fr. 3. 1), Asia (Fr. 3. 10, 17), and Babylon (Fr. 3. 67, 72), to Glaucus on the region West of the Euxine (Fr. 3. 36), to Andron on 'the war with the barbarians' (Fr. 3. 46). In contrast with 1801, most at any rate of the authorities cited are prose works, and are often comparatively obscure. Sometimes a considerable excerpt is given (Fr. 3. 29-35 37-42), but more commonly only a brief mention is made of author and work. How far these references can be trusted is somewhat problematical; in the two that occur to an extant book, it is incorrectly cited (Fr. 3. 50, 57). In one place epigraphic evidence is appealed to (Fr. 3. 54-6).

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

Fr. 1.		Fr. 2.
	Col. i.	Col. ii.
[.	
κ[]. υ-σε[. . .
[? φι]λοπονία[.
κ[]	λα[
5 [ε]ν πολιτεία	[
κ[5]ος Αντηνωρ	λα[
κ[]	15 [
[]	λα[
κ[εν τη Θεττ]αλων πολιτεία	λα[
10 []αικ[. . .

10] π[
]υ[

Fr. 3. Col. i.

	Μαργιανοί? εν] γ̄ Σκυ[θικ]ων	15]
]ων αρχη[. .] . ητρ[-]]
]α ποιουντε[ς ε]νθουσια] εν τω περι του κατα Ασι
	παρ ετ[εροις Μαρδοι κ[α]λουνται	αν]
5]ιλοι Αντικλε[ιδη]ς] ονομασιων
	Ασκλ]ηπιαδης εν [.] επιγ[ρ]α	20]
]]κη πολειτεια
]οικουσιν Ηρακ[λειδη]ς]ις
]]σω ευρυχωρια [. . . .
10	κα]τα Ασιαν α]
]	25]δικην ατ[.
	εν υ]πομνημασι]
]ο Ἰτυκαίος		? Πα]ρθοι πρ[.] . [.
]]ισθε[.

Col. ii.

[μ]ε[λ]ισσαι] αι της Δημητ[ρος ιερε]ι]α η αυτη Απολλ[ωνια ?] εν τη ᾱ επ[αγου]
 30 σαν δε τον καλαθον ταις Νυνφαις συν τω ιστω και τοις εργασις της Περ-
 σεφονης ᾱ μεν παραγενεσθαι εις Παρον και ξενιστεισαν παρα
 τω βασιλει Μελισσω χαρισασθαι ταις τουτου θυγατρασι ουσαις εξη
 κοντα τον της Φερσεφονης ιστον και πρωταις αυταις αναδουнай
 τα περι αυτην παθη τε και μυστηρια οθεν και μελισσας εκτοτε
 35 κληθηναι τας θεσμοφοριαζουσας {κληθηναι} γυναικας
 μελυγιον ποματιον τι Σκυτικον Γλαυκος εν ᾱ εξηγησεως τοπων των κει [
 μενων επ αριστερα του Ποντου μερη συνκαταθεμ[ε]νων δε των ελα
 των ελυσε τον συλλογον και απολυθεντες εκαστο[ς] επι τα ἴδια παρ
 εσκευαζον το μελυγιον τουτο δε το πομα μεθυσκει μαλλον του
 40 οινου γεινεται δε εψομενου του μελιτος μεθ ὕδατος και βοτα
 νη[ς] τινος εμβαλλομενης φερει γαρ αυτων η χωρα πολυ το με

75 μ . [. .] . . . ! μ ε [22 letters] . ο ρ ι α κ [.] . σ ε [

Fr. 4.	Fr. 6.	Fr. 7.
. . . .] του βασιλεως [. . . .
]]	λογικων] . [
]ειγε . [] εν τω Τρωικω] . λ [
]τοπ []δρος ο Αντιοχεις []δειο [
]ς ουτ [5]]] . αδιτ [
]ρεφε [] βλεφα[ρα] παρα Χαλ	5]εναισ . [
5 περιστ []ανθισ[. . .]νπλ[.] εοικεν [
περ το [] . . . ς μοιχ[.]οις φιλ [
]σειν τ []ς]]υν και [
] μητρο [10] κατα την ν[.]οις λ [
]α λι . []ενοι τρο . [.	10]λιν [
10]ηει []ος]]ει [
. . . .	π]αρα Περ[σαις
]]	
Fr. 5.		Fr. 8.
.
]ε . . [] . . πα [
]ρ[.] [Fr. 10.]τιμ [
.
]εμ [
Fr. 9.	Fr. 11.
.
] . αβρ [] α [
? Ξενο]φων εν ᾱ . [. . . .
? τοι]χους τεθυρ[ωμενους?		
] . [.] ε . [
. . . .		

Fr. 2. 5. Antenor may be the historian of Crete referred to e. g. by Plutarch, *Mal. Herod.* 22.

8. *Αριστοτελης εν?* Cf. Fr. 3. 59. Aristotle's treatise on the Thessalian constitution is cited by Harpocration s. v. *τετραρχία* as *ἡ κοινὴ Θεττ. πολ.*; Athen. xi. 499 b omits *κοινή*.

10. The doubtful τ is preceded by a horizontal stroke above the line like those above numerals.

Fr. 3. 1-4. These lines seem to form a connected note on the *Μαργιανοί*; cf. Strabo xi. 510-1, where the *Ἀμαρδοί*, *Μαργιανοί*, and *Σκύθαι* are mentioned in close connexion; possibly *Μαργιαίων* is to be restored in l. 2. *εὐθουσιαζουσι* (?) in l. 3 suggests that the name may have been connected with *μάργος*; cf. Hesych. *μαργᾶ*: *μαργαίνει*, *ὑβρίζει*, *ἐνθουσιᾶ*, *μαίνεται*. Several writers of *Σκυθικά* are known, e.g. Agathon of Samos (Plutarch, *Fluv.* iv. 5) and Ctesippus (*op. cit.* v. 2).

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

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

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

10. *κατα Ασιαν*: cf. l. 17; but the division] *τα Ασιανα* is of course possible.

13. Possibly *Διονυσίος* ο *Ιτυκαίος*, the writer of a *Ῥιζοτομικά* who is mentioned by Steph. Byz. s. v. *Ἰτύκη*.

19. *ονομασιων* may well be part of the title of some treatise.

27. *Παρθοί* more probably than *ορθοί*, perhaps.

29-35. *μέλισσαι*: the priestesses of Demeter. The same Apollonia (?) in the first book (says): "When bringing to the Nymphs the basket together with the loom and the work of Persephone she first went to Paros, and having been entertained in the palace of the king Melissus she presented to his daughters, who were 60 in number, the loom of Persephone, and delivered first to them her sufferings and mysteries; whence the women who took part in the Thesmophoria were thereafter called *Melissae*."

l. 29. A spot of ink in the margin is very doubtfully identified as ϵ , but its position points to a projecting word, so that a new paragraph is indicated. Cf. Hesych. *μέλισσαι αἱ τῆς Δήμητρος μύστιδες*, Porphy. *De antr. Nymph.* 18 *τὰς Δήμητρος ἱερείας ὡς τῆς χθονίας θεᾶς μυστίδας μελίσσαις οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐκάλλον*, Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* iv. 106. Though the letters at the beginning of the line are mostly broken, the remains well suit the reading adopted, with which *Ἀπολλ[ωνία]* or *Ἀπολλ[ωνίς]* seems unavoidable.

30. For the *κάλαθος* cf. e.g. Callim. *H. Cer.* 1 sqq., 121 sqq., and Schol. *H. Cer.* 1 *ὁ Φιλάδελφος Πτολεμαῖος κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔθη τινα ἴδρυσεν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὴν τοῦ καλάθου πρόδον. ἔθος γὰρ ἦν ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐν ὀρισμένη ἡμέρᾳ ἐπὶ ὀχήματος φέρεσθαι κάλαθον ἐς τιμὴν τῆς Δήμητρος*. The *κάλαθος* worn on the head is a common emblem both of Demeter and Persephone. References to the *ιστός* of the latter do not seem to occur.

ταὶς Νυμφαῖς: cf. Schol. Pindar, *Pyth.* iv. 106 *ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὰς περὶ τὰ ἱερά νύμφας μελίσσαις ἔλεγον Μνασίας ὁ Παταρεὺς ἀφηγεῖται λέγων . . . ἀνευ γὰρ Νυμφῶν οὔτε Δήμητρος ἱερὸν τιμᾶται . . . οὔτε γάμος οὐδεὶς ἀνευ Νυμφῶν συντελεῖται*.

31-2. $\bar{\alpha}$ = πρώτων: l. *ξενοθεῖσαν*. Melissus king of Paros and his 60 daughters are apparently not elsewhere mentioned. Paros, however, was prominent in the worship of Demeter; cf. e.g. Homer, *H. Demet.* 491, where Paros is mentioned next to Eleusis, Nicanor, *ap. Steph. Byz.* s. v. *Πάρος*, who says that the name *Δημητριάς* was applied to the island, and the statement in Schol. Aristoph. *Av.* 1764 that Archilochus wrote a hymn to Demeter at Paros. According to Pausan. x. 28. 3 the ὄργια τῆς Δήμητρος were said to have been brought to Thasos from Paros; other references are collected in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencycl.* iv. 2722-3.

34-5. Cf. Pindar, *Pylh.* iv. 106 μελίσσας Δελφίδος, of the prophetess, and Callim. *H. Apoll.* 110 Δηρι δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδαρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι. κληθῆναι has been inadvertently repeated.

36-42. 'Μελύγιον': a Scythian beverage. Glaucus in the 1st book of the description of places lying towards the left of the Black Sea (says) "when the drivers agreed, he dismissed the assembly and dispersing each to his home they prepared the μελύγιον. This drink is more intoxicating than wine and is made of honey boiled with water, with the addition of a certain herb; for their country produces much honey and also beer, which they make out of millet".

Cf. Etym. Magn. μελύγιον· πομάτιον Σκυθικόν, γινόμενον ἐκ μόνου μέλιτος μεθ' ὕδατος, βοτάνης τινὸς ἐμβαλλομένης (similarly Zonar. μελίγγον· πόμα τι Σκ. κτλ.), Hesych. μελίτιον· πόμα τι Σκυθικόν μέλιτος ἐφομένου σὺν ὕδατι καὶ πόα τινί. The Etym. Magn. is especially close to the papyrus, and the spelling μελύ(ε)ιον is confirmed as well as πομάτιον, which Dindorf wished to emend to πόμα τι from Hesych.; a more probable alteration would be to write ἐφομένου for ἐκ μόνου. In l. 36 l. Σκυθικόν. The treatise of Glaucus is unknown and his identity doubtful. Of the recorded writers of that name, the author of a work on Arabia often referred to by Steph. Byz. appears the most suitable. ἐλάτης (l. 37) = ἐλατήρ in Eurip. Fr. 773. 28 ποιμένας ἐλάται; Ἐλατ(έ)ων is hardly likely in this context.

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

45. l. Ζηνων, i. e. not improbably the grammarian of Myndus, who is cited e. g. in Etym. Magn. 590. 44 s. v. μορίαν. The vestiges before ων are consistent with e. g. δ, λ, μ, but Λεξ[έ]ων is unsuitable. As for μενεμανι, Mr. R. Levy tells us that *maya*, the Aramaic word for water, was used in Pehlevi, and a reduplicated form of this might produce something sufficiently close to the papyrus. Dr. Sayce notes the similarity of *amnis*.

46. Cf. Hesych. μέρμης· τρίορχος. The family name of Gyges was Μερμνάδαι according to Herodotus i. 7. 14. Ανδρων is perhaps more likely to be the historian from Halicarnassus than the Alexandrian who wrote Χρονικά (Athen. iv. 184 b), though a work by him with the title here given is not elsewhere cited. To read Ανδρωνικός for Ανδρον. is possible but not attractive.

48. This sense of μέροτες is not otherwise attested. Among the many writers named Dionysius the most suitable in this context seems to be, if not the prolific Διονύσιος ὁ Θράξ, Διονύσιος ὁ Τρύφωνος, whose extensive treatise περὶ ὀνομάτων is cited by Athenaeus, Harpocration, and Steph. Byz.

49-50. l. μεροψ. ε of οπερ has been corrected from α or ο. The word beginning with κ should mean 'parents' or something analogous; κ[η]δεμονας is hardly satisfactory. The μεροψ is mentioned by Aristotle in *An. Hist.* ix. 13, p. 615 b 25 φασὶ δέ τινες τοὺς μ. . . ἀντεκτρέφεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγγόνων; cf. Hesych. μέροτες· . . . καὶ ὄρνεά τινα, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης. It is strange that the reference given in l. 50 is mistaken both as to the treatise and the number of the book (there is no eighth book of the *De part. anim.*); cf. l. 57, n.

51. μεσοτελεστον; σο is doubtfully read and the σ may be ρ: also the space between the supposed ο and τ is rather wide and another letter may have intervened; but a compound of μέρος does not seem very likely. For μεσο- = ἡμι- cf. Hesych. μεσόψηρον· ἡμίξηρον. A few Aetolian forms are given in Hesych., e. g. κίββα, ἀερία, θαγόνες.

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

57. τοι was originally written after εν, i. e. the writer began to write τοις owing to the repetition of εν. μητραι σφηκῶν and ἀνθρηῶν are described by Aristotle in *An. Hist.* ix. 41,

pp. 627 b-628 a (cf. *An. Gen.* iii. 10, p. 761 a 6) so that there is the same mistake in the citation here as in l. 50. Cf. Hesych. μήτρα· εἶδος σφηκός.

58-60. Cf. Hesych. μήτρα· . . . καὶ ὁ κληρὸς ὑπὸ Σολέων, ὡς Κλείταρχος. In l. 58 ἀπ[ο]γραφοῦσι would also be possible, or the letter after *a* might well be *ι*. In l. 59 neither *as* καὶ nor *ais* καὶ suits the remains; perhaps there was a correction and *αι* καὶ was intended. That Σόλοι was included among Aristotle's collection of constitutions was unknown.

61. μισσηρ is presumably a copyist's error for μιστωρ; cf. Photius μίστωρ· ὅταν τις αὐτὸν μὴ καθαρὸν εἶδος παρέρχηται ἵνα μὴ δεῖ, μεμιασμένος, whence the supplement in the latter part of the line has been derived. The identity of Ἀυτοκλείδης is doubtful; he is not likely to be the writer of ἐξηγητικά mentioned by Plutarch, *Nic.* 23.

63. l. αρμοιαι. Hesych. gives several Chaldaean words, but μιθοργ is not one of them. It is conjectured by Sayce to be the opening of a Sumerian hymn, possibly = *me ta-ra-ga*, from some Tammuz dirge, as Prof. Langdon suggests.

64. The equation of Mithras to Prometheus, though not unnatural, is apparently unusual. For the latter part of the line cf. Hesych. μίθρας· ὁ ἥλιος παρὰ Πέρσαις, and the similar but longer notes in Suidas and Photius.

65-6. At the end of the line e. g. τοῖς Ἰβηροῖς or Ἀρμενίοις would be suitable; cf. Strabo xi, p. 501. The work on Ξένη φωνή is apparently not mentioned elsewhere, and with which, if any, of the known grammarians named Heraclides the author is to be identified is doubtful.

66-7. Cf. Hesych. μυδαλόσσης· ἀριθμός, καὶ τὰ περὶ οὐράνια σύνταξις. Βαβυλώνιοι. In consideration of this compiler's fondness for giving authority it is preferable to treat *κατα βαβυλωνα* as part of a title rather than to read e. g. Χαλδαιο[ι]ς τοῖς οὐσι; cf. ll. 72-3, where *των κατα βαβ.* is most easily explained in the same sense and as a citation of the same treatise. The writer's name must be as short as possible.

69. Cf. Hesych. Μινύαι· οἱ Ὀρχομένιοι, καὶ Μάγνητες. As in l. 67, the name of the author cited should be quite short, since the line would really be sufficiently filled with no further addition, especially if, as is quite possible, *εν τοῖς* stood in the title. There were many writers of works on rivers, besides Callimachus; cf. Schneider, *Callimachea*, ii, p. 326.

71. Cf. Hesych. μινύα· εἶδος ἀμπέλου.

72. Either *ο* before *παρα* is superfluous or something has dropped out. For the citation cf. n. on ll. 66-7. *μισαι* according to Sayce = Sumerian *me-zu*, 'to divine'.

74. The lexica throw no light on this entry, which seems to have no connexion with Hesych. μυτιλανός· ἀπόπληκτος, the latter word being too long for ἀπ[. . . .], as well as otherwise incongruous. Ηγησανδρος is presumably Hegesandrus of Delphi, the author of a collection of anecdotes called Ὑπομνήματα, in several books, cited by Hesych. s. v. ἀπόφαρσις and Suidas s. v. ἀλκονίδες as well as by Athenaeus.

Fr. 4. The blank spaces in ll. 7 and 9 indicate that the preceding words were γλωσσαι, and ll. 5-6 are no doubt complete at the beginning. The fragment may be from the top of a column.

Fr. 6. The writing in this fragment containing the ends of lines from the top of a column, is considerably smaller than in Frs. 2 and 3; that of Fr. 9 is similar and so is that of Fr. 1 so far as it goes.

1. βασιλεως· οἱ βασινοι ὡς? βασιλικοῖ or -κου is less suitable.

6. παρα Χα[λ]δαιοῖς· cf. Fr. 3. 63, 72.

Frs. 7-8. These two fragments are more cursively written than the rest.

Fr. 9. Cf. n. on Fr. 6. In l. 1 a narrow letter may be lost between the supposed β and ρ.

Fr. 11. Either the beginning of a line or of the explanation of a word.

1803. GLOSSARY.

16 × 29·7 cm.

Sixth century.

This sheet from a papyrus book was probably the uppermost of a quire, since the space between the two pages of the recto, down which the binding string passed, has an ornamental band of light purple colour, and the string itself, some of which still adheres to the sheet, showing the knot, is partially coated with the same colour. The style of the rather heavy sloping uncials points to a date in the sixth century perhaps rather than the fifth; the ink is of the brown shade characteristic of the Byzantine period. As usual, the words of the glossary, which all begin with σ, are made to protrude slightly into the margin; and the conclusion of the notes is marked by paragraphi, accompanied here and there by stops in the high or medial position. Quotations are sometimes indicated by the angular signs commonly employed for that purpose, but they are often omitted. Marks of elision are used, and there is one instance of a rough breathing (l. 42); all these additions are due to the original scribe, who was apparently a person of small intelligence, though he need not of course be the originator of all the slips that occur.

1803 is of a less interesting character than 1801–2 and the purpose suggested is rather scholastic than scientific; citations, however, are commendably frequent and from these the papyrus largely derives its value. They are taken either from prose (Demosthenes, Thucydides, Xenophon) or Comedy, both Old and New, and additions are thus made to the extant fragments of Eupolis *Χρυσούν Γένος*, Aristophanes *Γῆρας*, Menander *Συναριστώσαι*, *Ἐγχειρίδιον*, *Φιλάδελφοι*, and *Φανίον*; the poet's name is omitted in the case of the last three of these, but there can be little doubt that Menander is meant. The alphabetical arrangement, apart from the initial letter, is very negligent.

Fol. 1 verso.

στιφρον ο οι πολλοι στριφνῶ
 [>] ως Αριστοφανης Γηραι και
 [>] μη ὑποστρ[[ι]]φνον σε τῆ
 > φωνην εχεις και Μενᾶ
 5 > δρος εν Συναριστωσαις ως
 > [[α]]ει στεφρας εσομενας
 [>] και νεας ταλαντατος
 Σαραπιν δια του ᾶ ως εν Εγ

Fol. 1 recto.

πολλακεις.
 20 συναγαγειν το συναθροι
 σαι και συλλεξαι δε το αυτο
 τουτο ως εν Φιλαδελφοις
 χωριδιον πριω συνα
 γαγων πανθ' οσα εχεις
 25 τοδ' εγω δωσω σχολη
 μοι συλλεγε

> χιριδιωι ως σεμνος ο Σαρα
 10 > πισ θεος·
 συγγιγενεσθαι λεγεται κατ ε
 πενθεσιν του τ̄ και γιγνω
 σκειν μαλι[[ον]]στα οι παλαι
 οι αξιουσιν δε και χωρις
 15 αυτου
 σημιον γην σφραγιδα και
 σημηνασθαι το σφραγισαι
 ως . [

συμφοραν ου μονον την
 δυστυχιαν αλλα και την
 συντυχιαν ωστε και α
 30 γαθων συμφοραν λεγεῖ
 ως εν Ἰππευσιν επι συμ
 φοραις αγαθαισιν εισηγ
 γελμεναις ευαγγελεια
 θυειν
 35 συνεθιζεσθαι δια του τ̄ και

Fol. 2 recto.

ωργωι ως σχολη πορευ
 εται ουτοσι
 σιτον και την τροφην απλωσ
 ως Ξενοφων εν β̄ Ανα
 40 βασεως το δε στρατευ
 μα εποριζετο σιτον οπως
 ε[[.]]δυνατο εκ των ὕ
 ποζυγιων κοπτοντες
 βους και ονους και του
 45 καρπον ομοιως ως Δη
 μοσθενης εν τω κατα
 Διονυσωδωρου· παλιν
 καπηλευων και συνι
 στας [τ]ας τιμα[s] του σιτου
 50 και τον αρτον αυτον σιτῶ
 καλουσιν ως Ξενοφων
 εν τη Αν[α]βασι . [.

Fol. 2 verso.

των επιτηδιων ως ταχι
 στα βουλομενους διακιν
 55 δυνεειν
 σαβυττους κουρας ειδος τι
 Ευπολις εν Χρυσω Γενει
 και καρα . . ης ως μ' ηλθες
 εξ[[ε]]υρημενος σαβυττους
 60 σιωπησομαι αντι του σιω
 πησω και σιωπησει και
 σιωπησεται ως εν τω πε
 ρι του στεφανου καγω στερ
 ξῶ και σιωπησ[[ο]]μαι και
 65 Μενανδρος εν Φανιω
 σιωπησι παλιν εν τῷ με
 ρει κατα τ[α]υτα δε και α
 κουσομαι και ακουσει και
 ακουσεται και πηδησομαι

1. Cf. Moeris, p. 342 σιφρόν Ἀττικῶς· στριφρόν Ἑλληνες. ο after σιφρόν, if correct, = δ.

2-4. The line from the Γήρας cannot be correct as quoted, but is easily emended, e. g.

καὶ μὴ(ν) ὑπόστιφρον σὺ . . . οἱ ὑπόστιφρόν σε . . . ἔχειν. In place of υποστιφρον (ἄπαξ. εἰρημ.), which is obviously to be read, the copyist lapsed into the non-Attic υποστριφρον, but after noticing the error unintelligently made only a partial correction; there is no form στιρφνός.

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

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

11-15. Cf. e. g. Heraclid. *ap.* Eustath. 1722. 55 οἱ μὲν παλαιοὶ ἐν δυσὶ γάμμα ἔχρῶντο, γίγνομαι λέγοντες.

12. 1. $\bar{\gamma}$ for $\bar{\tau}$: the converse error occurs in l. 16.

13. *ι* of μαλιστα is written through λ , i. e. μαλλον was first written.

16-18. 1. την. Cf. Photius σημείον τὴν σφραγίδα καὶ σημαίνεσθαι τὸ σφραγίζεσθαι, Hesych. σημείον τέρας. ἡ σφραγίς, and σημήνασθαι σφραγίσασθαι, Harpocrat. σημεία οὕτω λεγουσι τὰς σφραγίδας. Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Φαίνοππον. In l. 18 *ως* is followed by what seems to be the top of a vertical stroke, so that neither Α[ριστοφάνης (cf. *Eq.* 952) nor Δ[ημοσθένης is probable.

19. πολλακεις: *ει* has been converted from *ισ*.

22. Φιλαδελφοις: of Menander presumably.

23-6. Two iambic verses apparently, but the first *ι* of χωρίδιον should be short and τὸ is likely to have preceded.

27-9. Cf. Suidas συμφορά τῶν μέσων ἐστὶ . . . δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ συμφορά καὶ τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ κακόν, διὸ λέγει ἐπὶ συμφοραῖσιν ἀγαθαῖς (Aristoph. *Eq.* 655; cf. ll. 31-2), Eustath. 647. 28, Hesych. συμφορά συντυχία σύμπτωση. ἀτυχία. In l. 29 1. ἀγαθην.

31-4 = *Eq.* 655-6. The papyrus supports the usual reading εισηγγελμέναις. R omits *ισ*, whence Cobet proposed ἀγαθαῖσι ταῖς ἡγγελμ.

35. Perhaps καὶ | χωρὶς αὐτου, as in ll. 14-15. δια του $\bar{\iota}$ presumably refers to the spelling εἰθλίειν, which is used *metri gratia*, e. g. in Pythag. *Carm. aur.* 35, but there seems to be no instance of *συνειθ.* apart from augmented forms.

36-7. This is no doubt part of a note on σχολῆ in the sense of βραδέως or οὐδαμῶς. Cf. Suidas σχολῆ γ' ἂν ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδ' ὄλω, βραδέως, οὐδαμῶς. 1. Γε[ωργωι, i. e. most probably the play of Menander; cf. ll. 8, 22, nn.

38 sqq. Cf. Harpocrat., and Suid. σίτος πᾶς ὁ σιτικός καρπός, οὐχ ὁ πῦρὸς μόνον καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ σιτία, Hesych. σίτος τροφή. The references in ll. 39 and 45-7 are to Xen. *Anab.* ii. 1. 6 and Dem. *In Dionysod.* 7. In l. 41 the papyrus correctly agrees with the 'deteriores' against CBAE in omitting καὶ πότον after σιτον. In l. 52 the reference may be to *Anab.* v. 4. 29 and σίτω can be read; but Αν[α]βασι is not very satisfactory, though τη, which seems to be right, points to that work or the *Cyrop.*, which is irreconcilable with the remains, τη αυτη being also unsuitable.

53-5 = Thucyd. vii. 60 διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων σπάνιν ὡς τάχιστα κτλ., cited no doubt in illustration of the word σπάνις. Cf. Photius and Suidas σπάνις ἐνδεια. Either σπάνιν preceded τῶν ἐπιτ. in the papyrus, or it was omitted.

56-9. Cf. Hesych. σάβυττος εἶδος ξυρήσεως εἰς καλλωπισμόν πότερον δὲ τοῦ πάγωνος ἢ τῆς κεφαλῆς, ἄδελον τινὲς δὲ τὸ γυναικεῖον. Photius gives the latter meaning only to σάβυττος and spells the equivalent of ξυρήσεως εἶδος, σαβύττης, but Hesych. is confirmed by the papyrus. ll. 58-9 look like a pair of trochaic acatalectic dimeters (cf. e. g. Aristoph. *Av.* 1478-80), but if so, there is apparently some corruption in l. 58, where, though it would be easy to write *ως* (ε)μ', the preceding word remains a difficulty. The doubtful κ after καὶ can be

χ or ζ; ησ is probable, but ωσ very uncertain. There is a reference to a *κουρεύς* in an already extant fragment of the Χρ. Γέν. (Kock 278).

61. *σιωπησει*: ε has been converted from ι.

62-4. *De Cor.* 112. 1. *σιωπησομαι*, as originally written.

65. *Φανιοι*: the papyrus confirms the spelling of this title, as to which there has been some doubt.

66. *εν τω* is very uncertain, but consistent with the meagre vestiges.

1804. *Λέξεις Ῥητορικαί.*

Fr. 4 16.6 × 13.4 cm.

Third century.

Fragments of a roll containing an alphabetical series of oratorical terms with notes thereon, the pieces preserved dealing with words which begin with the letters Π, Ρ, Σ. They are written in well-formed sloping uncials of medium size, in style recalling P. Rylands 57 (Vol. i, Plate 10), though perhaps of a somewhat later date. An angular sign, the angle pointing to the left instead of, as usual, to the right, is used to fill up short lines. As in 1801-2, the terms to be explained are given prominence by a slight protrusion into the margin and by the short blank spaces which follow them. A second hand, using ink of a different shade, has introduced one or two alterations.

Many of the words included in this glossary occur also in Harpocration, but its relations to that standard authority are less close than to the *Λέξεις Ῥητορικαί Seguerianae* edited by Bekker in *Anecd.* i, pp. 197-318. This affinity is evident not only in the substance of the glosses but also in their order, e.g. the four terms in Frs. 1 + 2. i Πυθαίος (?), προστρόπαιος, περίστατοι and πορείον follow the same sequence in *Anecd.* pp. 295-6, though separated there by a few additional words; similarly in *Anecd.* pp. 299, 300, ῥητορικὴ γραφή, ῥῶπος, ῥυτήρ, and σκευραφεία, συμμορία, συμμορίτης, σύμβολον are successive, corresponding to Frs. 3 and 4 of 1804 with one additional word in each fragment (Fr. 3. 5-8 [?], Fr. 4. 4-6 στρατηγολί). Material similarities are pointed out in the commentary, and though such matter is often common to e.g. Photius and the *Etymologicum Magnum*, the verbal correspondence is generally greatest with the Seguerian *Λέξεις*; see for instance Fr. 4. 14, n. (on the other hand, for a coincidence with Photius, Frs. 1 + 2. 9-13, n.). Points of difference between the *Λέξεις* of the papyrus and the Cod. Seg. are the omission in the latter, with a single exception, of the series of proper names in Frs. 1 + 2. ii, most of which, on the other hand, figure in Harpocration, and the disappearance of citations of authorities, to which 1804 occasionally refers (Demosthenes Fr. 4. 16, Aeschines Frs. 1 + 2. 9, Hyperides Fr. 4. 5, Dinarchus Fr. 3. 7). The relationship is nevertheless

distinct enough, and if the papyrus Λέξεις were not among the more or less immediate sources of the Seguerian, the two compilations must have had a common ancestor.

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. i.

[Πυθαιος? ονομα ε]ορ[της Αθηνη
 [σιν αγομενης του Α]πολ[λ]ω[νος
 [.]σας εν τοις εις ισ . [
 [.] οτι Πυθαεις Αθη
 5 [ν . .] . . . [.]ε αρματος αστρα <
 [π]τοντος [.? κο]μιζοντας Πυθα
 ει τας τ[.]ημ[ε]ιαν καλουσιν
 . α[.]ταισ . [.]
 προστροπ[αιος Αι]σχινης εν τωι πε
 10 ρι της πα[ρα]πρεσβει[α]ς δαιμων τις ε
 πι των α[λι]τηριων? ω]νομασθησαν δε
 οι μετα το [σταθηναι τροπαιον] πολεμι
 ους λαβοντ[ε]σ προστροπαιοι
 [π]εριστατοι [οι περιβλεπτο]ι
 15 [πορ]ειον [το διδομενον τοι]ς πρε[σβυ
 [ται]ς ω[σπερ εφοδιον] . [. . . .

Frs. 1 + 2. Col. ii.

[.
 Παμβ[ω]ταδαι δημοσ της Ερεχθιδος?
 Παισ[ν]ιδαι? δημοσ της Λεοντιδος?
 20 Παιω[ν]ες?
 Παλλ[η]νεις δημοσ της Αντιοχιδος?
 Περγα[σ]η δημοσ της Ερεχθιδος?
 Πειρα[ι]ευς? λιμην Αθηνησιν?
 [Π]εριθ[ο]ιδαι δημοσ της Οινηιδος?
 25 [.

Φιλιππικων ζ̄ συμβολαιον̄ δε̄ εῑδι
 κως γραμματειον̄ τι ο̄ ελαμβανεν [των
 δικαστων̄ εκαστος̄ εισιω[ν] εις̄ τ[ο̄ δι]καστηριον̄

Fr. 5.	Fr. 6.	Fr. 7.	Fr. 8.
.
]] . ιπ[.]υ[.]λα[.
]λοντο[.] . ιᾱ διαφ[.]περ[.]τ[.
π]λινθοις [.]ς̄ οῑ δε̄ την̄ . [.]ων̄ . [.
] . ιδεσμ[.]ευσ̄ απηει [.]
]βαλλο[ν	5] αποκτ . . [.	5] . τη̄ . [.
.] . ρο̄ . [.
.]σκε[.
.]ε̄

Frs. 1 + 2. i. 1-8. Apparently a note on Πυθαία or an analogous form. Cf. Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 295 Πυθαίος ὄνομα ἑορτῆς Ἀθήνησιν ἀγομένης τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πύθωνος, Etym. Magn. 696. 22 Πύθεια καὶ Πυθαίος ὄνομα ἑορτῆς ἀγομένης τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι. Harpocrat. gives a reference for Πυθαία to Hyperides πρὸς Ἀπελλαίον. In l. 1 ο of ε]ορ[της is very insecure and the initial supplement a little short, otherwise the restoration suggested suits well enough, and in view of other correspondences with this *Anecd.* is not improbable. In l. 5, if the word before αρματος was ἐπι, part of the π should be visible. In l. 7 the ε̄ is blotted and seems to have been cancelled. The first letter of l. 8 was either κ or χ.

9-13. Cf. Harpocrat. προστρόπαιον Δισχίης περὶ τῆς πρεσβείας κτλ., Photius προστρόπαιος δαίμων τις ἐπὶ τῶν ἐναγῶν (so too Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 296, and Etym. Magn. 700. 10), ἐπεὶ οἱ μετὰ τὸ σταθῆναι ἤδη τὸ τρόπαιον {οἱ} ἀναιροῦντές τινα τῶν πολεμίων πρόστροποι καὶ ἐναγεῖς εἰσίν. The reference in l. 9 is to Aesch. *Fals. Leg.* 158. In l. 11 a after των is clear, so that ἐναγῶν must be replaced by some synonym like ἀλιτηρίων or ἀκαθάρτων. In l. 13 προστροπαιοι seems preferable to the πρόστροποι of Photius, which is perhaps an error. The verbal correspondence in l. 12 with Photius makes it preferable to omit οἱ before ἀναιροῦντες rather than to emend ἐπεὶ οἱ to ἐπειδή with Naber.

14. Cf. Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 296 περίστατοι· οἱ περιβλεπτοι, ἐφ' οἷς ἄν τις σταίη βουλόμενος θεᾶσθαι and the similar gloss in Etym. Magn. 665. 13. Harpocrat. s. v. refers to Isocrates περὶ ἀντιδ. 269 with the explanation ἀντι τοῦ περὶ ἅς κύκλω ἴστανται οἱ θεώμενοι.

15-16. Cf. Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 296, and Etym. Magn. 684. 8 πορείον τὸ διδόμενον τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς ὑπὲρ (περὶ Etym. Magn.) τοῦ πορευθῆναι εἰς τὴν πρεσβείαν ὥσπερ ἐφόδιον. The papyrus apparently had practically the same note, but the vestige of a letter or two at the end of the line is too slight to indicate what stood after εφοδιον.

18. Cf. Harpocrat. Παμβωτάδης· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Νικόστρατον. Παμβωτάδα τῆς Ἐρεχθίδος δῆμος. Either δῆμος τῆς Ἐρεχθ. or δημ. των Ἀθηναίων will suitably fill the line.

19. Cf. Harpocrat. Παιανεῖς καὶ Παιονίδα· . . . διαφέρουσι δὲ οὔτοι (sc. οἱ Παιανεῖς) τῶν Παιονιδῶν, ὡς Ἴστρος ἐν Ἀτάκτῳ ὑποσημαίνει. μνημονεύουσι δὲ καὶ τούτων οἱ ῥήτορες, ὥσπερ καὶ Δεινάρχος . . . δῆμος δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος τῆς Λεοντίδος . . .

20. *παιώνισας* occurs in Dem. *De Cor.* 287, but in this series of proper names, a misspelling of *Παίονες* is perhaps more likely than a derivative of *Παίων*. The form *Παίωισα* occurs in Hesych. s. v. *Διάλος*.

21. Cf. Harpocrat. *Παλληνεύς* 'Υπερείδης ἐν τῇ ὑπὲρ Χαιρεφίλου ἀπολογία. Παλλήνη δῆμος τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος. τὸ δὲ ἐκ τόπου ἐπίρρημα Δείναρχος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Στεφάνου Παλλήνηθεν φησιν, ὁ δὲ δημότης Παλληνεύς.

22. Cf. Harpocrat. *Περγασῆθεν* Ἰσαῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Θουτίμου. *Περγασῆ* δῆμος τῆς Ἐρεχθίδος τὸν μέντοι δημότην διχῶς λέγεσθαι φασί, *Περγασέα* τε καὶ *Περγασῆθεν*.

23. *Πειραιεύς* λιμὴν Ἀθήνησιν is a gloss in Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 288.

24. Cf. Harpocrat. *Περιβοῖδαι* Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Πολυκλέα. δῆμός ἐστι τῆς Οἰνηίδος.

Fr. 3. 1-4. These lines are evidently part of a note on *ῥητορικὴ γραφή*, beginning probably in the last line of the preceding column (*[ῥητορικὴ γραφή ἢ κατα ῥητο]*) for which cf. e. g. Harpocrat., who after referring to Isaeus' speech against Euclides says: *ἔοικε ῥητορικὴ γραφὴ καλεῖσθαι ἢ κατὰ ῥήτορος γράψαντός τι ἢ εἰπόντος ἢ πράξαντος παράνομον . . . ἴσως δὲ καὶ . . . ὅτι κατὰ διαφόρους νόμους αἱ κατὰ τῶν ῥητόρων γραφαὶ εἰσάγονται, ὡς Ἀντιφῶν . . . ὑποσημαίνει, Photius Ῥητ. γραφῆ ἢ ἡγωνίζοντο οἱ ῥήτορες' οὐ γὰρ πάσας ἡγωνίζοντο τὰς δίκας τὸ παλαιὸν οἱ ῥήτορες, ἀλλ' ἐνίας' ἄλλοι δὲ ῥητορικὴν γραφὴν εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν κατὰ ῥήτορος γινομένην, γράψαντός τι ἢ εἰπόντος ἢ πράξαντος παράνομον, Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 299 Ῥητ. γραφὴν καὶ ῥητορικὴν γραψάμενος' ἢν οἱ ῥήτορες ἡγωνίζοντο γραφόμενοι ῥήτορας () εἰποῦσι τι ἢ πράξαι φαῖλον. The papyrus was evidently close to Photius and Bekker, *Anecd.*, but put the alternative explanations in the reverse order.*

5-8. This gloss, for the form of which cf. Fr. 4. 14-15, remains unidentified. The speech of Dinarchus *κατὰ Πολυεύκτου δωροδοκίας* is cited e. g. by Harpocrat. s. v. *δάρων γραφή*. It is identified with the *κατὰ Π. ἐκφυλλοφορηθέντος ἔνδειξις*.

9. Cf. Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 299 *ῥῶπος* ὁ παντοδαπὸς φόρτος, Photius *ῥῶπος* μίγματα . . . τινὲς δὲ καὶ τὸν παντοδαπὸν φόρτον ῥῶπον εἰρήκασιν, Etym. Magn. 377. 30 s. v. *ἔρρωπιζομεν*, *ῥῶπος* γὰρ ὁ ποικίλος καὶ λεπτός φόρτος (*ποικίλος* also Ael. Dionys. *ap.* Eustath. 927, but this would not fill the lacuna so well). For ll. 10-11 cf. e. g. Harpocrat. s. v. *ἐπιθέτους ἐορτάς*, Δημ. ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Χρυσίππου πρὸς τὴν Φ. π.; and the reference is to the *C. Phorm.* 9.

12. Cf. Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 299 *ῥυτήρ τί ἐστιν* ὁ ἰμάς. *κυρίως* δὲ τὰ ἡνία κτλ., Photius *ῥυτήρ* ἀπλῶς μὲν ὁ ἰμάς, *κυρίως* δὲ ἡνία κτλ. The supplement printed hardly fills the lacuna, but there is not room for *ἀπλῶς μὲν*: perhaps *ῥυτηρες οἱ ἰμαντες* was written.

Fr. 4. 1-3. Cf. Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 300 *σκεираφέια* *σκεираφέια* ἐστὶ τὰ κυβεῖα, ἧτοι ἐπεὶ *σκεираφός* τίς ἐστὶν ὄργανον κυβευτικόν, . . . ἢ ὅτι ἐν τῷ τῆς Σκειράδος Ἀθηνῶν ἱερῷ οἱ κυβεῖται ἔπαιζον, ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ὄντι. Photius and Etym. Magn. 717. 27 have similar notes but omit *ἔξω . . . ὄντι*. Harpocrat. citing Dinarchus, *In Proxen.* says *σκεираφία* ἔλεγον τὰ κυβευτήρια, ἐπειδὴ διέτριβον ἐν Σκίρω οἱ κυβεύοντες, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ ν' ὑποσημαίνει. The gloss in the papyrus seems to have lost in clearness owing to compression.

4-6. Cf. Harpocrat. *στρατηγοί* . . . οἱ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν χειροτονοῦμενοι στρατηγοὶ εἴ ἦσαν, ὡς μαθεῖν ἐστὶν ἐκ τε τῶν Ὑπερείδου κατ' Αὐτοκλέους . . . The vestiges in the middle of l. 4 are very scanty but so far as they go suit the letters suggested.

7-13. Cf. Harpocrat. *συμμορία* . . . ὁ γοῦν Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν συμμοριῶν φησὶ, περὶ τῶν χιλίων καὶ διακοσίων ἀνδρῶν λέγων τῶν πλουσιωτάτων, "ἐκ τούτων τοίνυν οἶμαι δεῖν ποιῆσαι *συμμορίας* κ', ὥσπερ νῦν εἰσὶ, σώματα ξ' ἐκάστην ἔχουσαν". Ὑπερείδης δὲ ἐν τῷ πρὸς Πολυεύκτου φησὶ "εἰσὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ *συμμορία* ἐκάστη ε' ἄνδρες" . . . *συμμορίται* δὲ εἰσὶν οἱ τῆς αὐτῆς αὐτοῖς μετέχοντες *συμμορίας*, ὡς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ Ὑπερείδης δεικνύσει, Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 300 *συμμορία* τί ἐστὶ τὰ συντάγματα τῶν πλουσιῶν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων πρὸς τριηραρχίας. εἰσὶ δὲ χίλιοι διακόσιοι *συμμορίτης* σημαίνει (). The ἡγεμῶν *συμμορίας* (ll. 11-13) is treated separately by Harpocrat. and defined as ὁ προέχων τῷ πλοῦταξ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῶν ἄλλων ἡγεμονεύει ἐπιλημμένος,

ὡς ὑποφαίνει Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Πολυεύκτου. The financial responsibility described by the papyrus is apparently not elsewhere stated. At the end of l. 7 κς, which is clear, is an error for κ (cf. e. g. Dem. *De Symm.* 17), perhaps arising from the ambiguity of an original εικοσι εξ εξηκοντα, where εξ should have been read as ἐξ not ζξ. The ξ is very uncertain, but the scanty remains are sufficiently suitable. In l. 11 παρ αυτων may be interpreted παρ' αὐτῶν, but more probably παρ is a mistake for ὑπέρ, or ὑπέρ by a common misspelling became οἰπερ and then οἰ παρ.

