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PREFACE

The present volume consists of literary texts, like Parts V and XI. The papyri of Lysias (1606), Hyperides (1607), Aeschines Socraticus (1608), and an oration on the cult of a Roman Emperor (1612) belong to the first of the three large literary finds of the 1905–6 season, which produced 841–4, &c., and has now been completely published; those of Ephorus (1610), a work on literary criticism (1611), and Herodotus (1619) belong to the second, which is not yet exhausted. Most of the other texts were found in the early part of the same season.

Prof. Hunt's continued absence from Oxford on military duties has prevented him from taking an active part in the decipherment and editing of this volume, but he has revised some of the papyri and the proofs. We are much indebted to Mr. E. Lobel, who has made numerous suggestions in the reconstruction and interpretation of the new classical texts, and to Dr. J. V. Bartlet for similar help in regard to the new theological texts. The assistance on various points afforded by Mr. T. W. Allen, Profs. J. Burnet, J. B. Bury, and A. E. Housman, Dr. C. Hude, Mr. H. Stuart Jones, Sir William M. Ramsay, Prof. M. Rostowzew, and Sir John E. Sandys is acknowledged in connexion with the individual papyri.

The two sections consisting of Contracts and Private Accounts, which were omitted from Part XII owing to want of space, are held over for Part XIV, which will contain non-literary documents and is in active preparation. We hope to issue it in the course of 1919, and that Mr. J. de M. Johnson's edition of the valuable Theocritus papyrus discovered by him at Antinoë will be issued simultaneously.

BERNARD P. GRENFELL.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD,
SEPTEMBER, 1918.
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NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The general method followed in this volume is the same as that in Parts I–XII. 1604 (Pindar) is printed in dual form, a literal transcript being accompanied by a reconstruction in modern style. In the other texts the originals are reproduced except for separation of words, capital initials in proper names, expansion of abbreviations, and supplements of lacunae. A reconstruction in modern form of the more complete portions of 1606–7 and 1610–12 is also given. Additions or corrections by the same hand as 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 mistaken omission in the original, braces { } a superfluous letter or letters, double square brackets [[ ] ] a deletion in the original. Dots placed 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 considered doubtful. Heavy Arabic numerals refer to the texts of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri in this volume and Parts I–XII, ordinary numerals to lines, small Roman numerals to columns. In the case of vellum fragments the terms recto and verso are used with reference to the upper and under sides of a leaf, not to the hair-side and flesh-side.

The abbreviations used in referring to papyrological publications are practically those adopted in the Archiv für Papyrysforchung, viz.:

Archiv = Archiv für Papyrysforchung.
I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1594. NEW RECENSION OF TOBIT xii.

6-2 x 7-5 cm. Late third century. Plate I (recto).

A nearly complete leaf of a diminutive vellum codex, containing Tobit xii, 14-19 in a recension which is not extant. Another fragment of a novel version of this popular apocryphon (ii. 2-4, 8) was published in 1076, but is later in date (sixth century) than 1594, which is written in a small neat uncial hand of an unusually early type, resembling the hands of 656 and 1007 (both Genesis: Part iv, Plate ii and Part vii, Plate i). 656 is probably earlier than A.D. 250 and likely to be somewhat older than 1007 and 1594, being written on papyrus and having no contractions, whereas in the other two fragments theos is contracted; but, like 1007, 1594 was probably written in the second half of the third century. The leaf when complete was nearly square, and of approximately the same size as P. Ryl. 28 (Part i, Plate v), a fourth-century treatise on ματρική: for other miniature codices of biblical texts cf. 842 and 1010. No punctuation is discernible, but a diaeresis over an initial υ apparently occurs on the verso, which is much damaged and difficult to decipher. There are traces of what may be lines of ruling in the margin of the recto, which is probably the hair-side.

There are two main Greek recensions of Tobit, one represented by the Codex Sinaiticus (N), the other by the Cod. Vaticanus (B) and Cod. Alexandrinus (A). The recension of N, which is fuller and more picturesque than that of BA, is tending to be regarded as the earlier. Besides these two there is for chs. vi. 9-xiii. 8 a third Greek redaction represented by three cursive MSS., and from vii. 11 supported by the Syriac version, which before that point agrees with BA. This third recension occupies an intermediate position, being allied to N but less verbose, and is sometimes supported by the Old Latin version, which, like the Aramaic and earlier Hebrew versions, generally supports N. The view put forward in 1076 int., that 1076 belongs to the third Greek recension partially preserved by the cursives, was adopted in the latest and only fully equipped edition of Tobit, that of Mr. D. C. Simpson in Charles's Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. i. 174 sqq.; cf. Journ. of Theol. Stud. xiv. 516 sqq.
Leaving undecided the question whether the original language of Tobit was Greek or Semitic, he thinks that the book was composed in Egypt not long before 170 B.C., and that the recension of N is the nearest approach to the original, while that of BA did not reach its present form until about A.D. 180, and the third recension was later still.

The conditions of the problem are somewhat altered by the discovery of 1594, which is on the whole much nearer to BA than to N or the third recension, here fortunately extant. In vv. 14–17, where the two main recensions do not greatly differ, 1594 agrees with BA against N in the insertion of èk (l. 3), ἦλιον (l. 3; ἦλιον ἡγήλιον BA; ἡγήλιον N), προσαναφέροντα (l. 3; add. τὰς προσαναφέρον τῶν ἦλιον BA; παρεστήκασιν N), the omission of αὐτῶν (l. 8), and the insertion of ἔσται (l. 12); against these can be set only the agreements with N in the form ἐκπέμπω (l. 8), the insertion of ἀπαίτητα in l. 13 (πάντα N; om. BA), and καὶ for BA's ὅτι in l. 9. In vv. 18–19, where the text of N is longer than that of BA and differently arranged, the new fragment agrees with BA in having ἐμαυτοῦ, not ἶμυ, in l. 15 and in constructing τὰς ἡμέρας with ἀπανάφόμεν ἕμων (ll. 18–19), whereas N connects the first phrase with the preceding εὐλογεῖτε or with an added repetition of it, αὐτῶ ἔμενετε. Against this must be set the partial agreements between 1594 and N as to the verb in l. 16 (ἡμῶν μεθ' ἕμων: om. B; ἢλθον Ἄ), and the occurrence in 1594. 20 of ἐθεωρεῖτε με (cf. Old Latin videbatis me) corresponding to N's θεωρεῖτε με. With the peculiar readings of the third Greek recension 1594 agrees against the other two in respect of the omission of Σάρραν in l. 2, and of ἡγήλιον in l. 3, the insertion of ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν in l. 9, and the reading θεοῦ in l. 6 (θεοῦ without τοῦ μεγάλου the cursives; cf. Dei Old Lat.). But elsewhere the third Greek recension follows N rather than 1594, and is shorter even than BA in v. 19.

The new recension has also a number of peculiar readings, such as the constant use of καὶ as a connecting particle, where BA vary the monotony by δὲ (l. 12; om. N) or ὅθεν (l. 17; om. N) or the absence of connexion (l. 19), and especially the new arrangement of vv. 18–19, which avoids both the obvious omission in B and the redundancy of N at this point. On the whole 1594, while belonging to the BA type of text, is distinctly better. Is this superiority to be explained as resulting from a revision of the BA text in the light of N, or from the priority and greater purity of the text illustrated by 1594, of which BA is a later form? The second hypothesis seems to us much the more probable for several reasons. In the first place 1594 is an older MS. than B or A. Secondly, the constant use of καὶ in 1594 points to a more archaic text than that of BA. Thirdly, the text of BA, where in comparison with that of 1594 it is markedly inferior, as in vv. 15 and 18, seems to have arisen out of the text of 1594,
not vice versa. In v. 15 the employment of ἄγιος by BA three times within the same sentence, referring to different persons in each case, is intolerable, and the addition of τὰς προσευχὰς τῶν ἄγιῶν looks like a Christian gloss on προσαναφέροντι, which is intelligible by itself, while BA’s ἄγιον ἄγγέλων (ἄγγέλων Ν; ἄγιον 1594 and the third recension) may be the result of a conflation of readings or of a confusion between ἄγιον and ἄγλαον, a contraction of ἄγγέλων found e.g. in 1603. 12. In v. 18 1594 has ἐγὼ μεθ’ ύμῶν ὧν ότι τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ χάριτι ἦμην ἄλλα τῇ θελήσει τοῦ θεοῦ corresponding to B’s ὧν τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ χάριτι ἄλλα τῇ θελήσει τοῦ θεοῦ ύμῶν without a verb, which is supplied by A (add. ἤλθων). The phrase ‘your God’ is very inappropriate in the mouth of an angel, and it is noticeable that the third recension, which at this point follows BA rather than Ν, ignores ύμῶν. The explanation is probably that ύμῶν had really nothing to do with θεοῦ, but is the survival of ἦμην μεθ’ ύμῶν found in both 1594 and Ν, and that A’s ἤλθων is merely a correction inserted to restore the defective grammar. 1594’s phrase ὧν ὧν ότι . . . in place of BA’s (ὅτι) ὧν ὧν . . . gives a more literary touch to the passage, and might easily cause difficulty to some one who did not understand that ἦμην was to be supplied with ἐγὼ μεθ’ ύμῶν, with the result that a simpler construction was substituted. Fourthly, the result of an attempt to combine the merits of BA and Ν is partly extant in the third recension, and though that edition now appears to have taken into consideration the text represented by 1594 as well as those of Ν and BA (cf. p. 2), it does not coincide with 1594, and is in fact nearer to Ν than to 1594 or BA, just like 1076. That fragment on account of its affinity to Ν is still to be considered as probably a specimen of the missing portion of the third recension, not as part of the recension illustrated by 1594. We are therefore disposed to regard 1594 as an earlier form of the BA text, which developed out of 1594 partly owing to certain editorial changes, partly owing to corruptions introduced in the normal course of transmission.

There remains the question whether 1594 or Ν more closely represents the original text of Tobit. Owing to the small size of the fragment it is difficult to speak with certainty; but with regard to the characteristics of the BA text which Simpson (Journ. of Theol. Stud. xiv. 527–8) selects as evidence for the later date of BA it is noticeable that (1) 1594 does not tend, like BA, to avoid καί as a connecting particle, (2) if 1594 is less redundant than in ll. 14–18, in ll. 19–20 it has a repetition which is absent from Ν, and (3) the two uncommon words in 1594, προσαναφέροντι and ἀπτανόμην, and the unusual construction in ll. 14–16 are absent from Ν, though as a rule the BA text is more commonplace than that of Ν. The Ν text is certainly not conspicuously better than that of 1594 in these six verses. The addition in Ν of Σάρραν before
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τὴν νύμφην in l. 1 and the omission of ἐκ in l. 3 and ἔπι τὴν γῆν in l. 9 are no improvements; ἄγιων without BA's ἀγγέλων in l. 3 and προσαναφέροντο without BA's τὰς προσευχὰς τῶν ἄγιων are hardly open to the inferences which Simpson (op. cit. 521) draws from a comparison of the 'angelology' of BA and N concerning the later character of BA. The use of θεοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου in l. 6 in place of N's κυρίου perhaps illustrates the tendency to emphasize the transcendental character of the Godhead which according to Simpson (loc. cit.) serves to distinguish BA from N, and ὀπτάνεσθαι (l. 19), as he pointed out, came to have a definite Christian connotation, being found in Acts i. 3 with reference to the appearances of Christ after the Resurrection. But the word occurs in the LXX and Ptolemaic papyri, and curious linguistic affinities between Tobit xii. 16-22 and the Gospels (cf. Simpson's n. ad loc.) are traceable in the text of N as well as BA, so that the mere occurrence of ὀπτάνεσθαι does not prove much. The reading of 1594 in v. 18 ἐγὼ μεθ' ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμᾶς αὐτῆς κόσμῳ ἡμᾶς is defensible against N's ἐγὼ ὅτε ἡμῶν μεθ' ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμᾶς κόσμῳ ἡμῶν μεθ' ὑμῶν: but the arrangement of vv. 18-19 as a whole is more satisfactory in N; for πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας is more appropriate in conjunction with ἐλογεῖτε than with ὀπτάνομαι, and the repetition ἐλογεῖτε . . . ἡμέρατε in N is probably better than the repetition ὀπτανόμαι . . . ἐθεωρεῖτε in 1594, which here combines the two verbs found singly in N and BA, though whether N's ἐθεωρεῖτε is superior to ἐθεωρεῖτε in 1594, here supported by the Old Latin, is very doubtful. In l. 3 ἄγιων (N) is perhaps preferable to ἄγιων (1594), the two words being liable to confusion as soon as contractions came into use (cf. p. 3).

Our conclusion therefore is that, while the recension of N is probably older than that of BA, N had before the age of the Antonines, perhaps even from the earliest times when Tobit was read in Greek, a rival in the shape of the text to which 1594 belongs. This was largely superseded after A.D. 200 by the BA recension, which was based on it; but traces of the influence of the 1594 text are discernible in the Old Latin version, which was made probably before 300, and the 1594 text remained sufficiently important by the side of the BA text for it to be used in the compilation of the intermediate text found in the cursives and 1076, which was designed (in the fourth or fifth century?) as a compromise between the various conflicting versions of the story. The result of the discovery of 1594 is, we think, to diminish somewhat the superiority in point of age which can be claimed for the recension of N over others, and to increase the respect due to both BA and the third recension, as being either based upon or, in the case of the third recension, influenced by an older recension which is independent of N and may well contain some original elements.
In place of a collation, we give the new text side by side with the three extant Greek versions and the Old Latin in full.

1594.

NEW RECENSION OF TOBIT XII

Recto.

[σα]σαβαί σε καὶ τὴν νῦμ [xii. 14] μὴν ἐσταί καὶ τὸν θν [ἐν
φην σου εγὼ εἰμὶ Ραφαὴλ εἰς ἐκ τῶν ζ ἀγων οἱ προσ
ἀναφέρουσι καὶ εἰσπορευ] 5 ονται εὐωδιὸν τὴν δο
ξῖς του θν του μεγάλου καὶ εὐαρχήσαν οἱ Β καὶ
esπαν επὶ πρόσωπον
[ε]πὶ την γνη και εὕβη
[θῆσαν καὶ εἰπεν αὐτοῖς
[μὴ φοβείσθε εἰρήνη]] 10

Verso.

Verso.

[σα]σαβαί σε καὶ τὴν νῦμ [xii. 14] μὴν ἐσταί καὶ τὸν θν [ἐν
λογείε εἰς τον απαντά
αἴωνα εγὼ μεθ' υμῶν 15 οὐχ οτι τη εμαυτον χαρι
tι ημὴν αλλα τη θελη
σει του θν καὶ αυτον ευλο
γείται καὶ πασας τας ημὲ
19
rpe απανομον νμι

20 και εὐθείατε με ση]

[οὐκ εὐφαγον ουδε επιν

1 line lost

1594.

14 ἰάσασθαι σε καὶ τὴν νῦμφην σου. 15 ἐγὼ εἰμὶ Ῥαφαὴλ, εἰς ἐκ τῶν ἐπτὰ ἄγιον οἱ προσαναφέρουσι καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εὐώδιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου. 16 καὶ ἐταραχθησαν οἱ δύο καὶ ἐπέσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἑφοβήθησαν. 17 καὶ ἐπεν αὐτοῖς [Μὴ φοβείςθε εἰρήνη] υμῖν ἐσται καὶ τὸν θεὸν εὐλογεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἀπάντα αἰῶνα. 18 ἐγὼ μεθ' υμῶν οὐχ ὅτι τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ χάριτι ἦμην, ἀλλὰ τῇ θελήσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ αὐτῶν εὐλογεῖτε. 19 καὶ

BA.

14 ἰάσασθαι καὶ Σάρραν τὴν νῦμφην σου. 15 ἐγὼ εἰμὶ Ῥαφαὴλ, εἰς τῶν ἐπτὰ ἄγιον οἱ παρεστηκασι καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εὐώδιον τῆς δόξης κυρίου. 16 καὶ ἐταραχθησαν οἱ δύο καὶ ἐπέσων ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν καὶ ἑφοβήθησαν. 17 καὶ ἐπεν αὐτοῖς Μή φοβείςθε, εἰρήνη υμίν τὸν θεὸν εὐλογεῖτε εἰς πάντα τὸν αἰῶνα. 18 ἐγὼ ὅτι ἦμην μεθ' υμῶν οὐχὶ τῇ ἐμή χάριτι ἦμην μεθ' υμῶν, ἀλλὰ τῇ θελήσει τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν εὐλογεῖτε, κατὰ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας

N.
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πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ὀπτανύμην ὑμῖν καὶ θεωρεῖτε μὲ ὦκ[ι] οὐκ ἐφαγον ... ὦκ ἐφαγον ...


14 ἤδασαθαί σε καὶ τὴν νῦμφην σου.

15 ἐγὼ εἰμὶ Ῥαφαὴλ, ἐσὶ τῶν ἁγίων τῶν παρεστῶτων ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἔταράξθησαν ἀμφότεροι καὶ ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὅτι ἐφοβήθησαν (ὅτι ἐφ. om. 44).

17 καὶ εἴπεν αὐτοῖς, Μη φοβεῖσθε, εἰρήνη ὑμῖν ἑσταυρωθείτε τοῖς θεοῖς, ὅτι οὐ τῇ ἐμῇ χάριτι ἄλλα τῇ θελήσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἥλθον. καὶ οὐκ ἐφαγον ...

3. προσαναφερομαι: this word occurs twice elsewhere in the LXX, Judith xi. 18 ἐλθώσαν προσαναφερόμενοι καὶ and 2 Macc. xi. 36 ἀ δὲ ἐκρίνε προσαναφερθέναι τῷ βασιλεί.

11-12. That καὶ should be read in 1. 11 before εἰρήνη with A is improbable, the line being long enough without it, and similar words of connexion being avoided elsewhere in the fragment; cf. p. 3. It is just possible that νὶ went should be read instead of νὶ in l. 12.

13. εἰ: εἰ might be read, but εἰ is regularly used in this phrase in the LXX and N. T.

15. οὐκ οὐκ: οὐκ is the only alternative to χ and the vestige of the next letter suits ς, but not ε, so that οὐκείμεν is an unsatisfactory reading, even if it suited the context. The traces of ς are slight, but suggest no other appropriate reading, so that οὐκ εἰ is practically certain; cf. int.

20-1. οὐ[ι] οὐ[κ] (so Ν) is very uncertain, but suits the slight traces somewhat better than κα[ι] οὐ[κ] (BA) or οὐ[κ] ε[φα]γον.

1595. ECCLESIASTICUS i.

18 x 11-2 cm. Sixth century.

A leaf from a papyrus codex, containing the first nine verses of Ecclesiasticus in the LXX, written with brown ink in large heavy round uncial of the type represented by e.g. Schubart, Pap. Graec. Berol. 44a (Iliad xxi), probably in the sixth century, to which documents found with or near 1595 belong. The numbering of the pages, if it existed in the position occupied by the numberings
in e.g. 1598, is not preserved, so that it is uncertain whether this is the first leaf of the codex or only of a section. The beginnings of verses are marked by fresh lines which project slightly, and the ends by high stops apparently throughout, though owing to injuries to the surface these are not always discernible. The usual contractions for ἰς, κύριος (but not in l. 1), and οὐδενὸς occur.

Verse 7 ἐπιστήμη θοφίας τίνι ἐφανερώθη καὶ τῇν πολυπειρίαν αὐτῆς τίς συνήκεν; which is generally regarded as a doublet of v. 6, is omitted, as in the chief uncial MSS.; but v. 5 (ἡν θοφίας λόγος θεοῦ ἐν ὑψίστοις, καὶ αἱ πορείαι αὐτῆς ἐντολαὶ αἰῶνιοι) is retained, as in some cursives and versions (cf. ll. 16–19, n.), though this too has generally been rejected as a doublet of the preceding verse; cf. Box-Oesterley in Charles’s Apocr. and Pseudepigr. i. 318. The resemblance, however, between vv. 4–5 is much less marked than that between vv. 6–7, and since v. 4 ends with αἰῶνοι, v. 5 with αἰῶνιοι, the hypothesis that the disappearance of v. 5 is an error due to homoioteleuton has, we think, more to justify it than the view that it is a Pharisaic addition. In other respects the text of 1595 is not remarkable, the spelling and arrangement agreeing with NAC rather than with B. A note at the bottom of the recto perhaps refers to an omission. This is the first papyrus of Ecclesiasticus.

Verso.

[πα]σα σοφία παρὰ κυρίον κ[αι 1
[μ]ετ αυτοῦ εστὶν
[εἰ]ς τον αἰῶνα·
[αμ]ιοὺν θαλασσῶν και
[5]ταγόνας ὑπὸ του και
[η]μερας αἰῶνος τις
[ε]ξαρθησει...
[υ]ρὸς οὐνοῦ και πλατος
[γ]ης και αβυσσου και
[α]σει...
[πρ]οτερα παντων εκτι
[σ]ται σοφια-
[και] συνεις φρονησε
[15]ως εχ αιωνος·
[η]θης σοφιας λογος 6ν

Recto.

eν υψιστοις·
και αι πορειαι αυτης εν
τολαι αιωνιιφη·
και αι ται πανοργη[ατα]
αυτης της ενγωψ·
eις εστιν σοφος [φοβε
25 ροσ σφοδρα·
καθημενος επι ηου
θρονου αυτοφη:
καθημενος επι ηου
θρονου αυτοφη:
και ειδεν και εκημενη
σεν αυτην·
20 μειας τυ[ι] απε
καλυβηθη·
και αι ται πανοργη[ατα]
αυτης της ενγωψ·
εις εστιν σοφος [φοβε
25 ροσ σφοδρα·
καθημενος επι ηου
θρονου αυτοφη:
και ειδεν και εκημενη
σεν αυτην·
και εξεειν αυτην επι
16–19. This verse (5), omitted by the uncial MSS., is found in cursive 248 and others and in the Syro-Hexaplar, Latin, and Sahidic versions; cf. int.
22. πανορυγματα: so ΝAC; πανοργυγματα B.
23–4. Between these lines several cursive (not 248), the Syro-Hexaplar, Latin, and Sahidic versions insert verse 7 ἐπιστήμη σοφίας κλ.: cf. int.
24. σοφός: this word, though found in the Greek MSS., is omitted by Box-Oesterley, l.c., following the versions. In place of ll. 24–5 the Syriac and Arabic versions have 'One (there is) who hath dominion over all her treasures'.
28. AV: B alone of the Greek MSS. assigns this word to the previous verse. That αὐτῷ, the reading of the MSS., was added at the end of the line is not quite certain, though without it the line would be rather short; cf. l. 33, n.
29. οὗτος: so ΝC; οὗτος BA.
33. Whether this line, which was written in uncial by a different hand in darker ink but intentionally obliterated, has any connexion with the main text is uncertain. The readings of all the letters except the first four are very doubtful, and there are several ink smudges on both sides of the papyrus which seem to be accidental. If εὐανείριον is right, the reference is perhaps to an omission by the first hand, i.e. of αὐτῷ in l. 28 rather than αὐτοῦ in l. 32.


10·7 × 5·2 cm. Fourth century.

A fragment from the lower part of a leaf of a papyrus codex of St. John’s Gospel, containing vi. 8–12 and 17–22, but with the loss of slightly more than half the lines. It was found together with third–fourth century documents, and probably belongs to the early or middle part of the fourth century, the script being a medium-sized semiuncial. 'I(ναυτός) is the only contraction, and one high stop occurs (l. 41); pauses are indicated by a slight space in l. 46, and probably by a larger space in the lacuna in l. 49. The papyrus, though hardly so old as 208 (parts of i and xx) and 1228 (xiv. 25–xxvi. 31) and not very correctly spelled, is interesting on account of its early date, being probably older than 847 (ii. ii–22 on vellum). The text is eclectic in places (e.g. l. 22), as often happens in early Biblical MSS., but tends, like 847, to support B rather than Σ, to which 208 and to a less degree 1228 incline, or A. There are 8 agreements with B in the 10 places where B and Σ differ, and in only 1 of 5 places, where A differs from both Σ and B, does 1596 apparently support A (l. 21, n.). A new order of words seems to occur in a passage where all three of the chief MSS. differ (ll. 40–1, n.).

Recto.

14 lines lost

15 [αὐτὸν Ἀνδρέας ο ἀδελφὸς Σιμωνὶς Πετροῦ] vi. 8
[ἐστιν πανδαιμόνιον ὁδε ο εἰχει πεντε αρτους κρι] 9
[θινους καὶ δύο υψαρία αλ]λα ταύτα τι εἰσὶν εἰ[ς τοσούτως εἰπέν ο Ἰς ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρωποὺς] 10
[ἀναπεσεν ἦν δε χορτὸς πολὺς εν τῷ τοπ[ω] 20 [ανεπεσαν οὐν οἱ ἄνδρες τον ἀριθ[μον] 11
[ωσεὶ πεντακισ]̄[χιλειοι εἰλεβεν οὐν] [τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰς κ]αι εὐχαριστήσας εδώ[ 25 [ἐνεπλησθησαν] λεγεὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀ]"ν 12

Verso.

13 lines lost

[Χοντῳ πε]ραγ̄ τ[ῆς βαλασσῆς εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ] 17
40 [κ]αι σκοτια ἡδη εγ[ε]γονει καὶ οὐ προς αὐτοὺς [ε]ληλυθει ο Ἰς. ἦ τε θ'αλασσα ανεμου μεγα 18
[λυ]ν πνεοντος διεξε[ρ]ετο εληλακτες οὐν 19
ως σταδιους εικοσι π'εντε η τριακοντα θεωρου 
[σι]ν Ἡν περιπατουντα επι της βαλασσῆς 45 και ενγυς του πλοι[ου γινομενον και]
εφοβηθησαν ο δε [λεγει αυτοις εγω ειμι 20
μη φοβεσθαι ηθελον ουν λαβειν αυτουν 21
εις το πλοιον και ευθεως εγενετο το πλοιον επι της γης εις ην υπηγον τη επαυ 50 ριον ο σχλος ο εστικος περαι της βαλασσης 
ἐθεν στι πλοιαριον [αλλο ουκ ην εκει ει μη εν

16–18. The restorations of these lines, based on Ἡ and B, are quite long enough, even allowing for the slope of the column towards the left, which is noticeable on the verso. Hence it is very improbable that 1596 agreed with A and many later MSS. in adding εν after παναριον in l. 16 and δε after εσπεν in l. 18.

19. χορτος πολυς: so nearly all MSS.; πολυς χορτος Α.
20. ουν οι] ἄνδρες: this, the reading of ΝΒ &c., suits the space better than ουν οι ανθρωποιοι ἄνδρες (A &c.). Some MSS. omit ουν or οι, and 1596 may have had οι ανθρωποιοι ἄνδρες, omitting ουν.
21. [ουει (A and most MSS.) suits the length of the lacuna better than ως (ΝΒ).
ειλεβεν: l. ελιθεν.
οι [v: so ΝαΒΔ and some others; δε Ν &c.
22. ευχαριστησας: so ΑΒ and most MSS.; ευχαριστησαν και ΝΔ &c.
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εδεκεν: so ND and some others; δεδεκεν AB and most MSS.

23. καί: so NAB and most MSS.; de καί D &c.

40. [ἐ]πὶ σκοτία ἑδύ εξελει: so AB and most MSS.; κατελαβεν de autous η σκοτία ND.

40-1. ou προς autous [κα]νελθει o l(ησου)w: ouσw εληλ. l(ησ.) προς aut. Ν; ουσω προς aut. εληλ. o l(ησ.) B; ουσ εληλ. προς aut. o l(ησ.) A. There is not room for ouσw here.

41. τε: so most MSS.; de D &c.

42. διεγειρετο: so B &c.; διηγειρετο ΝΑD &c.

43. ο: so ΝΒ and most MSS.; woue AD &c.; om. a few MSS.

σταδιον: so Νa vel bAB and most MSS.; σταδια Ν. D.

43-4. θεωροναι: the supplement in l. 43 is rather long; and possibly ορω[ς]νε occurred, though no such variant is known here. Before ι(ησου)w the MSS. insert των, but there is certainly not room for των here.

46. o δε: so all Greek MSS. except Ν, which has καί.

47. φοβερασθαι: l. φοβισθε....

49. επί της γης: so ΝAΦBD and most MSS.; επι την γην Ν* &c.

ηπηγον: so all MSS. except Ν*, which has ἑπηγονεν. That reading is possible here, for the supplement (13 letters) is 3 or 4 letters shorter than would be expected, but there may well have been a considerable space before τη επαρχου, which begins a new section.

51. ειδεν: so ND &c. (ειδεν); ειδον AB &c.; ειδον some MSS.

1597. ACTS OF THE APOSTLES xxvi.

5·7 X 2·8 cm. Late third or fourth century.

Plate I (verso).

This scrap from the bottom of a leaf of a papyrus codex is tantalizing, for it belongs to an abnormal recension of Acts. The script is a good-sized, somewhat irregular uncial, which is certainly not later than the fourth century and may belong to the latter part of the third. M has the middle brought down below the side strokes; the top stroke of ζ is curved and the middle of Ω is slurred. θεος is contracted, as usual. Whether stops were employed is uncertain. All that survives is 7–10 letters from the beginnings or ends of 10 fairly long lines which covered xxvi. 7–8 and 20, and the reconstructions of the lacunae are in several places doubtful; but enough remains to show that the text presented many novelties. In ch. xxvi D (Codex Bezae), the principal rival of the current text, is defective; but in ll. 3 and 8 there are strong indications of agreements between 1597 and some of the variants preserved in Old Latin MSS., so that the fragment seems to represent a very ancient Greek text akin to the ‘Western’, apparently avoiding some of the difficulties of construction and sense presented by the current text in this chapter. That a piece of the ‘Western’ text of Acts should make its appearance in Egypt is an interesting circumstance, but perhaps not very surprising. The reading of D in Matt. iii. 16–17 occurred in the Oxyrhynchus Ireneaus fragment (405;
Part iv, pp. 264–5), and in other papyrus or vellum fragments of Acts from Egypt occasional agreements with D are found (in P. Amh. 8 at ii. 13, and in von Soden's a² at iv. 32).

**Verso. Plate i.**

\[\text{to} \text{δωδεκάφιλον ημων εν εκτε} \]
\[\text{ νια νυκτια και ημεραν λατρευεν ευ?} \]
\[\text{ελπιδι θατανησαι περι ης υνε} \]
\[\text{ενκαλούμαι υπο Ιουδαιων ει?} \]
\[5 \text{ο} \text{θυ νεκριους εγειρει .......} \]

**Recto.**

\[\text{[απειθης τη} \text{ουρανω οπτασια α]Λλα τοις εν [} \]
\[\text{[Δαμασκω πρωτον τε και Ιεροπολομοι και]} \]
\[\text{[τη Ιουδαια και τοις εθνεοι εκπεφα [} \]
\[\text{[μετανοειν και επιστρεφειν εηπι τον θν [} \]
\[10 \text{[αξια της μετανοιας εργα πρ]ασοντας [} \]

1–3. The ordinary Greek text is \[\text{εν εκτε(ε)δα ηνετα και ημεραν λατρευου ελπιδε θατανησαι (} \]
\[\text{οπρει δς ελπιδος εγκαλουμαι, but Cod. Gigas (13th cent.) which has instanter noce ac} \]
\[\text{die deserviunt in spe peruenire, de qua spe nunc accusor in place of the usual noce ac die} \]
\[\text{deservientes speranti deuenire, de qua spe accusor, seems to be based on a Greek text closely} \]
\[\text{allied to 1597.} \]
\[\text{ελπιδ} \text{ι in l. 3 makes a verb, not a participle, necessary in l. 2; but whether} \]
\[\text{ev should be inserted at the end of l. 2 is doubtful, for it produces 20 letters in the lacuna,} \]
\[\text{whereas in l. 1 there are only 16 in the corresponding space. Line 1 is, however, very short} \]
\[\text{compared with the lines on the recto, and possibly a dittography or unknown variant} \]
\[\text{occurred in the lost part of it. If so, there was an appreciable difference in the length} \]
\[\text{of the lines on the two sides of the leaf, and not only is there plenty of room for λατρευεν} \]
\[\text{ev in l. 2, but ελπιδος, for the omission of which there is no parallel, can be restored instead} \]
\[\text{of νυν in l. 3, and βασιλευ inserted in l. 4 (cf. n.). But on the whole we prefer on account} \]
\[\text{of l. 1 to suppose that the lines on the verso are somewhat shorter than those on the recto.} \]

4. After Ιουδαιων, before which many cursives insert των, most Greek MSS. except A insert βασιλευ; but Cod. Gigas omits τεξ, and there may well have been a blank space before v. 8. There is no room for βασιλευ here without creating a great difficulty in the restoration}.

5. Verses 9–19, which are missing at the top of the recto, would occupy 33 or 34 lines corresponding to ll. 6–10, if the text was approximately as long as the ordinary one; but 1597 seems to be somewhat shorter than usual.

6. The restorations of ll. 9–10, which are practically certain, favour the insertion here
of either τε before καὶ with ΝΑΒ (but not traceable in the Old Latin) or εν before ιεροποιομοιοι with A, but not of both.

καὶ της Ιουδαίας: this restoration, though implying a new variant, suits the presumable length of the lacuna in I. 8 (if καὶ τοῖς εἴθεσιν is retained) much better than καὶ τοῖς Ιουδαίοις, which would have the support of in omnem regionem iudeis, the reading of the Cod. Colbertinus (13th cent.) and a corrector of the Cod. Perpinianus (13th cent.). ΝΒΑ have πάσαν τε την χωραν της Ιουδαίας, which is retained by Tischendorf in spite of the difficulty caused by the unexplained accusative, in later MSS. governed by an inserted εἰς (so von Soden). That 1597, which was shorter here than the current text, had καὶ εἰς πάσαν την χωραν της Ιουδαίας] and omitted καὶ τοῖς εἴθεσιν is possible, but less likely.

8. εκμυθά: απηγγελλον (ΝΒΑ) is the best attested reading, and the numerous variants are all compounds of διγέλλω in some form. The Old Latin MSS. have adnuntiare in some form, except the Floriacensis (6th–7th cent.) which has praedicavi, apparently representing εκμυθά.

9. του ἑ(τ)ων: τοῦ ἑων θ. some cursives, &c. (including von Soden's chief 'Pamphilus' group); cf. xiv. 15.

1598. I Thessalonians iv—II Thessalonians i.

Fr. 4 8.8 x 6.2 cm. Late third or fourth century.

Parts of two consecutive leaves and an unidentified scrap of a papyrus codex, containing I Thess. iv. 12–II Thess. i. 2 with considerable lacunae. The script is a large heavy round uncial of the early biblical type, not so formal and calligraphic as e.g. 1166 (Part ix, Plate i), but, like 406, probably of the late third rather than the fourth century. The usual contractions of θεός, 'Ησοῦς, κύριος, πατὴρ, and Χριστὸς occur. No stops are actually found, but a ʃ-shaped sign is used for filling up short lines. The numbers of the pages, which are twice preserved (pp. 207–8), suggest that the book was a collection of St. Paul's Epistles, and it is noteworthy that the usual order of these from Romans to I Thess. would exactly account for the preceding 206 pages.

The text is interesting, being, as often, eclectic in character. It agrees with B four times against ΝΑ, once with BA against Ν, twice with ΝΑ against B, once with Ν against BA. In ll. 60, 77, and 109 the papyrus clearly presented a longer text than any of the MSS., but in no case is the addition preserved, though fairly probable conjectures can be made. In l. 70 the papyrus is shorter than the MSS. The unidentified fragment does not agree with the ordinary text of any passage in either of these two Epistles. A seventh-century vellum fragment of I Thess. iii. 6–9, iv. 2–5 has been published by Wessely (Stud. zur Palaeogr. xii. 192).

Frs. 1 + 2 recto. 

Frs. 1 + 2 verso.

σε νοσ [χρειαν εχθε ου δελο] I. iv. 13 [ουτως ερχεται οταν λεγοσιν v. 3
μεν [δε νμας αγνοειν αδελ] 35 [ειρηνη και ασφαλεια τοις αι]
I THESSALONIANS IV—II THESSALONIANS I

3 [φοί] - [περὶ τῶν κοιμώμενων]
15 lines lost
νοῦ καὶ ὀψιν χρήσθη
eν Χω 

20 νᾶστησονται πρῶτον
πηντα τῆς ἡμέρας
οἱ περὶ [πάντων] αὐτῶν

25 συν τῷ κύριῳ [αἰεὶ καὶ οὕτως]
παντοτε σὺν [καὶ] εὐσεβῶς
7 lines lost

Frs. 3 + 4 verso.

[σθ] [νῦν καὶ προστάσασθαι] μεν v. 12
[νοῦς ὑμῶν ἐν κώ καὶ ὧν] νους
[θετοῦντας ὑμᾶς] καὶ ηγεῖται v. 13

70 [σταύρος τὸν] ἐξ [περισσοῦ]
[ἐν αἰγាគ διὰ τὸ] ἑρημοῦ ἀν
[τῶν] ἑρημευμένης ἐν αὐτῶι
[παρὰ]καθάλουμεν ἐν υἱας 
[δελφοὶ νουθετεῖτε] τους

75 [α']τ[ο'][κ]σί]νοις [παρὰ]μικρεῖσθ' 
[tους] ο[λ']γοῦ[ν]οις αντεχε
[σε] τοὺς α'[σθ]ε'νοις ἐν υἱων
[μακροθυμεῖτε] πρὸς παν

80 τι κακὸν τινι ἀπάθεοι 
[ἀλλὰ] παντοτε τὸ αἰὴγαθὸν δῶκε

tε καὶ εἰς [ἀλληλοὺς καὶ εἰς
παντα] παντοτε χαιρετε
[ἀδιαλείπτως προσευχεσθε]

85 εν πάντι εὐχαριστείτε τον
18 lines lost

17 lines lost

[δύσαμενοι θοράκα] πιστε
cαὶ καὶ αγαπη
cαὶ περικεφα

55 [λαῖον ἐπιδίδα σφωνίας ὅτι]
[ουκ ἔθετο ο θύμ] 
[ημα εἰς ὀρί]
[γνὴν ἀλλὰ εἰς π]εριποιη
c
[σωτηρίας δι] 

60 [μων παντων] ? εὐα 
[τε γρ]η

Frs. 3 + 4 recto.

[σι] καὶ περὶ ημῶν ἀσπασάσθε v. 26
105 τοὺς αὐτοὺς 
[παντα] εἰς 
[φιληματι] 
μας τον κύριον 
[ἀναγνωσθη] 

110 ρεῖ τοῦ κυρίου Ἡμᾶς 
θυμων
[πρὸς] Θεσσαλονικηκείς α

115 [Παύλου καὶ Σιλ]ουανός καὶ Π. ι. i
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Fr. 5 (middle of a column).

Verso. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>137</th>
<th>144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ρσ[</td>
<td>1ντ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1α[</td>
<td>1εετ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ρ[</td>
<td>1σετ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recto.

1–2. θελω[νεν: so ΝΑΒ and most MSS.; θελω some cursives, versions, and citations.
22. οἱ περὶ[παιδευματω: so most MSS.; om. FG &c.
25. τὸν (υπὸ)ν: so ΝΑΒ and most MSS.; some others have τὸ χριστῶ.
36. τιν: so ΝΑ &c.; ev B.
35. τοι: the ε is not usually elided here.
56. ρθ(ε)ς: so B with some cursives; ημας ο θ(ε)ς ΝΑ &c.
59. ἴνου: so Β and the Aethiopic version; for ίνυ Χυ, the ordinary reading, there is no room.
60. υπὲρ: so ΝεΑΔ and most others; περὶ Ν*Β.
67. τοι: so ΝεΑΔ and most MSS.; ως ΤΕ FG.
68. τοι: so ΝεΑΔ and most MSS.; υπερεκπερισσον ΝΑ and most MSS.; υπερεκπερισσον BD*FG. In iii. 10 and Eph. iii. 20 there is no variant for υπερεκπερισσον, but in Mark xiv. 31 ΝΒCD &c. read υπερεκπερισσον in place of εκ περισσον.
71. The supposed traces of ϵ(ρ)ναν are very doubtful, but no variant is known.
72. αὐτος: so ΝΟ* &c.; εαυτος ABDό &c.
77. ε(σθ)ναν εν νυμα: so Bartlett; the MSS. have nothing between ασθενων and μακρυμενεται.
82. και: so Ν*Β &c.; om. Ν*ΑΔ &c.
104. και: so BD* &c.; om. ΝΑΔο and most other MSS.
105. ειπερκα(ς (ΑΒΔ* &c.) suits the space better than τροκε(α (ΝΔ* and most others).
109. αδελφος τους αγιους: αδελφος Ν*B &c.; αγιος αδελφος Να &c.
111. After νμα the papyrus may have had αμην with ΝΑ &c.
112. The title agrees with ΝΒ*; other MSS. add ἐπιληπῳθεν οτι ἐτελεσθη οτι ἑγεράθη ἀπὸ Αθηρῶν.
113. The title agrees with ΝΑΒ; other MSS. prefix ἀρχεται.
114. Σιλβωνάω[ς: so ΝΑΒ &c.; some MSS. have Σιλβων.
117. Ιη(υς) τὴς Χρ(ιστί)ω: so ΝΑΒ &c.; Χ(ριστί)ω Ι(ηνυ)ω D and some others.
144. This line corresponds in position to l. 143, the upper part of the recto being lost. The first contraction was presumably some case of κύριος or χριστός, but l. 144 cannot be combined with l. 117.
A complete leaf of a papyrus codex containing Sim. viii. 6. 4–8. 3 of the Shepherd of Hermas, this being the eighth Greek fragment of that popular work which has been obtained from Egypt, besides a few Coptic fragments; cf. 1172. int. and Berl. Klassikertexte, vi, p. 16. The two pages are numbered 72 and 73, the columns being slightly longer than those in 1172, where Sim. ii occupies pp. 70–1. The script of the major portion is a medium-sized upright semiuncial with a tendency to exaggerate the last stroke of α, κ, and λ. Something seems to have gone wrong with the verso, where the original writing has been obliterated in ll. 5–6 and from 7 onwards, and a larger and less practised hand, which imitates the style of the first, takes its place up to the end of the page. The leaf was found with dated third-century documents, but the writing hardly suggests so early a date, and it more probably belongs to the fourth century, like 1172, than to the last quarter of the third. θέως and κύριος are contracted, as usual. Pauses are indicated by high stops and blank spaces. An apostrophe is sometimes used to mark elision or divide double consonants.

The text is not very good, being prone to omissions, especially owing to homoioteleuton, as in ll. 19–20, 25, 27, 40–1; cf. ll. 3, 9, 18, 22, 24, 32, 33, 41, 45, where 1599 is in nearly all cases clearly wrong. Other slips occur, e.g. in l. 29. But naturally the difference of nine centuries between the dates of 1599 and the Codex Athous, which for this part of the Shepherd is the sole Greek authority, expresses itself by a number of improvements in the older text. In five places (ll. 9 ἐλάλησας, 20, 31, 37, 54) it supports one or both of the Latin versions against the Athous, which in l. 54 had corrupted αὐτῶν to λοιπῶν, as discerned by Hilgenfeld. Of the other variants the most noteworthy occur in ll. 3–4, 5, 11, 25, 38, 42, 46, 48, 50, 56. Most of these are probably right; that in ll. 3–4 is apparently supported by the Aethiopic version. There are, as usual in Hermas papyri, several changes in the order of words (ll. 6, 30, 44, 47, 49, 52), where the evidence of the older witness is generally the more credible; cf. 1172. int.