14. Cf. Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 300 σύμβολον σημαίνει μὲν τὰ σημεῖα, σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὰ συμβόλαια καὶ τὰ γραμματεῖα. εἰδικῶς δὲ τὸ σύμβολον δηλοῖ γραμματεῖόν τι, ὃ ἐλάμβανε τῶν δικαστῶν ἕκαστος εἰσιὼν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, ὃ ἐστὶ πινάκιον. Photius, *Etym. Magn.*, and Suidas give the second sentence in the form σύμβολον ὃ ἐλάμβανον οἱ δικασταὶ εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον εἰσιόντες, εἶτα τοῦτο δόντες τὸ δικαστικὸν ἐκομίζοντο. Harpocration agrees with the papyrus in referring to the seventh *Philippic* but is otherwise dissimilar.

Fr. 5. π]λιθους in l. 2 suggests that this may be part of a note on πλιυθείον, a word which occurs a little above Πυθαῖος (cf. Frs. 1 + 2. i. 1-8 n.) in Bekker, *Anecd.* i, p. 295 πλιυθείον· τὸ πλιυθουργεῖον, ὅπου πλιυθοὶ γίνονται; cf. Harpocrat. πλιυθείον· ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ πλιυθος πλάττεται· Λυσίας ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λυσίθεου. If so, the fragment would probably belong to the upper part of Frs. 1 + 2. i.

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

5. At the end of this line the second hand has made an alteration, and it is not clear what was originally written or what was intended to stand.

Fr. 7. That this fragment comes from the ends of lines is indicated both by l. 6, where there is a narrow margin after the remains of the final letter, and in l. 8 by the lengthening of the cross-bar of the supposed ε, which might also be read as the dash used for filling a short line.

6. Probably ροι or ρος (προς?).

III. EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS.

1805. SOPHOCLES, *Trachiniae*.

Fr. 15 10 × 9.6 cm.

Late second century.

These scattered fragments from a roll of the *Trachiniae* are in a medium-sized hand of the common sloping type, of which it is a fair specimen, though less regular than e. g. 1800. Some annotations in cursive point to a date in the latter part of the second century rather than the beginning of the third. Stops in all three positions occur, and accents, breathings, and marks of elision and quantity have been introduced not infrequently, some at any rate of these being no doubt subsequent additions, due probably to the corrector whose hand is to be distinguished here and there.

Textually these fragments are, in the main, conservative. A few new readings occur, including one or two which are definite improvements, e. g. l. 1136, where a generally accepted correction is confirmed. For one of the unknown variants the authority of, probably, Aristophanes of Byzantium is cited. On the other hand, the papyrus apparently agrees with the MSS. in a passage requiring alteration on metrical grounds, and occasionally offers evidence which is inferior to theirs. In supplementing lacunae, Jebb's text has been followed, of course with no implication that the papyrus necessarily agreed with it.

Possibly further additions may eventually be made to the remains of this MS., the script of which is with difficulty distinguished from that of numerous other fragments which accompanied them.

Fr. 1.

· · · · ·
 [δρακων ελικτος αλλοτ ανδρειω τυ]π[ω
 [βουκρανος εκ δε δασκιου γενειαδ]ος
 [κρουνοι διερραινοντο κρηναιου πο]του
 15 [τοιονδ εγω μνηστηρα προσδεεγμ]ε[νη
 [δυστηνος αι κατθανειν επευχομ]ην [

[πριν τῆσδε κοιτῆς ἐμπελασθην]αῖ π[οτε
 [χρονῶ δε ἐν ὑστερῶ μεν ἀσμενῆ] δε μ[οι
 [ο κλεινὸς ἦλθε Ζηνὸς Ἀλκμη]νῆς τ[ε παῖς
 20 [ὄς εἰς ἀγῶνα τῶδε συμπεσῶν μ]αχῆς [ἔκλυται με καὶ τροπὸν μεν ἀν π]ονῶν

Fr. 2.

37 [ἐν]τ[ᾶ]υθα δὴ μάλιστα ταρβήσασ ἔχω
 [ἐξ ο]υ γὰρ ἐκτα κείνος Ἴφίτου βίαν
 [ἡμ]εῖς μ[εν ἐν Τραχίνι τῆδ ἀναστατο]

Fr. 3.

275 [ο τῶν ἀπαντῶν Ζεὺς πατὴρ Ὀλυ]μπι[ῶν]
 [πρᾶτον νιν ἐξεπέμψε]ν· οὐδ ἠνεσχετ[ο
 [οθουνεκ αὐτὸν μόνον] ἀνθρώπων δο[λω
 [ἐκτείνειν εἰ γὰρ ἐμφαν]ῶ[ς] ἠμύνατο
 [Ζεὺς ταν συνεγνώ ξυν] δίκη χειρ[ο]υμένῳ [ἔκ
 280 [υβριν γὰρ οὐ στεργουσιν· οὐδε δ]αιμονε[ῖς
 [κεῖνοι δ ὑπερχλιοντες ἐ]κ [γ]λωσσης κα[κῆς
 [αὐτοὶ μεν Αἰδοῦ πάντες] εἰσι οἰκητορες
 [πολις δε δουλῆ τασδε δ ἀσπε]ρ εἴσορα[ς]

Fr. 4.

[φρονεῖ νιν ὡς ἤξοντα τουτο] γὰρ λο[γ]ῶν
 290 [πολλοῦ καλῶς λεχθεντος ἠδισ]τον κλυεῖν
 [ἀνασσα νιν σοὶ τερψις ἐμφαν]ῆς κυρε[ῖ]
 [τῶν μεν παρῶντων τὰ δε π]ῆψυσμ[εν]ῆ λογῶν

Fr. 5.

301 [αι πριν με]ν ησα[ν εξ ελευθερων ισως
 [ανδρων τα]νυν δε δουλον ισχουσιν βιον
 [ω Ζευ τροπαιε] μηποτ εισιδοιμι σε

Frs. 6-10.

αγο]ρα συνεξ[ηκουον
 λει]μψι ταυτ[α
 αγο]ραι νοησαι [δει το επι λ]εμμωνος [αθροισμα?
 360 [τη]ν παιδα [δουναι] κρυφιον ως εχο[ι λεχος
 [εγ]κλημα [μικρον] αιτιαν θ' ετο[ιμασας
 [επι]στρατε[υει πατριδ]α την ταυ[της εν η
 [το]ν Ευρυτο[ν τονδ ειπε] δεσποζ[ειν θρονων
 [κτε]νιει[ν] τ [ανακτα πατερ]α τησδε και πολιν
 365 [επε]ρσε· κ[αι νυν ως ορας ηκει δομουσ
 5 lines lost

370 [δεσποι]ν' α τουδε τυχανω μαθων παρα
 [και ταυ]τα πολλ[οι προς μεση Τραχινιωσ
 [αγορα] συνεξ[ηκου]ον ωσα[υτωσ εμοι
 [ωστ εξ]ελεγχειν [ει δε] μη λεγ[ω φιλα
 [ουχ ηδ]ομαι· το δ' [ορθ]ον εξειρηχ ομως
 375 [οιμοι τ]αλαινα [πο]ν ποτ' ε[ιμι]πραγματος
 [τιν εισ]δεδεγμα[ι π]ημονη[ν υποστεγον
 • [λαθρα]ιον· ω δυστηνος α[ρ] α[νωνυμος
 [πεφυ]κεν ωσπ[ερ ουπαγ]ω[ν διωμνυτο
 [η καρτ]α λαμπρ[α και κατ ονομα και φυσιν
 380 [πατρο]σ μεν ουσα [γενεσιν Ευρυτου ποτε
 [Ιολη κα]λειτο· τ[η]σ εκει[ος ουδαμα
 [βλαστας] εφωνει δηθεν [ουδεν ιστορωσ
 [ολοιντο] μή τι παντες ο[ι κακοι τα δε
 [λαθραι ο]σ ασκε[ι] μη προπ[ουθ αυτω κακα
 385 [τι χρη ποε]ιν γ[υ]ναικες ω[σ εγω λογοισ

[τοις νυν πα]ρ[ουσι]ν εκπ[επληγμενη] κυρω
 [πευθου μολουσα τα]νδρο[ς] ως ταχ αν σαφη

Fr. 11.

532 [ταις αιχμαλω]τοις [παισιν ως επ εξοδω
 [τημος θυραι]ος ηλ[θον] ως υμας λαθρα
 [τα μεν φρασο]υσα χ[ερσιν] ατεχνησαμην
 535 [τα δ οια πασχ]ω [συνκατοικτιουμενη

Frs. 12, 13.

576 [της Ηρακλειας] ωστε μ]ητιν ει[σιδων
 [στερξει] γυναικα κει]νος αν[τι] σου πλεον
 [τουτ εννοησασ] ω φιλ[α]ι δομοις γαρ ην
 [κεινου θανοντος] εγκε]κλημε[νον] καλως
 580 [χιτωνα τουδ] εβαψα π]ροσβαλ[ουσο] οσα
 [ζων κεινος ειπε] και] πεπειρ[ανται] ταδε

Fr. 14.

602 οπως φερη]ς μοι τονδε] ταναυφη πεπλον
 δάρημ' εκ]εινω τανδρι] της εμης χερσ
 διδου]ς δε τ[ονδε] φραζ] οπως μηδεις βροτων
 605 κεινου παρ]οιθεν] αμφιδυσεται χροι
 μη]δε] ο[ψεται] νιν μητε φεγγος ηλιου

Fr. 15 Col. i.

]
]

744 [πως ειπας ω παι του παρ ανθρωπων] [^{μ θ}παρων ανθρωπου] [^αΑρ(ιστοφανης ?)]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]

Fr. 16.

763 [και πρωτα] μεν [δειλαιος ιλεω φρενι
 [κοσμω τε] χαι^αρων και στολη κατηυχετο

Fr. 15 Col. ii.

[κ]ομη δε λ[ευκον μυελον εκραινει μεσου
 [κ]ρατος διασπαρεντος [αιματος θ ομου
^δ
 απας ανευφημησεν ο[ιμωγη λεως
 του μεν νοσουντος το[υ δε διαπεπραγμενου
 785 κουδεις ετολμα τανδ[ρος αντιον μολειν
 [εσ]πατο γαρ πεδονδ[ε] κα[ι μεταρσιος
 [βο]ων ινζων· αμφι [δ ε]κτ[υπουνι πετραι
 Δοκρων ορειοι πρω[ν]ες E[υβοιας τ ακραι
 επει δ απειπε πολλα με[ν ταλας χθονι
 790 ριπτων εαυτον· πολλα δ [οιμωγη βωων
 το δυσπαρευνον λεκτρον [ενδατουμενος
 σου της ταλαινης. και τον [Οινεως γαμον
^α
 οιον καταστησαιο λυμ[αντην βιο
 τ[οτ] εκ προσεδρου λιγνυος δ[ιαστροφον
 795 οφθαλμον αρας ειδε μ' εν [πολλω στρατω
 δακρυροουντα· και με προσβλεψας καλει
 ω παι προσελ[θε]· μη φυγη[ς τουμον κακον

Fr. 17.

851 [μῦρα προ]φαι[νει δολιαν
 [και μεγα]λαν [αταν
 [ερρωγεν] παγα [δακρυων κεχυται?
 [νοσος?] ω ποπ[οι οιον αναρσιων
 [ουπω αγα]κλε[ιτον

Fr. 18.

[τι δ ω γεραια κ]αινο[ποιηθεν λεγεις
 [βεβηκε Δη]ανειρ[α την πανυστατην
 875 [οδων απασω]ν εξ ακ[ινητου ποδος
 [ου δη ποθ ως θα]νου[σα
 [παντ ακηκοας]
 [τεθνηκεν η τα]λαι[να

Fr. 19.

[ω παι γενου μοι παις ετ]ητη[μος γεγως
 1065 [και μη το μητρος ονο]μα πρε[σβευσης πλεον
 [δος μοι χερσιν σαιν αυ]τος εξ ο[ικου λαβων
 [εσ χειρα την τεκουσα]ν ως ειδω [σαφα
 [ει τουμον αλγεις μαλλο]ν η κει[νης ορων
 [λωβητον ειδος εν δικη] κακου[μενον
 1070 [ιθ ω τεκνον τολμησον οικ]τει[ρον τε με
 [πολλοισιν οικτρον οστι]ς ωστε [παρθενος
 [βεβρυχα κλαιων και τοδ ου]δ αν [εις ποτε
 [τονδ ανδρα φαιη προσθ ι]δε[ιν δεδρακοτα

Frs. 20, 21.

[προς του τερας τοι δια]κακω]ν εθεσπ[ισιας

- [αὐτὴ πρὸς αὐτῆς οὐδὲ]νος πρὸς ἐκτο[που]
 [οἰμοὶ πρὶν ὡς χρεὴν σφ ἐ]ξ ἐμῆς θανε[ῖν χερὸς
 [κάν σου στραφείη θυμὸς ? εἰ]ς τὸ παν μαθ[οῖς
 1135 [δεινὸν λόγου κατηρξά]ς· ἔπεε δ ἡ νοε[ῖς
 [ἀπαν τὸ χρεὴν ἡμαρτε] χρηστὰ μωμ[ενη
 [χρηστ ὦ κακιστε πατερ]α σὸν κτεινασ[α δρα
 [στεργημα γὰρ δοκουσα π]ροσβαλεῖν· σε[θεν
 [ἀπημπλαχ ὡς προσει]δε τοὺς ἐνδ[ῶν γαμοὺς
 1140 [καὶ τὶς τοσοῦτος φ]αρμακεὺς Τραχινί[ων
 [Νεσσοσ παλαί Κεν]ταυρ[ο]ς [· ξεπεισέ νιν
 [τοῖωδε φίλτρῳ τὸν σὸν ἐκμη]ναὶ ποθον]
 [ἰου ἰου δυστήνος οἰχομαι τ]α[λας·
 [ὀλωλ ὀλωλα φεγγος ουκετ] ἐ[στι μοῖ
 1145 [οἰμοὶ φρονῶ δὴ συμφορας] ἴν' ἔστα[μεν
 [ἰθ ὦ τεκνον πατηρ γὰρ ου]κέ[τ ἐστι σοι
 [καλεῖ τὸ παν μοι σπερμα σ]ῶν [ομαιμιῶν

Fr. 22.

-
 [ταχειαν ὦ παι προσθεσ ὡς π]ρὶν ἐμ[πεσειν
 [σπαραγμον ἢ τιν οιστρον ε]ς πῦρα[ν με θησ
 1255 [ἀγ ἐγκονεῖτ αἰρεσθε παυλα τ]οι κακ[ῶν
 [αὐτὴ τελευτὴ τοῦδε τανδρος]· υστα[τη
 [ἀλλ οὐδὲν εἰργεῖ σοι τελειουσθ]αί τα[δε

Fr. 23.

-
 [τῷ τὴνδ ἀτην υπεχόν]τι
 1275 [λείπου μηδέ συ] παρθε[ῖν ἐπ οίκων
 [μεγάλους μὲν ἰδο]ῦσα [νεοὺς θανατοὺς

Fr. 24.

Σοφ[οκλεοῡς]

[Ἰραχινιαῖ]

12. Unfortunately it is not clear whether the papyrus agreed with the MSS. in having τυπω(ι) βουκρανος, or supported Strabo's κύτει βούπρωρος, which is generally preferred. On the whole τυπ[ω] seems a more satisfactory reading than κυ[τει].

17. Bergk wished to reject this line.

275. Apparently Ολυμπιον was originally written, but a dot between ι and ω and a vestige of ink above the line point to the insertion of -ος as an alternative. The genitive would spoil the line.

278. ημύνατο : so L &c. ; ἡμύνετο B.

281. κ of ε]κ is directly above the first ι of εισι in l. 282, so that with υπερχλιοντες (L first hand and lemma of Schol.) the number of letters in the respective lacunae coincides. But υπερχλιδωντες (L corr. 1 A &c.) cannot be excluded.

292. Since the initial lacuna is of the same length as in the three preceding lines, it is likely enough that the papyrus agreed with LA in reading των δε.

Frs. 6-10. The cursive note at the top of this column refers to l. 372, and evidently explains the apparent inconsistency of ἀγορᾶ here with ἐν βουθερεί λειμώνι in l. 188, the inconsistency vanishing if ἀγορᾶ is taken in the sense of assembly or gathering; cf. Schol. ἀγορᾶ ἀθροίσματι. The reading suggested in the latter part of the third line is, however, highly doubtful, the μ being rather cramped and the σ very insecure. λων or των is possible.

360. εχο[ι : so edd. with A ; ἔχη (from ἔχει) L.

362-4. These verses have been much suspected, some critics bracketing ll. 362-3, others l. 362 τὴν ταύτης—l. 364 πατέρα.

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

370. ἄ : δ MSS., which is required by the preceding τὸ πᾶν.

372. Cf. n. on Frs. 6-10 above.

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

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

576. μ]ητιν : η suits the remains, which are inconsistent with ου.

579. εγκε]κλημιε[νον : a better spelling than that of L (-κλειμ-) or A (-κλεισμ-), and already restored by Dindorf. The ι was probably added by a corrector, but the colour of the ink is indistinguishable.

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

744. παρων, which was inadvertently written originally, has been amended to μαθων by the second hand, which also inserted in the margin the (unknown) v. l. ανθρωπου, attributing it to Αρ(), who is more probably Aristophanes than Aristarchus; cf. 1174. vi. 5, where Αρ() seems to be used side by side with Αριν() as an abbreviation of Ἀριστοφάνης. Subsequently the pen was drawn through this marginal note and also, rather unaccountably,

through the final word of the line. Possibly *ανθρωπων* was similarly cancelled and *ανθρωπου μαθων* rewritten above.

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

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

783. *ανευφημησεν*: this reading had been restored by Brunck from Hesych. s. v. *ανευφημήσει* and is also in Schol. Eurip. *Tro.* 573. *ανε φωνής εν L, ανευφώνησεν* or *ανεφώνησεν* other MSS.

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

790. *ριπτών*: cf. l. 780; *ρίπτων* MSS.

793. The alternative reading *οιαν* implies the corresponding v. l. *λυμαντήν* later in the verse; *οϊον . . . λυμαντήν* only MSS.

796. *δακρυροουντα*: analogous spellings are not infrequent in the papyri.

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

1071. *ωστε*: L mistakenly has *ῶστις*.

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

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

1136. *μω[ενη]* confirms the correction of Heath, which according to Subkoff was the reading of L²; *μνωμένη* LA &c.

1138. The stop after *π]ροσβαλειν* shows that *σέθεν* was constructed with *ἀπήπλακε* instead of with *στέργημα*.

1141. Some other letter than *ε* was originally written before *ξ*; that the alteration was made by the first hand is possible, but uncertain.

1254. *πὲρα[ν]*: the accent is a probable indication that *μεθης* was regarded as one word, as in L, since otherwise an acute on the *α* would be the normal accent. It is however possible that both accents were inserted, that on the *α* being lost.

Fr. 24. It is by no means certain that this small fragment of a title belongs to 1805.

1806. THEOCRITUS, *Idyll* xxii.

Height 29 cm. Late first century. Plate IV
(Col. iv).

Remains of four consecutive columns, of which the first two are represented by tiny scraps, with a small unplaced fragment. This was a handsome MS., the tall columns being carefully written in rather large uncials, round and upright, of an ornamental type exemplified in several Homeric papyri; cf. also e. g. 844 and

1375. The cross-bar of ϵ and θ is placed rather high, as in P. Brit. Mus. 271 (cf. Kenyon, *Palaeography*, Plate 15). On the whole a date rather before than after the close of the first century seems appropriate. One stop occurs in the middle position (l. 68), and there is also a doubtful rough breathing in the same line, and a circumflex accent in the unidentified fragment. A few corrections are from a second hand. An unusual feature in this roll is that the upper and lower margins are strongly tinged on the recto with yellow, probably due to cedar oil, which was used as a preservative against insects and gave a yellow tint (Vitruv. ii. 9. 13, Ovid, *Trist.* iii. 1. 13).

The *Hymn to the Dioscuri* is not well represented in the MSS. of Theocritus, and fresh evidence of so early a date is welcome. In l. 40 an obvious correction of Stephanus is confirmed. But the papyrus, in spite of its early date, is less enlightening than 1618; it solves no crux, and its distinguishing feature is the presence of several unknown variants of rather neutral character, l. 45 τεθραυμένος for τεθλασμένος, l. 60 ἀπέλθοις for ἰκάνοις, l. 77 κόγχου for κόχλου; cf. 694. 34, where σφιν παρέκειτο replaces γάρ σφιν ἔκειτο. The text shows a mixture of dialects similar to that found in the MSS., e. g. ἀπένθοις (so originally; ἀπέλθοις the corrector) and πύκτας side by side with Μαγνήσσης ἀπὸ νηός.

In the transcript below, the supplements follow the edition of Wilamowitz in the absence of any indication that the papyrus read otherwise; the collation appended is derived from the same source, supplemented by the edition of Ahrens.

Col. i.

8 [νηων θ αι δυνοντα και ουρανον εισ]ανιο[ντα

Col. ii.

38 [υδατι πεπληθυιαν ακ]ηρ[ατω αι δ υπενερθεν
[λαλλαι κρυσταλλω η]δ αρ[γυρω ινδαλλοντο

Col. iii.

40 [εκ βυθου] υψηλα[ι] δε πεφυκεσαν αγχοθι πευκαι
[λευκαι τε] πλα[τα]ρ[ο]ι. κ[αι α]κροκομοι κυπαρισσοι
[ανθεα τ ευωδη λασιαις φιλ]α εργα μελισσαις
[οσσ εαρος ληγοντος επιβ]ρκει αν λειμωνα

- [ενθα δ ανηρ υπεροπλος ε]νημενος ενδιασκειν^α
 45 [δεινος ιδειν σκληρησι τε]θραυμενος ουατα πυγμαις
 [στηθεα δ εσφαιρωτό πελ]ωρια και πλατυ νω[τον
 [σαρκι σιδηρειηι σφυρηλατο]ς οια κολοσσος
 [εν δε μυες στερεοισι βραχιο]σιν ακρον υπ ωμον [
 [εστασαν ητε πετροι ολοιτρο]χοι ουστε κυλινδε[ων
 50 [χειμαρρους ποταμος μεγαλαις περ]ιεξεσε διν[α]ις
 [αυταρ υπερ νωτοιο και αυχενος] ηφωρειτο
 [ακρων δερμα λεοντος αφημμε]νον εκ ποδεω[νων
 [τον προτερος προσεειπεν αεθλ]οφορος Πολυδ[ευκης
 [χαιρε ξειν οτις εσσι τινες βροτοι ω]ν οδε χα[ρος
 55 [χαιρω πως οτε τ ανδρας ορω τους μ]η πριν οπωπ[α
 [θαρσει μητ αδικοις μητ εξ αδικων φ]αθι λε[υσσειν
 [θαρσεω κουκ εκ σευ με διδασκεσθ]αι τοδ [εοικεν
 [αγριος ει προς παντα παλιγκοτο]ς η[δ υπεροπτης
 [τοιουσδ οιον ορας της σης γε μεν] ουκ ε[πιβαινω
 60 [ελθοις και ξεινων κε τυχων παλιν] οικαδ απε[[ν]]θοις^λ
 [μητε συ με ξεινιζε τα δ εξ εμευ ουκ] εν ετοιμω
 [δαιμονι ουδ αν τουδε πειν υδατο]ς συγε δοιης
 [γνωσεαι ει σευ διψος ανειμ]ενα χειλεα τερσει^ο
 [αργυρος η τις ο μισθος ερεις ω κ]εν σε πιθοιμεν
 65 [εις ενι χειρας αιειρον εναντιος ανδρι] καταστας
 [πυγμαχος η και ποσσι θενων σκελ]ος ομματα δ ορθοι
 [πυξ διατειναμενος σφετερης μη φει]δεο τεχνης
 [τις γαρ οτω χειρας και εμους συνερεισ]ω [ι]μαντας.
 [εγγυς ορας ου γυνυις εων (?) κεκλησε]θ ο πυκτας

Col. iv. Plate IV.

- 70 / η και α[εθ]λον· ετο[ιμον] εφ ω δηρισομεθ αμφω
 σος μεν εγω συ δ [εμος κεκλησεαι αι κε κρατησω
 ορνιθων φοινικ[ολοφων] τοιοιδε κυδοιμοι
 ειτ ουν ορνιθεσ[σιν] εοικότες ειτε λεουσι

- ^ε
 γινομεθ ουκ αλλω [κε μαχεσσαιμεσθ επ. αεθλω
 75 η ρ Αμυκος και κοχλ[ον ελων μυκησατο κοιλην
 ο[[^υ]] δε θοως συναγερθ[εν υπο σκιερας πλατανιστους
 κονχου φυσηθει[τος αι Βεβρυκες κομοωντες
 ως δ αυτως ηρωας ιω[ν εκαλεσσατο παντας
 Μαγνησσης απο νηος [υπειροχος εν δαι Καστωρ
 80 οι δ επι ουν σπειραισ[ιν εκαρτυναντο βοειαις
 χειρας και περι γυια [μακρους ειλιξαν ιμαντας
^ξ
 [εσ μεσσο]ν [[σ]]υναγο[ν φονον αλληλοισι πνεοντες
 [ενθα πολυ(s)] σφισι μο[χθος επειγομενοισιν ευχθη
 [οπποτερος] κατα [νωτα λαβοι φαος ηελιοιο

Unidentified Fragment.

. . .
]ομν[
]οϋ τ[
]κρι . [
] . [
 . . .

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

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

40. πεφυκεσαν: so Stephanus; πεφύκασιν MT.

41. πλατανοι τε is required, but cannot be read. The supposed ι (which is not ο) is followed by another vertical stroke, after which there is a blank space of about two letters' width. It looks as if the scribe had begun to write και immediately after πλατανοι and then changed his mind and left a space for the missing syllable. The loss of τε may have been caused by a misunderstanding of λεῦκαι, which was taken for λευκαί.

43. λειμωνα: λειμῶνας MSS.

45. τε]θραυμενος: τεθλασμένος (τεθλαγμ. M) MSS.

49. κυλινδε[ων: κυλίνδων MSS.

60. απελθοις (H² from απενθοις): ικάνοις MSS.

62. δοις, as originally written, is correct.

63. εἶ σου . . . τέρσει MSS.; the occurrence of τέρσει with v. l. -σοι at the end of the line points to εἶ σου or σευ preceding. εἰτέ σε . . . τέρσει Wilamowitz.

64. ε of *πιθοιμεν* was converted from a vertical stroke.

66. *θενων* . . . *ορθοι*: *θεων* . . . *ορθός* M, *θένων* . . . *ορθά* Tr. *ορθοι* for *ορθός* is no improvement, but is consistent with *θενων*, which also suits the space better than a shorter reading, the lacuna being of the same length as in the next four lines. *θένω σκέλος*; . . . *ορθά* WM.

68. There is something above the line, though whether it was intended for a rough breathing is rather doubtful.

69. It is unfortunate that this line is not better preserved, though *ο πυκτας*, which Wilamowitz obelizes, is at any rate something. *οὐ σύ με ἀμός* Tr., *οὐ γύννις* (*γύνις* M) *έών* MD, *οὐ γύννις έκών* Meineke, *οὐ γύννις ἀμός* Haupt. The spelling *πυκτας* is that of D (a corr.).

70. A short oblique dash in front of this verse has no evident significance. Cf. 694. 21.

77. *κονχου*: *κόχλου* MSS.

82. *συναγον* is the spelling of the MSS., as originally written here. Whether the termination is rightly read as *-γο[ν]* is not clear; the penultimate letter looks more like τ than γ, but the writer is apt to make the horizontal stroke project to the left, and this may be an extreme instance; moreover there is a suggestion of ε in the remains of the supposed ο. *ξυνατε[* would however be meaningless.

83. Consistency with the ordinary reading seems only to be obtained by the supposition of an original lipography of σ, which may of course have been supplied subsequently.

Unidentified fragment. This small piece is apparently in the same hand as the other fragments, though there is no instance in them of an accent (l. 2).

1807. ARATUS, *Διοσημέια*.

17.3 × 18.6 cm.

Second century.

This fragment contains the lower part of a column, preceded by a broad margin in which some cursive notes, both textual and explanatory, referring to the preceding column are entered. The notes on ll. 895 and 901 are in smaller and more lightly formed lettering than the v. l. on l. 897, but whether they really proceeded from a different writer the evidence is hardly sufficient to determine. The text of the Aratus is well written in a rather large hand, round and upright, somewhat similar to that of B. Berl. 6845 (Schubart, *Pap. Gr.*, Plate 19, c), though less heavy; it may be assigned with probability, like the Berlin papyrus, to the first half of the second century. Paragraphi were employed, and there are two instances of a high stop, inserted well above the line. The latter, and the occasional accents, are unlikely to be original and are due perhaps to the corrector, who may also be the author of the marginalia.

So far as it goes the papyrus shows a good text, which is in substantial agreement with the Marcianus (M), the oldest and best of the manuscripts. Readings found in later MSS. have, however, twice been subsequently incorporated, in one

place as a marginal variant (l. 897), in another as a correction (l. 930). A departure from accepted tradition in l. 927 is supported by Joh. Philoponus and also by another early Aratus papyrus at Berlin (*Berl. Klassikertexte*, v. i. iii. 1) in which a few letters from the last 14 lines of Col. ii are preserved. The papyrus reading is condemned very positively by the Berlin editors, but the coincidence of ancient testimony is worth notice; it is of course possible that the alternative lection was given in 1807 as a v. l.

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

Col. i.

895	· · · · ·	? φα]τνης
]]
897		νο]τω δ επικεκλιται
]]
]]
901] εγγυα αλληλων φαιν[ο]γ[ται]
]]
]]
	· · · · ·	

Col. ii.

	· · · · ·	[εξ̄ αλος] ερ[χηται φωνη περιπολλα λεληκωσ
915		[κε]ινυμε[νου κε] θαλασ[σαν υπερ φορευοιτ ανεμοιο
		και ποτε κ[αι κε]πφοι οπο[τ ευδιοι ποτε(ω)νται
		αντια μελ[λοντ]ων ανεμ[ων ειληδα φερονται
		πολλακι δ [αγριαδ]εσ νησσα[ι η ειναλιδιναι
		αιθυιαι χερσ[αία τ]ινασα[^ο ω]νται πτ[ερυγεσσιν
920		η νεφελη ορε[οσ] μηκυνεται εν κορ[υψησιν
		ηδη και παμποι λευκης γήρειον ακ[ανθησ
		σημ̄ εγενοντ ανεμου κωφη[^σ π] αλος ο[πποτε πολλοι
		ακρον επιπλωωσι τα μεν παροσ αλ[λα δ οπισσω
		και θερεοσ βρονται τε και αστραπαι [ε]ν[θεν (ε)ωσιν
925		ενθεν̄ επερχομ[ε]νοιο περισκοπε[ειν ανεμοιο

και δια νυκτα μελαιναν οτ αστε[ρες] αισσωσι
 ταρφεα· τοι δ οπιθεν ρυμοι επι[λευκαινονται]
 δειδεχθαι κεινοις αυτην οδον ε[ρχομενοιο
 πνευματος· ην δε κεν αλλοι εναν[τιον] αισσωσιν
 8'
 930 αλλοι[[ς]] εξ αλλων μερεων τοτε δη πεφυλαξο
 παντοιων ανεμων οι τ ακριτο[ι] εισι· μαλιστα
 ακριτα δε πνειουσιν επ ανδρα[σι] τεκμηρασθαι
 αυταρ οτ εξ ευροιο και εκ νοτου [αστραπτησιν]

895. Perhaps της φα]της was added in explanation of ἐγγύς, or the word may be part of a longer note on a previous line; cf. Schol. 892 εἰσι δὲ καὶ παρ' ἑκάτερα τῆς φάτης δύο ἀστέρες, κτλ. But e. g.]ανης or]ενης is also possible.

897. The marginal v. l., νο]τω δ επικεκλιται, is the reading of A and Maass (cf. l. 486); presumably επιερχεται stood in the text, as in CM.

901. A paraphrase of ἀλλήλων . . . ἰνδάλλονται. Cf. Schol. . . . ὁ δὲ νοῦς, ἐάν, φησίν, οἱ μὲν ἀστέρες ἐγγύς ἀλλήλων φαίνονται, ἀφανῆς δὲ ἡ φάτης, τηνικαῦτα βραχὺν χεῖμῶνα προσδόκα . . .

915. [κ]εινυμ[ε]νου : κινουμ. AC.

921. l. παπποι.

923. επιπλωσι : so Maass with several later MSS. (cf. Homer ε 284); -όωσι AM, -είωσι C.

924. τε : om. C.

927. τοι δ : so ACM and (M) Schol.; τοῖς δ' Philoponus, in *Aristot. Meteor.*, p. 100 (ll. 926-31), τοῖς Maass.

οπιθεν : ὀπισθεν A Philop.

επι[λευκαινονται] : so P. Berl. 7503-4 and Philop. ἰπολευκaiνονται (or -ωνται) MSS., Maass (cf. Homer E 502).

928. κείνης A.

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

κεν : so CM Philop., Maass ; και A.

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

1808. PLATO, *Republic* viii.

Width of column 4·5-5 cm.

Late second century.
 Plate IV (Cols. i-iii).

Remains of the upper parts of five narrow columns which are successive but for the loss of one column between the third and fourth; the original length of the columns was approximately double the amount preserved. The text is well written in good-sized uncials of the sloping oval type, in which the smallness of ε, θ, ο, σ is in marked contrast to the breadth of the square letters η, μ, ν, π; their

date is more probably second century than third. Single points in the high and middle position are used as stops, as well as a colon, which serves both for punctuation (iv. 5) and to mark a change of speaker, in combination with *paraphrasi* (v. 13); a short blank space is sometimes employed instead for the same purposes (iii. 10, v. 14). One instance occurs of a rough breathing, due very likely to the corrector whose hand is in evidence here and there and who may also have been the author of at any rate most of the marginalia, which are the interesting feature of this papyrus. Cols. i-ii covered the famous passage 546 b-c describing the Platonic Number, and the margins contain a quantity of explanatory annotations, for the most part well preserved, but rendered difficult by the frequent use of tachygraphic symbols, the interpretation of which is not always clear. The writer is strangely inconsistent and seems sometimes to have dropped into short-hand almost unawares, e. g. in Col. i, marg. 8 it is not easy to see what was gained by a tachygraphic η in $\iota\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\upsilon\nu$. In the existing scarcity of material for the study of early Greek tachygraphy this well-dated specimen, exiguous though it is, has a value. The two columns have been printed, so far as exigencies of type permit, as they stand, and a reconstruction is attempted in the commentary; the exact forms of the symbols can be better followed in the accompanying facsimile (Plate IV). With regard to the matter of the notes, to the elucidation of which Prof. A. E. Taylor has kindly contributed, there is a noteworthy coincidence with Dercylides, the earliest writer whose view about the numbers reached is given by Proclus in his commentary on the *Republic*; see Col. ii, marg. 12-13, n. The annotator's interpretation of the mathematics would therefore appear to be based, directly or indirectly, upon Dercylides, and thus gains considerably in interest; cf. Col. i, marg. 9-10, n., where a further small point of contact with $\delta\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \Delta\epsilon\rho\kappa\upsilon\lambda\iota\delta\eta\nu$ is observed.

In its testimony for the text of Plato the papyrus is undistinguished; some inaccuracies have been corrected by the second hand, which has introduced a novel variant in Col. ii. 8.

Col. i. Plate IV.

γεν]νη
[σουσι παιδα]ς
[ποτε ου δεον ε]σ

546 b

Col. ii. Plate IV.

] . ι μ̄η [.] ισομη[κ 1
]ηδε[.] . [. . .] φ λ η π ε σ θ μ ο [ν α δ ι ? 2
] . . [.] . [.] . ε χ ε ι τ ε τ ρ α γ ω ν ° α ρ ι θ μ ο ς [3
] . ε̄ ο υ τ ο σ χ η μ α \ \ C τ Μενωνι ε̄ ε̄ [4
τ]ο διπλασιον απο δ' μετ' γ' ε̄ [5
[μκη με]ν τη[ι 546 c
πρ[ομηκη] δ[ε
εκατ[ον με]ν αρι

	[τι δε θειωι με]ν		
5	[γεννηται περι] κοσμω . [. .]	1
	[οδος ην αριθμος] μ' αυλ επ[.] ν α	2
	[περιλαμβανει] α	3
	[τελειος ανθρω] Ηρακλειτ' ετη μ	4
	[πειωι δε εν ωι] τελ' \ στ' ε'	5
	[πρωτωι αυξησεις] ω κ' τρ ο θς ωρ	6
	[δυναμεναι τε και] οτι σ' γ' πλανητας	7
	[δυναστευομενα]ι] στ' / σιν	8
10	[τρις αποστασεις]] δυναμεν 1 ὑπο	9
	[τετταρας δε ορ]ους] τεινουσας	10
	[λαβουσαι ομοιο]ν] 1 αλλ 1 πλευρ 1	11
		ορθην \ βασιν	12
] δ ^ο ορ ^ο γ' αποστα	13
		σεις εχουσαι γ' ον	14
		δ κ' γονες τ ^ο	15
		ορι ^{οι} επιφερ ^ο	16

	θμων α[πο δ]ια	ρητ' αριθμ ο πλευ	6
5	μετρων [ρη]των	ραν εχ ^ω	7
	πεμπαδ[ος] δεο		
	μενων [ενο]ς εκα	λειπ ^ο μονα	8
	ου	δι γ' πλευρ' μη	9
	στων' αρρη[τ]ων	αρρητ' ο ν ου L	10
	δε δυειν [εκα]τον	εισι π ^λ	11
		κξ γ' ημερ	12
		Ζφ [ε] γυ ^υ	13
		τρι ^α δος	
10	δε κυβω[ν] γ' ξυμ		
	πα[ς] δε ου[τ]ος ο αρι		
	θμος γ[ε]ωμετρι		
	κος τουουτου κυ		
	ριος [αμεινωνων		
15	τε κ[αι] χειρωνων		

Col. iii. Plate IV.

[λ]ειν [φυλακες ον 546 d
 τες παρ ελαττον
 του δε[οντος ηγη
 σαμενο]ι τα μου
 5 σικης δ[ευτερον
 δε τα γυμναστι
 κης οθεν [αμου
 σοτερο[ν]] υ[μιν γε
 νησον]ται οι νε
 10 οι εκ [δε τουτων αρ

Col. iv.

πλουσιω[[ι]] τας ψυ
 χας· επι την αρ
 τ
 χην και την αρ
 κατα
 χαιαν αποστα
 5 σιν ηγετην: βι

χου[τες ου πανν

φυλ[ακικοι κα
 ταστ]ησονται
 προς τ[ο δοκιμα
 15 ζειν [τα Ησιοδου
 τε κα]ι παρ υμιν
 γενη [χρυσουν τε
 και [αργυρουν και
 χαλ]κουν και σιδη

Col. v.

νυ μεν ο[υν]: με
 ταβησετα[ι μεν
 δη ουτως [μετα
 βασα δε πως [οι
 5 κησει· η φαν]ε
 ρον οτι τα μ[εν

αζομενων δε	μιμησεται τ[ην	
και αντιτεινον	προτεραν π[ολι	
των αλληλοις εις	τειαν τα δε τ[ην	547 d
μεσον ωμολογη	10 ολιγαρχιαν· [α	
10 σαν· γην μεν	τ εν μεσω[ι ουσα	
και [οικ]ιας κατα	το δε τι [κ]αι αυτης	
[μ]ε	εξει [ιδι]ον· ου [
νειμανους ιδιω	τως εφη[[ι]] ουκο[υν	
[σασθ]αι· του[ς] δε	15 [τω]ι [με]ν τιμα[ν	
[πρι]ν φυλατ[το		
15 [μενο]υς υπ [αυ		

Col. i, marg. 1. Perhaps *κοσμοι*, the word in any case being explanatory of *θειωι γεννηται*. The two following lines, at the beginnings of which, to judge from the notes below, two or three letters may be lost, are obscure. *μ'*, if right, should = *μέν* or *-μεν*, and the next word may be a form of *αυτός*, perhaps *αυτόν*: tachygraphic *τ* becomes a vertical stroke, and ** = *ου*, and the combination of these might produce something like the symbol in the text, though different from that e.g. in Wessely, *Ein System der altgr. Tachygraphie*, Plate II. 9. 5. Further on, *ν* is surmounted by a small semicircle (perhaps incomplete), which may represent *ο* or *ω*.

4. The collocation of figures after *ετη* is peculiar. If *μ* = *μυριάς*, since the *ω* is written above and connected with *α* by enclosing dots, it would seem natural to suppose that the number meant is 1,800 × 10,000. On the other hand *α* ought to mean 1, not 1,000, and seeing that, as Prof. Taylor observes, the value 10,800 is assigned by some writers to the 'great year' of Heraclitus (cf. Sessorinus 18. 11), there is a probability that *μ ω* should have been written.

5-8. These four lines, which appear to be in a different hand from that of the rest of the marginalia, are an explanation of *τέλειος αριθμός*, but are not easy to interpret. Perhaps *τέλ(ει)ος* *ἄτ(ι) ἐ(ν)* [*αὐτ*] *ῶ* *κα(τὰ) τρ(οπήν) ὁ θ(εὸς) ὤρι(κεν) ὅτι σ(ύν)π(αντας) πλανητῆς* [*ἀποκ(αθ)ί-στησιν* may approximate to the sense, though there are several points here which are unsatisfactory. At the end of l. 5 a short vertical stroke, which might be read as *ι*, remains unaccounted for. Can *ἐ(ν)ι[αυτ]ῶ* be meant? But the order is not in favour of this. In l. 7 *σ'* is a recognized abbreviation of *σύν*, and *σ(ύν)π(αντας)* would be unobjectionable but for the occurrence in l. 14 of a similar curved symbol which remains unexplained. In l. 8 *ἀποκαθίστησιν* is the compound expected, but this will presuppose considerable irregularity at the beginnings of the lines. Taylor suggests that *σ' ἐ* may stand for *ὁ τ(έλειος) ἐ(ν)ιαυτός*, followed by *ἐ(ν) ῶ*: such drastic abbreviation, however, seems hardly possible, especially as the word *ἐνιαυτός* does not actually occur in the text.

9-10. *δυναμέν(ας) (τὰς) ὑποτεινούσας*? : a similar sign represents *ας* in Wessely, *op. cit.* Plates I. 2. ii. 2, III. 10. 1. That the same symbol should stand for both *-ας* and *τὰς* is not a serious objection, since there are analogies for this in tachygraphy, and the alternative *δυναμέν(αι) (αί)* not only necessitates the alteration of *υποτεινούσας* but also involves a similar incongruity in ll. 11-12, where the same sign occurs in conjunction with accusatives. Why, however, that case was used in these two places remains obscure. For the substance of the

note cf. Alex. Aphrod. *In Arist. Met.* A 8. 990 a 23 of the Pythagorean triangle ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ἡ ὑποτείνουσα ἴσον δύναται ἀμφοτέραις ἅμα, διὰ τοῦτο ἡ μὲν δυναμένη καλεῖται, αἱ δὲ δυναστεύμεναι, and Dercylides *ap. Proclus, In Remp.* ii, p. 25 (Kroll) τῶν μὲν περιχουσῶν τὸν πρῶτον ἐν συμφωνίᾳ λόγον ἔχουσῶν (i. e. 4 : 3), τῆς δ' ὑποτεινούσης ἡ (sic : *exspectas* διπλάσιον, Kroll; but what is expected is surely ἴσον) δυναμένης ἀμφοῖν.

11-12. (τὰς) ἄλλ(α)s πλευρ(ά)s, referring to δυναστεύμεναι; cf. the passage from Alex. Aphrod. quoted in the preceding note. In the next line the ἄλλαι πλευραὶ are more closely defined as the ὀρθή and the βάσις, the perpendicular and the base of the triangle. For the symbol interpreted as *as* or *tás* cf. n. on ll. 9-10 above. The sign \ ordinarily means εἶναι, and also represents *ov*, but these would be out of place here, where *καί* is desirable. Cf. ii, marg. 4.

13-16. δ̄ ὄρο(ι) γ̄ ἀποστάσεις ἔχουσι . . . δ̄ κ(εἰ)ονες τὸ ὄρι[ο(ν)] ἐπιφέρ(ουσι)?). For the high dot at the end of the first word of the note cf. Col. ii, marg. 8, where a similar mark occurs above λείπ(ει). Possibly there was a corresponding mark in the text. The latter part of the note is obscure. In l. 14 the symbol before *ov* is like that in l. 7 above, which may represent π. *ov* seems to be a termination rather than the relative, which would lack an antecedent, and also a governing verb, if τὸ ὄρι[ο(ν)] is the object of ἐπιφέρ(ουσι). With regard to this verb, the plural termination is demanded by κίονες, and the symbol at the end has a smaller and more rounded top than that standing for εἰ. The introduction of κίονες, as a synonym apparently of ὄροι, is hardly helpful.

Col. ii. 3. εκατ[ον]: so A²M Proclus; ἔκαστον AFD.

7. The v. l. εκαστον superscribed by a second hand is unrecorded.

9. δευιν: so AD; δυοῖν with others Burnet.

11. ο after ου[τ]ος has been cancelled by a dot placed above; οὔτος ἀριθμὸς MSS.

13. υ, which was originally written in place of ι, was presumably cancelled, but only the top is preserved; the correction may be by the original hand or the corrector.

Col. ii, marg. 1-5. This mutilated note refers to ll. 4-8 of the text, the value of ἀριθμῶν ἀπὸ διαμέτρων ῥητῶν πεμπάδος being explained by the aid of diagrams. The 'rational diameter of 5' means the rational number nearest to the diameter of a square, the side of which is 5. This diameter is $\sqrt{50}$ (*Euclid* i. 47), to which the nearest rational number is 7. The number 48 in ll. 1 and 9 marg. is of course arrived at by subtracting 1 (δεομένων ἐνός ll. 6-7, λείπ(ει) μονάδι marg. 8) from the square of 7 (ἀριθμῶν ἀπὸ διαμέτρων ll. 3-4). In marg. 2 perhaps προμήκη] δέ should be restored, and τ]φ̄ before λ(εἰ)πεσθ(αι): for μο[νάδι cf. marg. 8. In marg. 4 something like ὡς ἐν τῷ Μένωνι seems required, and the symbol before Μενωνι, which recurs in marg. 12-13, no doubt represents τφ̄; cf. e. g. Wessely, *op. cit.* Plate II. 7. 2, where the sign for τω is analogous, though the straight stroke is diagonal instead of being horizontal. Whether the preceding curved sign, which resembles a sigma (cf. ii, marg. 10), could represent ἐν is doubtful; at any rate the previous group is not in the least like the tachygraphic symbol for ὡς. The passage of the *Meno* referred to is 85 b ἀπὸ τῆς διαμέτρου . . . γίγναι' ἂν τὸ διπλάσιον χωρίον. In l. 5 l. ἀπὸ δ(ια)μέτ(ρου) γί(νεται). Of the following diagram only a small part is preserved, and its nature is not clear; there seems to have been more than a square with a diagonal.

6-7. It would be natural to expand this note ῥητ(ός) ἀριθμ(ός) ὁ πλευρὰν ἔχω(ν), but as this is an obviously incorrect definition of a finite number, Taylor suggests that ῥητ(ῶν) ἀριθμ(ός) κτλ. is meant, 'the square of a "rational diameter" is a square number', which is less tautologous in Greek than in English, but might have been more clearly expressed as ἀριθμὸς ἀπὸ ῥητῶν ὁ πλευρὰν ἔχων. Cf. marg. 10-11.

8-9. λείπ(ει) μονάδι, εἰ πλευρ(ά) μῆ. These words seem intelligible only if πλευρ(ά) here

is taken as referring to the side of the oblong; 'it is less by a unit, if the side = 48 ($\times 100$)'. This is certainly not very satisfactory, and there is something to be said for Taylor's proposal to insert ϵ before $\overline{\mu\eta}$: 'it is less by a unit; i. e. if the side is 5, the number will be $(49-1=) 48$ '. But emendation of this kind is better avoided, if possible. Cf. marg. 1-2, where there was a somewhat similar note.

10-11. ἀρρητ(ᾶν?) (δέ?) $\bar{\nu}$, οὐ (οὐκ) εἰσι πλ(ευραί). It seems simplest on the whole to regard the first two words of this note as a lemma from the Platonic text; cf. ῥητ(ᾶν?) in marg. 6. The curved symbol is rather like that in marg. 4, but some part may be lost in a hole in the papyrus, and at any rate the head differs in having a downward bend. With regard to (οὐκ), the usual tachygraphic equivalent of ου is an upward curve, but this sometimes degenerates into a straight stroke, as e. g. in Wessely, *op. cit.* Plate III. 10. 1.

12-13. (τῶ) κζ γί(νονται) ἡμέρ(αι) Ζϕ, ἀκ(ολούθως?) (τῶ) γυν(αικείῳ). In this note the number 27 appears to have been connected with the female *μηριαίων*. For the symbol for τω cf. marg. 4 above and n. *ad loc.*; if that is right, the group next to the figures in l. 13 must govern the dative, and hence ἀκ(ολούθως) is suggested. In the number Ζϕ the first figure might be taken for 'A, but is no doubt 'Z, since, as Taylor points out, 7,500 is given as the value of one of the *ἁρμονίαι* by Dercylides *ap. Proclus, In Remp.* ii. 25 (Kroll) ὁ μὲν ἐστὶν ὁμοιότητι φίλος, ὁ β, ὁ δὲ ἀνομοιότητι, ὁ σῆ, καὶ ὁ μὲν (γεννᾶ) τοιοῦτον ἄλλον τὸν μύρια, ὁ δὲ ἀνόμοιον μετ' ἐκείνου τὸν Ζϕ. Proclus obtains the number σῆ by the addition of κζ and μῆ (ii. 36 sqq.), but whether he is here following Dercylides he does not say.

Col. iii. 8. υ[μιν γε]νησον[ται]: the vestige before the lacuna and the arrangement of the lines makes the reading practically certain; *γενήσονται ὑμῖν* (FDM, Burnet) or *ἡμῖν* MSS.

10. εκ: or perhaps εγ.

Col. iv. 2. αρχην was first written (no doubt owing to the following *αρχαίαν*) the ϵ having been inserted at the same time as the τ over χ, which has not been deleted.

4. καταστασιν, as amended, is the ordinary reading.

12. To which hand the insertion of the missing syllable is due is uncertain.

Col. v. 1. με[ταβησεται]: so AM; *μεταβηθήσεται* D, *μεταθήσεται* F.

14. The superfluous ι adscript has been crossed through and a dot was also placed above it.

15. [τω]ι: so A, Burnet; τό FD. The vestige of the ι is very slight, but the reading is confirmed by the spacing.

1809. PLATO, *Phaedo*.11.3 \times 11.7 cm.

Early second century.

This fragment contains parts of three columns, of which the second, so far as it goes, is in fair preservation, but rather more than half the lines are missing at the foot. The hand is a small upright uncial of neat appearance, suggestive of the Trajan-Hadrian period. Vertical strokes are often finished at the base with a small hook or flourish which sometimes curves back to the perpendicular, e. g. in l. 13 the τ of *εναντιων* has the peculiar form \mathcal{T} . Besides stops in the high and middle positions a colon, as in 1808, is used for punctuation, this latter and perhaps the others also being apparently by the original hand. Paragraphi

denote alternations in the dialogue; whether they were accompanied by a colon, as usual, does not appear. Accents and breathings have been inserted here and there, more probably than not after the text was written; they may be due to the hand which has added some notes in a small second-century cursive in the upper margin. Though the general purport of these annotations is clear they are obscured by mutilation, and it is a matter of doubt to which lines precisely they referred. Possibly the symbols in the margin of Col. iii were intended to mark the place of other notes which have been lost.

The text is a good and interesting one, of the eclectic type frequently met with in papyri. Of the four readings in which the papyrus agrees with TW against B, three are accepted by Burnet (whose edition is the basis of the collation given below) and the fourth (iii. 13 ἔφη, ᾧ Κέβης for ᾧ Κέβης, ἔφη) may be right; on the other hand, in ii. 14 it agrees with B² in *καίτοι οὐτι* against the inferior *καὶ τοιοῦτό τι* of BTW, and in ii. 12 has the preferable *οὐδέ* of BT against *οὐτε* of B²W.

1]εγ[.]αι εκ των εναντ[ιων
2];

3].. [μ]εγεθ^ο μηδ[.]εν αλλα
4] αλλα τα [. . α]λλ^η τα εκ 8 θος αυτου εως αν μ . [. .]
5] . . ιων μεσος τις ει : τ . [.] μειζων 9 ειη μικρον
]αι μικρον του τε/
6] . τουτι.] το εν αυτωι μεσου και μικρον >
7]τητα μικρο[⁵] αν ειη και παλιν μεγε

Col. i.

Col. ii.

<p>] . η] . .] . ο]ε> 5] .] . οσ]α]]α 10] .] . :]</p>	<p>απολωλენαι : υπομενον δε και δεξαμενον την σμικρο τητα. ουκ εθελειν ειναι ετε ρον η ὅπερ ην : ωσπερ εγω· δε 5 ξαμενος και υπομεινας την σμικροτητα· και ετι ὡν ὄσπ[ερ] ειμι ουτος ὁ αυτος· σμικρος ειμι· εκεινο δε ου τετολμ[η κεν μεγα ὄν σμικρον ειν[αι 10 ως δ αυτως και το σμικρον [το εν ημιν· ουκ εθελει ποτε μ[ε γα γιγενεσθαι ουδε ειναι· ου[δ</p>	<p>102 e</p>
---	---	--------------

] αλλ ουδεν των εναντιων ετ[ι
]· ον οπερ ην· αμα τουναντι[ον
 15]· 15 γιγνεσθαι τε και ειαι· αλλ η [103
]· τοι απερχεται· η απολλυται· [
]· εν τουτωι τωι παθηματ[ι
]· [πανταπ]ασιν εφη ο Κεβ[η]ς
]· [ουτως φα]ινεται μ[οι και
 20]· [τις ειπε τ]ων παρο[ντων α
]· [κουσας οστι]ς δ ην [ου σα

Col. iii.

]· [των εχοντων τα εναντια ε]
]· λε[γομεν επονομαζοντες
]· αυτα τη[ι εκεινων επωνυμι
]· αι· νυ[ν δε περι εκεινων αυτων
 5]· ων [εροντων εχει την επω
]· νυμια[ν τα ονομαζομενα αυ
]· τα δ εκεινα ουκ αν ποτε φαμεν
]· εθελησ[αι γενεσιν αλληλων
]· δεξασθαι[ι και αμα βλεψας προς
 10]· ··· τον Κεβη[τα ειπεν αρα μη που
]· εφη ω Κεβη[ς κ[αι σε τι τουτων
]· εταραξεν [ων οδε ειπεν ου
]· δ αυ εφη ο Κεβ[η]ς ουτως εχω
]· καιτοι ουτι [λ]εγ[ω ως ου πολλα
 15]· μ[ε ταραττει συνωμολογη
]· [—]
]· κ[α]μ[εν]

Marginal note. 1. The letters]εν[are on a small detached fragment which seems to belong to this line, though whether it precedes or follows]αι εκ των εναντι[ων is doubtful.

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

5. ενά]ντιων is possible, though the vertical stroke before ι is rather long for τ and

would better suit e. g. ρ; but εκ | [των ενα]ντιων is unlikely, since ll. 6-7 indicate a longer line. ει: τ cannot be εη apparently.

6. . τouth is crossed through and]αι μικρον του τε / inserted above it, probably by the same hand. A very unintelligible collocation is left.

Col. i. This column would be expected to begin about 102 b 5, but the scanty remains are not easy to identify. The best point of departure is l. 6] . os, followed by]a (or]λ) in l. 7. Φαιδω]ρος | [δε ελαττω λεγεις ταυτ]a (T for τότ(ε)) could here be read, but the vestiges of ll. 1-4 do not seem to bear out this identification. b 6 μεγε]θος and b 8 η]δος are unsuitable, and though c 4 π]ρος is possible,]α]ληθη would give too short a line. The double dot in l. 11 is not of much assistance, since this may represent either a stop or a change of speaker; cf. int.

ii. 6. οσπ[ερ]: ὡσπερ W.

8. κεινω: so B²TW; ἐκείνος B.

ου: so B²TW; om. B.

10. ὡσαύτως T.

12. γενέσθαι W.

ουδε: so BT; οὔτε B²Wt.

13. ερ]ι | ον: so TW; αἴτιον B, and W v. L.

14. αμα: the μ has been altered, whether by the original or a later hand is not clear; αλλα was apparently first written.

19. The first ι of φα]νεται is under ι of [πανταπ]ασιν in the line above and τ of τωι in l. 17, so that [ουτω φα] is hardly enough for the lacuna, which may, however, be sufficiently filled by writing ουτως or ουτωι.

iii. 9. Whether the papyrus had προς or εις is of course not determinable; the same remark applies to ου]δ or ο | δ in l. 12.

10. The meaning of the marginal symbol, consisting of three heavy dots in the form pyramid, is unknown; it may refer to a lost marginal note.

11. εφη ω Κεβης: so TW; ὦ Κέβης εφη B, Burnet.

13. In the margin opposite this line there is a small circular mark like the sign for short quantity.

14. καιτοι ουτι: so B²; και τοιοῦτό τι BTW.

16. The marginal sign is on the broken edge of the papyrus and may be incomplete; here, too, the meaning is obscure.

1810. DEMOSTHENES, *Olynth.* i-iii, *Phil.* i, *De Pace.*

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

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

and the height of the roll must have approximated to 30 cm. Short lines are filled by the common angular sign. Paragraphii are used for purposes of punctuation, and the letter following the pause is sometimes slightly postponed; points in the high and medial position are also employed, though some of these look like later additions. A later hand is also responsible for one or two small corrections, for the coronis at *Olynth.* iii. Fr. 5. ii. 10 and the mark of elision in *Phil.* i. 15. 17.

The text is on the whole a good one, of the usual 'eclectic' kind. Peculiar variants (*Olynth.* ii. Frs. 14-18. 19, 22, *Olynth.* iii. 7. 2-3, *Phil.* 17. 4-6, 21. 3-5) are unimportant, and there is no tendency to depart from the tradition of the MSS. Of these S, by common consent the best, is often supported, in several places against all other testimony (*Olynth.* ii. Frs. 9-11. i. 3, Frs. 12-13. 5, 12, *Phil.* 4. 1, 27. 2, *De Pace* 2. i. 6, 22); in *Phil.* 11-13. ii. 5 a vulgate spelling has apparently been converted later to that of S. On the other hand agreements with the readings of other MSS. against S are not uncommon (*Olynth.* ii. Frs. 2-3. 11 (= YOF), 9-11. i. 2, 14-18. 1, *Olynth.* iii. 5. ii. 19 (= A), *Phil.* 4. 2 (= Y), 5-6. 15 (= FB), 11-13. i. 10, ii. 4, 14. 1, 10, 18-20. 10 (= YO)).

In the transcription given below, lines in minor pieces have been completed for the sake of convenience in reading, but in such cases the division of lines adopted is often quite hypothetical. In consequence of the fragments being so widely scattered over five speeches identification of small scraps is difficult, and a number of these have not been printed.

Olynth. i.

Fr. 1.

[τ]ε τ[ουτων ενι τωι πρωται § 9
 προθυμως και ως προση
 κον [εβοθησαμεν αυτοι ραι
 ου] και πολυ ταπεινοτερω
 5 νυν [αν εχρωμεθα τωι Φιλιπ

Fr. 2.

[βουλου εγω] δ ουκ αγνω § 16
 [μεν ω ανδρες] Αθηναιοι τουτο
 [οτι πολλακις] υμεις ου τ[ους
 [αιτιους αλλα τους] υ[στατους

Frs. 3-4.

[λιππον λαμβα]νειν· ει δε τ[ο]υ
 7 lines lost
 [μους ηδιον αν και ελευ]θε § 23
 10 [ρους η δουλους ειναι και] γαρ

[χουσαν και την οικεια]ν ταυ
 10 [την αδεως καρ]πουμειοι
 [αν δ εκεινα Φιλι]ππος λαβη
 τις αυτον κωλυσει δευρ[ο] βαδι
 ζει[ν]. Θηβα[οι μη] λει[αν πι § 26

[αῆθεις κατακουειν τιν]ος

Frs. 5-7.

ναιοι μ[η]δε του[θ] υμας λανθα § 25
 νετω οτι νυν αιρ[εσις] εστιν
 υμιν πο[τ]ερ υμας ε[κει] χρη
 πολεμε[ιν] η παρ υμ[ιν] εκει
 5 [νον]. εα[ν] μ[εν] γαρ α[ν]τεχη
 [τα των Ολυ]νθίων υ[μεις] εκει
 [πολεμησετε] και την [εκεινου]
 [κακως ποιησετε την υπαρ]

κρον [ει]πει[ν] ηι και] συνει[σ]
 15 βαλουσιν [ετοιμως α]λλ[α Φω
 κεις οι τη[ν οικειαν ουχ] οιοι
 τε οντε[ς φυλαττειν α]ν μη
 [βο]ηθη[σηθ] υμεις η αλλος
 τις αλλ ω [ταν ουχι βουλησε
 20 ται των α[τοπωτατων] μεν
 ταν ειη ει [α νυν ανοιαν οφλι
 σκανων [ομως ε]κ[λαλει] ταυ
 τα δυνη[θη]ει[ς] μη] πρα[ξει] αλ
 λα μη[ν] ηλικ[α] ε[στιν] [τα δια
 25 φορα ενθα[δ] η] εκει π[ολεμειν]
 ουδε λογου π[ρο]σδε[ιν] ηγου

Fr. 8.

] πολ § 28
 [λων ων καλως ποιουν]τες

Fr. 1. The identification of this fragment is made with hesitation, since the reading *προσῆκον* in place of *προσῆκεν*, though intelligible, is unattested, and it is not clear that any letter preceded ε in l. 1; on the other hand, the fact that l. 5 is apparently the last of a column affords some confirmation, since the end of a column is expected at about this point, and no other suitable position for the fragment has been found in these five speeches.

Frs. 3-4. 11.]ο is only a shade to the right of]γ and]θ in the preceding lines, and the omission of *του* before *κατακουειν* (so Bl(ass) with Liban.) seems probable.

Frs. 5-7. 12. βαδι[ζ]ει[ν]: so MSS., Liban.; βαδίζοντα Bl. with Rh. Gr. ii. 679 &c.

13-14. The papyrus seems to have had the ordinary reading. Dindorf read *οι* (so Baiter) *ει* (so two MSS.) *μη*, omitting *η* with Rh. Gr. ii. 679 &c. Bl. similarly omits *η*, inserting a sign of interrogation after *ειπειν*.

15. Bl. brackets *ετοιμως* following Rh. Gr. v. 36, vii. 941.

17. *οντες* is bracketed by Bl. following Rh. Gr. iv. 739.

24. γ seems to have been omitted after *ηλικα*, as in u (Coisl. 324).

Fr. 8. The length of l. 2 appears to suit this passage better than § 15 πολ|λωι φανωμεν *ερραιθυμηκο*τες, but the identification is not certain.

Olynth. ii.

Fr. 1.

[επι] πολλων μ[εν αυ τις ιδειν § 1
[ω ανδ]ρες [Αθη]ναιοι

Fr. 4.

. § 13
[ταυτ εβελη]σ[ηθ] ως π[ροσηκει
[και δη περαιν]ειν ου μ[ονου
[ω ανδρες Αθ]ηναιοι τ[α

Frs. 5-6.

.
[σκεψαιτ ου χαλεπω]ς οι δε § 17
[δη περι αυτον ουτε]ς ξενοι
[και πεξετ αι]ρο[ι] δοξαν μεν
[εχουσιν ως] ε[ι]σιν θαυμαστ[οι
5 [και σ]υγκ[εκ]ροτ[η]μ[ε]ν[οι τα
[του] πολεμου ως δ εγω τω[ν
[εν] αυτη τη χωραι γεγενη [.
[μενων τινος] ηκου[ν αν
4 lines lost

λεμ[ου και αγωνων τουτους] § 18
μεν [φιλοτιμιαι παντας απο
15 θειν [αυτον εφη βουλομε
νον [παιθ αυτου δοκειν ει
ναι τα]ργα προς γαρ αυ τοις
αλλοις [και την φιλοτιμιαν

Frs. 2, 3.

[καπιο]ρκουντ[α και ψευδο § 10
[μενον] δυνα[μιν βεβαιαν
7 lines lost

10 [και πλοι]ου κα[ι των] αλλων
[των τοι]ουτων [τα] κατοθεν ισ
[χυροτε]ρα ει[ναι] δει ουτω
[και των] πραξ[εων] τας αρχας
[και τας υ]ποθε[σεις]

Frs. 7-8.

[ανυπερβλητ]ον ει[ναι] ει
[δε τις σωφρ]ων η δικαιος
[αλλως την] καθ ημεραν ακρα
[σιαν του βιου και μ]εθην και
5 [κορδακισμου]ς ου δυναμε
[νος φερειν] παρεωσθαι και
[εν ουδενος] ει[ναι] μερει
[τον τοιουτο]ν λοιπους [δη § 19
[περι αυτον] ει[ναι] ληιστας
10 [και κολακας] κα[ι τοιουτους
[ανθρωπους οιο]υς μεθυσθεν
[τας ορχεισθαι τοι]αυτα οια
[εγω νυν] οκ[ω] προς υμας
[ονομασαι δηλ]ον δ οτι ταυ
15 [τ εστιν] αληθη] και γαρ ους
[ενθενδε] παντες απ[η]λαν
7 lines lost

ποιου[σιν] ενεκα του γελασθη
25 ναι το[υτους]

Frs. 9-11. Col. i.

το]ις σωμασιν § 21

[ημων τεω]ς μεν αν ερρω[με
[νος ηι τις] ουδεν επαισθα
[νεται επα]ν δ αρρωστημα

5 [τι συμβηι π]αντα κεινεται
[καν ρηγμα κ]αν στρεμμα [καν
[αλλο τι των υπ]αρχοντων >
[σαθρων ηι ου]τω και των πο
[λεων και των] τυραννων

10 [εως μεν αν εξω] πολεμω >
7 lines lost § 22

νομ[ιζει σωφρονος μεν
ανθ[ρωπου λογισ]μωι χρη

20 ται· μ[εγαλη γαρ ρο]πη μαλ
λον [δ ολον η τυχη] παρα παν
τ ε[στι τα των ανθρ]ωπων

Frs. 12-13.

[ει μηδεις υμω]ν ω ανδρες Α § 25
[θηναιοι] δυναται λο[γισασθαι
[ποσον π]ολεμειτε χρ[ονον Φι
[λιππω]ι και τι ποιο[υντων

5 [υμων] ο χρονος διε[ληλυθεν ου
[τος ισ]τε γαρ δηπο[υ τουθ οτι
[μελλο]ντων υμων [ετερους
[τινας] ελπιζοντ[ων πραξειν
[αιτιωμ]ενων αλλ[ηλους
10 [κρινοντων παλιν ελπιζον]
[των σχεδον ταυθ απερ] νυ[ι
[ποιουντων απας ο χ]ρονος
[διεληλυθεν ειθ ουτω]ς αγνω § 26
[μονως εχετ ω ανδρε]ς Αθη

Fr. 11. Col. ii.

δ[ικαιων αντηρατε και πολ § 24
λ ι[δρια]

Frs. 14-18.

[γεγον]εν δ[ια των αυτων του
[των ελ]πιζετε πραξεων
[εκ φαυλ]ων [αυτα χρηστα γε
[νησε]σθαι· αλλ ου[τ ευλογον
5 ου[τ εχο]ν εστιν [φυσιν τουτο
γε· π[ολυ γαρ] ρα[ιον εχοντας
φυλα[ττειν η κτη]σασθαι παν
τα π[εφυκεν νυν δ ο τι μεν
φυ[λαξομ]ε[ν ουδεν εστι

10 [υπο] του πολεμο[υ λοιπον
των προτερον κτ[ησασθαι
δε δει αυτων ου[ν ημων ερ
γον τουτ η[δη φημι δη δειν § 27
εισφερε[ιν χρηματα αυτους
3 lines lost

15 [ναιοι ωστε δι ων εκ χρ]ηστων [καυτα] δε απ αυ[ων των ερ
 [φauλα ταπραγματα της] πολεως [γων κρι]νοντας τους [μεν
 20 [αξιους επαινου τιμαν του]ς
 [δ αδικου]ντας κολαζειν τα]ς
 [προφασει]ς αφελειν και τ[α
 [καθ υμας] ελλειμματα ου γ[αρ
 [ε]στι πι[κρ]ωσ εξετασαι τ[ι πε
 25 [πρα]κται [τοι]ς αλλοις αν μη [πα
 [ρ υμων αυτω]ν πρωτον υ[παρ
 [ξη]ι τα δεου]τα· τ[ι]ν[ος γαρ ει

Fr. 19.

[μηδε] οτιουγ [συμπονειν ου §.30
 [χι γενη]σετα[ι των δεοντων
 [ημιν] ουδ[εν εν καιρωι το γαρ
 [ηδικ]ημεν[ον αι μερος ελ
 5 [λειψε]ι ειθ υ[μιν

Frs. 2-3. 11. ισχυροτε]ρα: so YOF corr.; ισχυρότατα other MSS., Bl., Butcher.

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

Frs. 5-6. 1. A stop may be lost before αι.

2. ουτε]ς: om. Bl. with Hermog. p. 50, Rh. Gr. vii. 607.

Frs. 7-8. 1. τάνδρός, which is omitted by Bl. and Butcher with SFB, was clearly not in the papyrus.

6. π]αρεωσθαι: so SAFBY: παρεωράσθαι vulg.

16. In estimating the number of lines lost below this one it has been assumed that the papyrus had και τοιούτους ανθρώπους, which Bl. brackets.

Frs. 9-11. i. 2. ημων: so FOPQ; om. SY, Bl., Butcher.

3. The papyrus agrees with S¹ (so Bl., Butcher) in omitting τῶν καθ' ἕκαστα σαθρῶν which is commonly added after ἐπαισθάνεται.

8. Whether the papyrus had σαθρων (S¹ &c., Bl.) or σαθρον (vulg., Butcher) is indeterminable.

21. Judged by the preceding and following lines there should be eleven letters in the lacuna, and the omission of το before ολον with S and Dion. Hal. 1089 is therefore probable. Bl. follows S, Butcher the vulg.

Fr. 11. ii. The identification is doubtful; ιδ[ιαι . . . πολ]λα[κίς is another possibility.

Frs. 12-13. 5. χρόνος: so S, Bl., Butcher; χρόνος ἅπας vulg.

7. υμων: so S; αὐτῶν other MSS., Butcher, om. Bl. with Schaefer and Cobet.

12. ἀπας ὁ χρόνος: so S, Bl., Butcher; ὁ χρόνος ἅπας vulg.

Frs. 14-18. 1. τῶν αὐτῶν . . . πράξεων: so most MSS.; τούτων ἐλπίζετε τῶν αὐτῶν πράξεων S, Butcher, and Bl. with [πράξεων]. Cobet bracketed τῶν αὐτῶν πράξεων, Gebauer πράξεων only.

12. A high stop may be lost after δει.

19. κρι]νοντας: κρίναντας MSS.

22. προφασε]ις: προφάσεις δ MSS. If δ were similarly omitted after τους (l. 20), which is quite possible, the asyndeton would balance those earlier in the sentence.

Olynth. iii.

Fr. 1.

τιμ[ωρη § 1
[σασθαι Φιλιπ]πον ὀρω γιγνο
[μενους τα δε] πραγματα εις
[τουτο προηκ]οντα· ὠσ[τ]ε [
5 [ὀπως μη πεισ]ομεθ αυτοι π[ρο
[τερον κακως σ]κεφασθαι δε
[ον ουδεν ουν αλλο] μοι δο[κου
[σιν οι τα τοιαυτα] λεγοντε[ς η
[την υποθεσιν περι] ης βου [
.

Fr. 4.

[ροις αυτον βο]ηθειν οτι γαρ
[εις τουτο π]εριστησεται τα π[ρα
[γματα εαν τα] παροντα προω
[μεθα σχ]εδ[ον ι]σμεν απαν
5 [τες δη]που· αλ[λ ο]τι μεν δη δει § 10
[βοηθ]ειν ειποι τις αν παντες
[εγνωκαμ]εν και [βο]ηθησομ[εν
[το δ οπως του]το λεγε· μη
[τοιουνν ω ανδρε]ς Αθηναιοι
10 [θαυμασητε αν π]αραδοξον
.

Frs. 2-3.

[σαι] χαλεπωτατον [ηγουμαι αλλ § 3
[εκ]ε[ι]ν απορω τινα χρη τρο
[πον ω ανδρες Αθηνα]ιοι προς
[υμα]ς περι αυτων ειπ[ειν
5 [πεπει]σμαι γαρ εξ ὀν [παρων
[και α]κ[ο]υων συνοιδ[α τα πλειω
5 lines lost
[λο]γους υπομενειν τουτο θε
[ωρ]ου[ι]τας ει ταληθη λε
[γω] και δι[α τουτο ινα τα λοι
15 [πα βε]λτιω [
.

Col. i.	Fr. 5.	Col. ii.
3 lines lost		
	αθ]ωι	
5 [ους καθιστασιν ειτα και τ]ους [τα δεοντα ποιει]ν βουλομε> [νους αθυμ]οτερους ποιουσιν [επειδα]ν δε ταυτα λυσητε και [την του τ]α βελτιστα λεγειν οδον	§ 11	πρα[ξαιμεν τωι νυν τα βελτιστα § 13 ειπ]οντι ζημιαν γενεσθαι πριν δε ταυτ ευ[τρεπισαι μηδαμω ω ανδρες Αθηναιοι μηδενα
10 [παρασχ]ητε ασφαλη τηνικαν τα τον γραφοντα α παντας ιστε οτι συμφερει ζητειν πριν	§ 12	5 αξιουτε μη τ]ηλικουτον ει ναι παρ υμιν ωσ[τε τους νομους τουτους παραβα]ντα μη δουναι δικην μηδε ου[τως ανοητον ωστε εις προυπτ]ον κακον
15 μων υφ [ν]μων απολεσθαι > βουλησεται ου γαρ ευ[ρ]ησετε αλλωσ τε και τουτου μονου περιγιγνεσθαι μελλοντος > του παθειν αδικωσ [τι κα]κον		10 αυτον εμβαλειν [ου μην ου § 14 > δ εκεινο γ υμασ αγ]νοειν δει ω ανδρες Αθηνα[ιοι οτι ψηφι σμ[α] ουδενωσ αξ]ιον εστιν αν μη προσγενη[ται το ποι
20 [τον ταυτα ει]ποντα και γραψαν		15 ειν εθελειν τα δοξ[αντα προ θυμωσ υμασ ει γαρ α]υταρκη τα ψηφισματα ην η [υμασ αναγ καζειν α προσηκε]ι πραττειν η περι ων αν γραφ]η διαπρα

Fr. 6.

[θεις πλην μικρ]ων [εις ατα § 35
[ξιαν ανελων εις] ταξ]ιν ηγα
[γον την πολιν τ]ην α[υτην
[λαβει]ν [τ]ου στρατευεσ[θαι του
5 [δικασ]ειν του ποιειν τ[ουθ ο
[τι καθ η]λικιαν εκαστο[σ εχοι
[και οτου] καιρωσ ειη ταξ]ιν ποι
[ησασ ου]κ εστιν οπου μ[ηδεν

Fr. 7.

ο]τι [και § 36
[τη πολει και] απασιν υμ]ιν
[συνοισειν] μελλει

Fr. 1. 5. Either πεισ]ομεθ or πεισ]ωμεθ could be read.

Frs. 2-3. 4-5. Bl. brackets περι αιτων and inserts και before παρων with Isidor. x. 126.

Fr. 5. i. 11-12. The interlineated readings are those of the ordinary text.

19. του: so MSS. except S, Isidor.; om. Bl., Butcher with S.

ii. 5. μη has been cancelled by dots placed above.

12. Bl. brackets δ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι.

15. τα: τα γε MSS.

16. υμας is bracketed by Bl. and Butcher with Cobet.

19. αν γραφ[η: so A suppl.; γραφείη corr. to γραφή S, with ἂν γραφή in a late hand, γράφει vulg. γραφείη Bl., Butcher.

Fr. 6. 1. Either μικρ]ων (S corr. h. 1 B corr. AO, Butcher), or μικρ]ον S¹B¹ can be read; μικρῶ Bl. with Dionys.

7. Bl. brackets τάξιν ποιήσας.

Fr. 7. 2-3. ἀπασιν υμ[ιν συνοίσειν: ἅπασι συνοίσειν ὑμῖν MSS.

Phil. i.

Fr. 1.

[κακῶς τ[α] πρᾶ[γματα] § 2

Fr. 2.

[σκοπων το τε] πληθος τ[ης] υπαρ § 4

[χουσης αυτ]ωι δυναμεως [

[και το τα χω]ρια παντα απο [

[λαλεσαι τη πολει ορθως] μεν [

Fr. 3.

[δρες Αθην]α[ιοι και υμεις] § 7

επι της τοιαυτη[s] εθελησητε

γενεσθαι γνωμης νυν ε[πει

[δηπερ ου προτε]ρον· και [

Fr. 4.

δοκ[ουντων οικειως εχειν] § 8

και π[ανθ] οσα περ καν αλλοις

τισιν [ανθρωποις ενι

Frs. 5-6.

τοσο[υτον] επειδαν απαντ α § 14

κουσητ[ε] κρινατε μη προτερον

προλαμ[βανετε μηδ αν εξ αρ

[χη]ς δοκ[ω] τινι καινην παρα

5 lines lost

10 μενα τη ν[υ]νι βοηθειαι

κωλυσαι δυ[νηθει]μεν αλ § 15

Fr. 7. Col. i.

[νητον εστιν εν η δια τ]ον φο § 18

[βον ειδως εντρεπει]ς υμας

[εισεται γαρ ακριβως] εισιν

[γαρ εισιν οι παντ εξ]αγγελ>

5 [λοντες εκεινωι παρ ημ]ω[ν]

[αυτων πλειους του δ]εινοντος 5 ε[

[ησυχιαν εχη η παριδ]ων ται η[

Fr. 7.

Col. ii.

λ	οσ αν δει[ξ̄]ηι τις πορισθ̄ει	[τ αφυλακτος ληφθη]ι μηδε	τ[
	σα παρα[σκευη και ποση και	[νος οντος εμποδω]ν πλειν	. [
	ποθ[εν διαμειναι δυνασεται	10 [επι την εκεινου χωρ]αν υμιν	.
15	τεως [αν η δ]ιαλυσ[ωμεθα πει	[αν ενδωι καιρον τα]υτα μεν	.
	σθεντες τον πο[λεμον η πε	[εστιν α πασιν δεδοχθα]ι φημι	.
	ριγενωμεθα τω[ν εχθρων	.	.
	ουτω γαρ ουκετ[ι του λοι	.	.

Fr. 8.

	[μακρον τουτον αλλ] οσον	§ 21	.
	[αν δοκη καλως εχ]ειν εκ δια		.
	[δοχης αλληλοις το]υς δ αλ		.
	[λους ξενους ειναι κε]λευω		.
5	[και μετα τουτων ιππε]ας δια		.
	[κοσιους και τουτων π]εντη		.
	[κοντα Αθηναιους του]λαχι[σ		.
	.		.

Fr. 9.

	π]αντελω[ς	§ 23	.
	[ταπεινην] ειναι δει πολιτα[ς		.
	.		.

Fr. 10.

	[ναι]μεθ [εκεισ αφικεσθαι δει	§ 32	.
	[τ]οινυν [.
	.		.

Frs. 11-13.

Col. i.

	εμποριων στομασι[ν ραιδι		
	ως [ε]σται α μεν ουν χρ[ησε	§ 33	
	[ται κα]ι ποτε τη δυνα[μει πα		
	[ρα το]ν καιρον ο τουτων [κυ		
5	[ριο]ς καταστας υφ υμ[ω]ν βου		
	[λε]υσεται· α δ υπαρξ[αι] δει πα		
	[ρ υ]μων [τα]υτ εστιν α εγω γε [
	[γρα]φα· αν [τ]αυτ ω ανδ[ρ]ες Α		
	[θη]ναιοι πορισ[η]τε [τα χρ]ημα		
10	[τα πρ]ωτον α λεγω· [ειτ]α και		
	[ταλ]λα παρασκευασα[ντε]ς τους		
	[σ]τρατιωτας τας τριηρεις του[ς]		

Col. ii.

	θοντα χρονον εις Αημ[ον	§ 34	
	και Ιμβρον εμβ[αλων αιχμα		
	λωτους πολιτας [υμετερους		
	ωιχετ· εχων και προς τωι [
5	Γερα[[ι]]στωι τα πλ[οια συλλαβων		
	αμυθητα χρη[ματα εξελεξε		
	τα τελευται[α εις Μαραθωνα		
	απεβη και [την ιεραν απο		
	της χω[ρας ωιχετ εχων τρι		
10	ηρη· υμ[εις] δ ουτε ταυτα δυ		
	νασθε κω[λυειν] ουτ εις		
	τους χρο[νους] ους αν προ		

[ιππ]εας εντελη πασαν την
 [δυνα]μιν νομοι κατακλειση
 15 [τε επι] τωι πολεμω[ι] μενειν
 [των] μεν χρηματο[ν] αυτοι
 [τ]αμιαι και ποριστα[ι γιγν]ομε
 [ν]οι· των δε πραξ[εων] παρα του
 [στρατηγου του λ]ο[γον] ζητουν
 20 [τες παυσεσθε αι περι]
 [των α]ντ[ων] βουλευομενοι
 7 lines lost
 μα[χων] αγων και φερων τους
 30 πλεου[τας] την θαλατταν ε
 [π]ειτα τ[ι] προς τουτωι του

Fr. 14.

[ατακτα α]οριστα· α[διορθω] § 36
 [τα απαντ]α τοιγαρου[ν] αμα
 [ακηκοαμεν] τι και τρι[ηραρ]
 [χους καθισταμε]ν· και το[υτοις]
 5 [αντιδοσεις ποιου]μεθ[α] και
 [περι χρηματων] πορου σκο
 [πουμεν και με]τα ταυτα εμ
 [βαινειν τους μ]ετοικους
 [εδοξε και τους] χ[ωρις] οικουν
 10 [τας ειτ αυτους παλ]ιν αντεμ
 [βιβαζειν ειτ εν οσω]ι ταυ[τα] § 37

Fr. 16.

[γης εχεται]· καν ε[τέρωσε] πατα
 [ξηι τις] εκεισε· εισ[ιν] αι χει

θησθε βοη[θειν] καιτοι τι δη § 35
 ποτε ω ανδ[ρες] Αθηναιο νο
 15 μιζετε την [μεν των Παν
 αθηναιων ε]ορτην και την
 των Διονυσι[ων] αι του καθη
 κοντος χρ[ο]ν[ου] γιγνεσθαι
 αν τε δεινοι λαχωσιν αν τε
 20 ιδιωτ[αι]

3 lines lost

§ 34 [οσ ουδ ει]ς ενα [των αποστο
 25 [λων και] τ[οσουτ]ον

Fr. 15. Plate IV.