The collation with the text of the Codex Athous (ca) is based on Lake's transcript in Facsimile of the Athos fragments of the Shepherd of Hermas, which supersedes Simonides's transcript used by Gebhardt-Harnack and the imperfect collation of Georgandas. The information as to the Latin Vulgate and Palatine versions (L¹ and L²) and Aethiopic version (A) is obtained from Gebhardt-Harnack's and Hilgenfeld's editions. A new edition of the Shepherd is much to be desired.
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Verso.

απὸ τῶν τοιούτων η ζωή ἀπεθανοῦσα

οἱ δὲ τὸν δεκατέρον καὶ ἀστριοῦν ἐπιδεδωκότες καὶ

οὔτω: ἐγγὺς αὐτῶν ἦσαν ὑποκρίται καὶ ἑσφεροῦσαν ἐπιτερας· καὶ ἑκατοτέρον τε [s] τους

δουλους του δεκατέρου (2nd hand) μὴ αφεντες α[1st h.ε]τους (2nd h.) μετανεοῦν·
αλλὰ ταῖς διδαχαίς ταῖς μωραῖς πειθοῦντες αὐτοὺς

οὔτω οὖν ἔχουσιν ἐλπίδα τοῦ μετανοησαί: βλέπεις

dε ξα αὐτῶν μετανεοῦσαις αὖ ὅτε ἐλαληθάσας

αὐτοῖς ταῖς ἐντολαῖς μου· καὶ εἰς μετανόησον·

οὐσί δὲ οὐ μετανοήσαν απολέσαν τὴν ψυχὴν

αὐτῶν· οὐσί δὲ μετανοήσαν εἰς αὐτῶν αγαθοῖς·

εἴσευναι· καὶ εἰς ἐναλήθη εἰς τὸ τινὲς·

τα τιχῆ τα πρῶτα· τίνες δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν πυρὶνον

ανεβησαν· βλέπεις οὖν φήσιν σοι τὴν μετανοια

τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ζωὴν εἶχεν τὸ δὲ μὴ μετα

νοήσαν ὄντως καὶ οὐ ημιξήρους εἰπει·

δόκαν καὶ εἰς αὐτῶς σχισμάς εἶχον· ακονε πε[ρήμε]ν

αὐτῶν· οὐσιν ησαν αἱ ραβδοί· ημιξήρους [·

διψαγεις εἰς αὐτῶς καὶ καταλαλεῖ τηρηθεῖν εἰρηνεύν

οικες εἰς αὐτοὺς· ἀλλα διχοστατοῦντες πᾶν

τοῖς καὶ τούτοις φήσιν εἰς κατανοησια βλέπεις·

φήσιν τινας ἡδη εἰς αὐτῶν μετανάζειν

ηκότας· καὶ εἰς ἐναλήθη στὶν εἰς αὐτοὺς μετα[νασια

οὐς οὐς φήσιν εἰς αὐτῶν μετανεοῦσαι·

βραδυτερον εἰς τα τιχῆ κατοικησοῦν·

οἱ δὲ οὐ μετανοησαίν ταῖς προς[σ]ιν αὐτῶν

θανατωι ἀποθανοῦνται·

Recto.

1st hand ὁ[σοὶ δὲ] χλωρας ἐπιδεδωκότες τας ραβδοὺς αὐτῶν

καὶ [σχισμᾶς ε]χοῦσας οὔτοι παντοτε πιστοι καὶ
ayalogi] egevento exontes de yflov tina ev
al'ηλyois peri proptwv kai peri dojgas. alla
pantes outoi moroi eisv ev al'ηλyois. alla kai ou
toi akousantes tov eunvlov mou ayaiboi
ontes ekatharismav eautovs kai meteuropev
taxu egevento ouv y katokhvaiois autov eis tov
puryov. evav de tis autov palin epistrapev
bav eivn diiskoxiasian ek kol'mepeterai tov puryov
kai apolestv tnu yfuvn auton. y fuv panta
40 eivn tnu tpyounvtau tais enotovs tau ky
kai tais enotovs de peri proptwv n peri dojev
ouv eivn alla peri makrodumiai kai peri tapi
vof(n)suunjv androv en tois de toinoutois y yfuv
ek vev de tois diiskoxotai v kai paranoimai
bavatoi.

35 tao de epidevdovtovv tais rabyovs miasv xlovas miasv
kata ouv eivn ouv tais pragmatias autov
epetphvmenov kai tais agioiv y kol'kewmeno
dia touto to ymuion autov yfuv kai to ymuion
apevanev pollov ouv akousantes tais enotovalv mou mete

50 nopevoun ouv ouv meteuropev y katokhvaiois autov
[eivn] tnu puryov tines de autov eivs telos apetevnav
ouv metanov v stou eunosv dia tais pragmav
[tau] y[ar] autov elasvdav(y)k]vnav tnu ky kai apetevnav
[vauv] apolevoun ouv tnu yfuvn autov dia tnu po

55 ymuion yn epraxav pollov de ey auton elasvdvnav
ouv ouv oti eunosv metanovv eivn tais meteuropev

1. tpyounv: so ca and L²; L¹ adds ergo, A igitur. The termination of the word following tpyounv is very uncertain; but, though the obliteration might be accidental instead of intentional, tpyounv does not seem long enough.

3. autov eivn autov yfuvv ouv tis elygev autov yfuv yar ca, supported by L¹-L² and A.

3-4. [bid]oxai eusefroantes etepos; biv, xias elisf. ca. pravas in L¹-L² perhaps implies a different adjective, but A's duplicem (docirinav) seems to support etepos, for which cf. Gal. i 6 etepov elagikov. The Gnostics are supposed to be meant.

5. µα[λ]λιστα: or possibly µαλλιστα.

πίλευ: om. ca, L².

ημαρτηκοτες: ημαρτηκοτας ca; cf. l. 9, where the accusative in -es recurs, and Jannaris, Hist. Gr. Gram. p. 120.
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6. ἀφεντες: ἀφεντες ἐὰν in accordance with the other participles.

autou metanouson: metanouson ἀπ'. ἐὰν.

7. πιθανοτες: so ca and L1 (delineantes); delineant L2; sedecunt A.

9. εἰ αυτῶν: πολλάκις εἰ αὐτ. ἐὰν with L1L2.

metanunymontes: καὶ metanunymontes ἐὰν; cf. l. 5, n.

περ' ἐνα τις ἐὰν.

εἰλάνθα: so L1L2 (pertulisti); εἰλάνθα ἐὰν; mutatio est A. Editors prefer εἰλάνθα.

 Cf. the passage immediately preceding l. 1, where ca has εἰλάνθα, but L1 implies εἰλάνθα.


11. metanouson: metanouson ἐὰν; egerint (v.l. egerint) L1L2. metanouson is probably due to a reminiscence of l. 10.

ψύχην: ζωήν ἐὰν; viitam L1L2.


16. εἰχεν: ξέγει ἐὰν; inesse (vitam) L1L2.

18. περὶ καὶ περὶ ἐὰν; de (his) tere L1L2.

19-20. οἱ ῥαβδοὶ[8] ἡμισθίων διηγοῦν εἰσὶ καὶ καταλαλοῦν: οἱ ῥαβδοὶ καθὰ (λ. κατὰ) τὸ αὐτὸ ἡμισθίων διηγοῦν εἰσὶν αὐτὴ γὰρ κύστιν ἀυτὴν τεθνήκασιν. οἱ δὲ ἡμισθίων ἡξοντες καὶ ἐν αὐτῶν σχημάζον, ἥτοι καὶ διηγοῦν καὶ καταλαλοῦν εἰσίν ἐὰν, the omissions in 1599 being mostly due to homoioteleuton; cf. int. The archetype of 1599 may well have already lost καθὰ τὸ αὐτὸ, which is omitted by L2 and A (tanthummodo L1).

20. μηδέποτε: et πιθανοτες L1L2; καὶ μηδέποτε Gebh.-Harn.; but καὶ is superfluous.

22. καὶ: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν; et (his) quidem L1; naut et L2.

23. ὡδί: om. ca, L1L2.

24. εἰς εἰς εἶν τὸν ἄνων μεταφέρον: ἐτέ, φησίν, εἶν τὸν ἄνων ἐπι γεῖν μεταφέρον. ca.

25. οὐκ οὐκ εἰς ὅσοι εἰς ὅσοι μεταφέρον; καὶ ὅσοι εἰς ὅσοι; quiescere tere p. 1L2; quiescere enim L2.

metanunymontes: metanunymontes ἐὰν; cf. ll. 19-20, n.

26. καταφθασὼν: -σους ca. Cf. l. 10, n. The supposed stop may be part of the κ of καταφθασών in l. 25.

27. οἱ δὲ μετανουσαι: so L1, qui tere non egerint; δοὺ οἱ δὲ μετανουσαι ἄλλα ἐμενοῦνται ca. Cf. ll. 10, 19, 20, and 29, nn.

29. οἱ: om. ca. Cf. l. 27 where the papyrus has οἱ for οἰοί.

30. οὐν οὐντος: οὐντος οὐντος ca.

31. δὲ: om. ca; but sed L1L2.

32. δοξα: 1. δοξα. δοξά τινος ca with L2 (dignitate quadam); L1 omits quadam. Cf. l. 41, n.

33. εἰ σναλὰς: add ἡξοντες περὶ προτειον ἐὰν, which edd. emend by inserting τὸν ἐὰν after ἡξοντες from L1 ἑλον inter se aemulationem de principatu et L2 de principatu certamin.

35. ἐκαθαρων: ἐκαθαρώσαν ca.

37. αὐτῶν: so L1L2 (corum); om. ca.

ἐπιστραφῆ: ἐπιστρεφῆ; redierit L1L2. In classical authors the passive was used in this sense; but cf. Matt. xii. 44 ἐπιστρεφέται εἰς τῶν ὁδῶν ματ.

38. ἐκκαλθησάται: ἐκκαλθησάται ἀπὸ ca; expelletur L1L2. ἐκκαλλᾶν is not attested, but seems not unlikely here; cf. l. 47 τοις αὐτοῖς μη καλλωμένοι. β and κ are often very similar in cursive hands from the second century onwards.

40-1. τῶν πτωχῶν τῶν ἐντολάς τοῦ κρατῆς καὶ τῶν ἐντολάς δε: τῶν τὰς ἐντ. τοῦ κρατῆς καὶ τῶν ἐντολάς δε: τῶν τὰς ἐντ. τοῦ κρατῆς καὶ τῶν ἐντολάς δε ca with L2; (vita enim) corum qui custodiunt mandata domini in mandali consistit L1. καὶ may be a mistake for κατα, but εὐ τοις δὲ τωνοῦσα occurs in l. 43.
1599. HERMAS, PASTOR, SIM. VIII

41. δοκέω: δέδημα τινάς ca with L1L2.
42. ταπεινοφορικός: ταπεινοφορίας ca; humilitatem animae L1; animi humil. L2. 

L2. ταπεινοφορίας occurs several times in the N. T. and 1 Clem. and in the Shepherd twice, Vīs. iii. 10. 6, Sim. v. 3. 7; but for ταπεινοφορίας Stephanus only quotes Tertullian. 1599 is likely to be right.

43. ἐν τοῖς ὑπό τινος ἐν τοῖς τεκτόνοις ὁδὸν ca. L1 has for ll. 42–3 per patientiam . . .

vilam homines consequenter.

44. ἐν τοῖς διαχορταίς: ἐν τοῖς διαχορταίς δὲ ca. ἐν ὑπὸ has been corrected. 

45. τῶν ἐπίθετοι· oí ἐπίθετοι ca, rightly.

46. ταῖς πραγματείαις αὕτων: ἐν ταῖς πραγματείαις ca; negotiationibus (involuti) L1L2.

47. τοῖς ἀγοις μὴ κολλωμεν: μὴ κολλ. τοῖς ἀγ. ca.

48. καὶ τὸ ἡμαῖν αὐ𝔁αναν: τὸ δὲ ἡμῖν ἄκρον ἐστὶν ca; dimidium mortuum est L1; dimidiae mortuæ sunt L2.

49. τῶν εὐτανοῦ μοι: μοι τῶν ἐντ. ca.

50. οὖν: γοῦν ca; L1L2 om. οᓄϲ ο.setBackgroundResource.

52. διὰ τὰς πραγματείας γὰρ: διὰ γὰρ τ. πραγμ. ca.

54. [οἷον: Hilgenfeld's conjecture for the meaningless λοιπὸν of ca is confirmed; cf. et cum abnegaverunt L1, enimque abneg. L2.

56. οὖν: om. ca; adhuc et his est regressus qui si cito . . . L1; quibus adhuc per celerem poenitentiam regressio est L2.

1600. TREATISE ON THE PASSION.

22.5 × 7.8 cm. Fifth century.

This and the next three fragments (1601–3) all come from works which do not seem to be extant, though in the absence of an adequate patristic lexicon, except for the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists, this is not quite certain. None of them is likely to have been composed before the third or fourth century. 1600, which is most of a leaf from a papyrus codex, contains part of a treatise on the Passion as foreshadowed in the Old Testament by various types such as Abel, Joseph, and Moses, and being therefore at once both old and new; illustrations from Deuteronomy and the Psalms are quoted. The verso clearly follows the recto, with an interval of perhaps not more than a single line at the top. The script is a good-sized round uncial of a formal type. The mound in which 1600 was found produced mainly fifth-century documents, and that century rather than the sixth is likely to be the date of the papyrus. The customary contractions for θεός, κύριος, and Χριστός occur. Pauses are indicated sometimes by high stops or blank spaces, but the employment of them is irregular. There are a few marginal corrections in a similar but not identical hand. On both sides of the papyrus the surface is much damaged in places. The restorations are largely due to Dr. Bartlet, who suggests that 1600 may come from Hippolytus, Πρὸς ἱουδαίους.
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Recto.

[... ...] Χ[ε]ρπν' ὁσ[ι ...]
[... ...] [.] πιστεως
[... ...] ε]κ μακρον προσ
[... ...] ουτω δη και το
5 [του κυ πι]δες εκ μακρου
[... ...] οθεν δια δε τυ
[που δηλω θ]εν σημερον
[εν ημιν θ] ηυχανει τετε
[λειωμε]ρον ]κ
10 [ ... ...]ας καινον το πα
[λαιον] νομιζω[μενον]
[εστι γ]αρ καινον και πια
[λαιον το] του κυ μυστη]
[ριον πιαλαιον μεν και]
15 [τα το]υ νομον καινον []
[δε κατα την χαριν αλλ ηαν]
[αποβ]λεψης εις τον τυποτ]
[και]νον οφη δια της θυ
[δοσε]θωσ τουν ει βον ει]
20 [λει το] του κυ μυστηριο []
[γνωρια]ι αποβλεψη δη]
[εις το]υ Αβελ· του δι αθελ]
[φου φ]ιλωμενον εις
[του ...] του νομιως
25 [ ... ...] [μου]μενον
[εις το]υ Ιοσηφ· τουν το [μου][ως]
πιταρσκουμε
[νο]ι εις τον Μωσεα
[τον] νομιως εκτιθει[μενον]

Verso.

30 τον ομοιωσ με
[νων εις τρις αλλους]
[τους ομοιως [κακως πα]
[σχοντες αποβ]λεψειν δε
[και εις τον εν Ησα]ια ως
35 προβατον σφ]αχθεντα
[του παταξαντα ...]
[και σωσαντα [πολλους] ]
[περι του αιματος [ ... ...]]
[δια προφητικης γραφης]
40 το του κυ μυστηριου
... ο μεν ω [μεν γαρ]
[Μωσης προφητευσε]
[και οφειθε την ]ζωην υ
[μων κρεμαμεν ι εμπρο
45 σθεν των οφθαλμων υ
[μων νυκτος και ημερας]
[και ου πιστευση τε εις την]
[ζωην υμων ο [δε Δαυειδ]
[ει]πεν ια τι εφραμειν εθεν και
50 λαοι εμελετησον κενα
[ταρασησαν οι βασιλεις]
[της γης και οι α]ρχοντες
[ανηχθησαν επι το αν]
[το κατα του κυ και κατα τον]
55 Χυ αυτου ον ... ει[... ...]
[e .. ως αρνιον [εις σφαγην]
[αγομενον του ...] [ ... ...]
[ελογισαιτο ... [ ... ...]
' Thus the Passion of the Lord which was (foreknown) for a long time and revealed by a pattern, to-day finds itself fulfilled in us . . . new which was thought old. For the mystery of the Lord is new and old, old in respect of the law, but new in respect of grace. But if thou wilt consider the pattern, thou wilt see that it is new by the giving (?) of God. If then thou wishest to know the mystery of the Lord, consider Abel who was killed through his brother; . . . who was likewise . . ; Joseph who was likewise sold; Moses who was likewise exposed; . . . who was likewise . . .; the others who likewise suffered evil things. And consider also him who in Isaiah was slain as a sheep, who (was ?) struck . . . and saved (many). Concerning the blood . . . the mystery of the Lord is (revealed) through prophetic writing. For Moses prophesied “And ye shall see your life hanging before your eyes night and day, and ye shall have no assurance of your life”. And David said “Why did the nations rage and the peoples imagine vain things? The kings of the earth set themselves and the rulers took counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed”. Whom . . . they considered as a lamb led to the slaughter . . .'

8-9. τετελεσμένον or τετελεσμένου would be expected, but hardly fills up l. 9, which is shorter than the rest and perhaps ends a sentence.

17. τον τυπον: the reading is very doubtful; but neither παλαιον not το παλαιον is satisfactory, and cf. l. 6. It is not quite certain that a fragment containing the supposed ὅ of τυπον, ὅ in l. 18, and the top of the ν of βουν and σφ in l. 19 is rightly placed here.

19. The marginal note apparently corrects ει βουλει το εαυ βουλη. λγ may have been written in the margin below εαυ or at the beginning of l. 20, or possibly εαυ | [βουν]λη should be restored at the ends of ll. 19-21. δι is, however, preferable in l. 21; cf. n.

21. There is a space between πατουσιν and δι, which perhaps belongs to a marginal addition beginning in l. 19; cf. n. δι is not wanted, πατουσιν being the apodosis of ει βουλη (but cf. l. 33, where there is room for δι); and δι is more likely.

22. The readings after Ἀβιά are very uncertain, but τον νπο του | [Καιν φ]δενομενον does not suit the vestiges.

24-5. εις [τον ιν]βακ τον ομοιον [νπο πρ]σφακομενον is unsuitable, though σφακομενον does not suggest an appropriate word.


34-5. Cf. Isa. liii. 7 ὃς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγήν ᾑχθη and ll. 56-7.

36. πατουσιντά: πατουσιντα would be expected.

43-8. A loose quotation of Deut. xxviii. 66 καὶ ἔσται ἡ ζωή σου κρεμαμένη ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου, καὶ φοβηθήσῃ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, καὶ αὐτοί πιστεύσει τῇ ζωή σου.

49-55 = Psalm ii. 1.


59-60. This unplaced fragment, being blank on the verso, presumably came near the ends of lines; but at the ends of ll. 13-15 there is apparently nothing lost. It is not clear which way up it is to be read.

1601. Homily on Spiritual Warfare.

12.7 x 10.2 cm. Late fourth or fifth century.

The lower part of a leaf of a papyrus codex containing a homily of some kind on the warfare of the soul, largely concerned with Joel i. 6 (ll. 2 sqq.) and 8 (ll. 23-8), but also referring to Hosea iii. 3 (ll. 29-30) and perhaps the Pentateuch
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(l. 32). For much of the reconstruction we are indebted to Dr. Bartlet. The script is a medium-sized semiuncial of the late fourth or fifth century, with occasional high stops and the usual contractions of θεός and probably κύριος, but not of νῖός. Abbreviations are found on the recto, which probably followed the verso, and these perhaps occurred at the ends of lines of the verso also. Brown ink was employed.

Verso.

[... ]ωμεῖν ........................
[..]ωμεν του νου [οτι εθυνος ανεβη
eπι του γην του κυ ισχυρον γη
gαρ φησιν αι ψυχαι των αγιων
5 και η ψυχη του θιον της απωλει(ας)?
εθυνος εξουσιων του κομου του
tου και πνευματικη εστιν ημιν
η παλη και αοβαινειν αυτο; ισχυν
ρον τυγχανον και ανεν αρι
10 θεων ον η τεταρτη ...........
κατα τουτο γαρ λεικεται ανα
ριθμητον τουτου [δε του εθυνο
[οι] οδουνες λεωντοισ ότι ο αντι
[δι]κος υμων διαβολος περιπατει
15 [ζ]ητων καταπιειν [.....]

Recto.

[εται[.......]
[πυρον αι[.....]
] κεραυνηση ριπτι
[ν αυτων απολυσι
]ρον περιτιθησιν δε
] οπερ δηλουται εν
[της μετα[ν]] ταυτα
θρηνησον προς με
2.5. ... because "a nation is come up on the land of the Lord in strength". By "land" he means the souls of the holy, and the soul of the son of destruction by the "nation" of the powers of this world; and our wrestling is spiritual. And it "is come up being strong and without numbers", of which the fourth ...; for on this account it has been called numberless. Of this nation "the teeth are those of a lion" because your adversary the Devil walketh about seeking to devour ... .

1. ἑσνεν: the first and third letters might be z, and the same applies to ἑσνεν in I. 2.

2-3. Cf. Joel i. 6 δι᾽ αὐτὸς ἀνέθη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν μον ἰδιωρῶν καὶ ἀναρίθμητον, οἱ ἀδώντες αὐτοῦ ἀδώντες λέωντος, καὶ αἱ μιλαὶ αὐτοῦ σκέμων.

6. α of ἑνὸς has been corrected.

7-8. Cf. Eph. vi. 12 δι᾽ αὐτὸς ἐστίν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλιν πρὸς αἶμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ ... πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας.

13-15. Cf. 1 Peter v. 8 ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος, ός λέων ἀρνόμενος, περιπατεῖ ζητῶν τίνα καταστήσει.

18. κεραυνὴς: κεραυνὸς is known, but apparently not κεραυνήν.