[τουθ υβ]ρεως εληλυθεν ωσ
 [τ επιστ]ελλειν Ευβοεσιν
 [ηδη το]μαντας επιστολας
 [επιστολης α]ναγνωσις
 5 [τουτων ω ανδρες] Αθηναιο § 38
 [των ανεγνωσμενω]ν αληθη
 [μεν εστι τα πολλα] ως ουκ εδει ο[υ]
 [μην αλλ] ισως ο[υ]χ ηδεα ακ[ου]
 [ειν αλλ] ει μεν] οσα αν τις υ
 10 [περβη] τωι λογ[ωι] να μη λυ
 [πηση και τα πρ]αγματα υπερ
 [βησεται] δει προς ηδονην
 [δημη]γορειν· ει δ η των λο
 [γων] χαρις αν ηι μη προσηκου
 15 [σα εργα]ι ζημια γιγνετα[ι]
 [αισχρον] εστι φενακιζειν [εαν]
 [τους και] απαντ' αναβαλλ[ο]
 [μενους α] αν η δυσχ[ερη] παν
 [των υστερι]ζειν τω[ν] εργαων

[ρες] προβαλλεσθα[ι δε η βλε
[πειν εν]αντιο[ν ουτ οιδεν
5 [ουτ εθελει] κα[ι

3 lines lost § 39
[λουθειν τοις πραγμασ]ιν [αλ]
[λ αυτους εμπροσθεν] ειναι
25 [των πραγματων και τ]ον αυ
[τον τροπον ωσπερ τ]ων στρα
[τευματων αξιωσει]ε τι[ς αν

Fr. 17.

[περι] του πολ[εμου ουδε προ § 41
[τω]ν πραγματ[ων προορατε
[ο]υδεν πριν [αν η γεγενη
[μ]ενον τι η γ[ιγνομενον
5 [πυθη]σθε [τ]αυτα δ [ισως προ
[τερο]ν μεν ην· νυ[ν δ επ αυ
[την η]κε[ι] τη[ν] ακμ[ην

Fr. 21.

[χοι τ]εθνασι [τωι δεει τους § 45
[τοιο]υτους α[ποστολους ου
[γαρ ε]στιν ο[υκ εστιν ω αν
[δρες Α]θην[αιοι εν ανδρα δυ
5 [νηθη]να[ι ποτε ταυθ· υμιν

Fr. 23.

[γματ αισ]χυ[νης ωστε των στρα § 47
[τηγων ε]καστο[ς δις και τρις
[κρινε]ται παρ υ[μιν περι θα
[νατου] προς δε [τους εχθρους
5 [ουδεις] ουδ απα[ξ αυτων α

Frs. 18-20.

[δεις υμων μητ ε]νθυ[μειται § 43
[μητ οργι]ζεται ορ[ων ω αν
[δρες Α]θηναιοι τ[ην μεν αν
3 lines lost
[σαν ηδη υπερ του μη π]αθειν
[κακως υπο Φιλιππο]ν· αλλα
[μην οτι γ ου στησε]ται[ι δηλον
10 [ει μη τις αυτ]ον [κωλυσ]ει [ε]ιτα
[τουτ ανα]μενο[υμεν και τρι
[ηρεις κ]ενας κ[αι τας παρα του
[δεινος ε]λπιδας αν αποστειλη

Fr. 22.

πραξη[ι προς υμας § 46
[ψευδομε]νοι ραιδ[ιως

Fr. 24.

[του προσηκοντος] κακο[υργου § 47
[μεν γαρ εστι κρι]θεντα α[πο
[θανειν στρατη]γου δε μαχο
[μενον τοις πολ]εμοις. [

καί: so MSS. except S, which omits καί: om. Bl., Butcher.

5. The deletion of the first ι of Γεραιστῶι seems to have been intended. There is a dot just above and slightly to the left of the ι, and on the line between α and ι something like a comma, both marks being in rather lighter ink. Γεραιστῶ SBO, Bl.; Γεραιστῶ vulg., Butcher.

12. Either προ|θησθε (SFB, Bl., Butcher) or προσ|θησθε (A) might have been written; προέλησθε vulg.

Fr. 14. 1. α]οριστα α[διορθωτα: so vulg.; ἀδιόρθωτα ἀόρισθ' SAY, Bl., Butcher.

10. αντεμ[βιβαζειν: so vulg. εἶτ' ἀντεμβ. S Vind. 1, Bl., Butcher.

Fr. 15. 18. α]: so S; other MSS. have οσα, but for this there is not room unless αναβαλλ[ομενους was differently divided, which is improbable.

19. υστ]ε[ρ]ειν (S, Bl., Butcher) is possible as a reading, but considerations of space favour υστ]ε[ρ]ειν.

27. τι]s αν: so SY, Bl., Butcher; ἄν τις others.

Fr. 16. 2-3. πατα]ξηι τις: or πα|ταξηις, with S.

Fr. 17. 3-4. γεγενημ]ενον τι η γ[ι]γνομενον: γεγ. ἢ γιγν. τι most MSS., Bl., Butcher; Y transposes γεγ. and γιγν., and the same order is equally possible in the papyrus, to which the position given to τι is apparently peculiar.

6. ην: ἐνήν SA, Bl., Butcher, ἐνήν ποιείν YO, ἦν ποιείν FB. The loss of the syllable εν- would be very easy after μεν.

Frs. 18-20. 2. Either οργιζεται (SAY) or λογιζεται (vulg.) is possible.

10. αυ]ον [κωλυσει: so YO; αὐτὸν κωλύσει F, κωλύσει S, κωλύσει Bl., Butcher.

Fr. 21. 1. τους, which Bl. omits with Schol. Aristid. p. 196, was evidently in the papyrus.

3-5. There is apparently no authority for the insertion of ᾧ ἄνδρες 'Αθ. after ἔστιν here, but this seems the easiest explanation of the clear]να[in l. 5, which cannot be δείνα unless there was a considerable omission; moreover if [δυνη]θην[αι be read in l. 4, the supplement at the end of l. 3 becomes rather long. Cf. Ol. 2. 10, where ᾧ ἄνδ. 'Αθ. follows οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν. The similarity of ἄνδρα δυνηθῆναι and ἄνδρες 'Αθηναῖοι might help to account for either the dropping or insertion of ᾧ ἄνδ. 'Αθ.

Fr. 24. 1. This line was probably the first of a new column, which is expected about this point. The margin above it, like that below Fr. 23. 9, is broken, but that the two fragments belonged to different columns is indicated by their dissimilar appearance.

Fr. 28. 2. πα]σι: so S (πᾶσιν), Bl., Butcher; πᾶσιν ὑμῖν other MSS.

De Pace.

Fr. 1.

ο]ν συν § 16

[επιστρατευειν ουδετ]εροις.

Fr. 2.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

[παντες αν βουλοινθ εν]εκα § 17
 [αυτων κρατησαντα]ς δε τους ε
 [τερους δεσποτα]ς υπαρ[χ]ειν
 [αυτων ουδε εις] τι ουν ηγου
 5 [μαι φοβερων και] τι φυλαξα
 [σθαι δειν ημας] μη κοινη
 [προφασιν και κοινον εγ
 [κλημα ο μελλων] πολεμος
 [προς απαντας λα]βημ ει γαρ § 18
 10 [Αργειοι μεν και Με]σσηνη[ο]ι
 [και Μεγαλοπολιτ]αι και τινες
 [των λοιπων Πε]λοπον[η]
 [σιων οσοι ταυτα το]υτοις φρο
 [νουσι δια την προς Λακ]ε
 15 [δαιμονιους ημιν επικ]ηρυ
 [κειαν εχθρωσ σχησουσι και]
 [το δοκειν ενδεχ]εσθαι [τι
 [των εκεινοις πεπραγμενων]
 [Θηβαιοι δε εχο]υσι μεν ωσ
 20 [λεγουσιν απεχ]θ[ω]σ

περι [των ιδιων εκαστος ορ] § 19
 γιζομενος κοινον εφ ημας
 αγαω[σ]ι [τον πολεμον τα των
 Αμφικ[τυωνων] δογματα προ
 5 στη[σαμενοι] ειτα επισπα
 σθωσ[ιν] εκαστοι περα του
 συμφ[εροντος] εαυτοις ημιν
 πολε[μησαι] ωσπερ και περι
 Φωκ[εας] ιστε γαρ δηπου του § 20
 10 θ' οτι [γυν] Θηβαιοι και Φιλιπ
 πος κ[αι] Θετταλοι ουχι ταυτα
 εκαστ[οι] μαλιστα εσπουδακο
 τες ταυ[τα] παντες επραξαν
 οιον Θ[η]βαιοι τον μεν Φιλιπ
 15 πον πα[ρελθειν] και λαβειν
 τας παρο[δους] ουκ εδυναντο
 κωλυ[σαι] ουδε γε των αυτοις
 πεπ[ονημενων] υστατον
 ελθο[ντα] την δοξαν εχειν
 20 νυνι γ[αρ] Θηβαιοις προς μεν § 21
 το [την χωραν] κεκομισθαι
 π[επρακται] τι προς δε τιμην
 κ[αι] δοξαν αισχιστα ει γαρ μη
 π[αρηλθε] Φιλιππος ουδεν αν
 25 α[υτοις] εδοκει ειναι ταυτα
 δ [ουκ] εβουλοντο αλλα τωι

Fr. 1. 2. επιστρατευειν (O) suits the length of the line better than -σειν, but remains of course uncertain.

Fr. 2. i. 2. Either αυτων or εαυτων can be read.

6. δειν ημας: so S, Bl., Butcher; φημι δειν ημας (ὕμ.) ὅπως, for which there is evidently not room, vulg.

ii. 7-8. ημιν] πολε[μησαι]: so MSS.; Bl. and Butcher bracket, following the indications of Schol. p. 164.

22. π[επρακται] τι: so S Bl., Butcher; κάλλιστα πέπρακται other MSS., Isidor.

<p>πι μικρ[οις τις] σεμνυνη [ται τοσοῦτ ἀπεχει το]υ τιμης [τινος δια ταυτα τυχ]ειν 15 [ω]στ [ἀπειροκαλος πρ]ος εδο ξεν ε[ιναι ουτος τοι]νυν ανελ[ων τα] τη[ς δοξ]ης κτη [ματα του πλ]ουτο[υ] πεποιη [ται μικρα κ]αι ουχ υμων α 20 [ξια αλλ ουδ] εκε[ι]ν ειδεν § 184 [οτι προς μεν χρημα]των</p>	<p>[τ]ην πολιν εις ομονοιαν αγοντες αθανατον αυ[τ]ων κλεος λελοιπασιν τ[ους] επι 20 τηδευοντας οια σοι βεβιω ται της αγορας ειργοντες· υμεις δε εις τουτο ω ανδρες § 186 Αθηναιοι προηχθητε ευ ηθιας και ραιθυμιας ωστε 25 [ο]υ[δε]</p>
---	---

Col. iii.

<p>ναι τοιουτων επιτη[δευ ματων οια τουτωι βε]βιω ται· και περι μεν τουτ[ου] § 187 κατα σχολην· ἃ δε Τιμ[οκρα 5 τει συνερει πολλα λεγ]ειν ε τι προς τουτοις εχων π[αυσο μαι· οίδα δ οτι ως μεν [ουκ ασυμφορος υμιν εσθ ο ν]ο · μοσ και π[α]ρα παντας τ[ους 10 νομους εισενη]ν[ε]γμεν[ος και κατα παντα αδικω]ς [ε χων ουχ εξει λεγειν [ακου</p>	<p>ω δ αυτον ως εκτετιστ[αι τα χ[ρ]ηματα Ανδροτ[ιω]νι 15 κ[αι] Γλαυκετη και Μελα[νω πωι λεγειν· και οτι [δε]ιν[ο τα[τα] αν παθοι παντ[ω]ν α[ν θρωπων ει πεπο[ι]ηκοτω[ν εκεινων τα δικαια υπερ 20 ων αυτος αιτιαν εχει θε[ι ναι τον νομον· μηδεν η[τ αυτος τον αλισκοιτο· εγω δε το[ν λογον ηγουμαι τουτον [ο]υ[δε]</p>
---	--

i. 7. Bl(ass) brackets ἡ . . . κτήματα, which words are absent in *c. Androt.* 75.

12. τις] σεμνυνη[ται: so F and *c. Androt.* 75; σεμνύνηται τις Bl., Butcher.

18. The papyrus apparently agreed with the MSS. in omitting τα which is read by edd. before του with *c. Androt.* 75.

19. ουκ υμων αξια: so F and *c. Androt.* 75.

20. ειδεν: so Bl. and Butcher with SLFYO; οιδεν vulg.

ii. 6. αγοσα: ἄγουσαι F.

7. After μναν most MSS. insert ἄς, ὅταν σοι δοκῆ, πάλιν γράφεις καταχωρεύειν, which is read in *c. Androt.* 76 (γράφεις); om. SAY¹; Bl. brackets.

8-9. α καταρσαιντ αν: so MSS.; ἄν καταράσαιθ^θ Bl., Butcher with *c. Androt.* 77.

12. οιοισπερ: so MSS., Butcher; οἴοσπερ Reiske with *c. Androt.* 77, Bl.
 18-19. αυ[τ]ων κλειος: so F; κλειος αὐτῶν other MSS., edd.; AYO have ἀγαγόντες for ἄγοντες.
 επιτηδευοντας: -σαντας F corr., *c. Androt.* 77, Bl.
 22. τουτο: so F and *c. Androt.* 78; τοσοῦτο(ν) other MSS. and v. l. F, Bl., Butcher.
 23. προηχθητε: so vulg. and *c. Androt.* 78; πρόηχθε S, προῆχθε Weil, Bl., Butcher.
 iii. 3. Whether the papyrus had τουτου (S) or τουτων is of course quite uncertain.
 4-5. Τιμ[οκρα]τει συνερει: so MSS.; Τιμοκράτης νῦν ἐρεῖ Dobree, Butcher.
 13-16. αυτον . . . Μελα[νω]πwai λεγειν: so A; other MSS. place λεγειν after αυτον.
 19. εκειων: τούτων F.
 20. Bl. and Butcher bracket αυτος, following Rh. Gr. v. 581. 16.
 23. τούτον ἡγοῦμαι F.

1812. ISOCRATES, *Ad Demonium.*

19.7 × 13.7 cm.

Fifth or sixth century.

This practically complete leaf from a papyrus codex is inscribed in a sloping uncial hand, similar in character to that of P. Rylands 58 (Plate 3), though rather more careful and regular, and is no doubt of about the same period. The ink, at the bottom of the verso partially obliterated, is of the characteristic reddish-brown shade. Stops in the middle position only are used. Whether a second hand can be distinguished is doubtful. The few alterations and insertions which occur are similar in style of writing and colour of ink to the body of the text, and must at any rate be practically contemporary.

The pages are numbered 17 and 18 respectively, the numbers being placed as in a modern book in the top outside corners. In the corner opposite to that containing the figure 18 is a δ, which seems to be a stichometrical figure marking the 400th line. With about 25 lines to the page, if the outer page at the beginning of the book was left blank (cf. e. g. P. Rylands 58), the first line of the 18th page would be approximately l. 400. Survivals of the application of stichometry to the speeches of Isocrates are to be found in the Codex Urbinas (Γ), but the unit there is rather larger than that indicated by 1812. As Drerup observes in his edition, p. lxxxii, the hundreds of Γ correspond to about 93 lines of the Teubner text, but page 18 in the papyrus is preceded by only 316 such lines, or more than 50 short of what would on that proportion be expected. On the other hand, the length of the stichometrical line on the system of Γ is calculated by Drerup at 37 letters, which is precisely the length of line in 1812. The inconsistency is due to his estimating the Teubner line at 40 letters, whereas in the Πρὸς Δημόνικον, at any rate, that number is usually exceeded.

The fact that the Πρὸς Δημόνικον stood at the beginning of the codex suggests at the outset an affinity with the so-called vulgate (ΑΠ), but the textual

position of the papyrus as between that family and Γ is a neutral one, the agreements and disagreements being fairly equally balanced. In one place a vulgate reading has been inserted as an alternative (l. 41). No support is given to the peculiar readings of ΣΥ. Besides the mediaeval MSS. there are available for comparison the eccentric second-century Berlin papyrus No. 8935, with which, among many natural discrepancies, two agreements on minor points are noticeable (ll. 36, 42), and also for a few lines another papyrus fragment, of the third century, at Strasbourg, with which 1812 differs twice (ll. 42, 48). Readings not otherwise attested are found in ll. 2 and 40, but they are unimportant.

Verso.

ἰξ

- ματι· πειρω το μεν σωμα ειναι φιλοπονος
 την δε ψυχην ειναι φιλοσοφος ινα τω μεν
 επιτελειν δυνα η δοξαντα τη δε προοραν
 επεστη τα συμφεροντα παν ο τι αν μελλης § 41
- 5 ερειν προτερον επισκοπει τη γνωμη πολλοις
 γαρ η γλωττα προτρεχει της διανοιας νομι
 ξε μηδεν ειναι των ανθρωπινων βεβαιον ουτως
 γαρ ουτε ευτυχων εση περιχαρης ουτε δυστυ
 χων περιλυπος δυο ποιου καιρους του λεγει[ν] § 42
- 10 η περι ων οισθα σαφως η περι ων αναγκαιον ειπειν
 εν τουτοις γαρ ¹⁵μονο[[ν]] ο λογος της σιωπης κρειτ
 των· εν δε τοις αλλοις αμεινον σιγαν η λεγειν
 χαιρε μεν επι τοις συμβαινουσιν των αγαθων
 και λυπου μετριως επι τοις γιγνομε[νοισ] των
 15 κακων γινου δε τοις αλλοις μηδε εν ετεροις
 ων καταδηλος ατοπο[ν γ]αρ την μεν ουσιαν
 εν τοις οικειαις αποκρυπτει την δε διανοιαν
 φανεραν εχοντα περιπατει μαλλον ευλαβου [§ 43
 ψογον η κινδυνον δει γαρ ειναι φοβεραν τοις με[ν
 20 φανλοισ την του βιου τελευτην τοις δε σπουδα[ι
 οισ την εν τω ζην αδοξιαν μαλιστα μεν πειρω
 ζην κατα την ασφαλειαν εαν δε ποτε σοι συμβη
 κινδυνευειν ζητει την εκ του [πολ]εμου σωτη

ριαν μετα καλης δοξης αλλα μη με]τ αισχρ[ας]
 25 φημης το μεν τελευτησαι παν[των] η [π]επω

Recto.

ιη δ
 μενη κατεκρινεν το δε καλως αποθα
 νειν. ιδιον τοις σπουδαιοις η φυσις απενει
 μεν. και μη θαυμασης ει πολλα των ειρη
 μενων ου πρεπει σοι προς την νυν παρου
 30 σαν ηλικιαν. ουδε γαρ εμε τουτο διελαθεν
 αλλα προειλομην δια της αυτης πραγμα
 τιας αμα του τε παροντος βιου συμβουλιαν
 εξενε^{γκειν}[[. α .]] και του μελλοντος χρονου
 παραγγελμα καταλειπειν την μεν γαρ του
 35 των χρειαν ραδειως ειδησεις τον δε μετ ευ
 νοιας συμβουλευσοντα χαλεπος ευρησεις. οπως
 ουν μη παρ ετερου τα λοιπα ζητης. αλλ εν
 τευθεν ωσπερ εκ ταμ[ει]ου προφερης ωθηην δειν
 μηδεν παραλειπειν ω[ν] αν εχω σοι συμβουλευειν
 40 πολλην δ α[ν] τοις θεοι[s] χα[ρι]ν σχοιην ει μη διαμαρ
 § 45
 τοιμι της δοξης ης [εχ]ων περι σου τυγχανω[[ν]]
 των γαρ αλλων τους πλειστους ευρησομεν
 ωσπερ των σιτιων τοις ηδιστοις μαλλον η τοις
 [ν]γιαινοτατοις χαιροντας ουτω και των φιλων
 45 [τ]οις συνεξαμαρτανουσι πλησιαζοντας αλλ ου
 τοις νοι[θ]ετ[ουσι] σε δε νομι[ζω] τουναντιον του
 των εγνω[κенаι] τεκμηριω χρωμενος τη περι τη[ν]
 αλλην σο[υ] παι[δι]αν φιλοπονια τον γαρ αυτω

1. το μεν σωμα : so P. Berl. ΔΠΣΥ; τῷ σώματι μέν ΓΘ, Dr(erup).

2. την δε ψυχην : so ΠΣΥ (om. P. Berl.); τῇ δὲ ψυχῇ others, Dr.
 ειναι : om. MSS.

4. 1. ἐπίστη : ΣΥ have ἐπιστήση.

5. ερειν : λεγειν P. Berl. ΔΠ.

8. εση : so P. Berl. and most MSS. ; ἔσει Γ pr., Dr.

11. *μονον* as originally written here is also in P. Berl., but this is probably a chance coincidence.

14. *και λυπον*: so Δ; *λυποῦ δέ* others, Dr.

26. A rather tall hooked top makes the δ in the margin above the end of this line look something like the symbol for 4,000, but that figure can hardly be meant here.

27. *η φυσις*: so ΠΣΥ; om. Γ, Dr.

29. *ννν*: om. P. Berl. ΣΥ.

32. *αμα*: om. ΣΥ, which have *συμβουλήν*.

34. *καταλιπειν*. The spelling of the papyrus is no doubt merely an instance of the common confusion of *ι* and *ει*; cf. e. g. l. 35 *ραδειωσ*.

36. *συμβουλευσοντα*: so P. Berl., though placing this word before *μετ ευνοιας*, which is also the order of ΔΠ. ΣΥ insert *σοι* before *συμβ*. *ι. χαλεπως*.

37. *τα λ. μη παρ ετ*. P. Berl. (*ετερων*) ΔΠ.

39. *παραλιπειν*: so P. Berl., but cf. n. on l. 34. *αν* is added also in ΔΠΣΥ.

40. ΔΠ read *τῷ θεῷ*.

μη, v. l. *μηθεν*: *μη*, as first written, is the reading of the MSS.

41. The superscribed reading *ην* is that of ΔΠ.

42. *γαρ*: so P. Berl.; *μὲν γάρ* others, including P. Arg., Dr.

45. *ἐξαμαρτ*. ΣΥ.

48. *σο[υ]*: so ΔΠΣΥ; om. P. Berl. P. Arg. Γ, Dr.

1813. CODEx THEODOSIANUS vii.

18·1 × 9·1 cm.

Early sixth century.
Plate I (recto).

The hand of this fragment from a vellum book is a fine specimen of Latin uncial writing, the letters, which are of medium size, being executed with much precision, and distinguished by both breadth and delicacy. If it belongs to the sixth century rather than the fifth, it is to be placed not later than the first third of the century, not only on the evidence of the hand but also because of the unlikelihood that after its supersession by Justinian's Codex of 529, the Codex of Theodosius would remain in demand. The fragment is thus approximately a contemporary of Paris. 9643 (R), on which the text of Book vii, the part of the Codex here concerned, principally depends. Eight lines are lost at the bottom of the recto, and if the margin below these corresponded to the deep margin at the top, the height of the page was approximately 29 cm.; its breadth, on the supposition that the lateral margins were half as liberal as the upper one, would be something like 22·5 cm., a little broader than in 1097, from a papyrus codex of Cicero, which in height practically coincided. Beginnings and ends of the lines are missing throughout, and the precise point of division is obscured by the uncertainty whether or how much the first lines of paragraphs protruded into the left margin; in the transcription below a protrusion of not more than one or two letters has been assumed. Double dots mark off the addresses and

dates of the rescripts from their texts. Abbreviations and numerals are usually accompanied by a medial dot; *p*(*raefectus*) *p*(*raetori*)*o*, in the one place where it occurs, is written with a horizontal line above, and a similar stroke was placed above numerals. There is no instance of punctuation, but the evidence is insufficient to infer that this was neglected.

The text of 1813 is close to that of R. In vii. 8. 11 the name *Eutyichianum*, over which R blunders, is correctly given, but some other misspellings are common to both; in vii. 8. 12 they agree on *vela*, where *bella* is restored from Cod. Iust., and at the end of vii. 8. 10 in the insertion of *conss*.

Recto. Plate I.

[*seri*]mus *quinque* *librarum* *auri* *co*ndemnatione *proposi* vii. 8. 9
 [*ta p*]raedia *quae* *ex* *Gildonis* *bonis* *a*d *nostrum* *aerarium* *de*
 [*lata*] *sunt* *ab* *hospitibus* *excusari* *n*unc *etiam* *praecipimus*
 [*ut* *omnes* *domus* *ex* *eodem* *iure* *v*enientes *in* *quibuslibet*
 5 [*civi*]tatibus *sunt* *constitutae* *ab* [*hospitibus* *excusentur* *quo*
 [*poss*]int *conductores* *facil*ius *inveniri* *si* *quis* *igitur* *con*
 [*tra* *nostr*]am *fecerit* *iuss*ionem *multa* *pridem* *ferietur* *in*
 [*flicta* : *pp*. *K*]arthag. *viii*. *id*. *Aug*. *H*onorio *viii*. *et* *Theodosio* *iii*. *aa*. *conss*.
 [*idem* *aa*. *Ioha*]nni *p*[*p*o]: *devotum* *p*[*ossessore*]m *ab* *omni* *inqui*
 10 [*etudine*] *liberamus* *primo* *ig*itur *omnium* *ad* *nullum*
 [*predium*] *per* *Africam* *vel* *public*um *vel* *privatum* *domus* *nos*
 [*trae*] *vel* *cuiuscumque* *iur*[*is* *nullus* *metator* (?) *accedat* *si*
 [*a* *qu*]oquam *fuerit* *destinatu*s *licentiam* *enim* *domino* *acto*
 [*ri* *ip*]siquae *plebi* *serenitas* *n*ostra *commissit* *ut* *eum* *qui* *prae*
 15 [*para*]ndi *grat*[*ia*] *ad* *possessio*nem *venerit* *multandi* *expel*
 [*lendi*] *habeat* *facultatem* *n*ec *crimen* *aliquod* *perime*
 [*scat* *c*]um *s*ibi *arbit*rium *ultionis* *suae* *sciat* *esse* *conces*
 [*sum* *rec*]tequae *sacrile*gium *prior* *arceat* *qui* *primus* *invene*
 [*rit* *ad*]ministrantem *ver*o *eiusque* *officii* *proceres* *quo*
 20 [*rum* *pr*]aecepto *inhibitam* [*personam* *ad* *agrum* *aliquem* *de*
 [*stinarit*] *in* *tempore* *pros*cribi *debere* *censemus* *solam* *sane*
 [*hospitalitate*]m *sub* *h*ac *observatione* *concedimus* *ut* *ni*
 [*hil* *ab* *hospite* *qu*]od *vel* *hominum* *vel* *animalium* *pastui* *ne*

Verso.

[*vel* *sponte* *contra* *pr*]aeceptum *nostrum* *probatu* fu[er]int
 [*obtulis*]se : *dat*. *prid*. *id*. *I*un. *Rave*[*n*]nae *post* *conss*. *Hon*[*ori* *viii*.
 [*et* *Theodosii* *v*. *aa*. *con*]ss.

- [idem aa. Probo c.s.l. post] alia: de hospitalitate iudicum et om
 5 [nium personarum quid si]bi etiam ipse possessor pr[ae
 [sumere debeat quare censura] omnia quae ad su[i] d[isp]endium
 [pertinebunt submota sint ia]m missa super h[ac] re auctoritas
 [declaravit: praelata litt]eris ad Eutychianu[m] p. urbi
 [die iiii. id. Ian. Constantio et C]onstante cons.
 10 [idem aa. Hadriano ppo: Afric. hoc p]rospectum est ut infra[usta hospi
 [talitatis praebitio tolleretur nec privatum quis]que a
 [domino aedium postulet et cet]era: dat. v. non. Mart. Rav[ennae]
 [Constantio et Constante co]nss.
 [idem aa. Eustathio ppo: devotissi]mos milites ex provinc[itu
 15 [redeuntes vel proficiscentes] ad vela muri novi sacr[at]is
 [simae urbis singulae turres in] pedep[lan]is suis sus[cip]iant
 [nec aliquis possessorum graviter fe]rat quasi [ill]a d[is]
 [positione quae super publicis aedific]iis processerat [vio
 [lata cum privatae quoque domus t]ertiam partem tal[is] rei
 20 [gratia soleant exhibere: dat. v.] non. Mart. Constant[inop.
 [Honorio xiii. et Theod. x. aa. cons.]
 [impp. Theodosius et Valentinianus] aa. Haelioni patricio et
 8. 14 [magistro officiorum: universi cui]uslibet

Recto 11. *predium* is written for the sake of shortening the supplement, which still seems a trifle long, though *dium* alone would be insufficient.

14. l. *ip]sique*; cf. l. 18, where *quae* is again written for *que*.

18. The omission of *prior*, which is absent in R but appears here in Cod. Iust., would make the line rather short.

Verso 2. *cons.*: this is also the spelling of R.

3. *con]ss*: so R; om. Mommsen-Meyer.

8. *etychiarum praef.* R. Some reduction in the number of letters is required and is most easily obtained by writing *p.* for *praef.*

9. *Constante vv cc* R.

10. *Hadriano proc. Afric(ae)* R, *Hadriano pp.* Cod. Iust., and cf. vi. 29. 11, vii. 4. 33. What 1813 had here remains of course uncertain; R's abbreviation of *Africae* is adopted as suitable to the space.

15. *vela*: so R; *bella* Cod. Iust.

20. *Const(antino)p(oli)* R.

22. *Haelioni* is also the spelling of R (l. *Hel.*).

1814. INDEX TO CODEX IUSTINIANUS, FIRST EDITION.

* 34.3 × 22.4 cm. A. D. 529-535. Plate V (verso).

This mutilated leaf from a papyrus book proves to be both from the juristic and the palaeographical point of view exceptionally interesting. It contains part of an index of rubrics and inscriptions of Justinian's Codex, not, however, of the extant second edition, but as originally issued in the year 529. This explanation, for which we are indebted to Professor de Zulueta, of the divergences of the index from the Codex as we have it, accounts so completely for the facts that no reasonable doubt can be entertained of its correctness.

Of the relation of the two editions of the Codex a good account is given by Rotondi in *Bull. dell' Istituto di diritto romano*, 1918, pp. 153 sqq. The second edition, which was five years later than the first, was a thorough revision designed, as stated in the prefatory constitution of Dec. 534 *De emendatione codicis*, to embody and co-ordinate the many new decisions and constitutions issued in the interval. It is precisely the absence of later matter of this kind that distinguishes our index. The most significant passage is ll. 42-6. Here the ordinary text of the Cod. Iust. i. 17 gives two constitutions of the years 530 and 533 under the rubric *De veteri iure enucleando et auctoritate iuris prudentium qui in digestis referuntur*. In 1814 the rubric is much simpler, approximating to the corresponding one of Cod. Theod. i. 4, and the two new constitutions of 530 and 533 are replaced by two others, of which one emanated from Justinian but the other is Cod. Theod. i. 4. 3, of A. D. 426. This evidence, which of itself would be sufficiently conclusive, is supported by analogous indications elsewhere. Thus the papyrus omits i. 14. 12, of Nov. 529, and the anti-Manichaean i. 11. 10, the exact date of which is unknown but which, as Krüger states, is probably posterior to i. 5. 18, being connected in substance with i. 5. 19-21 of 529-31. Its absence in the first edition of the Codex would therefore be expected. Again, the papyrus index passes directly from Cod. Iust. i. 11 to i. 14, omitting the two titles 12 and 13, which are both concerned with the Church. It is clear from the numbering of the rubrics preserved on the verso of the leaf that in this edition, as in the second, the principle of beginning with the ecclesiastical titles, which in the Codex Theodosianus had been placed at the end (Cod. Iust. i. 1-11 = Cod. Theod. xvi. 1-10), had already been adopted. That principle was only carried out with more completeness in the second edition by the insertion after i. 11 of two other titles connected with ecclesiastical matters from other parts of the Codex. In this procedure the revisors were acting quite in accordance with their powers as laid down by the constitution *De emendatione codicis* § 3 *si quae*

(*constitutiones*) *similes vel contrariae invenirentur, circumducere et a prioris codicis congregatione separare.*

Though primarily valuable as a relic of the original edition, the papyrus makes some contributions also to the text of the extant Codex. While agreeing with the MSS. in the omission of *Septimio* in l. 20, it inserts the name *Sextio* in l. 49 (with Cod. Theod.), *Iulio* in l. 48, and apparently *M(arco)* before *Palladio* in l. 13; it adds *v prov(inciarum)* (again with Cod. Theod.) after *vic(ario)* in l. 8, but omits *et consuli designato* in l. 27 and *nobilissimi* in l. 52. Evidently in the inscriptions of the constitutions little reliance can be placed upon the evidence of the MSS. on such matters; the tendency to abbreviate was not to be resisted, and Krüger's rule (cf. ed. mai. pp. xv, xxiii sqq.) of supplying a full inscription from any available source is justified. Thus he had already adopted *Sextio* in i. 18. 2, and at any rate *Iulio* can now be added in 18. 1: consistency would suggest the acceptance also of *quinque provinciarum* in i. 11. 3. There is further some useful evidence on individual points of detail. Lines 16-17 show that Cod. i. 11. 9, the inscription of which was missing, is to be attributed to Anastasius, and ll. 31-2 confirm the attribution of i. 14. 10 to Leo and Anthemius; the name of the addressee is in both cases lost. After l. 41 there is nothing corresponding to the supposed Greek constitution to which a place is assigned by Krüger at i. 16. 2, and the existence of that constitution, though not disproved, becomes more questionable.

Palaeographically the fragment is of importance, since there are few examples of early Latin uncials that can be so precisely dated with equal security. It is highly improbable that the first edition of the Codex would continue to be copied in Egypt after being superseded by the second, especially in view of the express prohibition in the constitution *De emendatione codicis* § 5 *ex prima Iustiniani codicis editione aliquid recitare.* The date of this manuscript may therefore be placed with small risk of error in the six years following April 529. The letters, written in brown ink, are of medium size and well formed, but the pen was rather coarse and the papyrus not of the best quality, so that, especially on the verso, the effect is not elegant. In rounded letters the separate strokes are not always closely joined. As in 1813, abbreviations are commonly followed by a medial dot often accompanied, in the case of *aa*, *cc*, *pp*, &c., by a horizontal stroke over the letters; but the scribe is inconsistent, omitting sometimes the dot and sometimes the stroke; he writes both *impp.* and *imp.p.* but the latter is probably due to inadvertence. *bo* = *-bus* in l. 18. When rubrics or inscriptions extend to a second line or more, these are considerably indented. Rubrics are marked off by horizontal dashes above and below them and the letter *℞* is placed both in front and at the end of each, as in the Verona fragments, whose practice

is followed by Krüger in his large edition. The prefixed \Re is accompanied by the number of the rubric, in Greek figures; constitutions, with one exception (l. 37), are not numbered. The first rubric on the recto is written in enlarged uncial letters. Apparent remains of pagination are visible in the top right-hand corner of the verso, probably []κε or []κθ, which are higher figures than would be expected unless the index was preceded by other matter.

Recto.		
	\Re [1a] <u>d[e] p[lagani]s sacrificiis</u>	Cod. Iust. i. 11.
	<u>[et] templis</u> \Re	
	[imp. Const. ? Di]odoto	
	[imp. Consta]ntin. a. ad Taurum \overline{pp} .	1
5	[impp. Gratian.] Valentin. et Theod.	2
	[aaa. Cyne]gio \overline{pp} .	
	i[impp. Arcadius et H]onorius aa. Ma	3
	[c]rovio [et Pr]oclian. vic. v. prov.	
	id. aa. Apollodo[ro pr]ocons. Africae	4
10	imp.p. Honor[. et The]odosius aa	5
	populo [Carta]gen[ie]nsi	
	id. aa. Asclepi[odoto p]p	6
	impp. Valen[tin. et Marcian. aa] M	7
	Pallad[io \overline{pp}]	
15	impp. Leo et An[them. aa Dioscoro \overline{pp} .	8
	αυτοκρα(τωρ) Αναστα[σιος α	9
	επαρχ(ω) πρ(αιτωριων) [
	\Re [1β] <u>de legib[us] et con]stitu[tionibus]</u>	14.
	<u>principum et [edictis]</u>	
20	[imp. Co]nstan[ti]n. [α] Basso \overline{pu}	1
	[impp. T]heo[dosius et] Valentin[ian. aa	2
	[α]d se[natum]	
	[id. aa ad senatum]	3
	[id. aa ad Volusian]um \overline{pp} .	4
25	[id. aa Florentio p]p.	5
	[id. aa Florentio \overline{pp}]	6
	[id. aa Cyro \overline{pp}]	7
	[id. aa ad senatum]	8
	[impp. Valentinian. et] Marchian[. aa ad Pal	9
30	[adium \overline{pp}]	

Verso. Plate V.

		[]κε	
	Αυτοκρατορες Δε[ων κ]αι Αυθ[εμιος αα . . .] .		i. 14. 10
	επαρχ(ω)		
	<i>impp.</i> Leo et Ζηνο ᾱα		11
	℞ υγ <i>de mandatis p[ri]ncipum</i> ℞		15.
35	<i>impp.</i> Gratian. Valen[tinian. et Theodo sius αα ad Eu[signium p̄p]		1
	β̄ η δια τον του δεσπ[οτου] Ιουστινου και Ιουστ τιμιανου [αα		2
	℞ ιδ̄ <i>de sen[at. con]sultis</i> ℞		16.
40	<i>impp.</i> Val[ent. Theod]osius et Arcad. ᾱ. ad s[enatum]		1
	℞ ιε̄ <i>[de auctoritate] iuris</i> <i>[prudentium]</i> ℞		17.
	<i>[impp.</i> Theodosius et Val[ent. a ad se [ad] s[enatu]m	Cod. Theod. i. 4. 3	
45	<i>imp.</i> Iustin[ianus] [M]er[et]ae p̄p		
	℞ ις̄ <i>de iuris et facti ignor[an]tia</i> ℞	Cod. Iust. i. 18.	
	<i>imp.</i> Anton. a Iulio Max. mil.		1
	<i>id.</i> a S[esxt] Iuv[er]tiali		2
50	<i>imp.</i> Philip[p]us [a Iul. ? Marc]ell. [3
	<i>impp.</i> Diocl. et M[aximian. αα] Iulianae		4
	<i>id.</i> αᾱ et c̄c Martiali		5
	<i>id.</i> αᾱ et c̄c Taur. et P[ollioni]		6
	<i>id.</i> αᾱ et c̄c Zoe		7
55	<i>id.</i> αᾱ et c̄c Dionys[ia]		8
	<i>id.</i> αᾱ et c̄c Gaio et [Anthemio]		9
	<i>id.</i> αᾱ et c̄c Amph[ia]		10
	<i>imp.</i> Con[stantin. a] [Vale]ria[no vic.]		11

3. This constitution is absent in Cod. Iust. Since a pagan emperor is excluded by the subject, and the first constitution should be older than the second, the choice of the emperor is limited to Constantine or Constantius, and the name in either case must have been considerably abbreviated. As the scribe uses the form *Constantin.* (ll. 4, 20, 58), it is perhaps better to suppose that *Const.* here = Constantius; cf. l. 5, where Theodosius is shortened to *Theod.* *Di'odoto* is preferred to *The'odoto* as the shorter.

4. *Constantin(us)*: l. *Constantius*. The same error is found in SCR.

7. 1. *Ma[c]robio.*
8. *v. prov(inciarum)*: so Cod. Theod. xvi. 10. 15 *quinque provinciarum*; om Cod. Iust.
11. 1. *Carthagin[ie]nsi*; that the *h* was omitted (so SCRM) is hardly certain.
13. *M*, representing the praenomen of Palladius, is a more suitable reading than] . 0 both in itself and because the lacuna is sufficiently filled without further addition. Om. Cod. Iust.
- 16-17. Om. Cod. Iust., where the constitution is given without the name of the emperor or addressee. The papyrus omits the anti-pagan Const. 10.
18. Titles 12 *De his qui ad ecclesias confugiunt vel ibi exclamant*, and 13 *De his qui in ecclesiis manumittuntur*, are here omitted.
20. *Basso*: so MSS. and S(umma Per.); the nomen *Septimio* is supplied from Cod. Theod. In the abbreviation of *praefecto urbi* the horizontal stroke passes through the letters.
27. *Cyro pp. et consuli designato* Cod. Iust. There would not be room for *et . . . design.* even if shortened to *et cons. d.*
29. 1. *Marcian.*
- 31-2. Om. Cod. Iust., but the names of the emperors could be restored from the date. The name of the addressee must have been very short, unless it was abbreviated: the remains do not suggest]^o.
33. The Greek η in *Zhno* was an oversight. Const. 12 is omitted.
36. *pp.* Cod. Iust., *proconsulem Africae* Cod. Theod.; what stood in the papyrus is of course uncertain.
- 37-8. The inscription of this constitution is deficient in the MSS. of Cod. Iust., but is restored from *Nov.* 124. 4 as $\text{\AA}\iota\tau\omicron\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\rho\epsilon\varsigma \text{\textit{I}}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma \text{\textit{k}}\alpha\iota \text{\textit{I}}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon\alpha\upsilon\omicron\varsigma \text{\textit{a}}\alpha$. The reading of the papyrus is unintelligible and it is not clear what was intended. β which is placed in the margin and has a horizontal stroke above is evidently a numeral, though there seems to be no reason why this particular constitution should have been numbered when others are not. Possibly $\delta\iota\alpha$ is the survival of $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\chi\iota\varsigma$, and $\delta. \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \delta\epsilon\omicron\sigma\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\omega}\nu \text{\textit{k}}\tau\lambda.$ should be restored.
41. Below this constitution Krüger marks the place of a lost second one, following indications in MSS. of P. Pithou. If it had any existence, that constitution was presumably issued by Justinian between the dates of the first and second codices.
- 42-3. Cod. Iust. here has *De veteri iure enucleando et auctoritate iuris prudentium qui in digestis referuntur*, with two constitutions of A. D. 530 and 533. In Cod. Theod. i. 4 the rubric is *De responsis prudentum*, under which there are three constitutions, the first two of which are of Constantine; one placing a ban upon the commentaries (*notas*) of Ulpian and Paulus on Papinianus, the other upholding the authority of Paulus, while the third corresponds to ll. 44-5 here. It is possible that *responsis*, not *auctoritate*, stood in the lacuna of l. 42, but in any case the rubric is not the same as in Cod. Theod. and is much shorter than that of Cod. Iust., occupying in fact an intermediate position. That the first two constitutions of Cod. Theod. i. 4 are dropped is an anticipation of Cod. Iust. i. 17. 1 § 6 *ea, quae antea in notis Aemilii Papiniani ex Ulpiano et Paulo nec non Marciano adscripta sunt . . . non statim respuere*, &c. On the other hand Cod. Theod. i. 4. 3, the law of citations, is retained pending the enucleation of the *ius vetus* in the Digest. Cod. Theod. i. 4. 2, which is virtually repeated in 3, may well have been regarded as superfluous.
- 44-5. *Imp. Theod. et Valentin. aa. ad senatum urbis Rom.* Cod. Theod. In l. 44 the scribe wrote *Valenti* and then inserted the dot between *t* and *i*. *a* was written for *aa*, probably owing to confusion with the *a* of *ad*, and there was apparently a dittography of *ad se*.
46. This constitution is unknown, but the name of Menas, to whom the constitution

of A. D. 529 *De codice confirmando*, prefixed no doubt to the first edition, was addressed, may be restored with great probability. § 3 of that constitution relates to former codices and to *veteres iuris interpretores*, but it is unlikely that that section, still less the entire constitution, stood in this position, where some other rescript to Menas, superseded subsequently, like Cod. Theod. i. 4. 3, by Cod. Iust. i. 17. 1-2, would be more appropriate.

48. *Iulio*: om. Cod. Iust.

49. l. *Sext(io)*; this name, which is absent in the MSS., had been rightly restored from Cod. Greg.

50. That the superfluous *o* was cancelled is not certain. A difficulty arises at the end of the line, where with the reading *Marcellae* the letters *lae* are expected, in place of which there is something that may be read as]. *li*. [or perhaps as]. *ll*. This constitution is apparently to be connected with iii. 44. 8, issued on the same date and addressed to *Iuliae*, and some variation here in the name of the addressee is therefore not surprising; but whether the insertion of *Iul.* is correct remains very doubtful.

52. l. *cc* (= *Caesares*): so PLM; *et centum S*, om. C, *et Maximianus nobiles caesares R*, *et Constantius et Maximianus nobilissimi CC*. Krüger.

HOMERIC FRAGMENTS

(The collations are with Ludwich's text.)

1815. 14.5 × 19.1 cm. Parts of two columns, written in an informal sloping hand on the verso of a fragment of a second-century taxing-account. Col. i contains A 33-50, Col. ii. A 59-75. 44 ωο of χωομενος corr. from ο. 45 εχων added above the line. φαρετρης 65 ον was written for ο γ, but the third stroke of the ν is blurred and ο γ' may be intended. 67 αντισας 71 νηεσ ηγασατ. Third century.

1816. 25.7 × 7.7 cm. Fragment containing ends of O 332-70 (complete column) and 386-409 (end of col., the upper part of Col. ii being lost), in nearly upright somewhat irregular uncials of about the middle of the third century. A mark of elision in l. 340. 338 om. 340 δ' ^{ελε}διος 344 ε]νιπρηξαντες 345 τειχεος 348 νεων θελοντα 386 In place of this line να[stands in the papyrus, l. 389, which is omitted in its proper place, apparently having been inserted here. The papyrus is broken above να[. 389 om.; cf. l. 386. On the verso a late third-century account.

1817. Fragments of three leaves, written with brown ink in a good-sized sloping and fairly regular hand in which light and heavy strokes are strongly contrasted. Probably sixth century. Accents, breathings, and marks of elision are frequent, and apparently all due to the original scribe. Stops in

the high and middle position are used. These fragments were found with 1818, and possibly belonged to the same codex or corpus, but the scripts, though they may be contemporary, are quite distinct.

Fol. 1 4.1 × 2.5 cm. Verso ends of P 379-84, recto beginnings of 418-24.

Fol. 2 1.5 × 2 cm. Verso a few letters from Σ 412-14, recto do. from 455-6.

Fol. 3 14.4 × 13.8 cm. Verso Σ 564-81 (end of col.). 571 ομα[ρτη

574 τε[τευ]χετο 576 ροδαγόν 577 χρ[ύσ]εοι 579 [δ]ύ[[ω]], corr. H¹? Recto
603-17 (end of col.). 604 δύω 612]αι[δαλ]έην. The scribe perhaps
began l. 614, being misled by the homoioarchon of 611 and 613. επ[[ε]ι
615 Αχιλλή[[ι]]ος. 617 Below this line is a row of angular marks, followed by
the title Ιλιαδ[ο]ς ι[η] enclosed in ornamental flourishes.

1818. Parts of five leaves of a papyrus book, written with brown ink in an ugly sloping hand of the fifth or sixth century, rather similar in type to that of 1818. Accents, breathings, and marks of elision have been freely inserted, partly by the original writer, but many being due to a second hand which has also added some of the stops (high and middle position) and made corrections in the text. The method of accentuation hardly differs from modern practice, except with regard to the retracted accent. ε has frequently been written for αι or vice versa, and many such misspellings have been corrected both by the first and second hands; these variations, and the common confusion of ι and ει, are generally not noticed in the following collation. A few scraps have not been identified.

Fol. 1 16.8 × 14.7 cm. Verso X 109-37 (ends of lines). 111 κατα]-
θ[ι]ομε[[υ]] οπλά τε πάντα 113 α]μύνονος 114 κτήματ' 115 η of νηυσιν
converted from ε 116 νίκος 118 οσά τε 121 was included. 125 κα[[ι]]
απο, corr. H², apparently neglecting to delete the α. 128 ληλοισι 129 όφρα
τάχιστα 134 αυτή. Recto 153-77 (beginnings). 154 [κ]οιλαινοι 163 πρω-
χώσι corr. to τρεχοῦσι by H² 164 τρίπος 171 κορυφήσι 172 ακροτάτη
174 άγε^{δη} 176 Πηλείδη.

Fol. 2 Recto X 190-202, 283-93, 203 (?). Lines 283-93 are each followed by a small comma-shaped mark by the first hand, implying that the verses, which were rewritten in the proper place (cf. Fol. 3), were to be cancelled. The dislocation may have been due to a defective archetype, or

the scribe's having turned over two leaves in mistake. 194 Δαρδανιδων^δ
 195 εϋμήτους^τ 196 αλάλ'κοιεν. βελέεσσι[[ν]] 200 οὐδ' ὁ 283 εἰ of πηξίεις
 converted from η 290 οὐδὲ. Verso 216-43. 220 πολὰ^λ 222 ἀμννε^π
 224 ἔφατ' 226 λιπε^{ε ε}[[ν]] 228 ἴσταμένη πτ[εροεντ? 233 Δηΐφοβ'[[ε]] 238 προσ-
 εἶπε^ε 239 πολὰ.^λ
 Fol. 3 Verso X 255-78. 260 Αχιλλεύ^ς 264 ἀλλήλοισι 265 οὐτε^δ
 270 δέ ται^{σε} 272 θυτίων. 274 ηλένατο [[χάλκεον ἔγχος]]^{φαιδιμος Ε[κτωρ} 275 μείλινον
 ἔγχος 277 Ἐκτορα διον.^{ποιμενα λαων} Recto 291-314. 298 ἔγωγ'[[α]] 304 μ'αν
 ασπουδ[[ε]]ί, corr. H² 305 [[μάλα]] μεγα 307 λαπάρης 310 α[[μ]]αλην^π
 312 Αχιλ[[λ]]εΐς, corr. H².
 Fol. 4 Recto X 336-57. 347 μ'[[ε]]όργας 353 αυτη[[ι]]. Verso 376-97.
 380 ἐρδεσκειν ὄσ'[[α]]^{ov} 383 καταλείψωσι[ν] 391 [ν]ν^ν 392 γλαφυρήσι.^ι
 Fol. 5 Verso Ψ 345-70. 348 ἔτρεφον^α 350 πίρατ'[[α]]^ε ἔειπεν 351 ωπλσαθ',^ι
 a corr. 353 κλήρο^ς 354 τόνδ'[[ε]] ἔλαχε, a converted from ε. 355 δουρικλυτος,
 but a straight stroke was begun after λ. 356 ελαννεμεν ἵππους^{δ υστατος αυτε} 359 εἶσαν^ε
 363 ομοκλήσαν τ'[[ε]]ς]] ἐπέεσσι 365 κονίη[[ι]] 367 πνοι[η]ς.^ι Recto 383-406.
 388 ἐλ'αφηράμεν[ος] 392 αξε... οἱ δε 393 ὀδ'ου 395 αγκῶνας δε 396 θρυλχθη^ι
 397 δακρνώφιν 401 Ατρεδης (ε from ι?) δουρι κ[λυτος] 405 ἵποισι.^π

1819. Fragments of a roll containing κ, λ, μ, well written in small upright uncials which may be assigned to the second century. Two marks of length and many accents (acute-angled), breathings, marks of elision, diaereses, and stops in the high position have been inserted by a later hand, probably that of the corrector who has made a few alterations in the text. The columns had a marked slope to the right, the last line of Fr. 2. ii beginning about 6 letters in advance of the first line. A facsimile of that fragment with a transcript of the text was given in the New Palaeographical Society's Series II, Plate 76.

Fr. 1 4.1 × 2.2 cm., κ 3-12. Fr. 2 26.4 × 14.2 cm., Col. i ends of λ 244-83, Col. ii 284-323. 259 Αμνθου]α τ' 285 βασιλευε[[ν]], corr. H²

287 ρ of Πηρῶ retouched by H² 292 κατ[[ε]]^α 297 θεσφατ' ἄπαντ' 298 κα
 for και. Τυνδάρειω 301 ἀμφω^{ξω} οὐς 302 πα[ρ] Ζηνο[ς] 303 In the margin
 opposite this line is γ̄ (= 300). 306 Ποσιδα[ωνι] 308 Ὠτον^τ 309 θρέψεν
 311 ἐννέ[[ο]]ωροι, corr. H²? 314 πολυά[[ε]]ικος, corr. H² 316 Πήλ[[ε]]ιον,
 corr. H². Frs. 3-5 beginnings of λ 414-26, 428-32. 418 κει[να] 429 κ]α-
 κ[ε]ι[ωη]. Fr. 6 2.2 × 1.5 cm., a few letters from μ 1-4. Some small fragments
 remain unidentified.

1820. 17.8 × 38.5 cm. Lower portion of a sheet, which was the uppermost of
 a quire, from a papyrus codex. The hand is a good example of the formal
 upright type commonly designated 'Coptic', resembling e.g. P. Grenf. II.
 112, and is of the sixth or seventh century. Stops in two positions (high
 and medial), accents, breathings, and marks of elision and quantity are fairly
 frequent; a few of these are evidently original, but the majority, which are
 more lightly written, are later additions, due probably to one of the correctors,
 of whom two, one using cursive forms, seem to be distinguishable. Besides
 these common signs a comma to separate words, and its converse, the
 sub-linear hyphen, occur among the subsequent insertions. The dimensions
 of the complete page may be estimated at about 34 × 19 cm.

Fol. 1 Verso σ 55-80. 63 πλεονεσσι]ν 64 βασιλιηes. In marg. αιου[σι
 H² 65 Ευρυμαχος τε κ[αι] Αντι]ροος. Marg. καταειρω[H² 67 marg. ¹περι
 ε. [²τ... [H² 70 ἦλθανε 73 ἐπίσπατον. Marg. αξ[ε]ι H² 78 ἐφασθ' ἐκ τ'
^αξ[ε]
 ονόμη]νε 80 In left marg. a diagonal dash. Recto 95-121. 96 Ιρο[[ν]]^{σ ο}
 101 ειλκε 102 αιθούσσης 105 In the left marg. a flourished sign 7. 107 On
 ω of εων an acute substituted for a grave accent. 109 On η of αορτηρ an
 acute substituted for a grave accent. 110 [α]ψ' δ αρ' 111 εδ[[ε]]ικανόωντ',
 the ε cancelled by a dot placed above it (H²?). 111^a om. 118 επι
 γαστέρα.

Fol. 2 Recto σ 137-63. 142 marg. ειτε κ[α]λ[ω]ς (not κ[α]λον or -λα
 apparently) | ειτε κακ[ω]ς H² 146 Against this line and ll. 148-51 there are
 oblique dashes in the left margin. 149 διακρίνεσθαι 152 δ of δέπας corr.
 153 κατα δω[μ]α 163 In the margin below this line μηδενος προκειμενον' H².
 Verso 178-205. 185-7 Oblique dashes in the left margin against these
 lines, and a coronis between ll. 186-7. 185 γρυσ^η 190 marg. το [τ]ημι-
 κα[v]τα H².

IV. MINOR LITERARY FRAGMENTS

1821. 6.8 × 4 cm. Beginnings of 9 verses, hexameters or elegiacs, from the bottom of a column, written in a rather small, informal, upright hand of the third century. Marks of elision are used:

<p>. νοστοι τε . [ενθα καμων πι . [μηνιν χωμενο[μοχθησας δ' ατελ . [5 ασπασιω[.]ε . . . [</p>	<p>και τοξω μνη[παντα δ' επιστα[μεν ειην ατρεκεως [ως σε παλιν μ[———[</p>
--	--

1822. 35.3 × 17 cm. On the recto remains of two columns of an account. On the verso ends and beginnings of lines of two columns from a hexameter poem, apparently relating to astronomy, e. g. i. ¹⁷ α]κροθι νυκτος ¹⁸]ειδεται ειδος· ¹⁹]λα φημιξαντο· ²¹]μεγα χειμα ²²]ου αυχμον ²⁸]ι ενιαυτω· ²⁹]υσι κομηται· ³²]σεληνη· (marginal adscript μισγησι) ³³]ν ηλιο[[^sν]] ελθη ii. ³⁰ αστατα γαρ στοιχει[ι ³³ Ζεϋς Κρονος Ερμ[ειας. Most of the lines of Col. i have a high or medial stop at the end. The last line of Col. ii is opposite i. 30, but the column begins at a higher point than Col. i and the lines are rather closer together, so that the number of the lines was probably the same in both. This papyrus was found with 1796, and is in much the same condition; the texts on the verso are apparently in the same hand, and the marginalia, too, are similar. But the height of 1822 is quite different from that of 1796, and there is no connexion in subject; the hands and contents of the rectos also differ, so that it is clear that two distinct rolls are represented. Second century.

1823. 20.8 × 6.6 cm. Strip from a column containing parts of 28 lines of a tragedy, ll. 7–15 at least being stichomuthic. Resolution is frequent. The upright well-formed uncial hand is evidently early, and may go back to the beginning of the first century B. C.

<p>[.]ετερρχ[[.]το λυπ[[.]σις πα[[.]ωσ[</p>	<p>15 . . . [.] . μ[ε]λαινη λ[πατερα φονευσας τοτε [[.]αν υπο ρητη[[.]ματα ημων ε . [</p>
---	---

5 [[.]ετοις αγ . . [
εις φοβον απω . [20 [.]νωνιν η . [
και ουκ εγγεκρυψω[(?)	[.] γαρ ητις . [
ως τωι γε μελλειν φρεν . [[.] . σαυτησ[
τεθνηκε των σων σπερ[μα	[.]ετοντα[
10 οιμοι προς αλλων και τοδ[[.] . ι τυμβου . [
ουτως εχει ταυτα ως π[25 [.]παισ . [
ποτερον δε παρελυσ η τ[[.] . [.] . [
η παρθε[νος	[.] . ρων σε . [
ω τλημον εθεμι[[.]ατρος ο γι . [

1824. 9.9 × 6.1 cm. Fragment of a (Menandrian?) comedy, from the top of a column. Alternations of the dialogue are indicated by double dots, and the names of speakers in abbreviated form have been entered above the line in cursive, as e. g. in 211. The speakers are Λάχης and Μιξί(), a name which does not occur in comedy but may stand e. g. for Μιξίδημος, Μιξίας, Μίξων, or Μιξωνίδης, and one of them is betrothing a girl called Pamphile (?) to the other. The text is written across the fibres of the verso (the recto being blank) in medium-sized sloping uncials, probably of the third century. Besides the double dots a high stop is used; a mark of elision (H²?) occurs in l. 10. Several lines are evidently nearly complete at the ends.

Λαχ

? βα]νεις εις με : εμοι δεο[
 ε]γω δε σοι Λαχης· ουκ εστ[

Μιξ'

]ν οιδα δηπουθεν : γεγ[
]ι· μη ποτ ειπης ωομη[ν

Λαχ

5 ε]πιδωσειν : ποθεν λα[βων ?
] . . ομολογω σοι λαμ[βανειν ?
] αμα πανθ εξει . [

]σ· διδωμι Παμ[φιλην ?
 παιδω]ν επ αρωτω γνησιω[ν

10]' αρεστα [ταυ]τα σ[ο]μ[]
]'
 λα]μβαν[. . .]χομ . [

]νε . [. . . .]β[

In l. 3 there is a small mark after Μιξ' on the edge of the papyrus, but it does not suggest any letter. For l. 9 cf. e. g. 211. 38-9; it may be inferred with some probability that the fragment is from the conclusion of the play. In l. 11 the small interlinear dash probably belongs to an abbreviation of one of the speakers' names.

1825. 11.9 × 13.1 cm. Fragment from the top of a leaf of a papyrus codex, containing on the recto ends of 8 lines, and on the verso beginnings of 10 lines, from a comedy. The hand is a round upright uncial of medium size, dating perhaps from the fifth century. Accents, &c., which are fairly frequent, may be by the original scribe, but a corrector's hand is apparently to be distinguished in verso 2. Brown ink, rather faded and effaced in places.

Recto.

Verso.

] ν πογους γαρ· ἀλλὰ πρου τυχη·
 ? δ]ει δε πείραν λαμβάνειν.
] παρακολουθῶν εξομαι
] . . . ὦν γαρ υπο ταύτης εγῶ
 5] τ ολουμαι προαπολω ταύτην εγ[ω
] . . . ωτεον τι γαρ ε . . . τις
 διατ]ριβη γινεται μου τοις γάμοις
] . . . λογ· κ . . . αι

εγῶ πολυ μαλλον ενεος [^ε
 τι ουν εν[.]φ[α][ι]νει : τα το τρ . [^ε
 ουκ αν δυναιτο φησιγ . [^ε
 αυτη αλλα πορίσατε . [.] . . [^ε
 5 μαλακῶς εχει[.] γαρ α . . [^ε
 και παρελθοῦσ' ὄχετο εξω . [^ε
 σοι κατ . . ἄλ . . . ση αίνε . ε . [^ε
 πορισω παιδίω τίθηας π . . λε . [^ε
 α . τε . . τε [^ε
 10 ε[^ε

Verso 2. ἐν [ἀ]φανεί? But the correction is unexplained. 6. Trochaic tetrameters begin here, but l. 8, where l. τίθηας, is irregular.

1826. 9 × 7.3 cm. Fragment, in places rubbed and faded, of a leaf of a papyrus codex containing a romantic prose narrative concerning King Sesonchosis. The hand is a medium-sized upright uncial of late third-fourth century type

Recto.

Verso.

] νη . . [^ε
] περικρατη . [^ε
] τον παιδα υ[ο]υν . [^ε
] Σεσογχωσις ἀνήλθε[^ε

Σεσ]ογχωσις . [^ε
] και τυγχανου[^ε
] . παντως αλλ εχου[σι ^ε
] οπερ επεκλωσαν του[^ε

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>5] . ια λοιπον μετα τω[ν
] ιππομάχων και οπλομ[αχων
 ειω]θота βασιλευσιν επι τ[ης
 εν]νομου ηλικιας γεν[ομενοις
 τω] πατρι ειπεν κ[</p> <p>10] υπο των πατρωω[ν
 κε]χαρ[ι]σθαι την ρ . [.
] . λ[. .] . ρ[.] αηδωσ . [.
] ρ[] οσ . [.] θυ . [.
 τε]λειουσθαι σ[</p> <p>.</p> | <p>5] μη βουλομενος τα τ . [.
] ειν οταν εκεινα αδε . [.
] τοτε αυτος επιφανε . [.
] ρι δε ενα των μορ . [.
] ανθρωπους π . . . [.</p> <p>10 ευ]δαιμονιαν την δω[
] τον θεον βοηθον . [.
 Σε]σογχο[σι]ς . . χω . [.
] ρτων εξω γε ολου . [.
] υτα δο πρου [.</p> <p>15] ε . . τ . [.</p> <p>.</p> |
|---|--|

The length of line seems to have been greater than that suggested by recto 7-8; in ll. 6-7, where the lacuna is approximately the same, something like *κατα τα ειω]θота* is required. In verso 10 the final *ν* of *ευδαιμονιαν* is corrected.

1827. Fr. 1 10.7 x 5.6 cm. Upper part of a narrow column, with a small detached fragment, containing a few nearly complete lines of prose, perhaps an oration, mentioning Phormio. Third century, written in medium-sized sloping uncials; a high stop in l. 11.

Fr. 1.

[. .] ερο[.] τουτοις
μεν ευ[κ]τον ον εν
[τ]ωι της πολεως α
[ξ]ιωματι και αγω
5 νιζεσθαι και κη
[ρ]υττεσθαι τη δε
[π]ολει τον τουτων
[στ]εφανον ου δο
[ξ]ησ γεγονοτα αλ
10 [λ] αισχυνης αιτι
[ον] αμα γ εκηρυτ
[τε]το Φορμιων . .

[. .] α σι Αθην[αι] . .
[. .] κει φιλο[.
15 [. .] τος ει . [.
[. .] οσδο[.
[. .] αγυ[.
[. .] ηνω[.
.

Fr. 2.

[νδ]
]να[.] . [.
]ρ[.]υγ[
.

In l. 2 there seems to be barely room for [κ], but *ευτονον* is not attractive, still less *ευγονον*.

1828. 4.9 x 2.9 cm. Fragment of a vellum leaf, inscribed in well-formed rather small sloping uncials of, probably, the third century. The contents are of an ethical character. Apparently the lines were of no great length, but their point of division is not fixed. The vellum is thin and rather discoloured.

Recto or flesh side.

· · · · ·
] και γαρ οξυχολ[ο]ς . [
] ο ικανον ποιων τρυφ[ηι
 κα]ι ο μεθυσος και ο καταλα[λος
 και ο ψε]μστης και ο πλεονεκτης [και
 5 ο αποστε]ρητης και ο τοιουτος τα [παρα
 πλησια?] ποιων [τ]ηι δι[α]νο[ιαι] του[

Verso.

· · · · ·
] . γ [
]υριον επιλανθανεται [
] πραξιν η γαρ τρυφη και . [
] ημας ου[κ] εχει δια την α . [
 5 ? η]ν ενδεδυται η δε τειμ[ωρια?
]ιθ[. ο]ταν πολλα . [.] . τω[

INDICES

(1700 is to be supplied before 78–99, 1800 before 0–28, such figures referring to papyri; figures in small raised type refer to fragments, Roman figures to columns; sch. = scholium.)

I. 1787–9 (SAPPHO and ALCAEUS).

ἀα[87.¹³ 10.
 ἄβροις 87.³⁷ 3.
 ἀ[βρόταν (?) 87.⁹ 3.
 ἄγαθος 88.⁴ 10.
 ἀγανα[87.³ ii. 12.
 ἀγαπάτα 87.³ ii. 10.
 ἄγε 88.¹² ii. 3. ἄγη[89.³¹ 3.
 ἀγοράν 88.¹⁵ i. 6 sch.
 ἄδειν 88.³ 3 sch.
 ἀ[δν 88.⁸ 5. ἄδιον 87.³ ii. 5.
 ἀδύλογοι 87.¹¹ 4.
 ἀ[δει 87.⁶ 7.
 ἀείκεα 89.¹ i. 6.
 ἀέρρων[88.⁵ 3.
 ἀ[δοι 87.⁶ 9.
 ἀθανατ[87.⁸ 1.
 ἀθύρματα 87.³ ii. 22.
 αἰ 88.² 6, ¹² ii. 4, ¹⁵ ii. 16;
 89.¹ i. 12 (?).
 αἰ[89.²³ 2.
 αἰγισό[88.⁸ 3.
 αἰδρος 89.⁶ 5.
 αἰει 88.⁶ 8.
 αἰθεί[88.¹⁵ ii. 5.
 Αἰολ[εῖ . . . 89.⁶ 6.
 αἰρουσ[89.⁷ 3 sch.
 αἰσχος 88.⁶ 4.
 αἰσχυρ[87.¹⁷ 3.
 αἰτιον 87.⁵ 6.
 αἰψα 87.⁴⁴ 5.
 ἀκατ[88.⁴ 3 2.
 ἄκοιτω 87.¹⁺² 2 I.

ἀκούην 87.⁴⁰ 3.
 [ἀκρ]αν 88.¹ 3.
 ἀλίκ[εσσι 87.¹² 7.
 ἀλίτρα[87.⁷ 4, ³² 2.
 ἀλλά 87.¹⁺² 16, ⁶ 2, ²⁷ 4.
 ἄλλος 88.⁴ 34. ἄλλοι 87.¹¹ 6.
 ἀλλ[89.¹ ii. 15.
 ἄλος 88.⁴ 25.
 ἄμεσ[87.²⁶ 6.
 ἀμπελ[88.¹ 4. ἀμπέλω 88.
 15 ii. 2 I.
 ἀμφ[87.¹⁸ 5. ἀμφι[89.²⁷ 3.
 ἄν 88.¹⁵ i. 4 sch.
 ἀναίτιον 88.¹⁵ ii. 12.
 ἀναξ 89.⁶ 8.
 Ἄνδρομέδαν 87.⁷ 5.
 ἀνέμω 89.¹ i. 15 (?).
 ἄνηρ 89.¹ ii. 6.
 ἄνθος 87.¹⁰ 5.
 ἀνθρώπ[87.¹⁴ 7.
 ἄν[ολβον 87.⁴⁰ 2.
 ἀντι 88.¹⁵ i. 15 sch. ἀν(τι τοῦ)
 88.¹⁵ i. 18 sch.
 αἰιδον 87.¹⁺² 1 I.
 ἀπαίσαν 87.⁴⁴ 2.
 ἀπαλ[88.⁴ 7.
 ἀπό 88.² 10 sch. ἀπί 87.⁷
 1; 88.¹ 2, ⁷ 3. ἀπ' 88.
 15 ii. 2 I.
 ἀπολελειμμένον 89.⁷ 3 sch.
 ἀπόλλυται 89.²⁴ 2.
 ἀπυγυε[(?) 87.¹³ 8.

ἀπυείπη[88.² 4.
 ἀπόθεσθαι 87.³³ 1.
 ἀρμονίας 87.¹³ 9.
 ἀροτρώμ[88.² 8.
 Ἄρτεμι[87.³⁷ 4.
 ἄς 88.¹⁵ ii. 4.
 ἄσαν 87.⁷ 4.
 ἄστ[ος? 89.²⁹ 4.
 ἄταις 89.¹⁶ 2 sch.
 ἀτέρα[87.¹⁵ 3.
 ἀτά[ασι 89.¹⁶ 1.
 αὔθι 87.³⁶ 2.
 αὔταν 87.¹⁺² 6, ⁴⁰ 4; 89.¹ i.
 9. αὔτή 88.² 10 sch. αὔτω
 88.⁴ 28. αὔταις 88.¹⁵ ii.
 23.
 αὔων 87.¹⁺² 18.
 Ἄφροδι[τα 87.¹¹ 3.
 Ἄχέρ[οντος 87.⁴ 10.
 ἄχθην 87.¹⁺² 5.
 βάρη 89.⁷ 3 sch.
 βασιλεύς 89.¹ i. 10. βασιλ[
 87.⁴ 6.
 βιάζω 88.⁷ 7.
 βόλλεο 87.³⁴ 4.
 βρόδ[88.⁸ 7. βροδο[87.¹⁶ 1.
 βροδόπαχυν 87.¹⁺² 18.
]βρομος 89.²⁹ 6.
 γάμει 89.¹ i. 7.

γάμον 89.¹ i. 14. γαμ[89.
³⁸ 2 sch.
 γάρ 87.³ ii. 2, 21, 7 I, ¹³ 7,
³⁶ 6, ⁴⁴ 9; 88.⁴ 16, 20, ¹⁵
 ii. 17, 19, 21, 25; 89.¹ i.
 12 (?), ii. 4, ⁹ 3 (?), ¹³ 2,
³¹ 3.
 γὰς 87.¹⁺² 19; 88.² 8 (?).
 γῆ 88.³ 2 sch.
 γένεσθαι 87.¹⁺² 17. ἐγένε[ν]το
 87.¹⁺² 13. ἔγεντο 87.³ ii.
 I. γενέσθω 89.¹ ii. 16.
 γένοιτο 87.³ ii. 23; 89.
 1 i. 13?
 γένηον 88.² 9.
 γεω[88.¹⁵ i. 4 sch.
 γῆρας 87.¹⁺² 12.
 γλαύκαν 88.¹ 4.
 γλαφύρα[89.⁶ 8.
 γλύκερον 87.⁶ 5.
 γλύκυσ 87.³ 17. γλυκῶς 89.
 1 i. 9.
 γόνα 87.¹⁺² 14.
 γυναικός 88.³ 7 sch. ? γύν]-
 αικι 87.⁴¹ 2.
 δα[89.⁷ 3.
 δαίμων 87.⁵ 3. δαίμονα 88.
¹⁵ ii. 12.
 [δαῦτε] 89.⁴¹ 5, v. l. δηῦτε.
 δάφνας (οἱ Δάφνας?) 87.³ ii. 4.
 δέην 88.⁴ 27.
 δείνα 87.³ ii. 17.
 δεκάμεθα 89.¹² 5. δέξεται 89.
²⁵ 4.
 δεύοντος 88.¹⁵ ii. 3.
 δῆ 88.¹² ii. 3; 89.²² 2.
 δηῦτε 87.³⁶ 4; 89.¹ i. 15, ⁴¹
 5 (v. l. δαῦτε).
 διδοίσι[87.²⁶ 5.
 Δίδυμος 88.¹⁵ i. 10 sch.
 [διπλ]ασίαν 88.¹⁵ ii. 28.
 δμῶ[88.¹⁵ ii. 3.
 δοκ[88.⁵ 3.
 δόκιμος 89.¹ ii. 6.
 δόμον 89.²⁹ 3.
 δρόμωμεν 89.¹ ii. 2.
 δρόπ[ω]σιν 88.¹⁵ ii. 23.
 δροσόεσσα[87.⁶ 8

δύνα 88.¹⁵ ii. 16.
 δύναμι[87.³ ii. 18.
 δύνατον 87.¹⁺² 17.
 δῶ[87.²⁴ 3.
 δῶρα 87.¹⁺² 10.
 εἶσω 87.⁶ 2.
 ἔγω 87.⁶ 2; 88.⁴ 20, ¹² ii. 8.
 με 87.³ ii. 19, 7 I, ²⁴ 2;
 88.⁴ 12, ¹² ii. 3, 6. μοι
 87.¹⁺² 24, ³ ii. 23. ἔμοι
 87.⁴⁴ 7; 89.¹ i. 12. ἄμ-
 μας 87.⁶ 4, ²⁸ 2 (?). ἄμ-
 μέων [89.¹ ii. 3?]. ἄμμ(υ)
 89.¹ i. 16, ¹² 2.
 ἐέρσας 87.¹¹ 9.
 εἶπε 88.¹² ii. 6. εἶπη[ν 88.
¹⁵ ii. 10.
 εἰς 88.¹⁵ i. 18 sch.; 89.¹ ii.
 2 (ἔς Pap.).
 εἰσάιον 87.³ ii. 9.
 εἰσικε[89.¹ ii. 13? (ἔσ Pap.).
 ἐκ, ἐξ 87.¹⁺² 13; 88.¹ 3, ⁹ 1;
 89.⁶ 7.
 ἐκά[87.³⁶ 6.
 ἐλευθέραις 88.³ 5.
 ἔλην, ἤλεο 87.⁶ 3.
 ἔλκεα 88.⁴ 40.
 ἐλ[λί]πω[ν 89.²⁰ 1.
 ἔλπις 87.¹⁺² 19.
 ἐλπῶρα 88.¹⁵ ii. 19.
 [ἐμβᾶ] 89.¹ i. 17.
 ἐμμ[87.³ 11.
 ἐμ[μεναι 88.² 9. (ἔστί) 88.
² 14 sch. (?). ἔων 87.³ ii.
 21. ἦσθα 87.¹⁺² 15. ἦς
 88.¹⁵ ii. 18. ἔσσεται 88.
¹⁴ 1; 89.⁹ 3. ἔων 89.⁶ 4.
 ἔοντ[88.⁶ 12. ἔοντες 89.
 1 ii. 11. εἰοίσεις 88.¹⁵ ii.
 24.
 ἐν 88.³ 3 sch.; 89.²⁹ 6. κᾶν
 87.⁹ 3. ἐν 87.⁴ 10.
 ? ἐν]δίκως 89.²⁰ 5.
 ἐνείκην 88.¹⁵ ii. 20.
 ἔννεκα 87.⁵ 5.
 ἐνούπ[88.⁴ 26.
 ἐξίο[89.⁴⁰ 2.
 ἐπάνω 88.¹⁵ i. 13 sch.
 ἐπέι 88.³ 7 sch.; 89.¹ i. 17.

Ἐπεί[ων? 89.⁶ 7.
 ἐπιάμ[88.¹⁵ ii. 22.
 ἐπικε[87.⁵ 2.
 ἐπιν[87.¹⁺² 26.
 ἐπι]ταδέως 89.⁷ 1.
 ἐπονάμενοι 88.¹⁵ ii. 25 (ἐπο-
 νημ.); 89.¹ i. 5.
 ἐπωμοσσ[? 87.⁹ 1.
 ἔρ[ωτες? 87.¹¹ 4.
 ἔσλοισ 89.¹ ii. 8.
 ἔσσ[88.⁴ 33.
 ἔσχατ[88.⁴ 31.
 ἔτι 87.⁹ 2.
 εἶ 87.⁴⁴ 9; 89.¹ i. 3.
 εὐμορφότερα 87.³⁴ 5.
 ἔχην 87.¹⁺² 18, ¹² 5; 89.¹ i.
 10. ἔχω 88.¹¹ 2. ἔχει
 87.³ ii. 19. ἔχη 89.¹ i. 2.
 ἔχοισα 87.¹¹ 6.
 ἔχυρον 89.¹ ii. 2.
 ζά 87.³ ii. 18.
 ζα[87.³¹ ii. 1.
 ζαμενόντων 89.¹ i. 6 and sch.
 ζαμενέτωσαν 89.¹ i. 6 sch.

ῆ 87.³ ii. 6, 17.
 ἦδέ 87.³⁶ 5.
 ἦδη 87.¹⁺² 12; 88.¹⁵ ii. 17.
 ἦριον 88.¹ 6.
 θαάσ[σ . . 87.¹¹ 7.
 θαλα[88.⁹ 1.
 θα[νατ . . ? 89.¹³ 2.
 θέλε 87.⁴⁴ 2. θέλω[87.¹² 4.
 θελήση[87.⁴⁴ 6.
 θέος 87.³ ii. 17. θέοισιν 87.⁷ 3.
 θ[ί]γοισα 87.¹⁺² 4.
 θρίξ, τρίχες 87.¹⁺² 13.
 θύμον 87.⁴⁴ 5.
 θύραν 87.¹⁹ 2.
 ἱατον 89.²⁹ 5.
 ? ἱα]ύην 89.¹³ 3.
 ἰδρεία 89.⁶ 2.
 ἰεναί, εἶμι 87.¹³ 3. ἱμ[εν (?)
 88.¹⁵ ii. 3.
 ἱκισθ' 87.³ ii. 12.
 ἴλλε . . . 87.⁴⁴ 10.

ἤμερο 87. 10 3. ἴμερον 87.
10 6.

ἴμερον 88. 5 6 ?

ἴμερον 88. 4 3

ἴππ[88. 1 I.

ἴσαν 87. 7 3. ἴσα 87. 1+2 15.

ἴχθυ[89. 40 3.

καί 87. 1+2 24, 28, 3 ii. 7, 4
10, 5 2, 7 I (?), 14 2, 9;
88. 4 22, 15 ii. 18; 89. 1 ii.
3, 7, 20 2, 32 2, 34 I. καί
τ³ 87. 34 I. κάπυνη[? 87.
13 8.

καίτοι 87. 4 7.

κάκος 89. 31 I. κάκον 89. 11 2.

κάκα 89. 1 i. 3. κάκων 88.
4 3 I, 15 ii. 15. κάκ[89.
25 5.

κα[κό]τροπε 87. 6 4.

κάλαμος 88. 1 5.

κάλαν 87. 3 ii. 13. κάλον 87.

1+2 25; 88. 15 ii. 19. κάλα

87. 1+2 10. κάλ[87. 3 ii. 22.

καλεῖν, κάλημι 87. 44 4.

καμ[89. 21 I.

κάρπος 88. 15 ii. 18.

καρτε[88. 15 ii. 27.

κατά 87. 1+2 19; 88. 3 2 sch.,

4 2 I. κάδ 88. 10 6. καδδ[

88. 1 7.

κατάγει 88. 7 4.

καταη[88. 10 3.

κατασχύνωμεν 89. 1 ii. 7.

κατισ[χ . . 87. 7 8.

κε(ν) 87. 1+2 16, 3 ii. 2, 21;

89. 1 i. 8, 9, 17.

κ[ειμένοις 89. 1 ii. 8. κειμεν . .

88. 15 i. 15 sch.

κελάδεις 88. 1 6.

κερρ[88. 1 15.

κῆνον 87. 3 ii. 6. κην[88. 12

ii. 4.

Κίρσα (?) 89. 6 9.

κλᾶμμα 88. 15 ii. 19.

κλεηδον[87. 14 4.

κλέος 87. 4 9.

κολοκύνταις 88. 4 6.

κ[ού]φω 88. 4 4.

κρίνειν, κεκρίμενος 89. 1 i. 7.

κυ[87. 19 4.

κῦμα 88. 4 25; 89. 1 i. 15.

κυμ[88. 6 I I.

Κύπρω 87. 4 6.

λαγγάνειν, λάχη 89. 1 ii. 4, v. l.

λάβη. λέλογχε 87. 1+2 25.

λαμβάνειν, λάβη 89. 1 ii. 4, v. l.

λάχη.

λάμπρον 87. 1+2 25.

λανθάνειν, λελάθ[? 87. 12 3.

λεῦκαι 87. 1+2 13.

λίγηαν 87. 13 I I.

λυγύραν 87. 1+2 I I. λίγυραι

87. 6 7.

λίμενα 89. 1 ii. 2.

λίμνας 88. 1 2.

λίτως 88. 2 I I.

λυμαιν[87. 14 8.

λύρ[87. 29 5.

μαινόμενον 89. 29 7.

μακ[87. 5 I.

μακάρων 87. 3 20.

μάλα 89. 6 4.

μάλθακον 89. 1 ii. 3, v. l. μόλθ.

μάν 87. 5 4.

μανιώδη 89. 29 7 sch.

μάρπτειν, ἔμαρπεν 87. 1+2 20.

μάχεσθαι 87. 44 7.

μέ[89. 26 5.

μέγα 87. 4 7; 89. 1 ii. 4, 38 2.

μεγαλ[89. 21 2.

μειδίαισα 87. 27 3.

μελαινα[87. 3 ii. 15. μελαίναν

87. 1+2 13.

μελλιχόφων[ος 87. 6 6.

μέλος 87. 6 5. μελών 87. 45 2

(title).

μέν 87. 3 ii. 7; 88. 15 ii. 17.

μένην 89. 1 i. 12. μενετ[89.

12 3.

μεριμνα[87. 30 I.

μή 87. 3 ii. 19, 24 2, 34 4; 88.

12 ii. 7, 15 ii. 23; 89. 1 ii.

3, 7.

μηδέ 89. 1 i. 5, 12 5.

μηδέν 87. 3 ii. 20. μηδεν[87.

34 2.

μηκέτι 87. 7 I I.

μητε[87. 27 2.

Μίκα 87. 6 I.

μιμήσκεισθαι, μνάσθητε 89. 1

ii. 5.

μόλθ[ακον 89. 1 ii. 3 (v. l.

μάλθ.).

μοναρχίαν 89. 12 4.

μόρος 89. 29 4.

μύγισ 87. 3 ii. 9.

μύρια 88. 2 10.

Μυρσίλου 89. 12 9 sch.

μ[ώ]μω ? 89. 1 ii. 5.

να[89. 24 I.

νάα 88. 4 19. ναῦν 88. 15 i.

5 sch. νᾶος 89. 1 i. 17.

νεβρίοισιν 87. 1+2 15.

νίκα[88. 15 ii. 8.

νό[88. 12 ii. 5.

νόημα 87. 44 3.

νομίσδει 87. 1+2 22.

ν[ύ]σον 89. 29 5.

νῦν 87. 3 ii. 11, 5 5, 34 3;

88. 2 9; 89. 1 ii. 6, 13 I.

ξεσ[88. 15 i. 5 sch.

ξυστοφορήμενος 89. 1 i. 8.

ὀ, ὄ (art., dem., rel.) 87. 1+2

8, 38 2. ὀ 88. 4 33. τό

87. 1+2 25, 5 6, 19 5; 88. 2

9, 15 ii. 19. τάν 87. 3 ii.

18, 9 2; 89. 1 ii. 10. τῶ

88. 2 8; 89. 1 i. 15, ii. 5.

τῶ[88. 10 2. τᾶς 87. 7 I;

88. 15 ii. 14. τῶ 89. 9 I.

τᾶ 88. 12 ii. 2. οἱ 88. 15

ii. 25. τά 87. 3 ii. 14, 44

10; 88. 2 I, 4 27, 12 ii. 4,

15 ii. 25. τοῖς 87. 3 ii. 24;

88. 4 23. τῶν 89. 1 ii. 12.

τᾶν 89. 7 3. ταῖς, ταῖσι

87. 3 ii. 7; 89. 1 ii. 14.

ὄδε, τάνδ[ε ? 89. 1 ii. 9. τᾶσδε

88. 12 ii. 5.

ὀδοίπορος 87. 3 ii. 8.

οἶδεν 88. 4 26. οἶσθα 87. 44 9.

ὄκ[88. 4 24.

ὄκνος 89. 1 ii. 3.

]ὄλθων 88. 2 12.