23-4. Cf. Joel i. 8 θρίψατον πρὸς με ὑπέρ νυμφῆς περιεξωσμένη σάκκον ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνδρὰ αὐτῆς τῶν παρθένων. There is not room here for περιεξωσμένη, unless it was contracted, and certainly not for υπὲρ νυμφῆς as well, so that the quotation was probably not verbal; cf. II. 2-3 and 29-30, nn.

29-30. Cf. Hos. iii. 3 καὶ εἶπα πρὸς αὐτήν, Ἡμέρας πολλὰς καθήσετι ἐπὶ ἐμοί, καὶ οὐ μὴ πορεύσῃς ... .

1602. HOMILY TO MONKS.

12.5 x 10.8 cm. Late fourth or fifth century.

A leaf of a vellum codex containing apparently the beginning of a section of a homily to ascetics on the spiritual warfare as illustrated by the history of Israel. The vellum is stained and shrivelled in places, rendering the decipherment sometimes difficult, especially on the verso (the flesh-side?), where the ink is fainter; and we are indebted to suggestions of Dr. Bartlet
for several readings. The script is a good-sized uncial of the early biblical type, not quite as old as 406 (Part iii, Plate i) or 849 (Part vi, Plate i), but probably of the late fourth century rather than the fifth. O is written small and the middle of Ω is slurred, as in 1597 (Plate i). Stops are freely employed, these being generally in the middle position, but double dots and a mark like an apostrophe are also used. A breathing is inserted in I. 4. θεῶς, Ἰησοῦς, Ἰσραήλ, κύριος, πνεῦμα, and Χρυστός are contracted. Some remarkable expressions occur in ll. 32–7.

Recto.

στρατιώται Χν. ακουσάτε πο

σακίς εκ χειρός ανθρώπων ο

θεο ερρύσατο τον Ἰησοῦν και με

χριῶν τα προς τον κύριον ετή

ρωσάν ὅνει ἀπέστη απ' αὐτῶν:

εκ χειρός γαρ Φαραώ εσώ

σεν αὐτὸν οντός ανθρώπων.

καὶ Ωγ βασιλεὼς ἀνοικτοὶ ῥυ.

καὶ Αδαμ. μετὰ τῶν αλλό

φυλῶν και επει τα προς θε

ετηρούσαν ετη εὐθείαις

αυτοῖς εκ καρπού τῆς ύποκυ

νας επαγγελμανος γην

Χανααναίων καὶ ὑπετάζε

αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἀλλοφυλούς.

καὶ μετὰ αὐτὰ σας εν τῇ τῆ

ἐρήμῳ καὶ τα άνδρῳ [καὶ]

παρεσχέντε οπτοὺς προφητάς ἐξεπεμψέν

κηρυσσόν τῃς κύριοι

Soldiers of Christ, hear how often God delivered Israel from the hand of the lawless, and while they kept the things pertaining to the Lord He did not withdraw from them—for He saved Israel from the hand of Pharaoh the lawless, and from Og, a more unholy king, and from Arad with the men of other nations, and when they kept the things pertaining to God He still gave to them from the fruit of strength, having promised to them the land of Canaan, and He subjected to them the men of other nations—and again how

Verso.

Χν Ἰν οἰνίνες κατα ταξιν

καὶ κληρον (καὶ) μερισμόν λα

βοντες πνὰ Χριω καλοπαθοῦ

τευ υπὸ τὸν λαον ανηρβη

σαν. ανηρβησαν' αποφάτα

τευ πνὸς ζωντος κατα

τας [αν]ομίας αυτῶν εσ

φαλη[ειαν] τής κληρονομί

ας. της αιωνίου και τήν a

δελφαὶ μεμεῖα νικηται

μεν[α]τε εως αν νπομεινὰ

τευ κ[υ]ρομεν τήν προσέλευ

σιν τήν προς κύριον και συμ

φυτῶν και ωπλον ευνά

κιας λαβομεν Χν Ἰν. αυτὸ

ὑπερ ἡμῶν φωνὰ εαυτῷ

γην [κα]ὶ οὐτῶς ὡς εστὶν-

καὶ παραλαβέτε τὴν λογον

οτι πνὰ δυναμεως επ ι

σχοτο των καιρον . . .
He supplied them in the desert and waterless place, and in addition He sent forth prophets to herald our Lord Christ Jesus, men who receiving in order and lot and due portion the spirit of Christ and suffering ills from the people were put to death. They were destroyed because they departed from the living Spirit after their own lawlessness; they lost the eternal inheritance. And now, brethren, remain conquerors. Remain until having endured we attain the approach unto the Lord, and receive as innate and a shield of well-pleasing Christ Jesus, Him who planted Himself for our sakes on earth so as He is; and accept the word, because a spirit of power in the last time ...

4. ετηρσαν: this form of the imperfect was introduced in the second century B.C.; cf. Mayser, Grammatik d. græch. Pop. aus d. Ptolemäerzeit, p. 323.

9. Αδάρ μετ’α ιων αλλοφυλων: Άδαρ is a Jewish month, not a proper name, and seems to be corrupt, probably for Άραδ the Canaanite (Numb. xxi. 1-3).

11. καινός τος λαχος: a phrase apparently meaning 'spoil'.

12. καινός: the subject reverts to ανωτες in l. 15, i.e. the Jews.

17. και has dots above it; cf. l. 37.

22. The correction (if the supposed vestige of ι above the line is really ink) may be by the first hand.

25. απεδήμων: the subject reverts to ανωτες in l. 15, i.e. the Jews.

32-5. We have not been able to find a parallel for the expressions in these lines.

36. φωνα is used transitively, as if it were φωνα. The traces suit φ very well. Cf. ἐφαντο for ἐφανεν in two British Museum Greek inscriptions, nos. 1004 and 1074, discussed by J. A. R. Munro in Class. Rev. 1917. 142.

37. γη: the dots above και indicating deletion are clear, but the scribe does not seem to have also placed dots over γη. He (or the preacher) apparently meant ἐν γη. πετα cannot be read instead. For γη as equivalent to human nature Bartlet compares Barn. vi. 9

38. λογος: i.e. the preacher's discourse probably, rather than the Gospel.

1803. HOMILY CONCERNING WOMEN.

21-1 x 13-3 cm. Fifth or sixth century.

The upper part of a column of a roll written in a large sloping uncial hand of the fifth or sixth century with light brown ink. The subject is a diatribe, addressed probably to ascetics, against the female sex, through whom the Evil One is wont to exert his wiles. Examples from the Bible are cited in ll. 1-11, a passage which seems to be modelled on Hebr. xi; the rest consists of a more general condemnation. A contraction αγ(γη)λων and stops in the high and (more commonly) middle position occur. 403 (Apocalypse of Baruch; Part iii, Plate i; fifth century) is a somewhat earlier specimen of this type of uncial, of which sixth-century specimens in smaller hands occur in P. Cairo Maspero 67097 verso (i. Plates xxviii–ix) and 67177 verso (ii. Plates xix–xx).

[... γυναικ ?]α του Ουριαν δε[ [... ・・・] δια γυναικος τον σοφωτατον [Σο]λα]ομων προς παραβασιν [παρηγγαγε ?]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

dia γυναικὸς τον αὐδριωτ[ατον Σαμψθν
5 ἔφησας ετυφλώσε. δια γυναικὸς τοις νιους Ηλει του ιερεως εδαφίσας εκτανε; δια γυναικὸς τον ουρανον [......... edωξε. δια γυναικὸς τοιν ............ Ιωσηφ εν φυλ(α)ης δεσμευσαίς .............
10 δια γυναικὸς τον παντοπ[......... Ἡλαυνην απετεμεν. τι δε υμιν ερω δια γυναικὸς τους ἀγλους [............ κα τεβάλε. δια γυναικὸς παντας[......... παντας φονευει. παντας ατίμαζει?
15 γυνη γαρ αναίδης ουδενος φε[ιδεται? ou Δευτην τιμα· ουκ ιερεα φ[ν ............. ou προφητην αιδειται· πι[αντον ......... κακιστον γυνη πονηρα [π]αντων ......... εαν δε και πλοντον εχη τη πονηρια αντης
20 [σ]υνεργουντα: δισουν το κακων [............. [.]τοξω. [.] αθεραπευτου [.]. ............

'... the wife of Uriah ...; by a woman he turned aside the most wise Solomon (?) to transgression; by a woman he shaved and blinded the most brave Samson; by a woman he dashed to the ground and (slew) the sons of Eli the priest; by a woman he ... and persecuted heaven; by a woman he bound the most ... Joseph in prison and ...; by a woman he cut off the head of the all ... John. What shall I say to you? By a woman he ... cast forth the angels; by a woman he ... all, he slays all, he dishonours all. For a shameless woman spares none ..., honours not a Levite, reverences not a priest, not a ..., not a prophet. A wicked woman is the worst of all (ills?), the ... of all; and if she also have wealth as her ally in wickedness, the evil is double ...'

7. There is hardly room for more than a participle at the end of the line. Gen. vi. 1 sqq. seems to be referred to; cf. l. 12 and II Peter ii. 4.
10. παντοπ[ : or παντογ[. παντοπ[αθη by itself is too short, but another word may have fol owed.
14. ατιμαζει is rather short and ατιμους ποιει can be read; cf. l. 15.
15. φε[ιδεται: or φε[ε[ιδομεν] ...
16. ου πρεσβυτερον and ουκ αποσταλων are rather long, but ου βασιλεα is possible.
17. Perhaps πι[αντον κακων or ζωων.
21. ε can be read in place of ε. το ζωων αθεραπευτον is too short, but it is not quite certain that a letter is lost before το.
II. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1604. Pindar, Dithyrambs.

Fr. 1 18 x 25:3 cm. Late second century.

Plate I (Fr. 1).

To the valuable papyri of Pindar already obtained from Oxyrhynchus (cf. 1614. int.) have now to be added two fragments of a roll containing his dithyrambs, an important section of the poet’s works hitherto represented only by the first 18 lines of an ode for the Athenians about Semele (Fr. 75 Schroeder) and a few short quotations. Two of these from the same dithyramb fortunately occur in the papyrus, thus establishing its authorship and character, while another Pindaric citation from an unspecified ode is also present. The larger fragment contains the middle portion of two columns, of which the first comes from a point near the conclusion of a dithyramb probably for the Argives, the second from the beginning of a dithyramb for the Thebans. The smaller fragment belongs to a third ode, possibly for the Corinthians, and may have preceded the other two instead of following them. According to the βίος Πινδάρου prefixed to the Codex Vratislaviensis there were two books of his dithyrambs, and the scholiast on Ol. xiii. 25 states that in the first (book) Pindar attributed the discovery of the dithyramb to Thebes (Fr. 71). This claim is likely to have been made in an ode for the Thebans, which may well have been the second of the three poems in 1604. If so, all three odes probably belong to the 1st book. Little can be made of the first and third dithyrambs owing to the loss of the beginnings of lines, but the first 30 lines of the second are nearly complete. In the reconstruction and interpretation of this difficult papyrus we are indebted for a number of valuable suggestions to Professors J. B. Bury and A. E. Housman, Sir John E. Sandys, Mr. H. Stuart Jones, and Mr. E. Lobel.

The dithyramb according to the usual view, which has recently been disputed by Professor Ridgeway,1 was originally a song to Dionysus, as the paean was a song to Apollo, but enlarged its scope in the time of Pindar’s predecessors, Lasus and Simonides. The latter wrote dithyrambs entitled Εὔρυπα and Μέμνων, and perhaps one on Δαναΐ, if the well-known fragment about her comes from a dithyramb rather than from a θρηνός. Pindar and Bacchylides belong to the middle dithyrambic period. Later dithyrambic poets exercised greater

freedom in their choice of subjects, and in Roman times ‘dithyramb’ seems to have been applied to any lyric poem which contained a narrative concerning the heroes; cf. Plut. De Mus. i0 and Jebb, Bacchyl, p. 39. Concerning the form and character of the dithyramb hardly anything was known before the discovery of the Bacchylides papyrus; but in this the last seven odes (xiv–xx Blass; xix and xx are mere fragments) are generally regarded as dithyrambs, though this classification of them is not altogether free from doubt, for, while xvi is called a dithyramb by Servius (c. 400 A.D.) and in 1091, it is in fact a paean to Apollo, and xix might be a ἀμφάνιος. The titles of these odes are ‘Ἀντηρομέναι Ἡ Ἐλεύσι τοῖς ἔπαινοις,’ 'Ἡρακλῆς,' 'Πηθοῖγος ᾽ Θησεύς, Θησεύς,' 'Ἰώ (Ἄθηναίος),’ 'Ἰδας (Λακεδα- μονίους),’ and [Καστανόρα?]. Dionysus is introduced only in xviii, the essential feature of these poems being the presentation of a myth. The metre is in only one case (xiv) dactylo-epitritic, which is generally employed in the epinician odes; but the division into strophes, antistrophes, and epodes is found in four out of the five well-preserved dithyrambs, the fifth having only strophes. The introduction of ‘free verse’ (ἀπολελογένα), not in strophes, is ascribed sometimes to Melanippides, a younger contemporary of Pindar (so Jebb, op. cit. p. 46, Weir Smyth, Greek Melic poets, iii), sometimes to Lasus, or to Pindar himself (Crusius in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. v. 1214) on the evidence of (1) Horace, Odes iv. 2.10 seu per audaces nova dithyrambos verba devolvit numerisque fertur lege solutis, (2) Pseudo-Censorinus, c. 9 Pindari . . . qui liberos etiam numeris modos edidit, (3) Fr. 75 about Semele, which is thought to be in ‘free verse’, (4) Pindar’s reference in Fr. 79 to his predecessors’ poetry as σχονωτένεα, which has been supposed to imply division into triads as contrasted with his own verse.

The new find, so far as it goes, does not contribute much to support Horace’s description of Pindar’s dithyrambs. Apart from σχονωτένεα (II. 1) there are only two new words εἰδάμπυς (I. 13) and ἀκαμπτεῖ (III. 12). Dithyramb I was certainly arranged in triads, II either in triads or, less probably, in strophes, while the remains of III are not long enough to show the arrangement. Hence, in the absence of any definite evidence for supposing that Fr. 75 is in ‘free verse’, that fragment can quite well be regarded as parallel to the first strophe of II, which is of about the same length. Fr. 79 happens to occur in II, and the recovery of the context of that passage so important for the history of the dithyramb shows that Pindar was not referring to the distinction between triads and ἀπολελο- μένα. The metre of II, and probably of III also, is dactylo-epitritic, that of I logaoedic, like Fr. 75. There are some irregularities (cf. II. 4–6, 8–11, 12, 13–14, 15–16, 19, 30, nn.), but hardly more prominent than those in the epinician odes. With regard to the subjects of the dithyrambs, the title of II was ‘Heraclès the bold or Cerberus’, an episode also treated by Stesichorus (Fr. 11), another
exploit of Heracles being treated by Bacchylides (cf. p. 28). I was apparently concerned with the deeds of an Argive hero, perhaps Perseus. The subject of III is uncertain, for the extant fragment comes from a part of the dithyramb in which Dionysus was apparently addressed. He is also prominent in II, and is referred to in I, so that Pindar’s dithyrambs were clearly more of the nature of Dionysiac odes than those of Bacchylides. There is no trace of any of the three odes having taken the form of a dialogue such as Bacchyl. xvii. On the whole the impression created by the new find is that Pindar as a dithyrambist was distinctly conservative, and the innovations introduced in the fifth century B.C. were not due to him.

The papyrus was found in the mound which produced 1082–3, 1231, 1233–4 &c., but it is doubtful whether it belonged to that collection of lyric and other texts. The handwriting is a medium-sized, rather square and sloping uncial resembling that of 223 (after A.D. 185; Part ii, Plate i) and the corrector who inserted two missing lines in 1234. 2. ii (Part x, Plate iv). That the main text was written before, not after, 200 is made probable (1) by the title of II, which is in a small cursive hand employing 4-shaped η and apparently different from that of the main text, (2) by the numerous scholia in another, still smaller cursive hand, referring to questions of reading or interpretation. These marginalia, which are practically contemporary with the main text, are very similar to those in 1234, and seem to belong to the second century rather than the third. The main text was originally corrupt in not a few passages, especially in III, and has been subjected to considerable revision. One of the correctors, who is responsible for the readings above the line in II. 27 and III. 9 αυ, is possibly identical with the original scribe or with the writer of the title, but more probably different. A second corrector, to whom we should assign all the other interlinear readings, is certainly distinct from the original scribe, the first corrector, and the writers of the title of II and the scholia. A few mistakes of spelling have escaped correction; cf. II. 8–11, 21, nn. An elaborate coronis, similar to those in 1234, occurred at the beginning of II, but there is no paragraphus after II. 18, where it would be expected. Accents, breathings, and marks of elision or quantity are not infrequent, being mostly due to the first hand, but in some cases added by the second corrector. The stops (high points, except two in the middle position in I. 10 (?) and II. 14) seem to be all due to the first hand, like the occasional diaereses.

I. Only the upper part of the column is of any value, but the slight traces of ll. 25–38 are sufficient to show that they correspond to ll. 11–24; cf. the reference to the antistrope in l. 20 schol. Lines 1–10 evidently belong
to the penultimate epode, which may have begun several lines earlier. The concluding epode is lost. To judge by the length of lines in II, not more than 10 letters (i.e. 4 syllables) would be expected to be lost before ll. 7–12, and 2 more letters before ll. 2–6 and 13–17. A shorter lacuna at the beginning (4 letters) would suit l. 15, but in l. 14 one or two words seem to be lost before ἄε[ξ]ετε. That the poem was for the Argives is indicated by the references in ll. 6–7 to the building of a city (Tiryns or Mycenae?) by Cyclopes in Argive territory, and in l. 9 to the house of Abas. The mention of the Gorgons in l. 5 suggests that Perseus was the subject, and possible mentions of Danaë and Acrisius or Proetus occur in ll. 1–3; but Phorcus himself (l. 5), apart from his being the father of the Gorgons and Graeae, is not known to be specially connected with the Perseus legends. The new strophe apparently introduces a change of subject. After a reference to the Dionysiac gathering and an address to the Muses, in l. 15 begins a narrative of an adventure of some one who seems to be newly mentioned. Phorcus and probably the Gorgons again occur, and Bury would refer this passage, not ll. 1–10, to Perseus. The approach of the end of the ode and some parallelisms with Fr. 75 suggest that Dionysus himself might be meant. Possibly Frs. 254 and 284 are to be connected with this poem; cf. ll. 1 and 17, nn. The metre is logaoedic. Some of the lines (e.g. strophe 1 and 3) might be regarded as ending in dochiomiacs, but these belong to tragedy rather than to lyrics.

Strophe

Epode

Some lines lost (?)
II. This dithyramb for the Thebans was evidently well known in antiquity on account of its opening reference to the σχουρότρις δαίδη and σών κλήσην, which is quoted by several writers (Fr. 79a) and enables ll. 1–3 to be restored. Another passage a few lines later (Fr. 79b), quoted by Strabo alone, had been much corrupted in the MSS. of that author; in a third fragment which occurs (Fr. 208) there are also marked differences between Plutarch’s citations and the text of the papyrus. Frs. 81 and 249 also have some points of connexion with II, but are probably from different poems; cf. l. 1, marg., n. The ode begins with a contrast between the older and newer form of dithyramb in favour of the newer, which claims inspiration from the festival held in honour of Dionysus at Olympus itself (ll. 1–8). There follows in ll. 8–23 a picturesque and vivid description of the celestial festival, and a characteristically grandiloquent reference to the poet himself, which leads to the subject of Thebes and the ancestry of Dionysus, whose mother Semele was the daughter of Cadmus and Harmonia (ll. 23–30). The poem breaks off shortly before the end of the antistrophe, where Dionysus himself was apparently being addressed. An epode probably followed; cf. p. 28. The metre is dactylo-epitritic, like that of Fr. 74b, a corrupt quotation from Pindar found in Epiphanius, which has been assigned by Schroeder to the dithyrambs. The main subject of the poem, Cerberus, is not reached.

Strophe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
<td>( \overline{_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. In this dithyramb about 10 letters seem to be missing at the beginnings of ll. 5–14, and about 5 more in ll. 15–25. There is no metrical correspondence in ll. 1–21, and whether ll. 22–6 correspond to some of ll. 1–10 or not is uncertain. Probably part of the fragment belongs to an epode, unless indeed this poem was in ἀπολελυμένα. Dionysus is apparently addressed in ll. 6 sqq., being invited to join in the festival celebrated at a certain city. Bury would
regard this as Corinth on the evidence of the 'neighbouring rock' (l. 10) and some other indications; cf. ll. 14–15, 18, 22, nn. The metre is apparently dactylo-epitritic, with perhaps an admixture of other rhythms. The scheme of ll. 3–19 is

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & - ? \omega \omega \\
2 & \omega \\
5 & \omega \omega \omega \omega \omega \omega \\
\end{align*}
\]

Fr. 1. Col. i. Plate i.