ὀλίγαις 88.¹⁵ ii. 20.
 ὄλα(ν) 87.³⁸ 3.
 ὄλοφ[ώιος ? 87.⁵ 3.
 ὀμάγν[ρ . . 88.¹⁰ 5.
 ὀμίλλει 88.⁴ 27.
 ὄμπαυε 88.¹⁵ ii. 7.
 [ὄμφ]ακας 88.¹⁵ ii. 24.
 ὄν 88.¹ 6.
 ὄνεσ[87.³⁷ 2.
 ὄνιαις 87.³ ii. 17.
 ? ὄννεχει 89.⁸ 4.
 ὄνοιρε 87.³ ii. 15.
 ὄπάσδοι 87.¹⁺² 23.
 ὄπποθεν 88.¹ 3.
 ὄπποτα 89.¹ i. 13.
 ὄρη[88.⁴ 3.
 ὄρ[νίθεσσι 88.¹ 2.
 ὄς [1789.¹ ii. 9]. ὄς τε, ἄς τε
 88.⁴ 17. ὄν τε 87.⁴⁴ 2.
 ὄσσοις 87.⁴ 8; 88.¹⁵ ii. 18.
 ὄσ[σα 87.⁴⁴ 6.
 ὄτα 87.³ ii. 4. ὄτα τε 87.³ ii.
 16.
 ὄττις 88.⁶ 10.
 οὐ, οὐκ 87.¹⁺² 14, 17, ³ ii. 2,
 21, ⁵ 4, ⁷ 8; 88.⁴ 20, 26,
 33, ¹⁵ ii. 20, 25 (?). ἔγωνκ
 87.⁶ 2. μηῖκ 88.¹² ii. 7.
 ? οὐ[δάμα (οἱ μῆ)δάμα 88.⁴ 11.
 οὐδέ 87.⁵ 8, ¹⁰ 2 (?), ¹⁸ 1 (?);
 88.¹⁵ ii. 13, 26.
 οὐδέν 87.⁵ 7.
 οὐτος, τοῦτο 87.¹⁺² 24, ⁵ 2;
 88.⁴ 26, ¹⁰ 4, ¹² ii. 8. τοῦ-
 του 88.¹⁵ i. 15 sch. ταῦτα
 87.¹⁸ 2; 88.³ 2 sch.
 οὕτω 87.³ ii. 21. οὕτω 88.
¹⁵ i. 10 sch.
 ὄψι (?) 88.¹⁵ ii. 21.
 πάθην 88.¹⁴ 3.
 παῖδα 87.⁹ 2. παῖδες 87.¹⁺²
 10. π[αῖ]δας 88.⁴ 5.
 πάλην 87.¹⁹ 5.
 πᾶν 87.³ ii. 5. παν[89.⁶ 3.
 παισ[αν ? 89.²⁹ 2. πάντα
 87.¹⁺² 12 (?); 88.² 10;
 89.²⁴ 1. πάντα[87.³ ii.
 24, ¹⁵ 2. πάντεσσι 87.¹³
 13.

πάντα 87.⁴ 9.
 παρέμμεναι, ? π]αρέσεται 89.⁹
 3.
 παρέσκεθε 88.¹⁵ ii. 11.
 παρεχε[88.¹⁵ ii. 28. παρέξει
 89.¹ i. 16.
 παρμέν[89.²² 1.
 πάρουθα 89.¹ ii. 5.
 πάσασθαι, π[ε]πάμεναι 87.³⁸ 1.
 παύσαι 88.¹⁵ ii. 15.
 πεδά 87.⁴⁴ 5.
 πεδέχην 87.³ ii. 19.
 πέδιον 88.⁹ 2.
 πει[89.²⁶ 4.
 Πελάσγων 89.⁶ 6.
 πέλη[ος 87.³⁸ 2.
 Πενθιλήαν 87.⁶ 3.
 περθέσθαι 87.³³ 4.
 πίθεισα[87.⁴⁴ 8.
 πισύνα 88.⁴ 24.
 ? π]λεξάνθιδος 88.¹ 1.
 πλήνοι 87.¹⁸ 4.
 πλοκαμ[87.¹⁴ 5, ¹⁵ 4.
 πλυ[87.³⁹ 1.
 ποῆσ[88.⁴ 19. ποησ[89.⁹ 2.
 ποίην 87.¹⁺² 16.
 πολ[88.¹ 2.
 πολίαις 88.⁴ 25.
 πόλιν 89.¹ ii. 10.
 πόλυν 89.¹ i. 16. πόλυ 87.
⁵ 7. πόλυ[88.⁹ 3. πόλυν
 88.⁶ 5. πόλλας 89.¹ i.
 11. πόλλα 88.⁴ 22, ¹² ii.
 9, 10. πόλλ[89.⁶ 5.
 πον[88.¹⁵ ii. 9.
 πονεῖν, ἐπόνησας 88.⁴ 21.
 ποτά 87.³ ii. 9; 88.¹³ 4;
 89.⁶ 7 (v. l. ποκά).
 πρίν 89.¹³ 2.
 πρόδηλον 89.¹ ii. 4.
 πρόκοφιν 87.¹⁺² 9.
 πρός 89.¹ i. 3.
 πρόσθα 88.¹⁵ ii. 25.
 προτέρω 89.¹ i. 15.
 προφ[89.¹⁹ 2.
 πτήσσειν, ἐπτάξατε 87.³ ii. 3.
 πω 88.⁴ 11.
 Σαφροῦς 87.⁴⁵ 1 (title).
 Σίσυφο[88.⁶ 13.

σός, σᾶς 88.¹⁵ ii. 14. σᾶ οἱ
 σαί 88.⁷ 8.
 σταφύλαις 88.¹⁵ ii. 20.
 στ]εράν 88.¹⁵ i. 4.
 στίχου 88.¹⁵ i. 15 sch.
 στ[ύ]μα[σι] 87.¹⁺² 9.
 σύ 87.²⁶ 7, ⁴⁴ 9; 88.¹⁵ ii. 14,
 σέ 87.⁴ 5, 10, ⁶ 1, 2, ²³ 3;
 88.¹⁵ ii. 2. σοί 88.¹⁵ i.
 3 sch., ii. 17.
 συνα[γέρ]ρεται 88.¹⁵ ii. 18.
 ? συναέρρ]αισα 87.³³ 5.
 ? συ]ννέχει 89.⁸ 4.
 συνουσιάζοντες 88.¹⁵ i. 2, 3
 sch
 σφ[89.¹ ii. 12.
 σφαλ[89.⁶ 11.
 σφι 87.¹³ 12.
 τε 87.³ ii. 14, 16, ²⁶ 4, ³⁴ 1 (?),
⁴⁴ 2; 88.⁴ 17, ¹⁵ ii. 9 (?)
 τέαντα 87.³ ii. 11. Cf. τοιαύτας.
 τέ]λεσον 87.⁴⁴ 3.
 τέρπειν,]τερεπ[87.¹⁰ 7.
 τ]ηλεφάνην 88.¹ 7.
 τιθέναι, θήται 87.¹⁺² 9.
 τίς 88.¹⁵ ii. 9. τί 87.¹⁺² 7,
 16.
 τις 87.⁶ 5; 89.¹ ii. 6.]τ[ς]
 89.¹ i. 7. τι 88.¹⁵ ii. 16.
 τινά 89.¹ ii. 3, ¹⁹ 2.
 τοι 88.¹⁵ ii. 25. Cf. 87.³⁴ 1;
 88.¹⁵ ii. 9.
 τοιαύτας 88.¹⁵ ii. 21. Cf.
 τέαντα.
 τόκης 89.¹ ii. 8.
 τόλυμ[87.⁴³ 2.
 τόξω 88.⁷ 3.
 τόπον 89.³¹ 2.
 τότα 89.¹ i. 12, ²² 2.
 τ]ρόπον 87.⁷ 7.
 τρυ[88.⁷ 6.
 Τυνδαρίδαις 87.⁷ 9.
 τύχην 87.⁴⁴ 6. τύχοισα 87
⁴⁴ 1.
 ὕδωρ 88.¹ 4.
 ὕμ[88.¹² ii. 10.
 ὕμο . . 87.¹⁺² 8.

ἕμους 87. ¹⁺² 20, ⁷ 2 (?).
 ὑπά 87. ³⁹ 3; 89. ¹ ii. 8.
 ὑπερβέβηται 88. ¹⁵ ii. 17.
 ὑπίησι 88. ⁴ 4.
 ὑπίσω 88. ⁴ 23.
 ὕπνος 87. ³ ii. 16.
 ὕστερον 88. ¹⁵ i. 18 sch.

Φαέθων 87. ⁴ 8.
 ἔφα 87. ¹² 6.
 φαρξώμεθα 89. ¹ ii. 1.
 φέροισι 87. ¹⁺² 14. φέροισα
 87. ¹⁺² 19.
 φθάνειν, ἔφθατε 87. ³ ii. 13.
 φθ]μέναν 87. ¹⁺² 22.
 φίλει 87. ¹⁺² 27. ἐφίλησ[87.
⁵ 4. ? φίλ[87. ⁴ 5.

φίλος, φίλε 87. ¹⁺² 11. φίλ[
 89. ⁶ 1. ? φίλ[87. ⁴ 5.
 φιλότατα 87. ⁶ 3.
 φοί[89. ¹⁹ 1.
 φοίταις 87. ³ ii. 16.

χαιρο[87. ²⁶ 4.
 χάλειπ[87. ¹⁹ 3.
 χαρίεντ' 87. ⁷ 10.
 χαρισ[88. ⁴ 22.
 χέλυνναν 87. ¹⁺² 11.
 χερσ[87. ⁹ 3 (-pp- Pap.).
 χλιδάνα 87. ⁴⁴ 8.
 χλωρός 88. ¹ 5.
 χόρον 87. ¹³ 10.
 χρήματος 88. ⁴ 28.
 χρώα 87. ¹⁺² 12.

χρόνος 88. ¹⁵ ii. 17.
 χῶρις 87. ³ ii. 18.

Ψάπφοι 87. ⁴ 5.
 ψύχα 87. ³ ii. 10. ψύχαν 88.
⁴ 32.
 ψύχρον 88. ¹ 4, ⁴ 36.

ῶ 88. ² 7, ¹⁵ ii. 9; 89. ⁶ 1.
 ῶ 89. ³² 3.
 ὠγύγιος 88. ¹⁵ i. 7 sch.
 ὠκιστα 89. ¹ ii. 1.
 ὠλομέν[88. ⁴ 29.
 ὠμοτέραις 88. ¹⁵ ii. 24.
]ώνυμον 89. ⁸ 5 (v. l.]ωννυμ.).
 ὦς 89. ¹ ii. 1.
 ὥστε 87. ³⁸ 2.

II. OTHER NEW TEXTS.

α 3. 8. = εἶς 4. ⁴ 5; 8. i. sch.
 4.
 *Αβδηρος 0. ¹¹ [2], 3.
 ἀγαθός 86. 5; 94. 12; 3. 29.
 *Αγαμέμων 90. 20.
 ἀγανόφρων 92. ¹ 12.
 ἀγαπᾶν 0. ¹ 14, ⁶⁺⁷ 11.
 ἀγγελίη 93. vi. 3.
 ἄγειν 92. ⁶⁵ 4; 93. viii. 3; [4.
¹⁺² 2]; 20. 73 sch.
 ἄγιος 86. 4.
 ἀγλαός 92. ¹ 15, 20. ἀγλ[
 91. 13.
 ἀγν[27. 17.
 ἀγνύαι 94. 7.
 ἀγοράζειν 95. ii. 7.
 ἄγιος 90. 21.
 ἄγων 98. ⁵⁻⁶ ii. 16?
 ἀγωνία 98. ⁴⁴ ii. 8.
 ἀγωνίζεσθαι 4. ³ 2; 27. 4.
 ἄδειν 95. ii. 14.
 ἀδελφή 98. ⁴⁴ i. 10.
 ἀδελφός 0. [17], ³ 45.
 ἀδικεῖν 95. ii. 1; 97. 12 et
 saep.
 ἀδίκημα 97. 52.
 ἀδικος 97. 63.
 ἀδροσίη 96. 18.

ἄεθλον 93. vii. 7.
 ἀεθλοφορεῖν 93. viii. 15.
 αἰί 93. v. 6.
 αἰεῖν 91. 9; 93. x. 1.
 ἀέλιος 92. ¹ 14.
 αἰτός 91. 8.
 ἀηδώς 26. recto 12.
 ἀθάνατος 92. ⁶⁵ 3.
 ἄθεος 85. ¹ recto 5. ἀθέως 0.
⁸ 20.
 ἀθεραπευσία 98. ⁴⁴ iv. 1.
 *Ἀθηνᾶ 2. ³ 54; [4. ⁴ 2]. *Ἀθάνα
 91. 4.
 *Ἀθηνάδιον 2. ³ 55.
 *Ἀθῆναι 0. ² 69, ³ 60; 4. ¹⁺² 1.
 *Ἀθηναῖος 0. ² 66, 72, ³ 7, 11,
 29, 42, 51, ⁴⁺⁵ 1, 9, ⁸ 9,
 22, 30; 4. ¹⁺² 4 (?), [23];
 27. 13?
 ἄθροισμα [5. 372 sch. ?].
 ἀθροεπυτος 96. 17.
 Αἴας [90. 34].
 Αἰγαῖος 90. 28.
 Αἴγυπτος [0. ¹ 10].
 *Αἴδης 95. ii. 27.
 αἰέν 90. 46.
 αἶμα 2. ³ 61.
 αἰνεῖν 93. x. 5; 20. 64 sch.

αἶνος 86. 4.
 Αἰολίς [0. ¹ 31].
 αἰρεῖν 91. 10.
 αἰρεῖν 4. ⁴ 4, αἰρεῖσθαι 93.
 viii. 6 (εἰλάμεθα).
 αἰσθάνεσθαι 96. 1.
 αἴσσειν 93. vi. 2.
 Αἰσχίνης 0. ³ 40, 41; 4. ¹⁺² 9.
 αἰσχύνη 27. 10.
 Αἴσωπος 0. ² 46, 57.
 αἴτε 90. ⁵ 4, 5.
 αἰτεῖν [0. ⁸ 27].
 αἰτία 0. ² 32.
 αἴτιος 27. 10.
 Αἰτωλός 2. ³ 51.
 αἰχμά 90. 32.
 αἰψα 94. 12.
 αἰών 97. 43.
 ἀκήρατος 91. 19.
 ἀκμητος 96. 12.
 ἀκολούθως 8. ii. sch. 13?
 ἀκόμοστος 94. 20.
 ἀκούειν 82. 8; 98. ⁴⁴ i. 7; 3.
 67-9.
 ἀκρίς 1. 43.
 ἀκρισίη 96. 21.
 ἀκρόθι 22. i. 17.
 ἀκρω[93. iv. 3.

ἄλβανιος 2.³ 65.
 ἄλέξανδρος 93. vii. 1; 98.¹⁵
 3, 20 2, 44 i. 6, 12, ii. 6,
 iii. 4, 15, v. 2 (?), 49 4?
 ἄλεξις 1. 50.
 ἀληθής 97. 4, 17, 38; 99. ii.
 14, 32.
 ἀληθινός 98.¹² 4?
 ἀλήτις 94. 20.
 ἀλίζωνος 93. vi. 4.
 ἀλίσκεσθαι 97. 25.
 ἀλιτήριος 4. 1+2 5?
 ἀλκιμος 90. 34.
 ἀλκτήρ 96. 11.
 ἀλλά 91. 10; 93. viii. 1;
 95. ii. 7, 27; 96. 4; 97.
 41, 60; 98.⁴⁸ 4; 99. ii.
 31; 2.³ 69; 3. 28; 9. sch.
 3; 25. recto 1, verso 4;
 26. verso 3; 27. 9.
 ἀλλήλων 96. 10; 97. 4; 7.
 901 sch.
 ἄλλος 90. 13; 93. ix. 4;
 94. 9, 15; 97. [19], 69;
 98.¹³ ii. 4, v. 22 (?); 0.
 [1 34?]; 2.³ 64; 8. i.
 sch. 11; 9. sch. 4; 23.
 10.
 ἄλλοτε 94. 9, 11.
 ἄλς 92.³⁶ 4; 93. v. 4, ix. 6.
 ἀλώη 94. 18.
 ἄλωσις 90. 14.
 ἄμα 92.¹ 5; 24. 7; 27. 11.
 ἀμαρτάνειν 0.¹² 8.
 ἀμείβεσθαι 94. 11.
 ἀμῆν 86. 4, 5.
 ἄμοιρος 0.² 45.
 ἄμπελος 2.³ 71.
 ἀμφιπολεῖν 92.¹ 4, 51 2.
 ἀμφότερος 93. vii. 3, ix. 1, x.
 6; 97. 62.
 ἀμφοτέρωθεν 93. vi. 4.
 ἄν [90. 23]; 97. 67; 99.
 ii. 18; 0.² 42, [57], 3 38;
 1. 47; 9. sch. 7, 9; 25.
 verso 3.
 ἄν (= εἰάν) 95. ii. 1, 23; 97.
 17.
 ἄνα 92.¹ 20; 94. 21; 95. ii.
 16 (ἄν).

ἀναβαίνειν 90. 8.
 ἄναβασις 3. 39, 52.
 ἀνάγειν 98.⁴⁴ ii. 14; 0.⁸ 10.
 ἀναγκάζειν 78. 14.
 ἀνάγκη 97. 15, 16.
 ἀναγράφειν 0.² 71; 2.³ 58?
 ἀναδιδόναι 2.³ 33.
 ἀναιρεῖν 98.⁴⁴ i. 12 (ἀνελεῖ).
 ἀναίτιος [99. ii. 20?].
 ἀνακόμζεσθαι 0.⁸ 31.
 ἀνακῆσθαι 0.⁵ 30.
 ἀναλογία 1. int.
 ἀνάλωμα 4.⁴ 12.
 ἄναξ 96. 9.
 ἀναξί 93. ii. 1.
 ἀναπληροῦν 90. 51 sch.
 ἀναρπάζειν 85. 2-4 verso 8.
 ἀνατέλλειν 78. 29.
 ἀνατρέπειν 99. ii. 18.
 ἀνδραγαθία 99. ii. 23.
 ἀνδρίας 0.⁸ 33.
 ἄνδρων 2.³ 46.
 ἀνειπεῖν 0.² 55.
 ἄνεμος 78. 8; 95. i. 7.
 ἀνέρχεσθαι 26. recto 4.
 ἀνευρίσκειν 95. ii. 16.
 ἀνήρ 85. 2-4 recto 11, verso
 4; 90. 21, 25; 93. viii.
 2, ix. 3, x. 3; 94. 6; 0.²
 70; 4.⁴ 8.
 ἄνθρωπος 78. 32; 94. 9, 15,
 95. ii. 17; 96. 5; 97. 8;
 98.² 7, 44 iv. 8; 0.²⁵ 3;
 26. verso 9.
 ἀνιστάται 0.³ 33.
 ἀνόητος 1. 45.
 ἀνομβεῖν 94. 13.
 ἀνομβος 94. 13.
 ἀντεκροφεῖν 2.³ 49.
 Ἄντημωρ 2.² 5.
 ἀντί 0.³ 50. ἀντὶ τοῦ 3. 60.
 Ἄντικλείδης 2.³ 5.
 Ἄντιοχεύς 2.⁶ 4.
 Ἄντιοχίς [4. 1+2 21?].
 Ἄντίπατρος 0.⁸ 26.
 ἀνώνυμος 90. 15.
 ἄξιος 93. x. 5.
 ἀξιούν 3. 14.
 ἀξίωμα 0.³ 28; 27. 4.
 ἄξων 93. vi. 1.

ἄοιδή 90. 48; 93. ix. 3.
 ἄοικος 98.² 8.
 ἀπατεῖν 95. ii. 23.
 ἀπαλλάττεσθαι 0.³ 71.
 ἄπαξ 99. i. 7?
 ἄπας 85. 2-4 verso 3; 98.⁴⁵
 3; 99. ii. 19.
 ἀπάτη (l. πάλη) 93. viii. 1.
 ἄπεφθοσ 90. 43.
 ἀπέχειν 95. ii. 5.
 ἀπιέναι 0.² 44, 46; 4.⁶ 4.
 ἀπλῶς 3. 38.
 ἀπό 85.¹ recto 3, 2-4 recto 6,
 8, verso 5, 8; 90. 27, 28,
 36; 92.¹ 16; 96. 9, 16,
 21; 0.¹ 31, 6-7 2; 8. ii.
 sch. 5.
 ἀποδεικνύειν 1. 52.
 ἀποδιδόναι 95. ii. 23.
 ἀποθνήσκειν 95. ii. 14; 98.
 44 iv. 9.
 ἀποκαθιστάται 8. i. sch. 8?
 ἀπόκριμα 0.² 21?
 ἀπολείπειν 96. 1; 0.³ 16.
 ἀπολλύναι 85. 2-4 recto 5; 97.
 27; 0.⁸ 14 (?), 21.
 ἀπολύειν 2.³ 38.
 Ἀπόλλων 4. 1+2 2.
 Ἄπολλ[ωνία?] 2.³ 29.
 ἀπόστασις 8. i. sch. 13.
 ἀποστερητής 28. recto 5.
 ἀποτέμνειν 0.² 43.
 ἀποτυπανάξειν 98.¹ 7.
 ἀπροβούλετος 0.⁶⁺⁷ 7.
 ἄρα 90. 15, 41; 96. 15;
 98.⁴⁴ iv. 8.
 ἀργιβρέντας 92.¹ 9.
 Ἄργος 90. 28, 36. [Ἄργ]όθεν
 90. 3.
 ἀργύριον 0.³ 65.
 ἄργυρος 90. 35.
 ἄρε[90.⁹
 ἄρεστός 24. 10.
 ἀρετή 90. 16.
 Ἄρης 0.³ 39.
 ἄρθμιος 93. x. 1.
 ἀριθμός 1. int. (?); 2.³ 67; 8.
 ii. sch. 3, 6.
 ἀριστερός 2.³ 37.
 ἀριστοπ[92.²⁴ 2.

- ἄριστος O. ³ 24.
 Ἄριστοτέλης 2. ³ 50, 57, 59.
 Ἄριστοφάνης 1. 21, 40 (?),
 [45], 46, 49, 59; 3. 2;
 5. 744 sch.?
 ἄρκεῖν 94. 3.
 ἄρμα 98. ⁴⁴ ii. 13; 4. ¹⁺² 5.
 ἄρμονία 2. ³ 63.
 ἄρνες 98. ² 9?
 ἄρτος 24. 9.
 ἄρρητος 8. ii. sch. 10.
 Ἄρτεμις 92. ¹ 3; 93. v. 5.
 ἄρτος 98. ⁴⁴ iv. 5; 3. 50.
 ἀρχαῖος 96. 9.
 ἀρχεῖν 90. 21; O. ³ 38.
 ἀρχή 85. ²⁻⁴ verso 2; O. ³ 46;
 2. ³ 2.
 Ἀρχιλόχος 93. viii. 4.
 ἀρχιμάγειρος 85. ²⁻⁴ recto 3.
 Ἀσβύστης 93. vi. 1.
 ἀσθενής 99. ii. 28.
 Ἀσία 2. ³ 10, 17.
 Ἀσκληπιάδης 2. ³ 6.
 ἀσμένως 98. ⁴⁴ iv. 7.
 ἀσπίς 90. ⁴ ii. 5.
 ἄσπον 94. 1.
 ἄστατος O. ³ 63; 22. ii. 30.
 ἀστήρ 78. 35; 93. iii. 2;
 1. int.
 ἀστράπτειν 4. ¹⁺² 5.
 ἄστρον 86. 2.
 ἄστνυ 90. 2.
 Ἀσωπός 92. ¹⁶ I.
 ἄτακτος O. ¹ 17.
 ἄτε 96. 2.
 ἀτέλ[21. 4.
 ἄτερ 96. 16.
 ἄτερθεν 91. 15.
 ἄτη 90. 8.
 ἀτρεκέως 21. 8.
 Ἄτρεύς 90. 22.
 Ἄτρώμητος O. ³ 43.
 Ἄττικός O. ⁵ 75.
 ἀτυχεῖν O. ⁸ 28.
 αἶ 90. ⁴ ii. 6.
 αἰδή 94. 3.
 αἰλεῖν 95. i. 4 *et saep.*
 Αἰλῆς 90. 27; 92. ⁴⁰ 2,
 αἰλός 95. ii. 12, 15.
 αἶξεν 78. 13, 38.
 αἶος 94. 8?
 αἰτεῖν 94. 8.
 αἶρα 96. 16.
 Αὐτοκλείδης 2. ³ 62.
 Αὐτοκλῆς 4. ⁴ 6.
 αὐτοκράτεια 78. 41.
 αὐτόρτος 95. ii. 8.
 αὐτός 88. ²⁻⁴ recto 11 (?), ver-
 so 6; 93. ix. 5; 94. 7,
 16; 95. ii. 5; 97. 14 *et*
saep.; 98. ¹ 8 (?), ⁷ 5 (?), ⁴⁴
 i. 1, 3, 9, 11, iii. 13, 19,
⁴⁵ 6; 99. ii. 17; O. ¹ 31,
 41, 43, 46, ² 45, 50, 54,
 68, ³ [23], 32, 65, ⁶⁺⁷ 2,
 7 (?), ⁸ 29, [32], ¹² 4; 1.
 22, 53; 2. ³ 29, 33, 34,
 41, [55]; 3. 15, 50; 4. ⁴
 11; 8. i. sch. 2 (?), 6 (?),
 9. sch. 6, 8; 25. verso 4;
 26. verso 7. ὁ αὐτός O. ¹
 24; 3. 21, 67; 4. ⁴ 13.
 αἰχμός 22. i. 22.
 ἄφθιτος 90. 47.
 ἀφθονία 96. 7.
 ἀφνειός 93. x. 3. ἀφνεός 94.
 12.
 Ἀφόβητος (Δαόφοβος Pap.) O.
³ 46.
 Ἀφόβος O. ³ 18.
 ἄφρων 2. ³ 48.
 Ἀχαιοί 90. 31.
 Ἀχαρνεῖς 1. 46.
 Αχιλλεύς 90. 33.
 β̄ 3. 39.
 βαβυλών 2. ³ 68, 73.
 βαβυλῆος 94. 18.
 βαίνειν 90. 33 (?); 98. ⁴⁵ 3;
 24. 1?
 βάλλειν 98. ⁴⁸ 6; O. ² 50; 4.
⁵ 4.
 βάρβαρος 98. ⁵⁻⁶ ii. 7, ⁴⁴ ii. 2,
 iii. 2, 11, iv. 13; 2. ³ 47.
 βαρνηχῆς 96. 16.
 βασανίζειν 95. ii. 19.
 βασιλεύειν 98. ⁵⁻⁶ 2.
 βασιλεύς 90. 21; 93. iv. 3,
 v. 2; 95. ii. 24; 99. ii.
 30; 2. ³ 32, ⁶ 1 (?); 26.
 recto 7. βασιλ[85. ⁵ 1;
 93. viii. 8.
 βάσις 8. i. sch. 12.
 βατήρ 1. int.
 βείρακες [1. 7].
 Βελβία 1. 42.
 βέλεκος [1. 21, 22, 27].
 Βέλλερος 1. 56.
 Βελλεροφόντης 1. 56.
 βέλος 1. 46.
 βέλτιστος 1. 39.
 βέμβυξ 1. 40?
 βερβίνια 1. 57.
 Βεργαῖος 1. 50, 52.
 Βέργη 1. 55.
 Βερενίκη 93. iii. 2, v. 6.
 Βερέσχεθαι 1. 45.
 βῆμα O. ³ 23, 51.
 βήρηκες 1. 59, 60.
 βιβλίον (βυβλ.) O. ¹ 33.
 βιοτή 94. 8.
 βιάπτειν 97. 70, 73.
 βλαστόν 78. 30; 96. 21.
 βλέφαρον 2. ⁶ 6.
 βοᾶν 92. ⁴¹ 3; 93. viii. 2.
 βοηθός 26. verso 11.
 βοτάνη 2. ³ 40.
 βου[93. iii. 3.
 βούβρωστις 94. 20.
 βουκόλος 98. ⁴⁴ iv. 4.
 βούλεσθαι 26. verso 5.
 βουλή 90. 4.
 βοῦς 93. ³ 1.
 βύειν 1. 48, 49.
 βωμός O. ² 35, 60.
 γ̄ 2. ³ 1; 8. 1 sch. 13.
 γάζα 98. ⁴⁴ iii. 15.
 γαλακτόρτος 95. ii. 9.
 γάμος 93. iv. 1; 25. recto 7.
 γάρ 78. 11, [13]; 85. ²⁻⁴
 verso 2; 92. ¹ 21, ⁴¹ 2,
⁴² 1; 93. vii. 7, x. 6; 95.
 i. 5, ii. 18; 96. 1, 6, 17,
 18; 97. 12, 16, 55, 68;
 98. ⁵⁻⁶ ii. 6, ¹⁸ 5, ⁴⁴ i. 8, ii.
 2; 99. ii. 21, 29; O. ¹ 22,
¹² 10; 1. [int.], 54; 2. ³

41; 22. ii. 30; 23. 21;
25. recto 1, 4, 6, verso 5;
28. recto 1, verso 3.
γαῦλος 93. ix. 7.
γε 93. ix. 5; 97. [22?], 47;
23. 8; 26. verso 13 (?);
27. 11.
γείνεσθαι 90. 41.
γελᾶν 96. 7.
γέμειν 2. 3 65.
γένεσις 85. 2-4 verso 12; 90.
51 sch.
γένος 0. [1 3, 37], 2 65, 3 12,
41, 4+5 9, 8 35; 2. 3 63;
24. 3? Χρυσούν Γ. 3. 57.
γέεσθαι 0. 3 25.
γεωργεῖν 93. vi. 6?
Γεωργός 3. 36.
γῆ 93. vii. 2 (?); 99. ii. 31;
0. 11 9 (?); 3. 16.
γῆθειν 96. 17.
Γῆρας 3. 2.
γίγνεσθαι 99. ii. 33; 0. 1 20,
26, 39, 2 71, 72, 3 18, 49,
62, 73, 6+7 9, 12 2, 21 3;
2. 3 40; 4. 4 15; 8. ii. sch.
5, 12; 25. recto 7; 26.
recto 8; 27. 9.
γιγνώσκειν 3. 12.
γλ[92. 8 1.
Γλαύκη 93. viii. 3.
Γλανκοβία 0. 3 44.
Γλαῦκος 2. 3 36.
γλαυξ 1. 7.
γλυκός 91. 13; 98. 10 6.
γλώσσα 93. x. 6.
γνά[θος 1. 32.
γνήσιος 24. 9.
γνώμη 0. 3 36.
γού[92. 36 5.
γόνυ 92. 1 22; 95. i. 11.
γραμματεῖον 4. 4 18.
γράφειν 98. 44 i. 5; 0. 1 32,
6+7 5; [4. 3 1]. γράφεσθαι
0. 3 52; 4. 3 3.
γυμνός 93. ix. 1.
γυναικεῖος 8. ii. sch. 13?
γυναικεράστρια 0. 1 18.
γυνή 85. 2-4 recto 3, 10; 98.
44 i. 11; 2. 3 35.

δ 1. 44; 8. i. sch. 13, 15.
δαϊδαλ . . . 91. 19.
δαίμων 93. vi. 4; 4. 1+2 10.
δακρύνει 0. 3 67, 69.
δακρυνόεις 90. 7.
δακρυσ[98. 2 3.
δάκτυλος 95. i. 8.
δαμ[92. 24 3.
Δαναοί 90. 44.
δανίσειν 95. ii. 22.
δάνος 95. ii. 22.
Δαρδανία [90. 29].
Δαρδανίδας 90. 1.
Δαρείος 98. 44 i. 9, iii. 17, 45 4.
δασ[92. 34 6.
δασ[90. 5 1.
δεδιέναι 93. viii. 2, x. 6.
δεῖν 82. 9; 97. 42; 93. 14
2 (?); 99. ii. 9, 31; 2. 3
62; [5. 372 sch. ?]; 25.
recto 2 (?). δεύντως 0. 3 54.
Δείναρχος 4. 3 7.
δεινότης 0. 3 20.
δέκα 95. ii. 9; 0. 8 27; 4. 4 4 (i).
δέλτος 2. 3 58.
Δελφοί 0. 2 30, 34, 47.
δέμας 92. 1 14.
δένδρεον 96. 10.
δεξιός 92. 43 1.
δέρειν 0. 2 39.
δέυεσθαι 94. 2.
δέχεσθαι 0. 3 67.
δεύτερος 98. 45 7; 3. 39 (β̄).
δεύτερον 95. ii. 3.
δῆ 98. 2 7; 99. ii. 7, 33.
δημ[2. 3 59.
Δημήτηρ 2. 3 39.
δῆμος 93. x. 1, 6; 0. 3 9, 14,
4+5 10, 6+7 3; [4. 1+2 28 *et*
saep.].
δημοσ[98. 4 3.
Δημοσθένης 99. ii. 9; 0. 3 10,
11, 13, 37, 55, 61, 8 25;
3. 45; 4. 3 9, 4 16.
δημοσία 0. 3 8.
δημότης 4. 4 10.
δήπουθεν 24. 3.
[δῆ]υς 90. 6.
δαί 90. 9, 28; 97. 23, 29;
98. 44 iv. 6; 99. ii. 15;

0. 1 44, 22 2; 3. 35; 4. 4
15; 28. verso 4.
διαβαίνειν 98. 45 5.
διαβάλλειν 0. 2 67.
διαδέχεται 0. 3 51.
διατᾶν 97. 66.
διακεδανόναι 94. 19.
διακόσιοι 98. 44 iv. 12.
διάλεκτος 0. 1 32.
διάμετρος 8. ii. sch. 5.
διάνοια 28. recto 6.
διαρπαγή 98. 44 iii. 12.
διατριβή 25. recto 7.
διάυλος 93. viii. 4.
διάφορος 98. 44 i. 4.
διαφρονεῖν 95. ii. 2.
διαφυλάσσειν 0. 3 28.
διδόναι 93. viii. 2, ix. 3; 94.
4; 98. 44 i. 3, 10; 0. 10 2;
3. 25; [4. 1+2 15]; 24. 8.
δίδυμος 92. 1 15.
διερός 90. 26.
δικάσειν 97. 64.
δίκαιος 85. 1 recto 3 (?), 4;
97. 1, 5, 10, 15, 56, 62,
68. δικαίως 93. 18 7?
δικαστήριον 0. 6+7 12; [4. 4
19].
δικαστής 4. 4 19.
δίκη 94. 10.
δίλογχος 1. 35.
διητός 94. 14 [-ωτος Pap.].
διό 78. 42.
διόλου 95. ii. 4.
Διονύσιος 2. 3 48.
Διονυσόδωρος 3. 47.
διοργίσειν 0. 2 48.
διπλάσιος 8. ii. sch. 5.
διστεφής 93. vii. 2.
διώκειν 98. 44 iii. 17.
δοκεῖν 97. 2; 0. 1 20.
δόξα 27. 8.
δουλεύειν 78. 12.
Δράκων 1. int.
δρᾶν 97. 49.
δρέπειν 92. 1 5.
δρόμος 98. 44 iii. 18?
δύναμις 86. 4; 99. ii. 26.
δύνασθαι 97. 49; 1. int.; 8.
i. sch. 9; 25. verso 3.

δυνατός O.² 70.
 δύνειν 78. 28; [95. ii. 5].
 δύο 95. i. 4, ii. 10, 25.
 δυσειδέστατος O.¹ 21.
 δυστυχία 3. 28.
 δω[92.³⁸ I.
 δώδεκα 95. ii. 9.
 Δωρίχα O.¹ 10.
 δωροδοκία 4.³ 8.
 δωτήρ 86. 5?

ε̄ 8. ii. sch. 4.
 εάν 95. ii. 20.
 εαρ 95. ii. 4.
 εαυτοῦ 97. 34; O.¹ 15, ² 22 (?),
 36,³¹ 2; 2.³ 61.
 ε̄βδομος (β) 4.⁴ 17.
 ἐγγύθεν 96. 15.
 ἐγγύς 96. 19; 7. 901 sch.
 ἐγκολάπτειν O.³ 35.
 ἐγλ[O.¹⁷ 4.
 Ἐγχειρίδιον 3. 8.
 ἔγχος 1. 47.
 ἐγχώριος 92.¹ 19.
 ἐγώ 90. 10; 93. ix. 4, 7;
 94. 8, 18-20. 95. i. 4 *et*
saep.; 1. 53; 2. 25, 26,
 58; 24. 1, 2; 25. recto
 4, 5, 7, verso 1. ἡμεῖς 78.
 11; 86. 3; 23. 18; 28.
 verso 4.
 ἔθειν 26. recto 7.
 ἐθέλειν 95. ii. 8, 11. Cf.
 θέλειν.
 ἔθνος 85. 2-4 verso 5; 92.⁴⁶ 4.
 εἰ 97. 49; 99. ii. 16, 18, 31;
 8. ii. sch. 9.
 εἰδέναί 93. x. 2; 1. 18; 2.³
 61; 24. 3.
]ειδεσθαι 22. i. 18.
 εἰδικῶς 4.⁴ 17?
 εἶδος 90. 5; 2.³ 49, 57;
 3. 56; 22. i. 18.
 εἰκάζειν 93. iv. 2?
 εἰκεῖν 94. 1; 2.⁷ 6. εἰκός [97.
 20].
 εἰκοσι (κ) 4.⁴ 7. κδ O.¹ 47.
 εἰκών O.³ 32.
 εἶναι 78. 9, 11, 37, [43];

85.¹ recto 5, 2-4 verso 8;
 90. 11 (?); 93. x. 4; 94.
 17 (ἦα), 18, 19 (ἔσκε);
 95. ii. 4, 19, 22, 24, 26;
 96. 4; 97. [6], 11; 97.
 15, 52, 57, 60, 62, 68;
 98.³ 2, ⁴⁴ i. 4, ii. 3, 8, iii.
 8, 14; 99. ii. 29; O.¹ 3,
 13, 17, [37], ² 11, 32, 66,
 68, ³ 12, 42, [⁴⁺⁵ 8], ⁸ [25],
 36, [37]; 1. 23, 51, 55;
 2.³ 32, 55; 3. 6; 4.⁴ 4,
 7, 8, [10]; 8. ii. sch. 11;
 9. sch. 5, 7, 9; 21. 8;
 24. 2; 27. 2.
 εἴπειν 85.¹ verso 3; 90. 26;
 93. vii. 6, x. 7; 98.⁷ 1 (?),
⁴⁴ iv. 8; 99. ii. 32; O.²
 32, [³ 70]; 4.³ 1 (?); 24.
 4; 26. recto 9.
 εἴπερ O.³ 36.
 εἰς 78. 26, 31; 90. 53 sch.;
 93. ix. 6 (?); 94. 12; 95.
 ii. 3; 97. 7; 98.¹⁰ 6
 (? corr. from εἰς), ⁴⁴ ii. 14,
 iii. 12; O.¹ 10, 12, ² 69,
³ 23; 1. 32, 54; 2.³
 31; 4.¹⁺² 3, ⁴ 19; 23. 6;
 24. 1. εἰς 90. 37; 92. 15;
 95. ii. 27.
 εἰς O.¹ 35; 4.⁴ 5 (ā); 8. i.
 sch. 4 (ā); 26. verso 8.
 [εἰσ]έρχεσθαι O.² 33.
 εἰσκειν 90. 45.
 εἶτα 98.⁴⁴ iii. 1.
 εἴτε 20. 142 sch.
 ἐκ, ἐξ 85.¹ verso 2, 2-4 verso
 2; 90. 22; 93. viii. 4, ix.
 4, 7; 94. 15; 2.³ 42; 4.
⁴ 8; 9. sch. 1, 4.
 ἐκα[98.¹³ ii. 3.
 ἕκαστος 90. 26; 99. ii. 9 (?),
 16; O.² 41; 2.³ 38; 4.⁴
 5, 19.
 ἐκείνος 97. 23; 99. ii. 24, 27;
 26. verso 6.
 ἐκλείειν 85. 2-4 verso 7.
 ἐκλείπειν 98.⁷ 2.
 ἐκλειψις [78. 39].
 ἐκπληξίς 98.⁵⁻⁶ ii. 11?

ἐκπνεύειν O.³ 26.
 ἔκτοτε 2.³ 34.
 ἐλαίη[93. viii. 7.
 ἐλάτης 2.³ 37.
 ἐλάτινος 98.¹⁷ 4.
 ἐλάττων 78. 36; 98.⁴⁴ iv. 14;
 O.¹ 26.
 ἐλεγείον O.¹ 34.
 ἐλεγχ[93. viii. 6.
 Ἐλείθια 92.¹ 17.
 Ἐλένη 90. 5.
 ἐλευθερία O.³ 27, 30, ⁸ 31, ⁹ 4.
 Ἐλικωνίδες 90. 24.
 ἔλκειν 96. 3.
 ἔλλας 98.⁵⁰ 2.
 Ἐλληγες O.³ 38.
 Ἐλληρισμός 1. int.?
 ἐλπ[92.³⁶ 2.
 ἐλπωρή 94. 7.
 ἐμβαίνειν 90. 24.
 ἐμβάλλειν 2.³ 41.
 ἐμός 90. 48; 93. vi. 2?
 ἐν 85. 2-4 recto 9; 90. 49
 sch.; 92.⁴⁷ 2; 93. v. 3,
 4 (εἰν), ix. 2; 95. ii. 17;
 97. [4], 23, 30, 70; 98.²
 7, 11, ⁴⁴ ii. 8, iii. 13, v. 18;
 O.² [59], 70, ³ 8, 33, [34],
 49, 71, [74, ⁸ 26], 29, ¹¹
 [3], 5; 1. 10 *et saep.*; 2.²
 4 *et saep.*; 3. 5 *et saep.*;
 4.¹⁺² 3 *et saep.*; 8. i. sch.
 5 (?), ii. sch. 4 (?); 9.
 sch. 6; 27. 2.
 ἐναίρειν 90. 2.
 ἐναντίος 85.¹ verso 2 (?); 9.
 sch. 1.
 ἐναυλος 93. vi. 1.
 ἐνδεια 98.⁴⁴ iv. 6.
 ἐνδύεσθαι 28. verso 5.
 ἐνείναι 97. 22; 4.⁴ 19.
 ἔνεκεν 85. 2-4 recto [1] *et saep.*
 ἐνεός 25. verso 1.
 ἔνθα 92.¹ 8; 4.⁴ 2; 21. 2.
 ἐνθάδε 93. ix. 7.
 ἐνθουσια[2.³ 3.
 ἐνιαύσιος 93. vii. 5.
 ἐνιαυτός 22. i. 28.
 ἐνοι O.¹ 17; 1. 41.

ἐνέα [0.13].
 ἔνομος 26. recto 8.
 ἔνοπλος 98. 5-6 ii. 8.
 ἐντολή 85.1 recto 4.
 Ἐνούλιος 92. 34 4.
 ἔξ 91. 8.
 ἔξειν[92. 36 3.
 ἔξελαύνειν 99. ii. 30.
 ἐξήγησις 2. 3 36.
 ἐξήκοντα 98. 44 ii. 2; 2. 3 32;
 4. 4 7 (ξ).
 ἐξῆς 98. 44 iv. 2.
 ἐξίεαι 0. 3 60.
 ἐξιλάσκεισθαι 0. 2 57.
 ἐξουσιάζειν 85. 2-4 recto II.
 ἐξυμνείν 0. 22 3.
 ἔξω [4. 4 2]; 25. verso 6;
 26. verso 13.
 ἐπάγειν 2. 3 29?
 ἐπακολουθεῖν 98. 44 iii. 7.
 ἐπάν 0. 2 33.
 ἐπ[ανέρχεται? 90. 15.
 ἐπανθεῖν 96. 14.
 ἐπεί 78. 33; 94. 17; 98. 18
 8; 99. i. II; [0. 8 21?].
 ἐπειδή 82. 28; 1. int.
 ἐπένθεσις 3. II.
 ἐπήβολος 93. ix. I.
 ἐπίηλυσις 96. I.
 ἐπί 93. vi. 3, vii. 2, viii. 3, x.
 I, 6; 94. 15; 96. 8, 21;
 98. 44 i. II, iii. 10, 45 4;
 0. 2 48, 3 6, 19, 62, 69;
 2. 3 37, 38; 4. 1+2 10; [5.
 372 sch. ?]; 24. 9; 26.
 recto 7.
 ἐπιγρα[2. 3 6.
 ἐπίγραμμα 0. 1 44, 3 34; 2. 3
 62.
 ἐπιγράφειν 2. 3 55.
 ἐπιδεικνύμι 0. 3 19.
 ἐπιδιδόμι 24. 5.
 ἐπιθυμείν 98. 44 iii. 16.
 ἐπιθύμιος 90. II.
 ἐπικαλεῖν 98. 44 ii. 9.
 ἐπικλώθειν 26. verso 4.
 ἐπικώμος 93. ix. 6.
 ἐπιλαμβάνειν 1. int.
 ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι 28. verso 2.
 ἐπιλήθεσθαι 93. x. 2.

ἐπισημαίνειν 4. 4 15.
 ἐπισκήπτειν 0. 2 53.
 ἐπισκώπτειν 0. 2 48.
 ἐπίστασθαι 21. 7.
 ἐπιστολή 98. 44 i. 13.
 ἐπιτανύειν 96. 6.
 ἐπιτήδευμα 97. 9.
 ἐπίτροπος 0. 3 17, 21.
 ἐπιφανε[26. verso 7.
 ἐπιφέρειν 8. i. sch. 16.
 ἐπιφωεῖν 86. 4.
 ἐπιχειρεῖν 98. 44 i. I?
 ἔπος 93. vi. 3; 98. 7 I.
 ἔρασθαι 95. ii. 14.
 ἔργον 2. 3 20.
 Ἐρεχθίδης [4. 1+2 18, 22].
 ἔρι[92. 35 1.
 Ἐρίγνιος 0. 1 8.
 ἔρκε[92. 1 20.
 Ἐρμ[είας 22. ii. 33.
 Ἐρμιππος 1. 57.
 ἔρασις 90. 44.
 ἔρπειν 94. 21.
 ἔρχεσθαι 90. 29; 92. 8 3;
 95. ii. 27; [2. 3 61]; 3.
 58; 22. i. 33.
 ἐρώτησις 0. 12 3.
 ἔσθλος 90. 19, 22; 93. x. 7.
 ἔσοπτρον 95. ii. 21.
 ἔτερος 78. 12; 97. 61; 2. 3 4.
 ἔτι 93. v. 3, vii. 6 (?); 95. ii.
 18; 96. 9; 2. 3 42.
 ἔτος 91. 10 (?); 8. i. sch. 4.
 εὔ 85. 2-4 verso 9, 11; 90. 24.
 εὐ[93. iv. 2.
 Εὐβοείς 2. 3 48.
 εὐγένεια 0. 8 21.
 εὐδαιμονία 26. verso 10.
 εὐειδής 96. 19.
 εὐηφενεῖν 94. 13.
 εὐε[92. 35 2.
 εὐθηνία 96. 8.
 εὐκαταφρόνητος 0. 1 20.
 εὐκτός 27. 2?
 εὐλάβεια 85. 2-4 verso 3.
 εὐλαβεῖσθαι 0. 3 64.
 εὐλαβής 85. 2-4 verso 4, 5.
 Εὐπολις 1. 15; 3. 57.
 εὐπρεπής 0. 8 37.
 εὐρεσις 0. 1 42.

εὐρίσκειν 95. ii. 17; 0. 3 73.
 Εὐρυνόμη 93. ix. 2.
 εὐρυχωρία 2. 3 23.
 εὔτε 96. 20.
 εὐτραφής 96. 5.
 εὐτυχία 93. x. 4.
 εὐνδρος 96. II.
 εὐφορεῖν 96. 13.
 Εὐφράτης 98. 45 5.
 εὐφρων 92. 41 2.
 εὐφύης 0. 3 48.
 εὐχθεσθαι 92. 39 2; 0. 12 12?
 εὐχή 98. 44 ii. 9.
 εὐώνυμος 0. 2 31.
 ἐφεδρεύειν 96. 4.
 ἐφώδιον 0. 3 64; [4. 1+2 16].
 ἐφύμιον 93. viii. 4.
 ἐχ[92. 34 5.
 ἔχων 78. 34, 40, 41; 90. 6,
 47; 93. vi. 1; 95. ii. 8,
 II, 18, 27; 98. 5-6 ii. II,
 44 ii. I, iv. 1; 0. 1 7, 14, 3
 37, 12 3; 1. 33; 3. 4, 24;
 8. i. sch. 14, ii. sch. 3; 23.
 II; 24. 7; 25. recto 3,
 verso 5; 26. verso 3; 28.
 verso 4.
 ἐχθρός 97. 47; 0. [3 72], 12
 12.
 ἔψιν 2. 3 40.
 ἔως 9. sch. 8.
 ζ 4. 4 17; 8. ii. sch. 12. ζ
 8. ii. sch. 13.
 ζαμενεῖν (ζαμενής?) 91. 2?
 Ζεὺς 90. 4; 91. 13; 92. 1 10;
 95. ii. 24; 22. ii. 33.
 ζῆν 95. ii. 14, 22; 98. 44 iv.
 9.
 Ζήνων 2. 3 45.
 ζητεῖν 95. ii. 6.
 ζῦτος 2. 3 42.
 ζῶον 2. 3 50, [57].
 η 8. ii. sch. 1, 9.
 η̄ 95. ii. 6, 17; 97. 27, 28,
 [61], 62; 4. 3 I, [2]; 23.
 12.
 ἠγεμών 4. 4 11.

Ἡγήσανδρος 2.³ 74.
 ἦδη 90. 43; [98.⁴⁴ iii. 19].
 ἦδύς 93. vi. 3, viii. 2. ἦδέως
 98.⁴⁴ iv. 9.
 ἡλικία 0.³ 19; 26. recto 8.
 ἡλιος 78. 43; 95. ii. 5, 6;
 2.³ 64; 22. i. 33.
 ἡμέρα 78. 27; 8. ii. sch. 12.
 ἡμερίη 96. 19.
 ἡμέτερος 94. 8; 99. ii. 25.
 ἡμιτελεστος 2.³ 51.
 ἦν 96. 1.
 ἦνία 4.³ 12.
 ἦνικα 92.¹ 12 (άν.); 93. viii.
 6.
 ἦρ 96. 22.
 Ἡραῖον 93. ix. 2.
 Ἡρακλείδης 2.³ 8 (?), 66.
 Ἡράκλειτος 8. i. sch. 4.
 ἦρως 90. 16, 19; 0.² 62.
 Ἡσιόνη 1. 50.
 ἦττον 97. 7.
 Ἡφαιστος (Αφ.) 91. 4.
 θάλαττα 99. ii. 31.
 θάνατος 85.¹ recto 2; 0.⁸ 13.
 θάπτειν 98.¹ 10?
 θάσθαι 93. vii. 4.
 θωμαστος 99. ii. 27.
 θεᾶσθαι 0.¹² 10.
 θέατρον 98.¹ 2.
 θέλειν 95. ii. 18, 23. Cf.
 ἐθέλειν.
 θεμι[23. 14.
 θεός 78. 9, [43]; 85.¹ recto
 4, 8, verso 3, 2-4 verso 7;
 86. 1; 93. ix. 7; 0.² 34,
 55; 1. 35; 3. 10; 8. i.
 sch. 6; 26. verso 11.
 θεράπων 98.¹ 9.
 θερμαίνειν 78. 30.
 θέρμειν 96. int.
 θέρος 95. ii. 4.
 θεσμοφοριάζειν 2.³ 35.
 Θεσσαλία [0.⁸ 23].
 Θέτις 98.⁴⁴ ii. 9.
 Θετταλοί 2.² 8.
 Θῆβαι 98.² 6, 7.
 Θηβαῖοι 98.³ 2?
 θηλύτατος 93. vii. 5.

θῆσκειν 94. 5; 95. i. 10, ii.
 21; 0.¹⁰ 4; 23. 9.
 θητός (θνατ.) 90. 25.
 Θεουκιδίδης 0.² 64, 65.
 Θράκη 0.¹¹ 3 (?); 1. 55.
 Θράξ 0.² 68.
 Θρασύβουλος 0.⁴⁺⁵ 7, 8, 6+7 6.
 Θράτται [1. 34].
 θρόνος 98.¹ 4.
 θυγάτηρ 92.¹ 13, 51 3; 0.¹
 14; 2.³ 32.
 θυροῦν 2.¹⁰ 3.
 θυσία 92.¹ 6; 0.² 62.
 θυσιάζειν 0.² 34, 45.
 ι 3. 35.
 ἰδέν. 93. ix. 5, x. 3; 95. ii. 4,
 20 (ἰδης); 96. 19.
 ἴδιος 85.²⁺⁴ recto 12; 2.³ 38.
 ἰδιώ[της 0.⁹ 3.
 ἰδρύειν 0.² 60.
 ἰέναι 92.¹ 15.
 ἰέναι 92.¹ 16; [94. 1].
 ἰέραξ 1. 7.
 [ἰερί]α 2.³ 29.
 ἰερεῖον 0.² 39.
 ἰερεύς 0.² 38 (ἰερεῖον Pap.).
 ἰερός 93. vi. 6. ἰρός 95. ix.
 4. ἰερόν 4.⁴ 2.
 ἰκανός 28. recto 2.
 ἴλιον 90. 37.
 ἰμάς [4.³ 12].
 ἴνα [2.³ 61].
 Ἰουλίς 0.¹ 38.
 ἰππέύς 98.⁴⁴ iii. 5, iv. 12, 16.
 Ἰππέις 3. 31.
 ἰππομάχος 26. recto 6.
 ἵππος 90. 50 sch.; 93. vi. 1;
 98.⁷ 3?
 ἰπποσῶα 92.⁵¹ 3.
 ἰπποτρόφος 90. 30.
 ἰσθμός 93. vi. 6.
 ἰσομήκης 8. ii. sch. 1.
 ἰσο⁸ 0.³ 36.
 ἰστ[93. vii. 7.
 ἰσάναι 91. 7; 93. ix. 2; [0.
 3 7]; 1. int.; [4. 1+2 12].
 ἰστός 2.³ 30, 33.
 ἰσχύειν 0.² 42.
 Ἰτυκαῖος 2.³ 13.

ἔχιμον 90.⁵ 3.
 Ἰωνία 0.¹¹ 5.
 Ἰωσήφ 85.²⁻⁴ recto 4.
 κ̄ 8. ii. sch. 12.
 Κ[1. int.
 Κα . . . 85.²⁻⁴ recto 8.
 Κάδμος 98.² 4.
 καθαρός 2.³ 61.
 καθέξεσθαι 92.¹ 10.
 καθῆσθαι 93. vi. 4.
 κανός 0.³ 56.
 καί, κᾶν 95. ii. 23; 97. 17.
 κᾶν εἰ 99. ii. 16. χ' υἰόν χ'
 ἄγιον 86. 4.
 καίτοι 97. 50.
 κακός 85.²⁻⁴ verso 8 (?), 11;
 90. 19; 97. 50; 98.² 5.
 κακῶς 20. 142 sch.
 κάλαθος 2.³ 30.
 κάλαμος 93. vii. 6; 95. ii. 13.
 καλεῖν 1. 27; 2.³ 4, 35; 3.
 51; 4. 1+2 7.
 Καλλιμάχος 90. 49 sch. (?);
 2.³ 43.
 κάλλος 90. 46.
 κάλπις 93. viii. 1.
 καλῶς 20. 142 sch.
 κάμνειν 21. 2.
 κάπηλος 2.³ 74.
 κᾶρα 3. 58?
 καρπός 96. 3 *et saep.*; 3. 45.
 κασίγητος 93. vii. 3.
 Κάσιος 93. ix. 6.
 Κάσσανδρα 90. 12.
 κατά 78. 27; 85.²⁻⁴ recto 2,
 1 verso 5; 90. 7, 48; 92.
 64 5 (?); 95. ii. 11; 98.
 5-6 1; 99. ii. 9 (?), 16;
 0.¹ 5, 2 50, 3 46; 2.³ 10,
 17, 64, 68, 73, 6 10; 3.
 11, 46; 4. [3 8], 4 5; 8. i.
 sch. 6?
 κατάγειν 93. ix. 7; 0.⁶⁺⁷ 3?
 καταδαπανᾶν 0.¹ 11.
 καταείρειν 20. 65 sch.
 καταλάλος 28. recto 3.
 καταλαμβάνειν 90. 50 sch. (?);
 92.¹ 18.
 καταλύειν 0.⁶⁺⁷ 4.

- καταμαρτυρεῖν 85. ²⁻⁴ recto 4;
 97. 25, 32, 36, 45.
 καταπίπτειν 0. ² 60.
 κατατιθέσθαι 93. ix. 5.
 καταφρονεῖν 85. ¹ recto 6;
 98. ⁴⁴ ii 5.
 καταψεύδεσθαι 85. ²⁻⁴ recto 2?
 κατηγορεῖν 0. ¹ 16.
 κε(ν) 90. 25; 93. v. 4, vii. 1,
 x. 3; 94. 4.
 κέγχρος 2. ³ 42.
 κείνος 93. ix. 5; 96. 10.
 Κείος 0. ¹ 38.
 κείσθαι 2. ³ 36.
 κελαινεφής 92. ¹ 9.
 κελεύειν 98. ⁴⁴ i. 6, ii. 13.
 κελουσι[92. ³⁴ 7.
 κενοτάφιμος 0. ³ 7.
 Κεραμεικός 0. ³ 34.
 κερανώς 91. 11.
 κεφαλή 95. i. 1; ii. 15.
 Κηληδόνες 91. 9.
 κήπος 96. 21.
 κηρύττειν 27. 5, 11.
 κινδυνεύειν 0. ⁶⁺⁷ 13. κινδυν[
 92. ⁶⁸ 1.
 Κινύρας 95. ii. 26.
 Κίνυψ 93. vii. 2.
 κίων 91. 7; 8. i. sch. 15.
 κλάδος 96. 14.
 κλαίειν 95. ii. 23.
 κλεί[93. iii. 2.
 Κλείς 0. ¹ 15.
 κλέος 90. 47, 48.
 κλύειν 93. ix. 4.
 κλωνίον 95. i. 3.
 Κνωσός 0. ⁸ 36.
 κοί[92. ⁷ 1.
 κοίλος 90. 17.
 κοινός 95. ii. 21.
 κοινωνός 4. ⁴ 9.
 Κοίτος 92. ¹ 13.
 κολωνός 96. 10.
 κομήτης 22. i. 29.
 κομῆδι 0. ³ 15.
 κομίζειν 0. ² 37; 4. ¹⁺² 6, ⁴ 13.
 κόμπασμα 1. 51.
 κονίη 93. viii. 7.
 κοπιᾶν 95. ii. 6.
 κορυφή 92. ¹ 11.
 κόσμος 93. viii. 1; 8. i. sch. 1.
 κουρά 3. 56.
 Κρατικός 1. 34.
 κράτος 86. 4.
 κρείσσων 93. x. 4.
 κρείων 90. 20.
 κρημνός 92. ¹ 8; 0. ² 51.
 κρήνη 95. ii. 8, 11.
 Κρής 0. ⁸ 36.
 κρίνειν 97. 65; 0. ³ 21.
 κρίσις 98. ⁴⁴ ii. 7.
 κριωπός 1. 26.
 Κρόνος 22. ii. 33.
 κρύπτειν 91. 12 (?); 23. 7.
 Κρωμνίτης 93. vi. 7.
 Κτησίφων 0. ³ 52.
]κτι[π . . 90. ⁷ 2?
 κυαν[98. ¹² 3.
 κυβερ]νητήρ 90. ⁷ 3?
 κυβευτής 4. ⁴ 3.
 κυβευτικός 4. ⁴ 1.
 κυκλάμιμος 96. int., 5.
 κυλίνδειν 98. ² 6.
 Κύνθιος 92. ¹ 8.
 Κυπρίς 90. 9.
 Κυπρόθε 93. ix. 7.
 κύριος 85. ²⁻⁴ verso 7, 9.
 κυρίως [4. ³ 12].
 κωλύειν 0. ⁶⁺⁷ 14.
 κώμη 1. 42.
 κώμος 93. viii. 3.
 κωφός 95. ii. 20.
 Λαγείδης 93. viii. 5.
 λάθυρος 1. 25.
 Λακεδαιμόνιοι 2. ³ 54?
 Λακωνική 1. 42.
 λαμβάνειν 96. 4; 98. ⁴⁴ i. 13,
 iii. 16, iv. 4; 0. ²¹ 4; 4.
¹⁺² 13. ⁴ 18; 24. 5 (?).
 6 (?), 11; 25. recto 2.
 Λαμία 0. ³ 23.
 λάμπειν 92. ¹ 14.
 λανθάνεσθαι 93. x. 5.
 Λαομέδων 90. 52 sch.
 Λαόφοβος 0. ³ 46 (Λαφόβητος
 Pap.).
 Λάριχος 0. ¹ 8, 13.
 Λάχσεις 92. ¹ 17.
 Λάχης 24. 1, 2, 5.
 Λάχος 94. 9.
 Λεάρχος 93. vii. 3.
 λέγειν 92. ¹ 9; 93. vi. 3, x. 7;
 95. ii. 24; 97. 48; 99.
 ii. 10, 13; 0. ¹ 31; 1. int.
 (δὲς), [22], 47; 2. ³ 43, 71;
 3. 11, 30.
 λειμών 5. 372-3 sch.
 λείπειν 86. 2; 8. ii. sch. 2, 8.
 Λεοντίς [4. ¹⁺² 19?].
 Λέσβως 0. ¹ 3.
 Λευκοκόμας 0. ⁸ 34, 35.
 λευκός 95. i. 9.
 λέχος 92. ¹ 4.
 Λεωπρέπης 0. ¹ 39.
 λήγειν 78. 14; 0. ² 56.
 λήκυθος 1. 58.
 Δήμιος 95. ii. 25.
 λίθος 0. ² 49.
 λιμήν 4. ¹⁺² 23.
 λιμός 96. 11.
 λιπαρότροφος 92. ¹ 6.
 λιπερνήτης 94. 17.
 λ]ογικός 2. ⁶ 2.
 λόγμος 86. 1.
 λογιμός 96. 2.
 λόγος 85. ¹ verso 5; 90.
 24 (?); 0. ² 20, 70, ³ 20,
 49, ⁹ 1; [1. 23]; 4. ⁴ 14.
 λοιμικός 0. ² 52.
 λοιπός 78. 35; 98. ⁴⁴ iii. 2;
 26. recto 5.
 λυ[90. ⁵ 5.
 Λύδιος 95. ii. 12.
 Λυδοί 2. ³ 46.
 λύειν 92. ¹ 13; 98. ⁴⁵ 3;
 2. ³ 38.
 Λύκος 0. ⁴⁺⁵ 8.
 λυμαίνειν 99. ii. 20.
 λυπ[23. 2.
 λύρα 95. ii. 12, 15.
 λυρικός 0. ¹ 34.
 λυσίμβροτος 91. 18.
 λυτήριος 0. ² 61.
 μ̄ 8. ii. sch. 1, 9.
 Μάγας 93. v. 2.
 Μάγνητες 2. ³ 69.
 μα[92. ³⁶ 1.
 Μακεδονία 0. ⁸ 29.

Μακεδών 98. 5-6 ii. 18, 44 ii. 1, 4, iii. 10, iv. 11; 99. ii. 22; 0. 3 39.
 μάλα 90. 45. μάλλον 0. 1 13; 2. 3 39; 25. verso 1. μάλιστα 3. 13.
 μαλακῶς 25. verso 5.
 Μαργανοί [2. 3 1].
 Μάρδοι 2. 3 4.
 μαρτυρεῖν 97. 3, 16, 18, 24, 39.
 μάχαιρα 0. 2 36.
 μάχη 95. ii. 2; 98. 13 i. 2, 45 6.
 μέγας 90. 1, 4, 34; 93. v. 4; 96. 2; 98. 12 2, 15 2; 22. i. 21.
 μέγεθος 0. 1 23; 1. 26; 9. sch. 3, 7.
 μεθύσκειν 28. 3 39.
 μέθυσος 28. recto 3.
 μείζων 9. sch. 5.
 μειοῦν 78. 39.
 μειρακίσκος 0. 8 37.
 μέλις 95. i. 2; 23. 15.
 μέλι 95. ii. 8; 2. 3 40, 41.
 μέλιτσα 2. 3 29, 34, 57.
 Μέλισσος 2. 3 32.
 μέλλειν 98. 44 i. 2; 2. 72; 23. 8.
 μελύγιον 2. 3 36, 39.
 μελωδία 2. 3 43.
 μέν [78. 13]; 90. 20, 23, 32, 46; 91. 1, 6, 16; 93. v. 1, vi. 7, ix. 4; 94. 3, 5, 11, 19; 97. 30, 71; 98. 44 iii. 5, iv. 10, 14; 99. ii. 13; 0. 1 [3], 22, [33?], 37, 2 65, 3 12, 41, [8 35]; 1. int.; 2. 3 31; 4. 3 5; 27. 2.
 Μένανδρος 3. 4, 65.
 μένειν 93. v. 4, 6.
 Μενέλαος 90. 27.
 μενεμανί 2. 3 45.
 Μένων 8. ii. sch. 4.
 μερίζω 95. ii. 24.
 μερισμός 78. 33.
 μερμνάδης 2. 3 46.
 μέρος 98. 44 iii. 9; 0. 3 58; 2. 3 37; 3. 66.

μέροψ 2. 3 48, 49.
 μέσος 9. sch. 5, 6.
 μεσοτέλεστος 2. 3 51.
 μετά 78. 34; 90. 50 sch.; 95. i. 2, 4; 98. 44 iii. 3, 17 (?); 0. 2 51, 8 12; 2. 3 40; 4. 1+2 12; 26. recto 5.
 μεταδιδόναι 0. 6+7 6.
 μεταλαμβάνειν 0. 3 57.
 μεταμέλεσθαι 95. ii. 3 (μετα-μελή?)
 μετοικίζω 0. 2 69.
 μέτρον 95. ii. 16, 17.
 μέχρι(ς) 92. 46 5 (?); 93. v. 4, 5; 96. 14; 0. 2 56 (?), 3 27, [4+5 8].
 μή 85. 2-4 verso 8; 92. 8 2; 93. x. 4, 7; 95. ii. 6; 97. 12, 13; 0. 3 54, 12 14; 1. int.; 2. 3 61; 24. 4; 26. verso 5.
 μηδέ 86. 2; 95. ii. 1; 96. 13, 15; 97. 58; 1. int.
 μηδεις 78. 40; 97. 13, 57; 20. 163 sch.
 μήλον 92. 1 7; 94. 19.
 μήν 93. ix. 5; 3. 3 (? μη Pap.).
 μήνης 21. 3.
 μήτηρ 0. 1 16, 3 43; 2. 4 8?
 Μητις 2. 3 54, 56.
 μήτρα 2. 3 57-9.
 μαίνειν 2. 3 62.
 μαίρος 78. 7.
 μιάστωρ 2. 3 61.
 μίγδαν 92. 1 7.
 μιγνύμαι 91. 2.
 Μίδας 95. ii. 26.
 μισόργη 2. 3 63.
 Μίσρας 2. 3 64.
 μικρός 93. x. 2; 98. 18 3; 0. 1 24; 2. 3 55; 9. sch. 6, 7, 9.
 μιλήχ 2. 3 65.
 μιν 94. 5.
 μινοδολέσσα 2. 3 67.
 Μινύαι 2. 3 69.
 μίωδες 2. 3 71.
 Μίξ() 24. 3.
 μισαί 2. 3 72.
 μίσγειν 22. i. 32 sch.

μισεῖν 97. 37.
 μίσος 97. 41.
 Μιτυληναῖοι 2. 3 74.
 Μιτυλήνη 0. 1 4.
 μνήμα 95. ii. 20.
 μνημονικός 0. 1 41.
 μνησικακεῖν 0. 3 61.
 μοῖρα 0. 2 43.
 Μοῖσα 90. 23; 91. 3.
 μοιχ[2. 6 8.
 μονάς 8. ii. sch. 2, 8.
 μόνος 86. 5; 91. 17 (?); 95. ii. 25; 96. 17 (μοῦν.); 99. ii. 17; 1. 19 (?). μόνον 83. int.; 97. 40; 99. ii. 33; 2. 3 69; 3. 27. μον[98. 5-6 ii. 10.
 μόριον 2. 3 50, [57].
 μορφή 90. 45; 0. 1 19.
 μοχθεῖν 21. 4.
 μύδρος 93. v. 4.
 μυθ . . 0. 2 18?
 μυριάς 98. 44 ii. 3, iv. 15; 8. i. sch. 4.
 Μυριναῖος 93. vii. 4.
 μύρον 95. ii. 7, 9.
 μυστήριον 2. 3 34.
 ὦ 8. ii. sch. 10.
 ναίειν 90. 5 8; 93. vii. 2.
 ναός 91. 1; 93. viii. 2 (νηός); 2. 3 54.
 Ναξόθεν 92. 16.
 ναῦς 90. 18, 27.
 νέεσθαι 93. ix. 6 (?); 94. 2.
 Νεῖλος 93. ix. 5; 96. 6, 20.
 Νειλώτης 93. vii. 5.
 νεῖος 94. 18.
 νεκρός 95. ii. 20; 98. 44 iii. 8.
 νέος 96. 20; (0. 1 13); 3. 7.
 νεφέλη 92. 68 2.
 νήπιος 0. 3 15.
 Νηρέυς 98. 44 ii. 10.
 Νηρηῖς 98. 44 ii. 10.
 νικαῖος 93. viii. 4.
 νίκη 93. x. 1.
 νιν 91. 10; 92. 41 1.
 νομίζω 78. 42; 97. 5.
 νόμος 96. 9; 97. 77.
 νόσος 0. 2 56, 62.

νόστος 21. 1.
 νοσφίξειν 0. 3 22.
 νοῦς 85. 1 verso 5; (93. x. 4);
 26. recto 3.
 Νύμφαι 2. 3 30.
 νῦν 90. 10; 95. ii. 18; 1.
 53.
 νύξ 95. ii. 5; 96. 15; 98.
 44 ii. 16; 22. i. 17.
 νύσσειν 90. 4 ii. 4.
 ξ 4. 4 7.
 ξανθός 90. 5.
 ξειπάτας 90. 10.
 ξενίζεν 2. 3 31.
 ξένος 91. 14 (?); 93. viii. 1
 (ξέν.); 98. 44 iii. 3, iv. 17;
 2. 3 66.
 Ξενόφων 2. 9 2 (?); 3. 39, 51.
 Ξέρξης 95. ii. 24.
 ξυρεῖν 3. 59.
 ὀ (dem.) 93. x. 1, 3, 5; 94. 11.
 ὀ μέν 90. 20, 23, 32, 46;
 93. x. 7. ὀ μέν . . . ὀ δέ
 91. 1-2; 93. vi. 7. ὀ μέν
 . . . δέ 94. 5. ὀ δέ 90. 41,
 4 ii. 6 (τοῖ δέ); 94. 5; 0. 2
 58, [3 67], 6+7 10.
 ὀ (rel.) 94. 3, 17, 19.
 ὄραρος 93. 2 10?
 ὀββός 95. ii. 27.
 ὄγδοος (ἦ) 2. 3 50, 57.
 ὄδε 85. 1 verso 5; 93. x. 7 (?);
 94. 20; 3. 25.
 ὀδέυεν 94. 6; 96. 8.
 ὀδός 85. 1 recto 7.
 ὄθεν 2. 3 34.
 οἴεσθαι 24. 4.
]οικεῖν 2. 3 8.
 οἴκημα [4. 4 1].
 οἰκία 2. 3 59.
 οἶκος 94. 8.
 οἴμοι 23. 10.
 Οἰνήσις [4. 1+2 24].
 οἶνος 95. ii. 9; 2. 3 40.
 οἶος 90. 5 4; 94. 10; 97. 48.
 οἴος τε 97. 56.
 οἴχεσθαι 25. verso 6.
 οἴχυνεν 92. 20 2.

ὀλ [92. 1 17.
 ὀλβιος 90. 2; 95. ii. 26.
 ὀλβος 94. 9, 10, 15.
 ὀλίγος 85. 2-4 recto 6; 95. ii.
 3.
 ὀλιγορία 99. ii. 25.
 ὀλλύναι 25. recto 5.
 ὀλοός 94. 20.
 Ὀλορος 0. 2 66.
 ὀλος 26. verso 13?
 ὀλυ[98. 24 3.
 Ὀλυ[μπ . . 92. 24 1.
 ὀμοιος 90. 45; 1. int., [26].
 ὀμοίως 1. int.; 3. 45.
 ὀμολογείν 24. 6.
 ὀμορέιν 2. 3 65.
 ὀμοῦ 86. 1.
 ὀμφάνος 93. ix. 3.
 ὀμόνυμος 0. 1 15.
 ὀμος 97. 18.
 ὀνειδίσειν 0. 2 47.
 Ὀνήτωρ 0. 3 17.
 ὄνομα [4. 1+2 1].
 ὀνομάζειν 4. 1+2 11.
 ὀνομασία 2. 3 19.
 ὀξύχολος 28. recto 1.
 ὀπλομάχος 26. recto 6.
 ὀπότε 92. 1 14.
 ὀπως 97. 66.
 ὀρ [92. 1 23.
 ὀρᾶν 94. 17; 95. ii. 21; 98.
 44 ii. 7.
 ὀρέγειν 94. 3 (?), 16.
 ὀρείχαλκος 90. 42.
 ὀρθός 8. i. sch. 12. ὀρ]θώς 1.
 int.
 ὀρίζεν 8. i. sch. 6.
 ὄριον 8. i. sch. 16.
 ὄρκιος 93. vi. 5?
 ὄρμᾶν 98. 44 iii. 1 (?), 12.
 ὄρνεον 2. 3 49.
 ὄρνωσθαι 90. 3; 96. 15.
 Ὀρσοτ]ρίανα 92. 47 1.
 Ὀρχομένοι 2. 3 69.
 ὄς 90. [1], 50 sch.; 92. 1 20,
 8, 4, 37 2; 93. vi. 4, ix. 5,
 x. 1; 94. 5; 95. ii. 25;
 97. 29, 45, 54, 55; 98. 6-6
 2 (?), 44 ii. 12, iii. 3; 0. 1 9,
 42, 48, [60], 3 22, 71; 2. 3

42, 58; 3. 1 (?); 4. 4 18;
 8. ii. sch. 4, 10; 28. verso
 5 (?). ἐν φ̄ 97. 23. ἐφ' φ̄
 93. 44 i. 11.
 ὄσγε 90. 14?
 ὄσος 3. 24.
 ὄσπερ 99. ii. 8; 2. 3 49; 26.
 verso 4.
 ὄστε 90. 17.
 ὄστις 93. x. 4.
 ὄταν 95. ii. 14; 1. 17; 26.
 verso 6; 28. verso 6.
 ὄτε 93. viii. 2; 96. 15. ἔσθ'
 ὄτε 96. 4.
 ὄτι 78. 11; 85. 1 recto 5;
 91. 14; 95. i. 10; 97. 33,
 37, 42; 98. 48 9; 0. 3 54,
 70; 1. int.; 4. 1+2 4; 8.
 i. sch. 5 (?), 7; 27. 13.
 οὐ(κ) 78. 42; 83. int.; 90.
 [15], 25; 93. vii. 7 (οὐ . . .
 πω), viii. 1, 2, x. 2; 94.
 1, 3; 95. ii. 3; 96. 4;
 97. 10, 33, 40, 52, 55,
 67, 72; 98. 44 iv. 14; 99.
 ii. 21; 0. 2 51, 55, 3 57,
 61, 67, 6+7 9; [1. int.];
 2. 3 69; 3. 27; 8. ii. sch.
 10 (?); 23. 7; 24. 2; 25.
 verso 3; 27. 8; 28. verso 4.
 οὐδ 96. 8.
 οὐ, οἶ 94. 1.
 οὐδέ 90. 15; 94. 3; 99. ii.
 22-4, 26.
 οὐδέεις [97. 7], 29; 98. 44 i.
 14; 0. 9 4.
 οὐδέποτε 93. x. 7.
 οὐκέτι 93. ix. 1.
 οὐκοῦν 78. 14.
 οὖν 97. 30; 0. 2 46; 25.
 verso 2.
 οὐποτε 0. 3 38.
 οὐρανός 78. 37; 85. 2-4 verso
 6.
 οὕτε 90. 10, 11; 93. x. 5;
 97. 53, 55.
 οὕτι 94. 17; 1. 16.
 οὕτως 85. 1 verso 4; 93. vi. 3,
 ix. 4; 95. ii. 4, 14; 96. 9;
 97. [10], 29, 31, 44, 51, 56,

71; 98.⁴⁴ i. 7; 99. ii. 29, 32; O.¹ 12, [43],² 46; 1. [int.], 23; 2.³ 32, 39; 4.⁴ 11; 5. 372 sch.; 23. 11; 24. 10; 25. recto 4, 5; 27. 17. οὔτωσι 99. ii. 21; 3. 37. οὔτω(ς) 91. 7; 95. ii. 21; [1. int.]; 2.³ 71; 23. 11.
 ὀφέλλειν 94. 15.
 ὀφθαλμός 85.¹ recto 10 (?); 96. ii. 21.
 ὄφρα 93. vii. 1.
 ὄψις O.¹ 22.
 πάθος O.² 52; 2.³ 34.
 Παιανεύς O.³ 13.
 παῖγμα 95. ii. 12.
 παῖδιον 25. verso 8.
 παίζειν 1. 54; [4.⁴ 3].
 Παῖονες 4.¹⁺² 20?
 Παιο[νίδης] 4.¹⁺² 19?
 παῖς 90. 13, 22; 92.¹ 16,³⁸ 6; 93. vii. 3, ix. 2; 94. 2; 95. ii. 11; O.² 66,³ 13, 42,⁴⁺⁵ 8; 24. 9; 26. recto 3.
 παλαιός 2.³ 43; 3. 13.
 παλάμη 91. 4.
 πάλη 93. viii. 1 (απατη Pap.).
 πάλι {95. ii. 16}. πάλιν 95. ii. 17; 98.⁵⁰ 3; 99. ii. 21; O.³ 29,⁸ 30; 3. 66; 9. sch. 7; 21. 9.
 Πάλλως 93. v. 5.
 Παλληνεύς 4.¹⁺² 21.
 Παμβωπάδης 4.¹⁺² 18.
 Παμφίλη 24. 8?
 πανάριστος 93. v. 6.
 παντελῶς O.¹ 24.
 πάντεχνος 91. 3.
 παντοδαπός [4.³ 9].
 παρὰ 92.¹ 8; 93. vii. 3, viii. 5, ix. 5 (παρ), x. 3; 94. 2; 95. ii. 15; 96. 10; 98.⁴⁴ iv. 4; 99. ii. 13; 1. 7, 24, [45]; 2.³ [4], 31, 45-6, 63, 67, 71-2,⁶ 13; 4.⁴ 1, 11 (l. ὑπέρ?), 13.
 παράγειν 95. ii. 20.

παραγίγεσθαι 2.³ 31.
 παραγραφή 4.³ 11.
 παραδιδόνα 98.¹ 6, 10.
 παρακολουθεῖν 25. recto 3.
 παραλύειν 23. 12.
 παράνομος O.³ 53.
 παραπλήσιος [28. recto 5?].
 παραπροσεβία 4.¹⁺² 10.
 παρασκευάζειν 2.³ 38.
 παρείναι 1. 47.
 παρελθεῖν [O.³ 24?]; 25. verso 6.
 παρθένος 95. ii. 11; 98.¹³ ii. 2 (?); 23. 13.
 Πά[ρ]ροι 2.³ 27.
 Πάρις 90. 10.
 Παρμενίων 98.⁴⁴ i. 3.
 Πάρος 2.³ 31.
 πάρος 94. 17.
 πᾶς 82. 12; 85.²⁻⁴ verso 2 (?); 86. 1, 3-5; 93. iv. 4; 94. 19; 95. ii. 24; 96. 8; 97. 43; 98.⁴⁴ iv. 7; 99. ii. 18, 32; O.⁶⁺⁷ 10 (?),⁸ 27 (?); 3. 24; 21. 7; 24. 7. πάντως 26. verso 3.
 πᾶ[σ]σαλος 92.⁵⁰ 3?
 Πατήρ 86. 4. πατήρ 90. 22; 92.³⁴ 5; 93. viii. 6 (?); O.¹ [5], 39,² 67,³ 16; 23. 16; 26. recto 9.
 πατῆρος 26. recto 10.
 παύριστος 93. x. 3.
 π[α]υσα[] 98.³⁶ 1.
 πέδα (= μέτεστι?) 90. 46.
 πέδη 96. 11.
 πεδίον 98.⁴⁴ iii. 8.
 πεζός 98.⁴⁴ iii. 6, iv. 11, 14.
 πείθειν 1. 39 (πειστέον).
 πείρα 25. recto 2.
 Πειρα[μ]εύς 4.¹⁺² 23.
 πέλαγος 98.⁴⁴ ii. 14.
 Πελοπίος 93. vi. 6.
 Πελοποννήσιοι O.² 73.
 πέμπειν 85. verso 8; 92.⁵⁷ 6.
 πέμπτος O.³ 58.
 πένης 95. ii. 19.
 πενία 95. ii. 16.
 πέντε 95. ii. 9; 98.¹⁴ iv. 15.
 πεπαίνειν 96. 13, 18.

περ 93. vi. 2.
 περαίνειν 97. 67.
 Πέργαμον 90. 8.
 Περγασή 4.¹⁺² 22.
 περί 90. 5, 49 sch.; 93. vi. 2; 95. i. 8; 96. 14; 98.¹⁴ 4, 11,⁴⁴ iii. 4, iv. 17; O.¹ 2, 25, 36,² 64,³ 10, 40, [4+5] 7,⁸ 22, 34,¹¹ 2]; 1. int., 22; 2.³ 17, 34, 50, 57, 69; 3. 62; 4.¹⁺² 9; 20. 67 sch.
 περίβλεπτος [4.¹⁺² 14].
 περιεξαιρείσθαι O.² 40.
 Περιβοϊδής 4.¹⁺² 24.
 περιστάνα O.² 35, 41.
 περικαλλής 96. 13.
 περικλής 90. 2.
 περικρατη[] 26. recto 2.
 περίτατος 4.¹⁺² 14.
 περιστρέφεσθαι 94. 14.
 περιστροφή 1. 40.
 περισχίζειν 83. int.
 περιτειχίζειν O.² 58.
 περσείη 96. 12, 16.
 Περσεφόνη 2.³ 30. Φερσ. 2.³ 33.
 Πέρσης 98.⁴⁴ ii. 4, iii. 1; 99. ii. 29; 2.³ 45, 64,⁶ 13.
 Περσικός 98.¹⁸ 2.
 περσίων 94. 10, 11.
 πέτηλον 96. 12.
 πηγαίος 95. ii. 10.
 πηθάλιον 95. ii. 25.
 πηδᾶν 3. 68.
 Πιερίδες 92.³⁹ 3.
 πικρός 95. ii. 22.
 πίνειν 96. 20; 98.⁴⁴ i. 16.
 πίπτειν 94. 12; 96. 15; 98.¹⁰ 3.
 πίσος 1. 25.
 πλανᾶσθαι 78. 10; O.¹ 30.
 πλανήτης 8. i. sch. 7.
 πλάσσειν 1. 45.
 πλείν O.¹ 9.
 Πλεισθείδας 90. 21.
 πλείων 95. ii. 18; 96. 3.
 πλέων 95. ii. 27. πλείστος O.¹ 12.
 πλεονέκτης 28. recto 4.

πλευρά 8. i. sch. 11, ii. sch. 6,
 9, 11.
 πλήθειν 94. 21.
 πλήθος 98. ⁵⁻⁶ ii. 12, ⁴⁴ iii. 3.
 πλημύρειν 96. 20.
 πλήρης 98. ⁴⁴ iii. 8, 14; 1. 48.
 πληροῦν 83. int.
 πλησίον 98. ⁴⁴ ii. 6.
 πλίνθος 4. ⁵ 2.
 πλόκαμος 95. i. 9.
 πλούσιος 95. ii. 19.
 πλοῦτος 95. ii. 16.
 πνεῦμα 82. 11. ἅγιον Πν. 86. 4.
 πνοή 78. 9.
 ποδήρης 1. 37.
 πόθεν 95. ii. 6, 7; 25. recto 1.
 ποθί 94. 21.
 ποιεῖν 82. 9; 96. 7 (?); 97.
 11; 2. ³ 3, 42; 4. ⁴ 12;
 28. recto 2, 6.
 ποικίλος 98. ⁴⁴ iii. 14.
 πολέμιος 4. ¹⁺² 12.
 πόλεμος 90. 7; [0. ² 74];
 2. ³ 46.
 πόλις 99. ii. 16, 28; 0. ¹ [4],
 38, ² 53, ³ 70, ⁸ 36; 4. ⁴
 2 (?); 27. 3, 7. πόλις 94.
 21.
 πολιτεία 0. ⁶⁺⁷ 7; 2. ³ 21, 60.
 πολιτεύεσθαι 0. ⁹ 2.
 πολλάκις 92. ⁴ 1; 98. ¹⁸ 4;
 0. ² 44; 3. 19.
 πολυγλαγής 96. int.
 πολύγομφος 90. 18.
 Πολύευκτος 4. ³ 8.
 Πολύιδος 1. 21.
 πολύπατος 93. iv. 1.
 πολυπληθής 96. 3.
 πολύς 78. 38; 92. ¹ 16; 94.
 16 (πολέεσσι), 19; 96. 6;
 98. ⁴⁴ iii. 9; 0. ² 49, 52;
 1. 16; 2. ³ 41; 3. 1; 25.
 verso 1; 28. verso 6.
 πολύνυμος 90. 6.
 πόμα 2. ³ 39.
 πομάτιον 2. ³ 36.
 πονεῖν 95. ii. 3, 13.
 πόνος 25. recto 1.
 πόντος 90. 28.
 Πόντος 2. ³ 37.