[απρδανα[  
[νλεγοντων[  
[ιονανακτα[  
[λειβομενονδ. [  
5 [υσεπατεραγουρον[  
[κλάπων·πτολίσσα . [  
[νεαργειμεγαλω. . [  
[ποιδυγενησεραταίδομου[  
[ντάβαντος[  
10 [λεεν· τρυγενηζοντοικλωκειδιονυσιακον[  
[δαιμονωβρομαιδιομαιπαπει[  
[κορυφαν[  
[θέμεν· εναμπυκεσ[  
[εστειμωσαιαλασαοιδαυ[  
15 [γαρενχωμαι·λεγοντιδεβροτοι[  
[ερκος[  
[αφυγονταινκεμελαναλμας[  
[φορκοιο·συγγονοπατερων· κοραν[  
\]
20 [ποντικολον·  
[ιανεαν· ατ[.]. α εανπερις[  
[ρομενον· πεξανιστρα[  
[ιου[  
[λεγοσεπμαχην[  
\]
25 [εραν[  

I. ΠΙΝΔΑΡΟΙΣ.

απὸ Δανά[  
ν λεγόντων [  
] οὖν ἀνακτα [  
] λειβόμενον δ. [  
] ύσε πατέρα Γοργών[  
Κυκλώματι πτόλει ἄρ[ά οἱ?  
] ν ἐν Ἀργείᾳ μεγά[λῳ .. [  
] ποι ξυγεντες ἐρατά δόμον  
] ντ' Ἀβαντος,  

τοὺς  

εὔθαμινων βρομιάδι θοῦνα πρέπει  
κορυφάν  
θέμεν. εὐάμπυκες  
ἀφέτ' ἑτι, Μοῖσαι, θάλος ἀοιδάν  
ὁμι[ ] γὰρ εὐχοραί. λέγοντι δὲ βροτοὶ  
] αν φυγόντα νῦν καὶ μέλαν ἥρκος ἄρμας  
] κοράν;] Φόρκοιο, σύγγυνον πατέρων,  
για[ ]  

ποιον τ' ἔμολον,  
]  

προμενον.  
]  
] λεγό(μενον) ἐπ' ἐπίμαχον.  
]  

θραν  

ἀντ. β
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Two lines lost

\[ \ldots \]

\[ \lambda \sigma \]

\[ \nu \]

\[ \rho \sigma \omega \]

\[ \tau e l e t a i o \sim \]

\[ \alpha v \]

\[ \alpha k e n t e r i s a t o \]

\[ . \]

\[ \nu \ i a t o \]

\[ \mu a n \theta a n a t o n \]

\[ \lambda a i o \]

Fr. i. Col. ii. Plate i.
Two lines lost

4  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

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

6  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

7  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

8  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

9  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

10  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

11  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

12  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

13  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

14  \[\cdots\]  \[\cdots\]

II. ΘΡΑΣ[ΤΣ] ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ Η ΚΕΡΒΕΡΟΣ ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ.

1  \[\cdots\]

2  \[\cdots\]

3  \[\cdots\]

4  \[\cdots\]

5  \[\cdots\]

6  \[\cdots\]

7  \[\cdots\]

8  \[\cdots\]

9  \[\cdots\]

10  \[\cdots\]

11  \[\cdots\]

12  \[\cdots\]
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Fr. 208
θ
μυριωνφαγγαζεταικλαγγαίδρακοντων*  οφ[
ριμφαδεισινάρτεμισοισόλος  νότολουσ
20 ξεσδαιοενοργαιο
βακχειασφυλουλουντωνα
οδεκκηλειταιχορευνόντασκικα[
ρώνωγελαιοςμεθ'εξαιρετοι[
καρυκασιοφωνέοναν
25 μοισ'ανέσταιο'ελλάδικα[i]ν'[
ευχομενονβρισαρματοιοί[
α
ευθάπιστορμωνιαι[.]αι[[επ]]γεξ[
καδμονυψ[.]παππιδεσ[[
ναν-δ[.]οδ'ακ[.]μφάν-
30 κατέκ[.]ένδοξο[.]ανθρωποι[
διονυσ[.]θ[.]θ[.]θ[.]γ[
ματε[[
πε:·[[
]['

Fr. 2.
[ναλ[
]
[ιτομιεστασιο]
[πόδα]

5 [
]κατε[.]ονκαναφίδια][ιτον[
]τεαντε[.]αμμελίζοι[
]πλοκος[.]φανκασισινων  α'τλ[[
]κροταφον[ ]

ελ[
]εων[.]φ[.]ο[.]φιλιδηπολε[.]ω]

10 [νοντεσκόπελονγειτοναπροτανυ []
]αμα'καιστρατία[.]ισ]
]ακανάμπτεκρεμασόν[
]στεχαρμας  ταστιδορατιδας
1604. PINDAR, DITHYRAMBS

18 μυρίων φθογγάζεται κλαγγαίς δρακόντων. ἡφισίων
1 ὑμίφα 6' εἶσιν Ἀρτέμις οἰσπόλος θεῦ- οἰσπόλος ἀντ. α

20 3 ξαίρ' ἐν ὀργαίς
3 Βακχίαις φίλον λέντων ἄγγροτέρων Μρομίφ'
4 ὁ δὲ κηλεῖται χορευούσαις καί θη-
5 ρῶν ἀγέλαις. ἐμὲ δ' ἥξαρέτοιν
6 κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων

25 7 Μοῖον ἀνέστατ' Ἑλλαδὶ κα[λ]ἀ[χόρῳ?
28 εὐχόμενον βρισαρμάτοις ἄλβον τε? Θήβαις,
9 ἕνδα ποθ' Ἀρμονίαν [ϕ]άμα γα[μετὰν
10 Κάδημων ὑψη[λά]ίς πραπτίδεσαι λαχεῖν κεδ-?
11 νάν' Δ[ιόδ]ς δ' ἀκο[ουσίν ὁ][μφάν

30 12 καὶ τέκ' εὐδοξ[ο]ν παρ'] ἀνθρώποις γενέαν.
13 Διόνυσ[ί], [ἴθ. [. . . .].]ρ[.].γ[.
14 ματέ[ρος?
15 πει [υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-υ-]

III. [ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΙΣ?]

]μαλ[
]
]υτὸ μὲν στάσις,
]πόδα

5 ] κατ[. . . .]ον κυνοχίτων
] πλόκων στεφ[ά]νον κισσίνων ἀν(τί τοῦ) πλ[εκτῶν?
] κρόταφον
]εόν ἐλθε φίλαν δὴ (?) πολέα

10 ]ον τε σκόπελον γείτονα πρύτανι . [
]αμα καὶ στρατιά,
] τ' ἀκναμπτεί κρέμασον,
]ς τε χάρμας τὰς ἐπιδοριάδας.
I. 1. Either Δωσ(α) (referring to Perseus) or Δωσ(ο) (e.g., τρίτον) and Δ, referring to Acrisius or Proetus) or Δωσ(ό) or else a πόδα ν (can be read, the last letter being quite uncertain. Pindar Fr. 284 from Schol. A Homer Η 319 αυτή δε (Δωσι), ὃς φησιν Παύδαρος καὶ ἀλλοι τινὲς, ἕθεσα ὑπὸ τοῦ πατριάδελφου αὐτῆς Προετοῦ, ἄθεν αὐτᾶς καὶ στάσει ἐκφάνθη might refer to this dithyramb.

3. Possibly ἄκριτον. The first letter might be ν or π, but hardly τ, so that Προετοῦ (cf. ll. 6–7, n.) is unsatisfactory. Lobel suggests Δωκίου, referring either to Proetus or Iobates, king of Lycia, who restored Proetus.

4. The doubtful δ can be α or λ. For λειβόμενον cf. Py. xii. 9 τὸν (sc. βρήκαν) . . . δαλ λειβόμενον δυσπερεῖ σῶν καμάτων.

5. The letter before σε can be ε, i, σ, ν, or ω. For Phorcus (= Phorcys), the father of the Gorgons, cf. l. 17 and p. 30.

6. Bury suggests πρόγονον τε Κυδούπων, Phorcus being grandfather of Polyphemus through his daughter Thoōsa.

6–7. The scholium is obscure, but seems to refer to the distinction between ὸ ( = εντός) and ὸι (= αὐτΆρ), and of with or without an accent presumably occurred in the text. Whether the traces of a word following μεγαλῶν belong to the text or a scholium is uncertain; τὸ is possible. Bury proposes πτόλεις ἄρα οι | δέδηκεν (οτ Τῦτου) κεῖναι ἐν Ἀργεὶ μεγάλῳ τίχερα. The city in question was probably either Tiryns, which was built by the Cyclopes for Proetus, as described in Bacchyl. x. 59–81, or Myidea or Mycenaean, of which Perseus was the legendary founder (Paus. ii. 15. 4), being assisted by the Cyclopes (Schol. Eur. Or. 965).

8–9. If ζυγίνετες is to be taken literally, τιμοῖα and ἀκροσ (Stuart Jones) are probable; but ἐρατό suggests that the context may concern music, and Bury proposed φώμης δ᾽ ὤμοι ζυγίνετες ἐρατοῦ βάρμιον | ἀκροῖαν ἀπὸ σκάλας | Ἀβαντος, comparing Homer λ 334 κηλθῆμι δ᾽ ἄχοινοι κατά μέγαρα σκάλαντον. ὃς τοὶ is, however, unsatisfactory, for if the doubtful letter was ν the middle stroke ought to have been visible, so that π (κόμη; Bury) or ν or τ is preferable. The 'house of Abas' means the palace at Argos; cf. Py. viii. 55 "Αβαντος εὐρυκάρπας ἄγιας.

10. The stop after ἕλεον is not quite certain, and δ can be read for λ. Bury proposes τοῖς δ᾽ ἐξαιρ. ἐκήλεον, based on the scholium, in which τοῖς is apparently quoted from the text
and Διονυσιακον refers to a different word. For ἐκάλειν cf. II. 22 and the Homeric verse cited in ll. 8–9, n. The objection to it is that Pindar elsewhere uses the contracted forms in imperfects.

11-13. A new strophe begins here. Bury proposes something like ἀλλ᾿ ἄνδρῳ εἰδομάνων βρομάδει θοινὰ πρὸς τειν ἔργους λόγοις κορυφάν ἐπιχαριοίσα τέθεμεν. Cf. Νεμ. ix. 8 ἄλλ᾿ ἄν ἐμὲ ν ἄμαμιν φόρμαγγει, ἀνὰ δ᾿ ἀιήν ἐπ᾿ αὐτῶ προσφορᾶν ἵππιαν θεόθλων κορυφάν. 13-14. εἰδομάνων is not found elsewhere, but ἐλκαμάνων, κοινάμανων, λεπαράμανων, and χρυσάμανων occur in Pindar. For ἐξέτερ (Bury, Stuart Jones) cf. Οἰ. vi. 105 ἐμὼν δ᾿ ἐμὸν ἐνεκές εὑτερὲς ἀνθεῖα. Before it Bury proposes Περσηός οὐν, in order to explain οὐν in l. 16. Πρόμων οὐν is also possible; cf. l. 17, n. 15. οὐμι] was suggested by Bury, who proposes an epithet of ἀιών, e.g. κυηνάρ, before it.

16. Regarding οὐν as Perseus, Bury proposes Δικτέας πεδία (or γώγα) φυγώτα. κύρια (Stuart Jones) is also possible. If Dionysus, who according to Paus. ii. 22. 1 attacked Argos from the sea, were meant (cf. l. 17, n.), δεσμία (Lobel) would be suitable; cf. Eur. Bacch. 610 sqq. It is not clear whether ἐρῶς was simply omitted by the first hand or was intended to take the place of ἄλμας. The corresponding line of the antistrophe hardly projects as far as would be expected if it contained equivalents of both words; but the collocation ἐρῶς ἄλμας occurs in Πύ. ii. 80 ἓξάττυτος ἐμὶ φεδός ὡς ὑπὲρ ἐ. ἄ., where ἄλμας is usually connected with ἓξαττυτος, not ἐρῶς, and ἐρῶς is thought to mean 'net'. This parallel makes us disposed to retain both words, and to regard them as a periphrasis for the sea, like the scholiast on Πύ. ii. 80, who explains ἐρῶς as ἑπνάεια, 'surface'.

17. κορν points to a word like it in the text, either a synonym or κορν differently spelled (κοργάν;?) or wrongly accented (cf. II. 19, n.). The Graeae or more probably the Gorgons (cf. l. 5 and p. 30) must be meant, and the line may have begun with ἑς followed by a word implying 'abode' (τῶς;?). Pindar Fr. 254 from Apollodorus ii. 38 αὐτὰ δὲ αἱ νύμφαι πτηνα ἔχον πέδαλα καὶ τὴν κύλον, ην φασιν εἶναι πήραν. Πύρανος δὲ καὶ Ἡσίοδος ἐν Ἀισθάδι ἐπὶ τοίς Περσηός κτλ. may have referred to this dithyramb. σύγγνυν πατέρων is obscure. If the stops before and after these words are correct, they seem to be in apposition to οὐν, which is
unsatisfactory. As Stuart Jones remarks, ὀγγονον would be expected to agree with a word like ὑφάτων in the next line. πατέρων is probably the plural of amplification; cf. Fr. 75. 10 Βράμμων ὣν τ’ Ἐριθέαν τῷ Βροτοὶ καλότεοι, γώγων ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων μελέτεον γυναῖκων τῷ Καδμείων ἐμολού (v. l. Σεμλήν). The resemblances between this passage and ll. 15–19 (βροτοὶ . . . πατέρων . . . ἐμολοῦ) suggest that νῦν might be Dionysus, not Perseus; cf. l. 16, n.

18. ς is not visible on the facsimile.

19. [πον: or ] λο. μ. of ἐμολοῦ is corrected from τ.

20. The marginal note refers to ἵων, which ‘is rejected (?), being superfluously introduced from the antistrophe’; i.e. l. 34, which ends ἵων and also contained a superfluous word. The last letter of απ[.] . . . might be δ or λ, but ἀπ[οβόλα(λεται)] and ἀποβο(κιμάζεται) are not satisfactory readings.

23. The ο of λέγο(μενον) is not raised above the line, as would be expected if the word is an abbreviation; but λέγο is inadmissible.

28. In the margin are traces of a scholium.

34. ἵων: cf. l. 20, n. το κεν πειρασον would be expected; cf. l. 6, schol.

Π. ‘Heracles the bold or Cerberus. For the Thebans.

Formerly both dithyrambic song issued from the lips of men long drawn out and the sigma under suspicion; but now new gates have been opened for sacred choirs: they (sing ?), knowing what manner of festival of Bromius the celestials by the very sceptre of Zeus celebrate in their halls. Beside the majesty of the great mother of the gods begins the beating of drums; therewith swells the music of the castanets and the torch blazing below the yellow pine-brands; therewith resounding laments of the Naiads, wild dances and shouts are stirred in the fury of tossing the neck on high. Therewith moves the almighty thunderbolt breathing fire, and the sword of the god of War, and the valiant aegis of Pallas’ rings with the hissing of countless serpents. Lightly comes Artemis the lone huntress, who has yoked in the Bacchic race the noon of savage lions for Bromius, while he is enchanted also by the dancing throng of beasts. Me too, a chosen herald of wise words, the Muse raised up to pray for prosperity (?) for Hellas with its fair dances and chariotpressing Thebes, where of old, as the story tells, Cadmus by high design won sage Harmonia as his bride, and she hearten to the voice of Zeus and became the mother of offspring famed among men. O Dionysus, . . .

I marg. ὑφάτων. Προκλῆς ἢ Κέρβερος: Heracles is called θρασυμόχων in Ol. vi. 67. For other examples of alternative titles of dithyrambs cf. p. 28. It is tempting to connect with this ode Pindar Fr. 249a (Schol. AB on Homer Π 194) Προκλῆς εἰς Ἰλιὸν κατελθὼν ἐπὶ τὸν Κέρβερον συνέτυχε Μελείον τῷ Οίνισος, οὐ καί δεῖθεν ἡμάς τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ Δηλιναῖοι, ἐπανειλθεν εἰς φῶς ἐσπενεν εἰς Ἀταλλον πρὸς Οίνια, καταλαβὼν δὲ μηποτεύκους τὴν κάρην Άχλεων τοῦ πλησίον παταμῶν, διεπάλαιαν αὐτῷ . . . δοκεὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἐλλάδι παταμῶν μέγιστον εἶναι ὦ Αχλεώς δικαὶ πάντων ὑδάρ τῇ ποινῇ προστηκρια καλεῖται. η ιστορία παρὰ Πιδάρφο. But Fr. 249 b (221. ix. 14), which seems to belong to the passage in question about the Achelois, is in a different metre, πρόσθη μὲν ο’ Άχλεωι τὸν αὐτὸτατον εἴρωπι κρᾶνα Μελείας το παταμ&oelig; βοαί τρέφον κάλαμον. A fragment concerning Heracles from a dithyramb (Fr. 81) is quoted by Aristides ii. 70 δι καὶ ἐτερωθεί μεμνημένος περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν διδυράμβο τυίε’ σε δ’ ἐγὸ παράμοι, παρά νῦν Βέργκ’, φρονιν, αἰνέω μὲν, Γηρανὴ, τὸ δὲ µὴ Δί (Δι Ηέρμαν) φίλτερον σύγμις πάμαν. The metre of this from αἰνέω . . . πάμαν corresponds to Π. 1–3 κβ, and the words preceding αἰνέω might correspond metrically to the end of an epode; but the capture of the oxen of Geryones is a different exploit, and Fr. 81 is likely to belong to another dithyramb. Fr. 169 (Plato, Gorg. 484 b, Aristides, ii. 68, Schol. Pind. Ὑμ. ix. 35 νόμος ὑ πάντων βασιλείας κτλ.), which mentions Geryones and in is dactylo-epitritic metre, but does not correspond to the extant part of Π, and Fr. 168 (Athenaeus, x. 411 b, Philostratus, Ἱμ. ii. 24 δ’ο’ λ δοβοι θερμα κτλ.), which refers to the devouring of an ox by Heracles at the house of Coronus, an
episode connected with the capture of the Cretan bull (Apollod. ii. 5. 7), and is not in
dactylo-epitritic metre, certainly have no connexion with our dithyramb.

1-3 (= Fr. 79a). Cf. Strabo x. 469 μάρτυρες δ’ οἱ ποιητές τῶν τουοίτων ἐποιοῦν (sc. con-
cerning the Curettes and Corybantes): δ’ θε γὰρ Πινδαρος ἐν τῷ διδυμίῳ μὲν ἐπὶ σχοινοτείναι (σχοινοτείναι ezz).

Diodore, αὐδᾶ (σει. 1. αὐθαί) διδυμάμων (ἐβγ. most MSS.), μυστήρες δ’ (εἰ δ’ οἱ, most ezz.) τῶν περὶ τῶν Διάνυσων ἐμαῦ τῶν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν ἄνευ, μεταβᾶ ἀπὸ τούτων φρος ’οι μὲν καταρχῆς (καταρχῆς ezz.) μέτερ παρὰ μεγάλα (τί. 1. μεγάλα: μεγάλα παρά ezz.) δροίμα (ῥάμμιν ezz.), κυμάλων, ἐν δὲ κεχάλων (κεχάλων ezz.) κρατάλ’ αἴθουμεν τὰ δῆς (δῆς same ezz.) ὑπὸ εὐανάγων πεῖκας (= ll. 8-11), τὴν κοινωνία τῶν περὶ τῶν Διάνυσων ἀποδειχθέντων νομίμων παρά τῶν Ἐλληνι καὶ τῶν παρὰ τούς Φρυξί περὶ τὴν μνήμα τῶν θεῶν συναιείναι ἀλλήλοις, Athen. x. 455 b Πινδαρος δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀντιγονοργίαν φόβοι, ὡς δ’ οὖν φρατίς Κλεήρχος, οἰκογενεῖ τῶν ἐν μελοποίαι προβληθέντων, ὡς πολλῶν τούτων προσκομισμῶν διὰ τὸ διδυμό (διδυμός ezz.) εἶναι ἀπο-
σχέσεως τοῦ σιγμά καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ δοκιμαῦν, ἐποίησε (corrupt?): πρὸς μὲν εἰπὲ σχοινοτείναι (l. -τείνεις) τ’ αὐθᾶ καὶ τὸ σαῦ τίθον (κιβθῆλων ezz.) ἄνδρασσοι, x. 448 c καθιστήρ οἱ διάκρισι καλοίνεσσι τῶν γρίμων’ ὅδιν καὶ Πινδαρος πρὸς τὸ θ’ ἐποίησεν φόβοι (corrupt?), xi. 467 a τὸ δὲ σὰν αὐτῷ τοῦ σιγμά
Δωρικάς εἰρήκαναι. οἱ γὰρ μονυκοῦτο, καθίστατε πολλάκις Δρυστέφενες φρατίς, τὸ σιγμὰ λέγειν παραστάτω 
διὰ τὸ σκληροτόμων εἶναι καὶ ἀντιπέρδειος αὐλῆ... καὶ Πινδαρος δὲ φρατίς πρὸς μὲν ἕπει σχοινοτείναι τ’ αὐθᾶ καὶ τὸ σὰν κιβθῆλων ἀπὸ στομάτων. Dionysius, De comp. verb. 14 εἰσὶ δ’ οἱ καὶ διάκρισις όδίων φόδα ἐπέσωσεν ἑβδομ’ δὲ τὸ διδυμόν ἐν ὃς φρατίς πρὸς μὲν ἕπει σχοινοτείναι φρατίς (or other corruptions) διδυμάμων καὶ τὸ σὰν κιβθῆλων (τί. 1. κιβθῆλων) ἄνδρασσοι (τί. 1-πο). From these varying forms of l. 3 Hermann restored τὸ σὰν κιβθῆλων ἄνδρασσον ἀπὸ στομάτων. The termination of the line is wanting in both ll. 3 and 18, but there is no reason to doubt Hermann’s restoration; cf. for the metre l. 7.

1. σχοινοτείναι: this is formed on the analogy of ἠνώτειναι, μουσαγένεια, &c., and means 'stretched out like a rope', 'prolix' ; cf. Philostr. Heroic. i. 14 μὴ ἀποτείναι (τὰ ἄραμα) μὴ δὲ σχοινοτείναι ἐφαγάζεται. It does not refer to division into triads, but II itself is divided into triads or strophes; cf. p. 28 and l. 3, n.

2. The division αὐθᾶ διδυμάμων would be expected from the arrangement of l. 19-20, but δὰ (or δῆ) δὲ does not suit the traces of l. 2, and the real dividing-point of the feet is probably after αὐθᾶ here and cei- in l. 20.