πορείον 4. ¹⁺² 15.
 πορεύεσθαι 3. 36.
 πορίζειν 25. verso 4, 8.
 Ποσειδῶν 98. ⁴⁴ ii. 11.
 ποταμός 86. 3; 96. 1; 2. ³ 70.
 ποτέ 78. 12. 15; 94. 11;
 95. ii. 20, 23 (τότε Pap.).
 πότερον 23. 12.
 ποτόν 94. 16.
 που 0. ¹ 43; 1. 16; 25. recto
 1 (ποῦ?).
 Πουλκράτης 90. 47.
 πούς 90. 33; 93. ix. 5; 95.
 ii. 15.
 πῶμα 82. 24.
 πῶξις 28. verso 3.
 πράσσειν [4. ³ 1].
 πρεσβύτης 4. ¹⁺² 15. πρεσ-
 βύτερος [85. ²⁻⁴ recto 2].
 πρεσβύτατος 0. ¹ 8, ³ 44.
 Πρίμος 90. 1, 13.
 πρίσθαι 3. 23.
 πρίν 93. ii. 1.
 προαπολλύναι 25. recto 5.
 πρόβατον 0. ¹² 11.
 πρόγνωσις 2. ³ 72.
 προειπεῖν 99. ii. 11.
 προκείσθαι 20. 163 sch.
 Προμηθεύς 2. ³ 64.
 πρὸς 98. ⁴⁴ i. 5, ii. 8; 2. ³ 47;
 [4. ³ 10]; 23. 10.
 προσαγορεύειν 2. ³ 59.
 προσδοκᾶν 95. ii. 21.
 προσερίζειν 95. ii. 1.
 προσευρίσκειν 0. ¹ 45.
 προσέχειν 99. ii. 17.
 πρόσθεν 94. 13.
 πρόσσδος 92. ³⁷ 3.
 προσομιλητής 0. ¹ 11 ?
 προσπέμπειν 0. ³ 66.
 προσποιεῖσθαι 98. ⁴⁴ i. 15.
 προστάσιμον 1. 11.
 προστιθέναι 0. ¹ 42 ?
 προστρόπαιος 4. ¹⁺² 9, [13].
 προσφέρειν 98. ⁴⁴ iv. 2; 0. ²
 63.
 πρότερος 96. 14. πρότερον 0.
² 55.
 προφερέστατος 90. 32.
 πρωταεῖον 86. 2 ?

πρωϊζόν 94. 6.
 πρώτος 2. ³ 33. \bar{a} 2. ³ 29, 36,
 66, ⁹ 2. πρώτον 82. 11;
 93. viii. 5; 1. int. \bar{a} 2. ³
 31. πρωτο[98. ⁷ 4.
 πτέρυξ 94. 14.
 Πτολεμαῖος 93. viii. 6.
 Πτῶον 92. ⁴⁷ 2.
 πυ]γή 1. 49 ?
 Πυθαεὺς 4. ¹⁺² 4, 6.
 Πυθαῖος [4. ¹⁺² 1].
 πυλ[0. ¹⁷ 2.
 πυθάνεσθαι 93. vii. 1; 98. ⁴⁴
 iii. 18, ⁴⁸ 7; 0. ³ 68.
 πω 93. vii. 7. πω[92. ⁵ 2.
 πως 97. 19.
 ῥήτος 8. ii. sch. 6; 23. 17.
 ῥήτωρ 0. ³ 11, 41, ⁸ 27; [4. ³
 1, 3].
 ῥίζα 96. 2.
 ῥίπτειν 98. ⁴⁴ ii. 15.
 ῥόδιος 0. ³ 76; 2. ³ 71.
 ῥόδος 0. ³ 74.
 ῥόθως 86. 3.
 ῥόθος 92. ¹ 16.
 ῥυθμός 91. 5.
 ῥυτήρ [4. ³ 12].
 ῥώμη 0. ³ 37.
 ῥώπος 4. ³ 9.
 σάβντος 3. 56, 59.
 Σαλμωνεύς 1. 10.
 Σαπφώ 0. ¹ 2, 3.
 Σάραπις 3. 8, 9.
 Σάτυροι 1. 17.
 σάφα 1. 18.
 σείειν 95. i. 6.
 σελήμη 22. i. 32.
 σεμνός 3. 9.
 Σεσογῶσις 26. recto 4, verso
 1, 12.
 σῆμα 96. 19.
 σημαίνειν 3. 17; 4. ³ [5], 6
⁴⁴ 14.
 σημείον 78. 26; 3. 16.
 σημερινός 93. vi. 2.
 σιγᾶν 86. 2.
 Σιδόνιος 93. ix. 7.
 Σιμωνίδης 0. ¹ 36-7.

Σισυφίδης 93. vi. 5.
 σίτος 94. [3], 16; 96. 6; 3.
 3, 50.
 σιωπᾶν 3. 60-2, 66.
 Σκάμανδρος 0. 1 5.
 Σκαμανδρώνυμος 0. 1 6.
 σκειράφιον 4. 4 I.
 σκευάζειν 98. 17 2.
 Σκηνή 98. 44 iii. 11; 0. 3 50.
 σκοπέειν 1. 53.
 Σκυθικός 2. 3 I, 36.
 σκυθρωπ[85. 2-4 recto 13.
 σμικρός 97. 52.
 Σοδομείτης 85. 2-4 recto 7.
 Σολεύς 2. 3 60.
 Σόλοι 2. 3 58.
 σός 23. 9.
 Σουσάννα 85. 2-4 recto 2.
 σοφ[92. 47 4.
 σοφι[0. 2 24.
 σοφίζειν 90. 23.
 Σοφοκλῆς 1. 10; 5. 24 I.
 σοφός 1. 18.
 σπέρμα 23. 9.
 Σπιθραδάτης 98. 5-6 ii. 6.
 σπλάγχχνα 0. 2 40.
 [σπουδ]αίος 97. 2.
 στέινος 93. vi. 5.
 Στειριεύς 0. 4+5 9.
 στέφανος 95. i. 1, ii. 7; 0. 3
 56; 3. 63; 27. 8.
 στεφανούν 0. 3 54.
 στήλη 0. 3 35.
 στιφρός 3. 1, 6.
 στοιχεῖν 22. ii. 30?
 στόμα 92. 1 16.
 στρατεία [0. 8 22?].
 στρατεύειν 90. 52 sch.
 στρατηγός 99. ii. 24; 4. 4 4.
 Στρατιῶται 1. 57.
 στρατός 1. 9.
 στριφνός 3. 1.
 σύ 82. 9, 11; 90. 47; 93.
 iv. 3, viii. 5; 94. 1; 95.
 ii. 23; 3. 3; 21. 9; 24. 1,
 6, 10; 25. verso 7.
 συγγίγνεσθαι 3. 11.
 συγκατατίθεσθαι 2. 3 37.
 συλλέγειν 3. 21, 26.
 σύλλογος 2. 3 38.

συμβαίνειν 0. 1 25.
 συμβόλιον 4. 4 16, 17.
 σύμβολον 93. viii. 1; 4. 4 14.
 συμμορία 4. 4 7, 9.
 συμμορίτης 4. 4 9.
 συμπαθέστερος 0. 3 72.
 σύμπας 8. i. sch. 7?
 συμφέρειν 96. 17; 99. ii. 14.
 συμφορά 0. 20 3; 3. 27, 30.
 σύν 0. 6+7 2 (?); 2. 3 30.
 συναγειν 3. 20, 23.
 συναθροίζειν 3. 20.
 συνανιέσθαι 96. 21.
 συν[άπτειν 98. 45 6.
 Συναριστώσαι 3. 5.
 συναυχεῖν 0. 8 24.
 συνθέξεσθαι 3. 35.
 συνεργός 0. 8 24?
 συνουσιασμός 85. 2-4 recto I *el*
saep.
 σύνταξις 2. 3 67.
 συντόμως 0. 3 26.
 συντυχία 3. 29.
 σφαγιάζεσθαι 98. 44 ii. 15; 0.
 2 37.
 σφραγίζειν 3. 17.
 σφραγίς 3. 16.
 σχῆμα 8. ii. sch. 4. σχημ[
 1. 41.
 σχηματίζειν 1. int.
 σχίζειν 95. ii. 25.
 σχολή 0. 3 74. σχολῆ 3. 25,
 38.
 σώζειν 82. 10; 85. 2-4 recto
 6; 92. 64 I (?); 99. ii. 18.
 σῶμα 98. 1 8, 5-6 ii. 9, 48 3.
 Σωσίβιος 93. vii. 1.
 τ 3. 12.
 τάλαντον 98. 44 i. 8; 0. 3 66.
 ταλαπείριος 90. 8.
 τάλαις 95. ii. 19. τάλαντατος
 3. 7.
 τανίσφυρος 90. 11.
 Ταρσός 2. 3 58.
 τάσσειν 95. ii. 5.
 ταύρεος 95. ii. 13.
 τε 78. 28; 86. 1; 90. 13,
 14, 44; 92. 1 17; 93. vii.
 1, 3; 95. ii. 14; 96. 11;

97. 56; 98. 2 9, 10; 0.
 [2 60], 3 34; 2. 3 34.
 τόκος 94. 1.
 Τελμώνιος 90. 34.
 τέλειος 92. 1 17; 8. i. sch. 5.
 τελειότατος 93. iv. 4.
 τελειοῖν 26. recto 14.
 τέλος 99. ii. 15; 0. 3 27.
 τέμενος 92. 38 3;
 τέως 93. viii. 6.
 τερπνός 92. 1 13.
 τέταρτος (δ) 1. 44.
 τετράγωνος 8. ii. sch. 3.
 τέτρωρος 98. 44 ii. 12.
 τέτρωτος 1. 4; 8. i. sch. 13,
 15 (δ).
 Τεύκρος 90. 49, 51 sch.
 τῆ 93. vi. 7.
 τηρικαῦτα 20. 190 sch.
 τιθέναι 93. iii. 4 (?); 94. 12;
 95. ii. 15; 96. 10.
 τίκτειν 93. v. 5.
 τιμᾶν 0. 3 31, [3 33].
 τιμή 0. 6+7 10.
 τιμ[ωρία 28. verso 5?
 τίς 82. 9; 91. 5; 95. ii.
 16, 17, 27; 99. ii. 9; 0.
 3 69; 25. recto 6, verso 2.
 τις 78. 15; 90. 52 sch.; 93.
 vii. 1, 6 (?), viii. 7, ix. 3, x.
 3; 94. 4; 97. 49; 98.
 44 iv. 3, 48 I (?); 99. ii.
 27; 0. 1 [6], 10, 40 (?),
 46, 2 34, 69; 2. 3 26, 41,
 63, 71; 3. 56; 4. 1+2 10,
 [3 1, 2], 4 [1]; 18; 9. sch.
 5; 25. recto 6.
 τίτθη 25. verso 8.
 τλήμων 23. 14.
 τόθι 92. 34 3.
 τοι 92. 37 2; 94. 10.
 τοῖνον 97. 10.
 τοῖος 94. 14.
 τοῖοσδε 94. 10; 0. 3 35.
 τοιούτος 92. 1 4; 97. 47; 0. 2
 32, 3 70; 28. recto 5.
 τοῖχος 91. 6; 2. 10 3?
 τολμᾶν 99. ii. 12.
 τόλμη 99. ii. 22.
 τόξον 21. 6.

τόπος 0. 2 59; 2. 3 36.
 τόσος 93. v. 2, 3 (τόσσ.), x.
 5; 94. 2.
 τοσοῦτος 98. 2 5.
 τότε 96. 3; 0. 9 5; 23. 16 (?);
 26. verso 7.
 τραγῳδία 2. 3 43.
 τραγῳδός 0. 3 47, 57.
 Τραχινίαι [5. 24 2].
 τρεῖς 95. ii. 8, 10; 0. 1 7;
 8. i. sch. 13 (γ̄).
 τρέπειν 98. 44 ii. 9.
 τρέφειν 0. 11 8.
 τριάκοντα 0. 6+7 4.
 τριήραρχος 4. 4 8.
 τρίορχος 2. 3 46.
 τρίς 90. 43; 95. ii. 26.
 τρισχίλιοι 98. 44 iv. 16.
 τριταγωνιστήν 0. 3 47.
 τρίτος 2. 3 I (γ̄).
 Τροία 90. 14, 19.
 τρόπαιον 4. 1+2 12.
 τροπή 8. i. sch. 6 ?
 τρόπος 92. 64 6 (?); 0. 1 18.
 τροφή 3. 38.
 τρυφή 28. recto 2, verso 3.
 τρύφος 98. 44 iv. 5.
 Τρωικός 2. 6 3.
 Τρωίλος 90. 41.
 Τρώες 90. 44.
 τυγχάνειν 0. 6+7 10 (?); 26.
 verso 2.
 τύμβος 23. 24.
 τύμπανον 95. ii. 13.
 τύπτειν 90. 4 ii. 7.
 τύχη 0. 3 64; 25. recto 1.
 ὕδωρ 93. vii. 3; 95. ii. 6, 10, 25;
 96. 3, 15, 20; 2. 3 40, 45.
 ὕθλος 1. 52.
 ὕϊος 86. 4. υῖες 90. 31.
 ὕλλις 90. 41.
 ὑμνείν 86. 3; 90. 12.
 ὑπάρχειν 97. 46; 0. 1 23.
 ὑπασπιστής 98. 44 iv. 3.
 ὑπέρ 91. 8; 93. iv. 1; 95. ii.
 15; 4. 4 11 (? οι παρ Pap.).
 Ὑπερβόρειοι 91. 1.
 Ὑπερείδης 4. 4 5.
 ὑπερήφανος 90. 17.

ὑπερθε 92. 1 11.
 ὑπέρτατος 92. 44 2.
 ὑπό 78. 15; 85. 2-4 recto
 12 (?), verso 6; 97. 18,
 [23], 36, 38; 98. 44 iv. 1;
 0. 1 17, 2 36, 3 15, 16, 8 26;
 2. 3 48, 65; 23. 17; 25.
 recto 4; 26. recto 10.
 ὑποκρ[92. 46 2.
 ὑποκρίνειν 0. 3 48.
 ὑπόμνημα 2. 3 12, 43, [74 ?].
 ὑπόστιψρος 3. 3.
 ὑποτεινέιν 8. i. sch. 9.
 ὕστερον [97. 21 ?]; 4. 4 12.
 ὑψίπολος 90. 14.
 φ̄ 8. ii. sch. 13.
 φαγεῖν 98. 44 iv. 7.
 φασεφόρος 86. 2.
 φαίνειν 0. 1 44. φαίνεσθαι 91.
 5; 97. 51, 63; 99. ii. 15;
 7. 901 sch.
 φαιώδης 0. 1 22.
 φάναϊ 90. 49 sch.; 93. ix. 3;
 94. 1; 0. 1 45; 2. 3 55;
 25. verso 3.
 φανερός 78. 10; 95. i. 5.
 Φάνιον 3. 65.
 φάος 92. 1 15.
 φάρμακον 98. 44 i. 1; 0. 3 25.
 φάτης 7. 895 sch. ?
 φαῦλος [4. 3 2].
 φείδεσθαι 95. ii. 2.
 φέρειν 78. 27; 92. 1 5 (?);
 2. 3 41.
 Φερσεφόνη 2. 3 33. Π. 2. 3 30.
 φεύγειν 95. ii. 2.
 φήμη 4. 4 15.
 φημιζέσθαι 22. i. 19.
 φθέγγεσθαι 92. 1 19.
 φθό]γγος 92. 50 4.
 φιλ[2. 7 7.
 Φιλάδελφοι 3. 22.
 φιλάργυρος 0. 1 40.
 Φιλιππικά 4. 4 17.
 Φίλιππος 98. 1 9, 44 i. 5; 99.
 ii. 21.
 φιλοπονία 2. 2 2.
 φίλος 85. 2-4 recto 6; [0. 3
 73]; 27. 14 ?

φιλοσο[φ. . 0. 2 25.
 Φιλοχάρης 0. 3 45.
 φοβε[85. 2-4 verso 13.
 φοβεῖσθαι 85. 2-4 verso 4, 6.
 φόβος 85. 2-4 verso 7, 9; 23. 6.
 φοινεύειν 23. 16.
 φόνος 95. ii. 2.
 Φορμίον 4. 3 10; 27. 12.
 φόρτος 4. 3 9.
 φραδ[90. 5 7.
 φρασ[92. 11 3.
 φρήν 23. 8 ?
 φροεῖν 96. 2.
 φρόνημα 85. 2-4 verso 8.
 Φρύγιος 95. ii. 13.
 φυνγὰς 0. 3 59.
 φύειν 94. 5.
 Φύλαρχος 1. 44.
 φυλάσσειν 92. 1 11; 97. 43;
 98. 44 i. 7.
 φυλέτης 4. 4 10.
 Φυλή 0. 6+7 2.
 φυλή 4. 4 4.
 φύραμα 1. 60.
 φυτόν 78. 31.
 Φωκαῖς 93. v. 4.
 φωνή 2. 3 66; 3. 4.
 φῶς 90. 30.
 χα[90. 4 ii. 6.
 Χαλδαῖοι 2. 3 63, 67, 72, 6 6.
 χάλκασπις 90. 31.
 χάλκεος 91. 6; 0. 3 32.
 Χαλκίαικος 2. 3 54.
 χαλκός 90. 43.
 Χαμιλιέων 0. 1 29.
 Χάραξος 0. 1 9.
 χαρίζεσθαι 2. 3 32; 26. recto
 II.
 χάρις 92. 37 5.
 Χάρτες 92. 1 7.
 χατεῖν 96. 5 ?
 χείλος 93. vi. 2.
 χέμα 22. i. 21.
 χεμών 95. ii. 4.
 χεῖρ 94. 3.
 χθών 91. 11; 96. 8.
 χιλιοι 98. 44 i. 8, iv. 12.
 χιώνος 95. ii. 10.
 χλοερός 96. 12.

χορός 92.³⁷ 4; 93. viii. 3.
 χρήμα 95. ii. 18; 97. 28;
 O.³ 22.
 χρήσθαι O.¹ 32, 12 8.
 χρήσιμος 97. 6.
 χρήσις 78. 32.
 χρηστηριάζεσθαι O.² 53.
 χρόνος 92.¹ 11; 95. ii. 22.
 χρυσ[92.⁴⁰ 2.
 χρύσεος 91. 8; O.³ 55. Χρυ-
 σούν Γένος 3. 57.
 χρυσεόστραφος 90. 40.
 χρυσο[92.²⁶ 2.
 χρυσοέθειρα 90. 9.
 χρυσός 90. 42; 95. ii. 17.
 χύσις 96. 6.
 χυτᾶ[92.¹² 1.

χώεσθαι 21. 3.
 χώμα 96. 11.
 χώρα 2.³ 41.
 χωρίδιον 3. 23.
 χωρίς 3. 14.
 ψ̄ 98.⁵⁻⁶ ii. 17.
]ψευδής 93. x. 8.
 ψεύστης 28. recto 4.
 ψηφ[O.⁶⁺⁷ 15.
 ψήφωμα O.⁶⁺⁷ 5, 8.
 ψήφος O.³ 59.
 ψυχή 85.¹ recto 9.

ω̄ 8. i. sch. 4.
 ω̄ 91. 3; 1. 39; 23. 14.

ω̄γύγιος 96. 9.
 ὠδε 93. vii. 6, x. 7; 94. 21.
 ὠδῖς 92.¹ 14.
 ὠθεῖν O.² 51.
 ὠκός 90. 33.
 ὦς 90. 27, [30], 48, 51 sch.;
 93. ix. 3; 97. 46; 99. ii.
 26; O.¹ 17, ² 44 (= ὥστε),
 62, ⁶⁺⁷ 3, 14, [⁸ 24], ⁹ 5;
 1. 54; 2.³ 43, 66, 74; 3.
 2 et saep.; 21. 9; 23. 8,
 11. (Prep.) 3. 58.
 ὦσει 90. 42; 93. vi. 2; 3. 5.
 ὥσπερ 95. ii. 19; O.¹ 28(?);
 1. 25; [4. ¹⁺² 16].
 ὥστε 3. 29.
 ὠφελεῖν 97. 69, 71.

III. PASSAGES DISCUSSED.

(a) AUTHORS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Alcaeus Fr. 19	71	Hesych. s. v. <i>σάβυτρος</i>	165
46	60	Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> xii. 2. 2	99
Anonymus ed. Bellermann 3, 85	23	Philostratus, <i>Im.</i> ii. 1	43
Aristides ii. 5c8	43	Photius s. v. <i>προστρόπιος</i>	169
Aristophanes, <i>Eg.</i> 655	165	<i>σαβύττης</i>	165
<i>Thesm.</i> 760	43	Pindar Fr. 53	84-5
Fr. 755	154	Proclus, <i>In Rempub.</i> ii, p. 25 (Kroll)	190
Athenaeus xv. 687 a	42	Sappho Fr. 39	43
Babrius 115. 4	42	76	45
Bacchylides xvi (xvii). 66	96	77	45
Bekker, <i>Anecd.</i> i, p. 299	170	78. 1-2	45
Callimachus Fr. 35 d	99, 100, 106-7	79	42
122	109	106	59
193	99	129	43
209	108	169	42
217	110	Sophocles, <i>Ant.</i> 287	112
Catullus lxvi. 79-83	100, 106-7	Suidas s. v. <i>Ἰβυκος</i>	74
Curtius iii. 8. 20	133	<i>Σαπφώ</i>	146
12. 1	123, 134	Thucyd. vii. 60	165
Diodorus xvii. 33. 1	133	Tzetzes, <i>In Il.</i> p. 68	82
Etym. Magn. s. v. <i>μελύγειον</i>	161	Xenophon, <i>Anab.</i> ii. 1. 6	165

(b) PAPYRI.

	PAGE		PAGE
P. Berl. 6870 <i>Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad.</i>		P. Oxy. II. 208	9
1918. 763	22-3	VII. 1011	7
P. Halle 2	41, 45-6	XI. 1360. I. 9	59
P. Oxy. I. 7 6	42	1364	119
15	113		

Fragment of papyrus with several columns of Greek text. The text is written in a cursive hand and is significantly damaged and fragmented.

Fragment of papyrus with several lines of Greek text. The text is written in a cursive hand and is significantly damaged and fragmented.

No. 1813, recto

Fragment of papyrus with several columns of Greek text. The text is written in a cursive hand and is significantly damaged and fragmented.

No. 1778, Fols. 1, 2, recto

No. 1786

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with vertical columns of Coptic text. The script is a mix of uncial and minuscule characters. Some legible words include "ZETA", "XETA", "YETA", "THETA", "IOTA", "KAPPA", "LAMBDA", "MUTTA", "NUN", "SIGMA", "TETA", "ZETA", "THETA", "IOTA", "KAPPA", "LAMBDA", "MUTTA", "NUN", "SIGMA", "TETA".

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with vertical columns of Coptic text. The script is a mix of uncial and minuscule characters. Some legible words include "TAN", "XETA", "YETA", "THETA", "IOTA", "KAPPA", "LAMBDA", "MUTTA", "NUN", "SIGMA", "TETA".

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with several lines of Coptic text. The script is a mix of uncial and minuscule characters. Some legible words include "USQUIN", "IOTAP", "IOMURIO", "AEDRQUA", "XETA", "YETA", "THETA", "IOTA", "KAPPA", "LAMBDA", "MUTTA", "NUN", "SIGMA", "TETA".

No 1813, recto

Fragment of a papyrus scroll with several lines of Coptic text. The script is a mix of uncial and minuscule characters. Some legible words include "MINIST", "IOTAP", "IOMURIO", "AEDRQUA", "XETA", "YETA", "THETA", "IOTA", "KAPPA", "LAMBDA", "MUTTA", "NUN", "SIGMA", "TETA".

No. 1778, Fols. 1, 2, recto



τὸν ἄνθρωπον
 ἔκτισεν ἀπὸ
 τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος
 καὶ ἐκ τῆς παρθένου
 μαριάνης καὶ ἐγένετο
 ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἐγενήθη
 σὰρξ καὶ ἐσῆν ἡμεῖς
 ἰσχυρὸς καὶ ἠγάπησεν
 τὸν κόσμον ἑαυτὸν
 ἑαρίσας ἑαυτὸν ἰσοπέ-
 ρητον ἡμῶν ὡς ἄνθρωπος
 ἠγάπησεν ἑαυτὸν ἑαρίσας
 ἑαυτὸν ἰσοπέρητον ἡμῶν
 ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἠγάπησεν
 τὸν κόσμον ἑαυτὸν
 ἑαρίσας ἑαυτὸν ἰσοπέ-
 ρητον ἡμῶν ὡς ἄνθρωπος

No. 1791

ΖΑΙΟΕΧΗ
 ΝΟΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΖΑΙΟΥΚΙ
 ΕΝΟΤ ΜΗ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΗΜΕ
 ΙΑΣΙΚ ΖΑΥΡΥΟΝΤΟΝ
 ΠΙ ΧΕ ΗΟ ΙΟΟΤΑΜΕ
 ΑΝΚΥΤΑΝΙ ΕΟΟ
 ΠΛΟΤΟΟΧΗΝ
 ΚΑΤΟΜΑΟ ΤΗ Μ
 ΙΜΩΝΗΝ ΤΕ ΤΟΝΟΤΑ
 ΝΟΤΟΤΑ Α ΜΟ
 ΟΚΥΜΑΤΩΙ
 ΣΑΡΟΟΟΙΑ
 ΡΚΕΝ
 ΣΑΟΟΟ

Fr. 2

ΖΑΥΝ ΣΑΥΙΤΙΣ ΝΑΥΙΤΑΙ
 ΩΟΕΤΥ ΟΥΟΝΟΡΕΗ
 ΧΑΥΙΟΥΗ ΟΑΤΙΟΟΕΙ
 ΠΟΥΕΛΑ ΜΑΟΙΟΕΟ
 Α ΟΡΦΑΝ ΑΝΕΤΕΚΟΙ ΟΥΟΙΟΙΑ
 ΤΟΚΕΛΕ ΤΕΣΑΚΑΥΑΟΟΟ ΝΕΤΗ
 ΡΑΥΟΥ ΠΥΡΑΥΟΟΚΑΡΟΟΑ ΟΤΤΟΝΕΣΕ
 ΟΥΟΧΑ ΟΔΑΝΚΕΛΕΟΟΥΗΡΕ ΟΟ

No. 1790, Frs. 2+3, Col. ii

Fr. 1, Col. i

No. 1789

Fr. 3

Η ΚΑ... ΙΩΝΕΤΣ
 ... ΝΕΙΩΚΥ
 ΟΡΝΙΘΩΝΦΟΙΝΙ...
 ΕΠΟΥΝΟΙΝΕΙΘ...
 ΓΙΝΟΥΕΘΥΚΑΜ...
 ΗΡΑΛΥΚΟΚΑΙΡΟΧΑ...
 ΟΥ... ΟΥΝΑΙΕΡΟ...
 ΚΕΙ ΧΟΥΦΥΧΕΕ...
 ΩΣΑΥΤΩΧΗΡΩΑΙΟΙ...
 ΜΑΝΗΕΧΗΛΙΟΝΗΣ...
 ΟΙΛΑΠΙ... ΕΙΡΑ...
 ΕΙΡΑΚ... ΠΕΡΙ...
 ΕΥΝΑ...
 ΦΙΩ...

No. 1806, Col. iv

Π...
 ΑΜΩΝ
 ΜΕΤΡΩΝ
 ΜΕΜΠΙΑ
 ΜΕΝΩ...
 ΕΝ... ΑΡΡ...
 ... ΕΙΝ...
 ΔΕΚΥΒ...
 ... ΕΟΥ...
 ... ΜΟ... ΠΡ...
 ... ΚΟ... ΚΥ... ΚΥ...
 ... Τ...

No. 1808, Cols. i-iii

ΡΕΩΣΕΝΑΥ ΕΝΩ...
 ΜΕΙΝΕΒΟΕΥ...
 ΑΠΑΣΕΤΙ...
 ... ΝΑΓΝΩ...
 ... ΕΙΝ...
 ... Ε...
 ... ΟΥ...
 ... Χ...
 ... Ο...
 ... Μ...
 ... Α...
 ... Δ...
 ... Ο...
 ... Ε...
 ... Ζ...
 ... Κ...
 ... Ο...
 ... Τ...
 ... Ν...
 ... Κ...
 ... Χ...

No. 1810, Phil. i, Fr. 15

The Egypt Exploration Society

GRAECO-ROMAN MEMOIRS.

THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY, as recently reconstituted and renamed, proposes to continue with but slight modifications the work of the *Egypt Exploration Fund*, which was founded in 1882 to conduct archaeological researches in Egypt. In 1897 a special department, called the *Graeco-Roman Branch*, was initiated for the discovery and publication of remains of classical antiquity and early Christianity in Egypt. The volumes published by the *Graeco-Roman Branch* are to be continued under the name of *Graeco-Roman Memoirs*. It is intended that they shall appear annually, as heretofore, under the editorship of PROFS. GRENFELL and HUNT. Each will consist of 250 quarto pages or more, with facsimile plates of the more important papyri.

All persons interested in the promotion of the Society's objects are eligible for election as Members. An entrance fee of £1 1s. is payable on election, and an annual subscription of £2 2s. is due annually on January 1. Members have the right of attendance and voting at all meetings, and may introduce friends to the Lectures and Exhibitions of the Society, and have access to the Library now in course of formation at the Society's Rooms.

The *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* or, if preferred, a *Graeco-Roman Memoir* is presented gratis to all Members, and other publications may be purchased by them at a substantial discount. Full particulars may be obtained from the Secretary, 13 Tavistock Square, London, W.C. 1, or from the Secretary of the American Branch, 503 Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY.

EXCAVATION MEMOIRS.

- I. THE STORE CITY OF PITHOM AND THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Thirteen Plates and Plans. (*Fourth and Revised Edition*, 1888.) 25s.
- II. TANIS, Part I. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Seventeen Plates and two Plans. (*Second Edition*, 1889.) 25s.
- III. NAUKRATIS, Part I. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. With Chapters by CECIL SMITH, ERNEST A. GARDNER, and BARCLAY V. HEAD. Forty-four Plates and Plans. (*Second Edition*, 1888.) 25s.
- IV. GOSHEN AND THE SHRINE OF SAFT-EL-HENNEH. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Eleven Plates and Plans. (*Second Edition*, 1888.) 25s.
- V. TANIS, Part II; including TELL DEFENNEH (The Biblical 'Tahpanhes') and TELL NEBESHEH. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, F. LL. GRIFFITH, and A. S. MURRAY. Fifty-one Plates and Plans. 1888. (*Out of print*.)
- VI. NAUKRATIS, Part II. By ERNEST A. GARDNER and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Twenty-four Plates and Plans. 1888. (*Out of print*.)
- VII. THE CITY OF ONIAS AND THE MOUND OF THE JEW. The Antiquities of Tell-el-Yahūdiyyeh. By EDOUARD NAVILLE and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Twenty-six Plates and Plans. 1890. 25s.

- VIII. BUBASTIS. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Fifty-four Plates. (*Second Edition*, 1891.) 25s.
- IX. TWO HIEROGLYPHIC PAPYRI FROM TANIS. Containing THE SIGN PAPYRUS (a Syllabary). By F. LL. GRIFFITH. THE GEOGRAPHICAL PAPYRUS (an Almanack). By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. With Remarks by HEINRICH BRUGSCH. 1889. (*Out of print.*)
- X. THE FESTIVAL HALL OF OSORKON II (BUBASTIS). By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Thirty-nine Plates. 1892. 25s.
- XI. AHNAS EL MEDINEH. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Eighteen Plates. And THE TOMB OF PAHERI AT EL KAB. By J. J. TYLOR and F. LL. GRIFFITH Ten Plates. 1894. 25s.
- XII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Introductory. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Fifteen Plates and Plans. 1894. 25s.
- XIII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part I. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates I-XXIV (three coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1895. 30s.
- XIV. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part II. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates XXV-LV (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1897. 30s.
- XV. DESHASHEH. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Photogravure and thirty-seven Plates. 1898. 25s.
- XVI. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part III. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates LVI-LXXXVI (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1898. 30s.
- XVII. DENDEREH. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Thirty-eight Plates. 1900. 25s. (Forty extra Plates of Inscriptions. 10s.)
- XVIII. THE ROYAL TOMBS OF THE FIRST DYNASTY. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Sixty-eight Plates. 1900. 25s.
- XIX. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part IV. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates LXXXVII-CXVIII (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1901. 30s.
- XX. DIOSPOLIS PARVA. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Forty-nine Plates. 1901. (*Out of print.*)
- XXI. THE ROYAL TOMBS OF THE EARLIEST DYNASTIES, Part II. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Sixty-three Plates. 1901. 25s. (Thirty-five extra Plates. 10s.)
- XXII. ABYDOS, Part I. By W. M. F. PETRIE. Eighty-one Plates. 1902. 25s.
- XXIII. EL AMRAH AND ABYDOS. By D. RANDALL-MACIVER, A. C. MACE, and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Sixty Plates. 1902. 25s.
- XXIV. ABYDOS, Part II. By W. M. F. PETRIE. Sixty-four Plates. 1903. 25s.
- XXV. ABYDOS, Part III. By C. T. CURRELLY, E. R. AYRTON, and A. E. P. WEIGALL, &c. Sixty-one Plates. 1904. 25s.
- XXVI. EHNASYA. By W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE. Forty-three Plates. 1905. 25s. (ROMAN EHNASYA. Thirty-two extra Plates. 10s.)
- XXVII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part V. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates CXIX-CL with Description. Royal folio. 1906. 30s.
- XXVIII. THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY TEMPLE AT DEIR EL BAHARI, Part I. By EDOUARD NAVILLE and H. R. HALL. Thirty-one Plates. 1907. (*Out of print.*)
- XXIX. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part VI. By EDOUARD NAVILLE. Plates CLI-CLXXIV (one coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 1908. 30s.
- XXX. THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY TEMPLE AT DEIR EL BAHARI, Part II. By EDOUARD NAVILLE and SOMERS CLARKE. Twenty-four Plates. 1910. 25s.
- XXXI. PRE-DYNASTIC CEMETERY AT EL MAHASNA. By E. R. AYRTON and W. L. S. LOAT. 1911. 25s.
- XXXII. THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY TEMPLE AT DEIR EL BAHARI, Part III. By EDOUARD NAVILLE, H. R. HALL, and C. T. CURRELLY. Thirty-six Plates. 1913. 25s.
- XXXIII. CEMETERIES OF ABYDOS, Part I. By EDOUARD NAVILLE, T. E. PEET, H. R. HALL and K. HADDON. 1914. 25s.
- XXXIV. CEMETERIES OF ABYDOS, Part II. By T. E. PEET. 1914. 25s.
- XXXV. CEMETERIES OF ABYDOS, Part III. By T. E. PEET and W. L. S. LOAT. 1913. 25s.
- XXXVI. THE INSCRIPTIONS OF SINAI, Part I. By A. H. GARDINER and T. E. PEET. Eighty-six Plates and Plans. Royal folio. 1917. 35s.
- XXXVII. BALABISH. By G. A. WAINWRIGHT. Twenty-five Plates. 1920. 42s.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Edited by F. LL. GRIFFITH.

- I. BENI HASAN, Part I. By PERCY E. NEWBERRY. With Plans by G. W. FRASER. Forty-nine Plates (four coloured). 1893. (*Out of print.*)
- II. BENI HASAN, Part II. By PERCY E. NEWBERRY. With Appendix, Plans, and Measurements by G. W. FRASER. Thirty-seven Plates (two coloured). 1894. 25s.
- III. EL BERSHEH, Part I. By PERCY E. NEWBERRY. Thirty-four Plates (two coloured). 1894. 25s.
- IV. EL BERSHEH, Part II. By F. LL. GRIFFITH and PERCY E. NEWBERRY. With Appendix by G. W. FRASER. Twenty-three Plates (two coloured). 1895. 25s.
- V. BENI HASAN, Part III. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. (Hieroglyphs, and manufacture, &c., of Flint Knives.) Ten coloured Plates. 1896. 25s.
- VI. HIEROGLYPHS FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. Nine coloured Plates. 1898. 25s.
- VII. BENI HASAN, Part IV. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. (Illustrating beasts and birds, arts, crafts, &c.) Twenty-seven Plates (twenty-one coloured). 1900. 25s.
- VIII. THE MASTABA OF PTAHHETEP AND AKHETHETEP AT SAQQAREH, Part I. By NORMAN DE G. DAVIES and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Thirty-one Plates (three coloured). 1900. 25s.
- IX. THE MASTABA OF PTAHHETEP AND AKHETHETEP, Part II. By N. DE G. DAVIES and F. LL. GRIFFITH. Thirty-five Plates. 1901. 25s.
- X. THE ROCK TOMBS OF SHEIKH SAÏD. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Thirty-five Plates. 1901. 25s.
- XI. THE ROCK TOMBS OF DEIR EL GEBRÂWI, Part I. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Twenty-seven Plates (two coloured). 1902. 25s.
- XII. DEIR EL GEBRÂWI, Part II. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Thirty Plates (two coloured). 1902. 25s.
- XIII. THE ROCK TOMBS OF EL AMARNA, Part I. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-one Plates. 1903. 25s.
- XIV. EL AMARNA, Part II. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-seven Plates. 1905. 25s.
- XV. EL AMARNA, Part III. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty Plates. 1905. 25s.
- XVI. EL AMARNA, Part IV. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-five Plates. 1906. 25s.
- XVII. EL AMARNA, Part V. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-four Plates. 1908. 25s.
- XVIII. EL AMARNA, Part VI. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-four Plates. 1908. 25s.
- XIX. THE ISLAND OF MEROË. By J. W. CROWFOOT, and MEROITIC INSCRIPTIONS, Part I. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. Thirty-five Plates. 1911. 25s.
- XX. MEROITIC INSCRIPTIONS, Part II. By F. LL. GRIFFITH. Forty-eight Plates. 1912. 25s.
- XXI. FIVE THEBAN TOMBS. By N. DE G. DAVIES. Forty-three Plates. 1913. 25s.
- XXII. THE ROCK TOMBS OF MEIR, Part I. By A. M. BLACKMAN. Thirty-three Plates. 1914. 25s.
- XXIII. MEIR, Part II. By A. M. BLACKMAN. Thirty-five Plates. 1915. 25s.
- XXIV. MEIR, Part III. By A. M. BLACKMAN. Thirty-nine Plates. 1915. 25s.

GRAECO-ROMAN MEMOIRS.

- I. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part I. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Eight Collotype Plates. 1898. (*Out of print.*)
- II. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part II. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Eight Collotype Plates. 1899. 25s.
- III. FAYÛM TOWNS AND THEIR PAPYRI. By B. P. GRENFELL, A. S. HUNT, and D. G. HOGARTH. Eighteen Plates. 1900. 25s.
- IV. THE TEBTUNIS PAPYRI. By B. P. GRENFELL, A. S. HUNT, and J. G. SMYLY. Nine Collotype Plates. 1902. (*Not for sale.*)
- V. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part III. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 1903. 25s.

- VI. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part IV. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Eight Collotype Plates. 1904. 25s.
- VII. THE HIBEH PAPYRI, Part I. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Ten Collotype Plates. 1906. 45s.
- VIII. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part V. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Seven Collotype Plates. 1908. 25s.
- IX. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part VI. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 1908. 25s.
- X. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part VII. By A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 1910. 25s.
- XI. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part VIII. By A. S. HUNT. Seven Collotype Plates. 1911. 25s.
- XII. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part IX. By A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 1912. 25s.
- XIII. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part X. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 1914. 25s.
- XIV. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XI. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Seven Collotype Plates. 1915. 25s.
- XV. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XII. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Two Collotype Plates. 1916. 25s.
- XVI. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XIII. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Six Collotype Plates. 1919. 25s.
- XVII. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XIV. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Three Collotype Plates. 1920. 42s.
- XVIII. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XV. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. Five Collotype Plates. 1922. 42s.
- XIX. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XVI. By B. P. GRENFELL, A. S. HUNT, and H. I. BELL. (*In preparation.*)

ANNUAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS. Edited by F. LL. GRIFFITH. 1892-1912. 2s. 6d. each. General Index, 4s. net.

JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY (commencing 1914). Vols. i-v, quarterly parts 6s. Vol. vi, quarterly parts 12s. 6d.; Vol. vii, two double parts, 25s. each.

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS.

ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ: 'Sayings of Our Lord,' from an Early Greek Papyrus. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. 1897. (*Out of print.*)

NEW SAYINGS OF JESUS AND FRAGMENT OF A LOST GOSPEL, with the text of the 'Logia' discovered in 1897. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. 1904. 1s. net.

FRAGMENT OF AN UNCANONICAL GOSPEL. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. 1908. 1s. net.

COPTIC OSTRACA. By W. E. CRUM. 1902. 10s. 6d. net.

THE THEBAN TOMB SERIES, Vol. I. THE TOMB OF AMENEMHËT (No. 82). By NINA DE G. DAVIES and A. H. GARDINER. 1915. 35s. Vol. II. THE TOMB OF ANTEFOKER. 1920. 42s.

THE MAYER PAPYRI A and B. By T. E. PEET. Twenty-seven Plates. 1920. 50s.

Offices of the Egypt Exploration Society:

13 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, LONDON, W.C. 1, AND
503 TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON, MASS., U.S.A.

Agents:

BERNARD QUARITCH, 11 GRAFTON STREET, NEW BOND STREET, W. 1
HUMPHREY MILFORD, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, AMEN CORNER, E.C. 4 AND
29 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

C. F. CLAY, CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, FETTER LANE, E.C. 4
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co., 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C. 4
GEORGE SALBY, 65 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C. 1

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY



3 1197 22884 0200