3. καὶ τὸ σὰν κιβθῆλων: the meaning of this is of a long-standing difficulty. Atheneaus and Dionysius (cf. ll. 1-3, n.) supposed that it referred to the φάλαι ἄργα, i.e. of Pindar’s pre-
decessor, Lasus, Atheneaus x. 455 c proceeding to quote a line without σ from Lasus’ hymn
to Demeter. The epitomator of Atheneaus, followed by Eustathius, p. 1335, 52, misunder-
standing this, attributed the composition of odes without σ to Pindar himself. Boeckh and
Dissen translate κιβθῆλων ‘στράτημ’, supposing that it refers to the mispronunciation of σ in
the Dorian dialect (so also Donaldson and Weir Smyth), and that Pindar meant to contrast
the old-fashioned odes in which σ was used with the new kind without σ invented by Lasus,
Pindar himself reverting to the old-fashioned type. Sandys (translation of Pindar in the
Loeb series), connecting κιβθῆλων (sc. ἔν) with ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ στομάτων, translates ‘when
the sibilant θ was discarded from the lips of men’, i.e. was rejected as spurious! The
mutuated condition of ll. 4-5 leaves the context obscure in some points, especi-
ally as to the precise nature of the transition to the account of the Dionysiac festival in
Olympus (cf. ll. 4-6, n.); but it is tolerably certain that the new kind of dithyramb which
is contrasted with the old is not the dithyramb of Lasus, but of Pindar himself, as is also
shown by the definite reference to himself in l. 23. Hence Boeckh’s view of Pindar’s rela-
tion to the two kinds of dithyramb is just the opposite of what the context demands.
Sandys’s translation gives the right kind of sense, but ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ στομάτων is much more
likely to be dependent on ἐφες than on κιβθῆλων, and the position of τ’ indicates that ἐφες, not
ἔν, is to be supplied with κιβθῆλων. We are disposed, therefore, to regard τὸ σὰν κιβθῆλων as
a reference to Lasus’ φόρα ἀσυμμ, σῶν being used as the equivalent of σίγμα, and κύθδαλον comparing it to base coin which when produced is rejected, and implying a contrast with Pindar’s own use of σ, which was unrestricted.

4-6. διαιτητέρος ἐποιεὶ δὲ and πόλει were suggested by Sandys, νῦν by Lobel, κύθδαλοι by Bury. The slight vestiges towards the end of the line suit πολεί, rather well, especially the π and λ (for which α is the only alternative); but the preceding lacuna is rather short for the proposed supplement. The metre of 1. 4 is fixed by l. 22. For opening the ‘gates’ of song cf. Ol. vi. 27 πῦλαι ὑμών ὑπαίτιαιμοὺς, Ἕμημ. ix. 2 ὑπαίτιαιμεῖνεξίνοιννέικασταθίραι, Bacchyl. Fr. 5. 2 οὔτε γὰρ βράστοι ἀρρήτων ἐπίων πῦλας ἐξερεύν. κύθδαλοι refers to the κώδλα χοροί of the dithyramb. To find an anapaest short enough for the lacuna before κύθδαλος in l. 5 is difficult. If πολεί is right, κύθδαλος must belong to a new sentence and may refer to χοροῖ (e.g. something like σοφοι αἱ κύθδαλοι); but Bury would connect it with the preceding line, suggesting διαιτητέρος ἐποιεὶ δὲ — — κύθδαλοι νέαν [σοφοί εἰς κύθδαλοι | αὐνάρθρον κτλ., and comparing Ἕμημ. ix. 3 ἀλλ’ ἐποιοίγυναυ̃νπρόσετεκαι Ἐυρ. Bacch. 471 τὰ δ’ βραγ’ ἐωτι τῶν ἐναίων ἐκχωντα σοι; νεών γὰρ νεών, Βρομίοις γιὰ Βρομίοις, and δόκων γιὰ τελεφονικούς are possible readings; but τελεφονικοῦ (Sandys) suits ιστότιτον particularly well, and the metaphor of the gates is attractive. For Βρομίοις [τελεφονικοῦ cf. Ὑπ. ix. 97 μεικταίαν σὺ καὶ μεικταίαν ὁράων ἐν Παυλλίδοις ἔνων, Βρομίοις is inadmissible. The metre of l. 5 is somewhat abnormal. After a choriambus is an anapaest and a cretic, or else an ionic a minore and iambus. For anaepasts in dactylo-epitritics cf. e.g. Ὑπ. i. 2, 6, iii. 4; for ‘iambic catalexis’ cf. Ol. vi. 5, Ἕμημ. viii. 14.

7. The last syllable of οὐρανίδαι was marked long by the first hand, short by the corrector, who wished to indicate (rightly) that the word was nom. plur., not dat. sing.; cf. l. 8 ἐρμαί. The syllable is long as a matter of fact, but there was no point in marking it long at the end of a line, unless indeed the first hand wished to connect it with ἐν in l. 8 and scanned -μανίδαι ἐν together in spite of the hiatus. But, as Housman remarks, the metre of l. 8 corresponds to e.g. Ὑπ. iv. 296 δαῦδαλεν φόρμα γραμμική σταγάζων πολίταις, and in each case the phrase — o o o — o o comes both before and after, so that αἱ is to be regarded as merely a slip.

8. The last syllable of the line seems to stand by itself (cf. the preceding n.), as frequently in Bacchylides’ dactylo-epitritics. In Pindar’s there seem to be instances of hypercatalexis in Frs. 29-30 (from an ὑμωμοῦ). ἵσον γὰρ: there is no room for στα in the lacuna and the marginal ιστότιτον indicates that the main text was in some respect different. If there had been a wrong accent over if it ought to have been visible, and there is no doubt that the first hand read ιστότιτον, a Doric form not found in Pindar but quite suitable in itself. ιστότιτον would make sense (cf. κύθδαλος in l. 5), but ιστότιτον is preferable.

8-11. σεμνή ... πείκαι: this passage (Fr. 79 b.; cf. ll. 1-3, n.) is quoted by Strabo with several corruptions or variations, σολ for σεμνή, μέτα παρά for μετα πάρ, ροδόμοι κυμβάλων for ρόδισμα κυμβάλων, and κεφαλὴν for κέφαλα (or κεφαλὴν). Misled by soi, modern editors were unable to restore the passage on the right lines. The confirmation of the schema Pindaricum κατάρχει ... βραβίζει against emendations is interesting. Another instance occurs in l. 13 μακικών τὰ δάλακαί τὰ δρίστερα, which had been obscured in the quotations of this by Plutarch. Two more occur in ll. 18-19 of the fragmentary dithyramb for the Athenians (Fr. 75); in the epinician odes this construction is rare. κυμβάλων may have stood in Strabo’s text of II, but τετάνων is likely to be right; cf. Catullus, Alys 9 ἱπατίνων, ῥυθίμι, Cybelle, tua, mater, initia, which may even have been an imitation of this passage. Bergk referred to this dithyramb Fr. 80, a quotation from Pindar in a Herculaneum fragment of Philodemus, De pictate, which is restored κυμβάλων (cf. κυμβάλων): μαίνετι (ο θεός). The metre may well be dactylo-epitritic, but there is no place for Fr. 80 in the context of the reference to Cybele in ll. 8-9. Owing to the lacuna at the end of l. 27 the
correction of τῆμανων to τῦπανων is not absolutely certain, for γάριμ (Bury) can there be supplied instead of γαίμεταν (Housman); but, as Housman observes, l. 9 seems to be unrhymed as it stands, since ω ο -- in this metre is not elsewhere followed by ω ω, unless there is a break between them, as at Ol. vi. 4-5 and Bacchyl. viii. 9-10, and scribes have often written τῦμανων where authors did not; e.g. Hom. Hymn. xiv. 3, Eur. Hel. 1347, Aesch. Fr. 57. 10, Apoll. Rhod. i. 1139, Anth. Pal. vi. 165. 5, and in the Catullus passage cited above the MSS. give γυμναμι ροιματιν among the metre. With τὺπανων l. 9 will have the rhythm of Ol. vi. 2 κινας ως ως θαηων μέγαρον. The point of ξενιαθαι as applied to πεικας is not clear: Dissen explains it by the colour of the fire. With ll. 10-12 cf. Soph. Antiph. 1126-9 οι δ᾽ υπερ διλόφου πέτασα στερψα δωσα λεγον, ένθα Κασίκαι στεικουσι Νέμπαι Βακχίδες.

12. έν δε Νατών: ω ω ω corresponds to ω ω ω (apparently) in l. 30; cf. l. 19, n., and e.g. Ol. iii, epode 1, 4, 5.

13-14. These lines are thrice quoted by Plutarch, (1) Quaest. conv. i. 5. 2, (2) vii. 5. 4, (3) De def. orac. 14, copied by Euseb. Praep. evang. v. 4. p. 185, and Theodoret, Graec. aff. cur., ed. Gaisford, p. 374. In (2) μανιας τ᾽ αλαλων τ᾽ ρησωμενων occurs, the quotation being accommodated to Plutarch's sentence; (1) and (3) have ρωσωμενων for ρησωμεναι; (1) has ερανγεν, (2) and (3) ρωσωμεναι for ρησωμεναι. Both ρωσωμενων (which would correspond to Νατών in l. 12) and ρησωμεναι seem to be ancient variants (Theodoret, op. cit., p. 375 coins a verb ρησωμενων from the quotation), and ρησωμεναι, which occurs nowhere else, is, as Housman remarks, more appropriate than ρησωμεναι to both κλώνω and Νατόω: cf. Catull. Alys 23 ubi capita Maenades vi iacunt hederigerae, Cic. II Verr. iii. 49 cerviculum iaetaturum, Eur. Bacch. 864 δεραν εις αθηνα δροσερω βιτουσα τοσονα. The metre, as he observes, does not help much in deciding between ρησωμεναι and ρησωμεναι, for though with ρησωμεναι the scheme of l. 13 - - - - - - - οι - - - corresponds to the last verse of the epodes in Py. iii, e.g. l. 23, - - - can generally take the place of - - - - - , and is preceded by - - - and followed by - - - in e.g. Nem. xi. 14. ρη-(or υφ-)-ησωμεναι is apparently the end of a member of the rhythm with syllaba acesps, and a member of the rhythm also comes to an end after συν κλώνω, as the hiatus there proves, so that these two words have to constitute a whole member; cf. γαλακτωμα in Ol. vii. 9 and γαλακτος in Py. v. 7. The alternative is to write ειν ελονω, but there seem to be only two examples of ειν in Pindar's MSS., and not one is established by the metre, though cf. 1614. 9.

αλαα[α]: the first hand seems to have written αλα[α]α originally. The final αα was then crossed out and ω no doubt added above [α], but whether the scribe himself or a corrector made the alteration is uncertain. Several of the MSS. of Plutarch have αλλακα for αλλακα, but the third letter here is more like α than λ, and the loop of it, though narrow, does not seem to be correction.

15-16. κεραυνας αμπενων περ: cf. Fr. 146 περ πιευντος α τε (Pallas) κεραυνά δυσχότα δεξιων κατά χειρα πατρός (Herm.). In l. 15 - - - occurs twice, very likely as equivalent to - - - in the antistrope (lost); cf. ll. 12 and 19, nn.

17. αλλικεσα: in Ol. ix. 72 and Py. v. 71 αλλικεσας is found, but the metre here requires ακ ι to be separate syllables. The scholiast perhaps indicates a variant, but may be no more than ακις accentuated; cf. l. 19, n.

18. This verse is a Σημαχόραων. δε[εων] is a gloss on δρακάνων.

19. ριμα αδ ειων: - - - here corresponds to - - - in l. 1; cf. ll. 12, 15-16, nn. οισόνδος: this word, which seems to have been wrongly spelt but rightly accentuated by the first hand, was wrongly accentuated by the corrector; cf. l. 17 and l. 17, nn. οισόνδος δαιμον (unnamed) occurs in Py. iv. 28.

20. The syllable κεω really belongs to l. 19; cf. l. 2, n.

21. The misspelling βακχεις is not corrected. διγρατερων was suggested by Sandys and
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Bury; cf. Nem. iii. 46 λεόντεσσαν ἐγγυπτέως. Βρομίω (Bury) is required to explain ὅ δε in l. 22. The metre is practically certain; cf. ll. 1-3, n.

22-3. καὶ θηρῶν: so Housman and Bury. The α of καὶ is nearly certain, the only alternative being ο. The sentence is suggested by the mention of lions in the line above. Bacchus is flattered not only by the attentions of his fellow-gods, but also by the worship of brute creatures. ἀγέλαια λεόντων occurs in Pind. Fr. 239.

25-6. Cf. Fr. 151 Μαιν ἄνεκε με, καὶ λαόι[κ]ήρω αὐτῶν te were suggested by Bury; Sandys proposes καὶ γαῖα[ν] with ο[ίκοι]ν te, but the traces of a letter after καὶ suggest α, δ, λ, or ν. For the late position of τε cf. Nem. ix. 34 πάρο πεισθάαι ἵππου τε. That θήρας occurred at the end of l. 26 is clear from what follows (cf. Fr. 195 ἱάματε Θεία, but a restoration in which εὐχαριστοὶ meant ‘boasting myself’ rather than ‘praying for’ would be more appropriate. ἄνεκε is, however, inadmissible in l. 26, the o before the lacuna being almost certain. For the metre of that line cf. l. 7, n.

27. The first hand wrote ποτ ορμονείν. φίλαμα γα[-μα]ταν is due to Housman, who corrects τυμπάνων in l. 9 to τυπάνων: Bury, retaining τυμπάνων there, proposed φίλαμα γαρτείν: cf. ll. 8-11, n. The first hand wrote φίλαμα γαῖα: the first corrector then added a above the line, deleting e and perhaps ν also; cf. III. 9, n. As Housman remarks, a verb does not seem necessary with φίλαμα (sc. ἀνεκε). cf. Aesch. Septem 217-18 ἄλλ’ οὖν θεὸς τοὺς τῆς ἀλογίας πόλεως εὐελεήσθω λόγος, and φάετε in Pindar himself (according to the usually accepted emendation of Bothe) in Is. viii. 40 Λυκία, ὃν τε ἐουεβεβεβαίων φάετε Ιωακίου τράφων πέθον, and ἢταίμα in Stat. Thēb. l. 669.

28. ὕψηλατον could be read in place of ψηλατίν. There is little doubt about the ι, τ being the only alternative. λαξεῖν κελ- (or δγ-)μιάν is due to Bury. Nonnus, Dionys. iv. 28 sqq., compares Harmonia as at first reluctant to marry Cadmus. Housman prefers ζεύγον σεμνῶν, comparing Nem. ν. 47 σεμνῶν Θετων Πηλα τθ, Aesch. Prom. 560 ἄγαγες ἡσίων... δαμαρτα, and, for the present infinitive with ποτε in a past sense, Py. vi. 21-4 τάν ποτ... φαντί... πατατιν. σεμνός has however occurred in l. 8. For πατατίδες in connexion with a suitor he compares Is. viii. 30 ἄλλ’ οὔ σφιν ἄμβλατοι τέλεσαν εὐνών θεών πατατίδες.

30. εὐδοκῆν: if ζ is right, the parts of it were joined instead of being written, as elsewhere in 1604, as a dot between two strokes. The second ι is also doubtful, ι being quite as suitable. But the position of the accent over ῦ strongly favours εὐδοκῆν, for εὐδοκῇν and -κην[ν] are inadmissible, and though a crossed out ι might be read in place of ζ, εὐδοκ[η]ν is not a known word and εὐδοκ[η]n is unsatisfactory apart from the wrong accent. At the beginning of the line — ὁ — corresponds to ὁ — ὁ in l. 12; cf. l. 19, n. παρ’ ἀνθρόπ[ιν] γενέαν is due to Bury. Σεμνός may be substituted for γενέαν, she being in any case the person chiefly meant, as is shown by the reference to her in l. 32.

31. Δίονυσι must be vocative, for any other case would fill up the lacuna, leaving no room for the letter preceding θ, which apparently had an acute accent and was therefore a vowel. Probably Διονυσί was written and the θ not elided; cf. τε εἰρήνεαι in l. 13. If the two letters in the lacuna formed a diphthong, the accent ought to have been more to the left.

32. ματί[φος]: i.e. Semele; cf. l. 30, n. o could be read in place of ε.

ΠΠ. 1. The doubtful λ can be η.

3. στάσει elsewhere in Pindar means ‘sedition’, but here may, as Bury remarks, refer to the chorus either in the sense of κατάστασις (χοροῦ) or of a division; cf. l. 5, n.


6. τείν must refer to Dionysus, if τε[ν]εί[ν] is right; cf. int. p. 29.

7-8. Bury suggests βαλών ἐὰν [πλάκων ο[π]ερ]'[βα]ς[ν] κυστινων [ἀμβ]τει την κράταφον, making μεληζων the end of a clause and connecting ll. 7-8 with ταῦθε in l. 9. A stop may, however, have been lost after κράταφον. The scholium probably refers to the unusual expression
\[\pi\lambda\kappa\omicron\omega\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\omega\nu.\] For \(\pi\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega\nu,\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\omega\nu,\) cf. Eur. \(H\i\varepsilon\rho\rho\i\omicron.\ 73\ \pi\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\nu\omega\nu.\ \delta\rho\mu\nu\) (cf. \(N\epsilon\mu.\ \text{iv.}\ 17\)) does not suit the vestiges.

9. Apparently \(\phi\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i\i
indicates the second of the three. Parts of about 50 lines near the end of that play are extant in 1013, and there are 14 other fragments of it known, but no correspondence with 1605 is at all likely, though one or two are just possible; cf. ll. 24–5, nn. Geta was the slave of Thrasonides, but who his interlocutor here was is quite obscure. Other known characters in the play are Clinias, Demeas, and Cratea. For the plot, which turned upon the redemption of Cratea through her father Demeas from servitude with Thrasonides, a rough soldier, see 1013. int. and Koerte, *Menandrea*, ii.

The handwriting is a medium-sized sloping uncial resembling 1878 (Part xi, Plate iii), and probably of the third century, to which some dated documents found together with 1605 belong. The speaker's name is written more cursively by a different hand, which does not seem to be appreciably later than that of the main text. Paragraphi occur, indicating changes of speaker, but no stops.

Another papyrus (3rd cent.) containing 23 lines divided between two scenes, which has recently been published by Wilamowitz (*Sitzungsbl. d. Berl. Akad. 1918*, 747–9) as part of an uncertain comedy, perhaps by Menander, is probably to be assigned to the Μισοψϊμενος. In the second scene a woman called Cratea unexpectedly recognizes her father, whereupon the owner of the house intervenes, and in the margin of l. 18 Γε( ) occurs as the name of a speaker. Wilamowitz, though noticing the agreement with the Μισοψϊμενος with regard to Cratea, attributes the fragment to a different play, chiefly because Γε( ) is supposed also to occur in the margin of l. 12 in reference to a character who is addressed in the next line as τηθία. From this he infers that Γε( ) is an unknown feminine name. But it is much more likely that Γε( ) in l. 18 is Γε(τας), and that in l. 12, where the decipherment is admitted to be very uncertain, either the marginal note is to be read differently or some rearrangement of the supposed speakers is to be introduced. Geta and Cratea will then be the characters in the Μισοψϊμενος, the father will be Demeas, and the owner of the house Thrasonides, the action being highly appropriate to that play. This explanation is confirmed by the striking parallelism between Fr. ii of the Μισοψϊμενος, ἀδείοις γεγόνασιν αἱ σπάθαι and l. ii of the Berlin papyrus, Ἰ ρ ῥ ικό τῶς σπάθας τῶν γειτῶν.

Col. i. Col. ii.

\[ oυκετι ]

\[ Θρασωνιδ \]

\[ τί ταναφ α\]

\[ καλος ]

\[ ου παιδι \]

9 lines lost
1605. MENANDER, ΜΙΧΟΤΜΕΝΟΣ

30 ἠννυν λεγεῖν
εἰς τουργόν
διακοσίον

10 εἰς

15 Γε(τας) ἀναγείρε [·] · []

20 []

25 ν κακῶν

15 [ . . . . ]

30 ώς εἰσ'[·]

35 φαίνει

dιὸδος[·]

40 προσευξ[·]

45 [·] · [·]

24. οὐκεότι is apparently the first word in the last line of a small detached fragment of 1013 (l. 26). But an actual coincidence is unlikely.

25. ἑρωδαμίδ : this might possibly coincide with the corrupt Fr. 14 (Koerte) of the Μισωίμενος, which is generally restored μισσινα μέν | ἑρωδαμίδ(λην), ὁ πάτερ, ἀπεκτάκιας δ' σοι.

29. διηλοτυπόν : cf. Περικεφαλαία 408–9 ὁ δ' ἀλάστορος ἐγώ | καὶ διηλοτυπὸς ἀνθρωπὸς, spoken by Polemon, the counterpart of Thrasonides in that play.

34. Perhaps ἀναγείρε [στεφανόν, as in Σαμίλα 145. The γ is however very doubtful and ἀναγείρε·] can be read. It is not clear whether Γε(τας) refers to l. 34 or to l. 35. The surface of the papyrus between ll. 33–4 is rubbed, but there is no trace of a paragraphus, so that if Γε(τας) refers to l. 34 there was probably a change of speaker in the middle of that line.
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1606. LYSIAS, Orations πρὸς Ἰπποθέρσων, Against Theomnestus, &c.

Height 29.5 cm. Late second or early third century.
Plate II (Fr. 6, Cols. i–ii).

Lysias has hitherto been represented in papyri only by some small third-century B.C. pieces of the oration against Theomnestides (P. Hibeh 14); but the following fragments of several of his lost private speeches are more extensive and valuable. Like 1607–8 and 1612, they form part of the first of the three large finds of literary papyri in 1905–6, which also produced 841–4, 852–3, 1012, 1016–17, 1384, and 1376, the publication of this find being now completed. The small group consisting of Frs. 8–18 was found separately in a different part of the same mound, but no doubt belongs to the same roll. Originally about 200 in number, the fragments have been reduced by combinations to 150. Much the longest of them is Fr. 6, which contains (1) the last three columns of a speech, with the title (ll. 237–8) πρὸς Ἰπποθέρσων ὑπὲρ θεραταινῆς followed by a blank space, (2) the first two columns of a speech directed against a certain Theomnestus by an unnamed plaintiff. πρὸς Ἰπποθέρσων is known as the title of a speech by Lysias (no. lxii) from Harpocrateion, who makes two quotations from it, Fr. 122 (Sauppe) ἀφανῆς οὐσία καὶ φανέρα and Fr. 123 ἵππωνυμος. Fr. 122 seems to be connected with Fr. 2 of the papyrus, where ὠνύμα... ἀφανίσαι is a probable restoration in ll. 29–32, and φανερόν is possible in l. 48; but ἵππωνυμος does not seem to occur in 1606, though it is tempting to restore his name in l. 89. The title of the second speech would at first sight be expected to be κατὰ Θεομνήστου: but two orations of Lysias with that title are extant (x and xi), xi being merely an abbreviation of x. Since both of these are quite distinct from the speech against Theomnestus in the papyrus and presumably refer to a different person, while Harpocrateion seems to have known of only one speech κατὰ Θεομνήστου, i.e. the extant oration x (Blass, Attische Beredsamkeit, i. 611), the title of the second speech in 1606 is likely to have been something else. Fr. 9, belonging to the smaller group, contains parts of the last 16 lines of what is obviously a third speech, with part of the title, which seems to be unknown, and a few letters from the beginning of what is much more likely to be a fourth speech than the oration πρὸς Ἰπποθέρσων, and among the numerous minute scraps from the main find are certainly three (Frs. 19, 20, and 22), and perhaps two more (Frs. 21 and 44), which contain parts of titles. The minimum number of speeches represented by the fragments as a whole is four, a figure which could be obtained by assigning Fr. 9. ii to the speech πρὸς Ἰπποθέρσων, Fr. 19 (κατὰ Θεομνήστου?) or Fr. 22 to the speech against Theomnestus, and Fr. 20 to the title of the third
speech, and ignoring Frs. 21 and 44. But at least six of the lost orations are much more probably represented, and though all of these may have been quite short, it is clear that the fragments are widely scattered over different parts of the roll. Lysias is credited by Plutarch (Vita Lys. 836a) with no fewer than 425 speeches, of which Dionysius and Caecilius recognized 233 as genuine. The names of about 170 are known, and 34 are extant.

The script is a handsome uncial approximating towards the early biblical type, like 1234 (Part X, Plate iv) and 1365 (Part XI, Plate vi), and probably belongs to the early part of the third century or even the end of the second. Iota adscript was generally written. Paragraphi and two kinds of stops, in the high and middle position, are employed; that Fr. 82, in which a coronis occurs, belongs to 1606 is not certain. Fr. 6, in which the upper and lower margins are preserved, shows that there were 46–49 lines in a column. The other fragments are or may be from the middles of columns except when it is otherwise stated. The lines, which tend to begin and end more to the left as the column proceeds, range from 15 to 22 letters, generally having 18 or 19, and the >>-shaped sign is used for filling up short lines. Deletions are indicated by a line drawn (by the first hand) above the letters in question; but the text has not apparently been subjected to any independent revision, and several mistakes are noticeable, generally omissions; cf. ll. 47, 115, 139, 141, 173, 217, 349–56, 536.

Of the oration πρὸς Πτολεμαίου the three concluding columns (ll. 126–238), though requiring a good deal of restoration, are fairly well preserved, and some intelligible passages are provided by four other fragments (1–2 and 4–5) evidently belonging to earlier columns of the same speech (ll. 7–19, 28–47, 76–86, 114–24). The respective order of these is doubtful, but Fr. 4 may be placed below Fr. 2 with an interval not exceeding 2 or 3 lines between ll. 48 and 76; cf. ll. 38–44, n. Frs. 3 and 26 also probably belong to this oration, and perhaps Frs. 28–30, 87, and 100–1. It must have been one of Lysias' more important speeches, being concerned, like the oration against Eratosthenes (xii), with the administration of the Thirty Tyrants and his own grievances. In xii Lysias prosecuted Eratosthenes, who was one of the Thirty, for the murder of his brother Polemarchus (cf. 1606. 8–9, 161); the present action mainly turned on the question of the restoration of Lysias' property on his return from exile. As the title implies, the speech was on the side of the defence; but that the real defendant was not the θέραταυα but Lysias himself, is clear not only from the general tenour of the fragments, in which Lysias is very prominent, but from the expression φεῦγε τὴν δίκην applied to him in ll. 183–4, and the closing appeal in l. 221 ἀποψηφώσασθαι Ἀρηίων. How the θέραταυα became involved in the case does not appear, but presumably she was acting merely as Lysias' agent. With the plaintiff Hippo-
therses were associated one or more other individuals, the plural being employed
in reference to the side of the prosecution, which is called ὁσία in ll. 32 and 229
and perhaps of ἀντίθενοι in l. 133. Nicostratus and Xenocrates (ll. 17–18) may well
be two of the persons meant, and possibly Sosias (ll. 92–3, n.). The dispute
was concerned with the ownership of property (ὁσία) worth 70 (?) talents, formerly
belonging to Lysias, which had been seized by the Thirty and apparently sold
by them to Hippotherses and his associates (ll. 28–34), and which Lysias was now
trying to recover. By the terms of the amnesty arranged at the time of the
restoration of the democracy in B.C. 403, sales made during the administration
of the Thirty remained valid; but unsold property reverted to its original owners,
an exception being made in the case of land and houses, i.e. immovable property,
which were to be returned in any case (ll. 38–48). This reference to the amnesty
is important, confirming Grote’s views (Hist. of Greece, viii, ch. 66) on the
nature of the agreement; but the precise application of it to the dispute between
Hippotherses and Lysias is obscured by the incompleteness of Frs. 1–5. Lysias
evidently regarded the terms of the amnesty as in favour of his contentions, but
Hippotherses too may have appealed to it, and perhaps the interpretation was
one of the chief points of dispute. In ll. 13–17 Lysias complains that he was
being prevented by the prosecution from buying back his own property from
the purchasers; but in ll. 76 sqq. he is found objecting to a claim of Hippo-
therses for half the price of, apparently, the ὁσία described in ll. 28–34, and in
ll. 114 sqq. he criticizes the legality of the sales effected by the Thirty. This
evidence is not very easy to combine into a connected argument; but apparently
the ὁσία bought from the Thirty by Hippotherses contained land and houses,
and Hippotherses refused to surrender these without compensation, whereupon
Lysias, through the θεράπων, took some step towards ejecting Hippotherses
which resulted in the prosecution, possibly in some form of δίκη εξουσίας. The
peroration, to which ll. 127–236 belong, does not throw much light on the
facts of the case, which are referred to only in general terms (ll. 224–39), but
in itself is of much interest, since it contains an eloquent comparison of Lysias’
behaviour towards the State with that of his opponent. The patriotism of Lysias,
who after losing his brother and much property made large sacrifices in support
of the democrats, is recorded in a passage which was evidently before Plutarch
when writing his account of this part of Lysias’ life (ll. 163–71, n.), and is
contrasted with the pro-Spartan zeal of Hippotherses. The speech must have
been delivered very soon after the restoration of the democracy, i.e. in 403 or
402 B.C.

The second oration, that directed in prosecution of Theomnestus, after a very
short introduction (ll. 239–46), proceeds to the narration of the facts. The
unnamed plaintiff claims to have lent his friend Theomnæstus 30 minae in order to pay a debt to a certain Theozotides for which judgement had been entered against Theomnæstus. The transaction took place without witnesses, and Theomnæstus, having subsequently quarrelled with the plaintiff, now denied the loan (ll. 246–61). After a mutilated passage apparently explaining the nature of the quarrel, which seems to have been connected with the guardianship of some property, and the unsuccessful attempts of the plaintiff to get his money returned (ll. 261–95), a dilemma is propounded for the defence. Theomnæstus must maintain either that he borrowed the money from some one else, or that he did not borrow any money at all, in order to pay Theozotides (ll. 295–301). Of these alternative lines of defence the first is rebutted in ll. 301–40, Fr. 7 probably belonging to the column following Fr. 6. v, while the second is dealt with in ll. 340–66 by putting a number of questions designed to show that Theomnæstus would not have run the risks which he actually incurred, if he had had the requisite money at hand. The rest of the speech is lost, and there are no indications of the date of its delivery.

The third speech (Frs. 8, 9. i and probably some of Frs. 10–18), apparently against a person whose name ended in -ylius, seems to have been concerned with the sale of a ship at Carthage, and a question of partnership; but there is nothing to show what was the subject of the fourth speech (Fr. 9. ii and probably some of Frs. 10–18). With regard to the remaining fragments the more or less probable position of Frs. 13, 16, 28, 45, 53, 73, 80, and 128 has been ascertained. Fr. 25 apparently comes from a fifth speech about an inheritance (κληρος), and Frs. 31 and 39, which probably belong to the same oration, may be connected with a reference in Harpocration to βεβαιώσεως δίκη in two unnamed speeches of Lysias (cf. l. 493, n.), while probably one of Frs. 19–22 belongs to the title of it. Fr. 64 might come from the speech πρὸς Ἀλκιβιάδην or that πρὸς Ἀρχεβιάδην.

We are indebted to Mr. E. Lobel and Dr. C. Hude for several good suggestions in the restoration of this papyrus.

(a) πρὸς Ἡποθέρσην.

Fr. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11 letters</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>5 7</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ικ[. . . .]</td>
<td>αμ[. . . .]</td>
<td>συκιφαν[τ]</td>
<td>η[. . . .]</td>
<td>ουτος</td>
<td>διους τους εωςημεροις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[τ]α εαυτου</td>
<td>δυναται κομιζε</td>
<td>σιται Νικοστρατος γαρ δι</td>
<td>καζεται μετα Ξενοκλεους</td>
<td>τοιν πωλησαυτος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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20 .]να ασπ[δ 12 letters

30 .]ο παρα[ 14 ”

40 περιτηκον[τα 11 ”

50 δραχμω[ν 11 ”

60 }υρ[ 14 ”

70 ]δοσις £[ 13 ”

Fr. 2.

Col. i.  Col. ii.  Fr. 3.
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1606. LYSIS

Fr. 4. Col. i.

[... ... ...] μετα τα[ντα] τοι
[vu]ω ανδρες δικασται τι
[
ημισαν της τιμης ηξι
[ον παρα Λυσιου λαβειν λε
80 [γαυ] τας εαυτου συμφο
[p]ας ωστερ τουτου θησαυ
[p]ον [επι των τριακοντα
[ε]φικοτος αλλ ουκ απολοω
[λε]κοτος τα ουτα διαγα
85 [νακτουντος δ αυτου και
[καλτο]πως φεροντος προς
[... ... ... ...]μελ...
[... ... ... ...]μου Αχαρ
90 [νεως ...]πωςιν αυτω
[... ... ... ...]παραλαβων
[... ... ... ...]τοι Σωσια
[δην ... ... ...]μειτηρη η
[... ... ... ...]συγκείμε
95 [ν ... ... ...]ος ομολο
[γ ... ... ...]ν τοις αν
[... ... ... ...]με
[ν ... ... ... ...]ανηρ
[... ... ... ... ...]νου
100 [... ... ... ...]σεδει
[... ... ... ... ...]μ. ...]

Fr. 4. Col. ii.

προδ
δικη
νηλιμ
105 γεν.

Fr. 5.

[ ... ... ... ... ] δεινων γαρ
[αν ειν ω ανδρες δικασται [ ... ... ... ... ]
[ ... ... ... ... ] ποιμενου των δε ουτων [ ... ... ... ... ]
[α]ποστερεισθε ως αδικουν
[τε]ς καιτο[ς] δικαίως αν
[οργιζο]εισθε τοις εωνημε
115 [ει κατηλθε[τε] μ[ε]ν ως αδι]
[καυμενοι των δε ουτων [ ... ... ... ... ]
[α]ποστερεισθε ως αδικουν
[τε]ς καιτο[ς] δικαίως αν
[οργιζο]εισθε τοις εωνημε

Fr. 6.

120 [νοις τα μετερα εν ταις τοι:
[αυ]ταις συμφοραις προω
[το]ν μεν γαρ των τριακοντα
[ουδεν α]ν επωλουν ει τοι [ ... ... ... ... ]
[υσυμο]λενοι μη θεαν ει.
125 [... ... ... ]φι ... γκαν ει[. ...]
[ ... ... ... ... ]ον εφι[ ... ]

Col. ii + Fr. 80. Plate ii.

[Η]ει[ε]νον γενον ουτα ε
απο[λων] επε[θε]ν αυτων δι
168 [ ... ... ... ]
170 [ ... ... ... ]
[τα]λα]ντα παρασχειν τι
[λε] και αντι τ[ο]ν ουδε
[ ... ... ... ... ]
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[γειν . . . . .]ς βελτίως:
[. . . . . . . . τ]ου[. . . . . . .] αυτιδι
[κους . . . . . . έισ.] . . . .] υμιν
135 [. . . . .] τουτων επιτρεπο
[μεν α]κουσαντας τα Λυσι
[αι και Ι]ποθερεση πεπρα
[γυμεν]α οποτεραν Βουλευθε
[κρισιν?] πραγματος ψηφι
140 [ςασθαι] περι τουτων οπο
[<τερος βελτ]ιων ον περι την
[ημετερ]αν ποιην τυχα
[νει δε]σιων δ υμων ακον
[σαι ων και] ουτος υμων δο
145 [ξας χρη]στος ειναι προθυ
[μηται ε]πι του λοιπου και ο
[Ιπποθερ]ης ακουσας τα
[προσηκ]λουν αυτω βελτι
[ων το λοιπ]του ηι οτιλι] μεν
150 [ουν . . . . .]κα Λυσι[. . . . τι]μιν
[. . . . . . . . έπι . . . .]παντε
[λως δηλο]ν εος [με]ν γαρ ν
[μεις ηνδα]μονειτε πλου
[σιωτατος η]ν των μετοι
155 [κον επειδ]η δε συμφο
[ρα εγενετο] επεμεγε
[ουδε γ]ερ ελαχιστον με
[τοι των με]τερων δυστυ
[προιως . . . . .]σει ανομως
160 [υπο των τρια]κοντα και
[αδελφ]ου και] χρη]ματων
[πολλων απε]στερη[π]η[. . . . . .]
[επει δε] φευγ]ων ωιχετο
[επικουρους] τριακοσι
165 [ους επεμψεν?] εις την κα

παρ υμιν κεκοιμηται και
φευγων μεν τοιουτο την
175 κατελθων δε ουδενα πι
[π]οτε Αθηναιων ελυπη
[σε]ν ουτε περι των αυτων
[αμυ]νημισκον ευερ
γ[εσι]ν ουτε περι των αλ
180 λο[π]τριων οινειδι[ζ]ουν αμαρ
[τη]ματων νυν δ αναγ
κη περι αυτων λεγειν ν
πο τοιουτο γαρ φευγει την
δικην] ος επι μεν των τε
185 τρα[κ]ο]σιων φευγων ωιχε
το εκ Δεκελειας δε ορμω
μενος μ[ρ]τα των πολε
μων ε[πι τη]ν πατριδα
estrateν[σεν οι δε της τηρ]
190 λεος εχθροι κατηγα]
γον αγ]των και] πολι]την
υμε]τερων επι]νησαν
ωσι οιμαι παρι δηλον
ειν[ς] οτι [μ]ειο [νυν]
195 φρονει των [τε]ιχων αικο
δομημενων [η των
tote καθημεριεων []
ουδ εμη]θιας ελπιδας ε
χει επι τα[ι]ς υμετεραισ
200 ευπο[π]ιας και συμφοραις
eιτα τε[λεως?] ου [π]ολιτης
[και] ουδεσποτ]]εται αυτω
μεταμελη[ς]αρ φινδε δι
α την ηλικια[ιν] βελτι
205 ον γεγενημε[ι]ος συκο
φαντει τους πολ]λους με
Fr. 6. Col. iii.

Α[υσιαν δε χαριν] παρά[ ]
τον [δημον ἀπολαμβάνειν <ευ>]
ἐργ[εἰσιαν] τὴν μεγίστην
στὴν πεπονυκτησίαν σεο

220 μο[ι ου]ν ὑμον ὁ αὐτός
dikastai apopshēfiasosei
Αυστός μεμνημενος
και τῷυτον κ[αι] τῶν ἀλλων
τοι εἰ[ρημενον] εἰ δε

225 μὴ] τις εσται τοιτον αὐτῶν
πὼν δυστυχέστερος εἰ τα]
[μεν] αυτοι βιαι λῃσονται

Fr. 6. Col. iv.

[φαίνεται] [διὰ τοῦ] . . . [.] 240 [ ]
[προς ?] υμᾶς [σχ]εδόν παν
[. . . .]ναι οὐτω γαρ διε
[θηκε ?]ν ωστε μη μο

245 [ . . . α]λλα κα[ι] τὴν ουσιαν
[. . . . . . . . ου]τὶ δ εταίρων

(b) Against Theomnestus.

Fr. 6. Col. v.

240 [. . . . .] τον Θεομνηστος
[προς?] υμᾶς [σχ]εδόν παν
[. . . . .] ναι οὐτω γαρ διε
[θηκε?] ν ωστε μη μο

245 [ . . . α]λλα κ[α]ι τὴν ουσιαν
[. . . . . . . . ου]τὶ δ εταίρων

290 [ ]
[. . . . . . . . ου]τος οὐδ' αὐτῶς αρι

295 τει αναγκὴ δ αὐτῶι
[Θεο]μυ[ησ]ων τριακον
[τ]α μιας εδώκα δικην
δεν εκτισα[ι] Θεοδοτίδην
250 πριν δύνα τον ηλιον ει
dε μη υπερμέρον ειναι
dους δε ωσπερ εικο[ς] αν[ε]ν
μαρτυρων αποστ[ε]ρου[μ]ε
νος αναγκαζομαι δικα
255 ἔσθαι Θεομυστος δε
προ του μεν ην μοι φιλος
cαι εταιρος ἵννι δε πει
σθεις υπο τον εμων εχθρων
tαυτα τε πραττει και αλ
260 λο οτιον αν εις εμε [ε]τολμη
σειν πριν δ[ε] ταυτην η
[μι]ν την διαφοραν γενε
στ[α]ι ουτε η[ν]ωχθη[σ]α ουτε
απηιτησα [το αργ]υριον ου
265 δει . [.....] πολυς εγο
[.....]ν δε εορον
[.....]ν επιτροπην
ουσιας αυτο χαιτεσκευα
σμειηθην [.....] ντο με
270 εκ[.....]ν τη της α
π[.....]ν τε οτε εδω
κ[αυτου ανευ μ]αρτυρων.
δους [δε και την] απαιτη
σιν [.....] νεπτυ
275 ον ει... ποιο ημενος
ηγη[σαμην περ]εργον
eιναι[.....] μονον
σι[.....]ερων
π[.....] ν
280 εισ[.....] ν
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| μαρτυρε[ ] | 330 χο[ρ]γε[ ] αν[δρα]σ[ι] [εις Διν][ν] ον[υσία πα[.] ....... Χι
| [σι ] | λ[ι]ας δρα[ξ][µας] ....... μι
| [ ] | σθον διελη[σε] .......

285 μ. [. . . . . . . . ] εξ αυ
| τ[.] . . . . . . τ[.] ου πρα
| γ[µατος . . . . . . ] ποιη

Frs. 7 + 45 + 73.

333α [. . . . . . ] νοι[, . . . . . .]
334 περί τ[.] [. ου] [. . . . . .]
| τε δε | περι του βοσ τι[ . . . . . .]
| [ε]π[ ε] | οικειοι ουτ[ι[ . . . . . .]
| [. ιαι | προς μεν ουν πιο παρ ε
340 [να]λ ταυτα λεγο αν [δε .
| [ . . . ] | οντος αργυρ[ιου .
| [. . . ] | μας τον Θεο[µηστον ?
345 [. . ι] Αργυριον πε[ρ][ι]δ[ειν] ε
| [αν][τον εις τον ε]σχατ[ουν] κι
| δ[ι]νον ελθουτα και[τι]ταν
| την [δ]υναμιν επι[δ]ειξαι
| τοις εκ]θροις και (τ[ις] ουτ[ω] σφο
| [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . ] [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

(c) Against . . . ylius, &c.

Fr. 8.

370 [ειν Κ]αρχηδον απ[ε]δο[το]
| μαρτυρε[ ]
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[μα]τυρησουσιν [ν]μιν [φ]i
[ἐπι]πειὸντες . . .

Fr. 10.

[σ]τατι[π]
405 [.δ.] . . . . [.ε] καὶ [.ς] [.ε]ις μεντ[ι]
]παρ ετεροι[ν] ?
]ας δὲ λει[ε][
410 ]διαλλα[ε]
]ε . [.]

[προς ] . νυ[ι]γ[υ]

Fr. 11.

[. . . . ] . τ[ι]
[. . . ] . Π[λ]α[ν]
[. . . . ] . [.
415 [.ν] . θ[ι]
]οντα [. .] . δικαι[π]
[.ειν δη τισιν α[ι]
[.ου.] ανα[α]ρ [. . . ου]
420 τω σφόδρα μου [κατε]
[. . . ] . σθε[ι] α[ντ][
[. . . ] . δειμο[ν]
[. . . ] . τθ[ι] . . θ[ι]
435 ]γα[ι . .

Fr. 12.

[λ]ον [. . .]
[. . . ] . μ[.] . .
425 [.ον οντα[.] . .
436 ] μαρτυρ[ι]
[μαμαι]

Fr. 13.

top of col.

Fr. 14.

440 δι ετη προσ[ι] εφα?

σκε βουλεσθαι[ι]
με ποιησασθαι[ι]

end of col.

Fr. 15.

[. . . ] . θηστ[ι]
447 ]π[οι]νυ
450 ] . θτ [.
453 ] . π[.
445 . . ε[ι]
]εφα . .
[. . . ] . .
455 ] . ι . [.
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(d) MISCELLANEOUS.

Fr. 19  Fr. 20.  Fr. 21.  Fr. 22.
456 ἵππον 457 προς 458 παραργομον; 459 ἀπειθής
460 προς [Ὁ; ?] [οντες καὶ [παρῄξομεν]

Fr. 23.
[...] ποτέ [ου καὶ [τομή]
πάρεχομεν [παρῄς καὶ [φασκοῦν]

Fr. 24.

Fr. 25.

Fr. 26.

[...] οὐκ ἄ[ [...] ἀλλ οἱ μὲν ἄπτε[ [...] παρεμούς αὐ[ [...] οὐκ αὖ εἰ[ [...] οἰκονομοι τοιούτω θε[ [...] τροπο[ ζηγερ[ [...] καὶ οὐ γανα[ [...] επὶ τῶν πατ[ [...] τα[ [...] 500 άτρ[ [...] 555 πον[ [...] εὐ τη[ [...] ἀπ[ [...] 520 π[ [...] 525 β[ [...] 545 η[ [...] 555 ρα[ [...]
Το Οξύρυνχος Παπύροι

στερομένος [.....]  ἐξήνθη
510 μου δοκούσιν οί τα νημε
τερα ξριάμενοι [.....]  τῇ

Fr. 29 + 30 + 28?.

530 δω[.....] σ[....]  ἐν
540 ποσιν ε[.....] αὐτόν τα
ρα[.....] ν αποδει
ἐξα[.....] γ[.....] αὐτον ενα[.....]

τα μονον [ α;?] α[ν] αὐτο δίκαι
ο[ς] παρ υμον φ[ε]ροι το[.....] ν
[.....] ν ποσ γαρ ἡ δυνατ[α]ι

end of col.

Fr. 32.

550 [. ] δεντρ[ ] του ουτος δε τ[ ]
[. ] ντ[ ] διαγομενος [ ]
ο[ς] εθελ[. ] [ 560 ] δια[, ]λευκε την [ ]
ἐκετε ου γαρ δι[α]κ[οιν ]
μεν υπ[ ] ε[ι]ς[ ] [..... ]

555 υπερ τ[ο]υτον [. ]
[. ] [ 570 ] ν

Fr. 33.

[. ] νεω[ 580 ] [ ] .

στρατεύον[ ]  ν και [ 595 ] ν γαρ [ ]

Fr. 34.

575 και έτε[ ]

συνε[ 590 ] ἔ
tων [ te ]
λευ[ 585 δι[ ]

Fr. 35.

Fr. 36.

Fr. 37.

Fr. 38.
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Fr. 39.

[...]

Fr. 40.

Col. i.

2 lines lost

Col. ii.

[...

Fr. 41.

[...]

Fr. 42.

[...]

Fr. 43.

[...]

Fr. 44.

[...]

Fr. 45.

[...]

Fr. 46.

[...]

Fr. 47.

[...]

Fr. 48.

[...]

Fr. 49.

[...]

Fr. 50.

[...]

Fr. 51.

[...]

Fr. 52.

[...]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Fr. 53</th>
<th>Fr. 54</th>
<th>Fr. 55</th>
<th>Fr. 56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>( \mu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \lambda \varepsilon \iota \varsigma )</td>
<td>( \kappa \alpha i\tau \alpha )</td>
<td>( \omega \phi \varepsilon )</td>
<td>( \eta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \alpha \delta \eta \kappa )</td>
<td>( \mu \alpha \tau \upsilon \sigma \iota \iota )</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>end of col.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \kappa \mu )</td>
<td>( \kappa \mu )</td>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \theta \omega \nu \delta )</td>
<td>( \sigma \sigma )</td>
<td>( \sigma \eta \iota \tau \iota \sigma )</td>
<td>( \tau \epsilon \iota )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \tau \epsilon \pi \nu )</td>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>( \sigma \mu \mu \nu )</td>
<td>( \kappa \alpha \nu )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \Theta )</td>
<td>( \tau \alpha \lambda )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota )</td>
<td>( \omega )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \tau \iota \nu )</td>
<td>end of col.</td>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \theta \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \sigma \sigma \omega \kappa )</td>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \theta \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \sigma \sigma \omega \kappa )</td>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \lambda )</td>
<td>( \lambda \alpha \kappa )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \chi )</td>
<td>( \lambda \alpha \kappa )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \omega )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma \rho \omega \nu )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
<td>( \lambda \nu \varsigma \iota \omega \sigma \iota \tau \tau )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | \( \gamma \rho \omega \nu \) | \( \lambda \nu \varsiga
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Fr. 125.  
928 [δικω]  
930 [στρ[στ  
932 [eiα[  
935 [και[  
Fr. 129.  
936 [τρια[  
938 [η πο[  
940 [νοκ. [  
942 [νος [  
Fr. 132.  
946 [πο[  
948 [σφ[  
950 [προ[  
Fr. 133.  
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948 [πο[  
950 [πο[  
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955 [σθα[ι  
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Fr. 135.  
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962 [ται[π[  
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966 [α[  
Fr. 136.  
970 [ε[  
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975 [το[  
Fr. 137.  
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Fr. 155.  
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Fr. 2. ... σαλλη[θ] ... οὐ[σ] ... διέ ἐξοδομέκο[ν] ... ταλάντων ... ἀπέδο[ε] ... ὥν οὖ[σ] αὐ[τῷ] ... ἰδίᾳ[ν] ... οὐτ[ρ] ... ἀποδόθαι πολ[λ] ... ἥμρον ἠδύνατο. ... έπ[ε] ... τιμημένην μεθ' ὑ[μῶν] ... φιλικῶν Λυσιά[ς] ... κρίττοι και μετ' α[ὐ] ... τῶν ἥμερ[ὰ] ... ἔριν ... κατηθεν. ἐκείνων τῶν συνθήκων τά μὲν πεπραμέκτα τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ξένων, τά δὲ εἰπ[αρ] ... κατελθώντα κι[μι]κετάσθαι, οὗτος ἀστεὶ ... τόν [ο[υ]ν ... οἰκίαν κεκτήμενον, καὶ α[ι] ... αὐ[λὸ] ... τοῦ κατελθώντων ἀπεδίδοσαν, ἐνα[ν] ... δὲ ... ἀπόδοτος ... .

... and sold the property for 7ο talents, which property they were unable either to realize or to sell within a long period. So when Lysias departed with you into exile and returned with your democracy, the treaty enjoining that buyers should keep their purchases, but the returned exiles should recover what was unsold, he, not having obtained either land or house, which even the treaty restored to the returned exiles, or if it did (not) ... restore ... .

Fr. 4. μετὰ τοῖς τοι[υ] ... διὰ τὰς ... τῆς τιμῆς ἡξ[α] ... τοῦ δια[λυτο] ... Λυσιά ... κρίττοι ... τῶν εὐ[μηνίων] ... ἀνθρωπίνων ξένων, τάς ... τῶν συνθήκων τά μὲν πεπραμέκτα τῶν εὐ[μηνίων] ... ξένων, τά δὲ εἰπ[αρ] ... κατελθώντα κι[μι]κετάσθαι, οὗτος ἀστεὶ ... τόν [ο[υ]ν ... οἰκίαν κεκτήμενον, καὶ α[ι] ... αὐ[λὸ] ... τοῦ κατελθώντων ἀπεδίδοσαν, ἐνα[ν] ... δὲ ... ἀπόδοτος ... .

... Afterwards then, gentlemen of the jury, he claimed to receive half the price from Lysias, recounting his own misfortunes, as if Lysias had discovered a treasure in the time of the Thirty and not lost his property. Lysias being indignant and unwilling to submit ...

Fr. 5. δεινὰ ... γιὰ ... ἄν εἰ ... διὰ τὰς ... τοῖς τοι[υ] ... διὰ τὰς ... τῆς τιμῆς ἡξ[α] ... τοῦ δια[λυτο] ... Λυσιά ... κρίττοι ... τῶν εὐ[μηνίων] ... ἀνθρωπίνων ξένων, τάς ... τῶν συνθήκων τά μὲν πεπραμέκτα τῶν εὐ[μηνίων] ... ξένων, τά δὲ εἰπ[αρ] ... κατελθώντα κι[μι]κετάσθαι, ο الذى ... τοῖς τοι[υ] ... διὰ τὰς ... τῆς τιμῆς ἡξ[α] ... τοῦ δια[λυτο] ... Λυσιά ... κρίττοι ... τῶν εὐ[μηνίων] ... ἀνθρωπίνων ξένων, τάς ... τῶν συνθήκων τά μὲν πεπραμέκτα τῶν εὐ[μηνίων] ... ξένων, τά δὲ εἰπ[αρ] ... κατελθώντα κι[μι]κετάσθαι, ο الذى ... τοῖς τοι[υ] ... διὰ τὰς ... τῆς τιμῆς ἡξ[α] ... τοῦ δια[λυτο]...
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Δικήν τις ὑπὲρ τῶν τετρακοσίων φεύγων ἄχετο, ἐκ Δεκέλειας δὲ ὄρμακόν καὶ τῶν πολεμίων ἐπὶ τῇ παραβίᾳ ἐστρατεύετο, οἵ δὲ τῆς πολεμίς εὐχων κατήγγειλον αὐτῷ καὶ πιστεύουσιν ἑπισκόπασιν. ὡςτ', οἷμα, τὰ τινὰ πλὴν εἰναὶ διὰ τοῦ ἑυρήμα τοῦ κατάγγειλον αὐτῷ καὶ πιστεύουσιν ἑπισκόπασιν. ἦν δὲ δῆλον αὐτῷ ἱνα φρονήση τῶν τετρακοσίων φιλομέμενοι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν καθηκόντων, ὥστε δὴ οἷσιν αὐτῶν ἐξεπεκτείνεται εὐθυγραμμία καὶ συμφωνία, εἶναι τῆς ἕλεος; ὥστε δὲ πιστεύοντες αὐτῷ μεταμελήσανταν ὁ ἄλλος δήλῳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ δικαίως βεβλημένοις, εἰκοσάπεντες τοὺς πολλοὺς µὲθ' ὑμᾶς εἰργασθῆναι ἔτοις | Δυστάνει δὲ χάραι παρὰ τοῖς δήμοις ἀπολαμβάνειν εἰς τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν ἐμμέμενοι καὶ τῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν εἰρήμεν. ἢ δὲ μῆλη, τίς ἐστιν τοῦτον ἀνθρώπον δυνατοῦτον προκειμένου, εἰ τὰ μὲν αὐτοῦ βία λήψωσιν, πᾶς δ' ὑμᾶς δώσει; ἡ τε χάρις ἐμμέμενος εἰς τὰς παραδόσεις, εἰ μὴ μόνον τῷ ἑκατοκτητῷ συμψάχνων αὐτοῦς ἐξέστη, ἄλλα καὶ νυνὶ περὶ δοὺς [ὡς] ὑμᾶς εἰργασθῶν | ὑπὸ αὐτὰ δὲ κελεύουσιν ψηφισθείν; 

πρὸς Ἱπποθέρσην ὑπὲρ θεραπείας.

. . . we leave it to you, after hearing the actions of Lysias and Hippocrates, to give whichever verdict on the matter you choose with regard to the question which of the two is the better citizen. And I beg you to listen, in order that both Lysias, having been judged by you to have done his duty, may be still more zealous in the future, and Hippocrates hearing the truth about himself may behave better. . . . For while you were prosperous Lysias was the richest of the metoeci; but when disaster came he stayed on; for he did not in the least fail to share in your misfortunes, being illegally deprived by the Thirty of both his brother and much money. When he left Athens in flight, he sent 300 mercenaries to help in the restoration and provided both 2,000 drachmae in money and 200 shields . . . (and going to) Thrasydaeus the Elean, who was his guest-friend, he persuaded him to provide two talents in taxes, though in return for this he has never obtained any recompense or favour from you. Such was his behaviour in exile, while since his return he has never given offence to a single Athenian either by recalling the benefits conferred by himself or by making reproaches for the sins of others. But now it is necessary to speak about him, since his accuser is a man of this character: in the time of the Four Hundred he took to flight, and making Decealos his head-quarters fought with the enemy against his country; and it was the foes of the city who changed him and made him your fellow-citizen. Hence it is, I think, plain to all that he is now less pleased with the walls which were built than with the walls which were then destroyed, and bases quite dissimilar hopes upon your good fortunes and your disasters, and then being a full citizen, and never having repented or improved through age, he slandered the democracy after what he has done against you . . . (it is just) that Lysias should receive the thanks of the people for having conferred the greatest benefit upon them. I entreat you therefore, gentlemen of the jury, to acquit Lysias, remembering both this and the other arguments which I have used. Otherwise who in the world will be more unfortunate than Lysias, if his opponents are to take part of his property by force and part of it is to be given to them by you, or who will be happier than they, if you intend not only to pardon them for their past misdeeds but also now, whatever proposals they may make to you, to vote for all their demands? Against Hippocrates on behalf of a maidervant.

Fr. 6, iv–v, 7. [Ναὶ ἔσται διὰ τοῦ] . . . [. . . τοῦ Θεομύρστος πρὸς ὑμᾶς] ἡμᾶς [σχέδιον πάν] . . . οὕτω γὰρ διεξήκονταν καὶ οὕτως μὴ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τρόποποι εἶναι καὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ὁμαλής . . . διότι δ' ἐταίρῳ [Θεομύρστῷ] τοῦ ματαίου, δικήν δὲν ἐκεῖνος ἡ δικαίωσις πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον, εἰ δὲ μῆλη, ὑπερμερόν εἶναι. διὸς δὲ ὡσπερ εἰκότως ἀνέρχομαι, ἀποκρίθηκα [εἰ] εἰρήμενος ἀναγκαζομαι δικαίως. Θεομύρστος δὲ πρὸς τὸν μὲν ἢ μοι φίλος καὶ ἐκεῖνος, νῦν δὲ πολλοὶ ἐρωτοῦν τῶν ἐμῶν εὐχων ταῦτα τέρτα τέρτα καὶ ἄλλα ὡσπερ ἢν ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ὑμᾶς αἰσθήσεις, πρὸς δὲ τοῦτον ἤρθη, τὸν ταῦτα διαγραφὴν γενέσθαι, οὔτε ἡ φύλαξ ὡσπερ ἀπήγγειλα τὸ ἀργυρόν, ὀπλέτι (l. 293) . . . τὴν ἀνάγκην . . . ἄνω ὀξύνοις ἀνά γειτὸν, τὴν ἀνάγκην δ' αἰτήτως εἰ μὴ παρ' ἐμῶν τ' ἄργυρῳ ἐχει, διὸν δὲ τὰς [ὁ] παρ' ἐμῶν φιλίας εἰς ἑννέαν [εἰ] αὐτῶν τὸ πάντα; ἦκατοκτήτως τῷ Θεομύρστῳ. εἷς δὲ τοῦ
... As he was my associate, I gave Theomnestus 30 minae, when he was obliged to pay a penalty to Theozotides before sunset or else become liable for default. Having given him the money naturally without witnessing and being defrauded of it, I am compelled to go to law.

Theomnestus previously was my friend and associate, but now at the persuasion of my enemies this is how he acts, and he would have dared to do anything else against me. Before this quarrel between us arose, I neither troubled him nor demanded back the money ... (l. 295) He must, if he has not had the money from me, make one of two pleas, either that he has received it from some one else, or that he himself paid Theozotides in full. If on the one hand he is going to assert that he received it from some one else, ... (l. 315) ... he hesitated to ask from me who was aware of his straits (?), but thought fit to borrow from persons who were going to inform his enemies. Is it, however, probable that my money should be lent out (?) to others, and that he should borrow from others than myself? To show that he did not think fit ... to borrow from some one else, I will produce an important piece of evidence. When he was providing a men’s chorus at the Dionysiac festival, ... (l. 338) With regard then to the assertion that he received the money from some one else, that is my answer. But if (he paid from) the money which he had by him, you must put these questions to Theomnestus. Is it likely that he would have overlooked the extreme danger which he incurred and put so much power into his enemies’ hands? Who ever had such excessive trust in fortune, even if suddenly he became possessed, that he was obliged to endanger his body and life as well, having come to this pass if the sun set leaving him a defaulter? Who is so senseless as to place himself at the mercy of his enemies, or who is so foolish as to ...
11. ἐν Πειραιᾷ: according to xii. 17 Lysias went to Megara from Athens, and Plut. op. cit. 385f states δύρην ἐν Μεγάραις. The Piraeus is mentioned here as being the head-quarters of the exiles after its capture by Thrasybulus. One of the houses of Lysias and his brother was there; cf. Plato, Rep. 327a.

11–12. ἑκ:] cf. l. 78.
12–13. ἀπ[οφέρομεν: or ἀποκομίζομεν; cf. ἀπομικτοῦμαι in l. 16. αὐ[τοῦ] or αὐτ[οῦ] could also be read, and the verb may be intransitive; but possibly τα εὐαυτοῦ, which in l. 16 has a line above it, was added in the margin of ll. 12–13.
16–17. ἀπομικτοῦμαι: cf. l. 43 and 12–13, n. The omission of τα εὐαυτοῦ here is no improvement, unless the words had been inserted in the margin of ll. 12–13.
17–18. Neither Nicrostratus nor Xenocles is known from other sources.
20. ἀποτάξις: Lysias had a shield-manufacturing business; cf. xii. 19 and Plut. op. cit. 385f, quoted in ll. 163–71, n.
29. ὀστίαμα: cf. ll. 9–10, n. ουσιαν . . . σ]ολαγοθ[εισαν αὐτ[οῖ] | δε is possible.
30. ἐθ[ομικο]τα: the first letter might be σ or ω, and the traces of the second and third are very doubtful, but unless there was another word before the number, ἐθ[ομικο]τα is preferable to e.g. ἐθ[ει τρακο]τα.
31. [απεδείχτο] is far from certain, especially since i or ω can be read in place of π, so that the subject might be singular. If [ἀπεδείχθη] is right, the subject seems to be the Thirty Tyrants as contrasted with οὐτοι in l. 32, which refers to Hippotherses and his associates.
32. ἀπομικτοῦμαι: i.e. ἐγγαρινία: cf. the contrast between ἀφανής and φανερὰ ὀστία in the fragment of this speech quoted on p. 48.
35–6. Cf. l. 163.
38–44. For οὖσα meaning Lysias cf. l. 5, n. The context does not suit the reference of οὔσα to Hippotherses, though there may be only a short gap between ll. 48 and 76; cf. int. p. 49.
47. This line seems to be corrupt, though ο[.] (but not α[.]) or any other letter than α[.] can be read in place of ι[.] A diphthong of αυ or αυ is the simplest hypothesis, but there may well be an omission of μυ before αποδοῦ[α], and possibly [ω]πα δε αυ (μυ) αποδοῦ[α] should be read.
48. The letter before ρα can be ε, but φανερα is possible; cf. int. p. 48.
83. θηρῖνος suits the space better than [θηρίνος: in l. 153 the spelling of θηρίον] αυνείτε is uncertain.
86. [χαλε]παρις φειρύητο: cf. xix. 50.
89. [πλο]υ: αὐτ[ο]ν is less suitable, and ιερωμ[ου] (cf. Lys. Fr. 123 quoted on p. 48) is inadmissible.
92–3. Σωσίας[δρ:] Σωσία (genitive) or Σωσία[πα]κτα is possible; but cf. Fr. 64, where άνασχύς[το]ς Σωσία[δρ:] can be restored in ll. 736–7. παραλοξω[ν τον ανασχύς] τον Σωσία[δρ:] could even be read here. Fr. 75, where Σωσία[δρ:] is not unlikely in l. 781, may also refer to this person.
93–4. δανειστήριο̆ should perhaps be restored in l. 93, but α] εἰς την η[τερα ην] συγκεκρῐμ[ν] is possible.
102. This line is in the same position in the column as l. 92.
113–18. Cf. xxxiv. 11 δεινὸν γὰρ ἐν εἰς, δ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναίοι, εἰ ἦν μὲν ἐφεύγομεν εἰμαχόμεθα λακεδαιμονίας ἵνα κατέλθωμεν, κατέλθωμες δὲ φεύγομεν ὡς μὴ μαχόμεθα.
129. α]ει]κο[στα: i.e. in ll. 38 sqq. probably.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

129—35. Either η in l. 129 or ...με in l. 130 is likely to belong to ημας, which is expected about this point, being perhaps contrasted with τημας in l. 133—4. If there was a pause after απαδικοῦς, the next sentence may have begun ημας [τουρμα] ημας. In view of the stop, however, at the end of l. 132, τημας απαδικοῦς may be connected with what follows, and mean both parties to the suit, not Lysias' adversaries. ημας in l. 134 clearly goes with επιτρεπμε [μεν]: cf. Plato, Apol. 35 επιτρεπμε ... κρώος. There is room for [ἐν περὶ] before τούτων in l. 135, but περὶ τούτων occurs shortly after in l. 140.

139. [χριστος]: cf. xxv. 10 οὕτως γὰρ ἀν δικαιοσύνην (τῆς) κρίσιν περὶ αὐτῶν παώσῃ. For [γραμμα] there is no room. περὶ τούτων would be expected before προγνωστος, but since περὶ τούτων occurs in the next line, the sentence would be improved by the omission of προγνωστος.

141. There seems to have been an omission of τε at the beginning of this line, as in l. 115.

145. [ευμας] or [μεν].

149. It is not certain that the space (the width of a letter) between ιι and ιοι ιοι was blank, the surface of the papyrus being damaged. Whether μεν had a δε answering to it is not clear, and perhaps μεν [τοι should be read.

150. υμας or ημας.

155—6. Cf. xii. 43 ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦν ναυμαχία καὶ ἦ συμφορὰ τῷ πόλει ἐγένετο.

157—9. Cf. xii. 20 ὡδὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐλάχιστον μέρος τῆς οἰκίας ἔλεον ... ἐνιχθοῦνεις, xii. 22 μετὰ γὰρ ἄν καὶ ἐμὸι τοῦτον τὰσχαοῦν ὦκ ἐλάχιστον μέρος, and especially xvi. 2 τῶν μὲν κοικῶν  ἐλάχιστον αὐτῶν μετάχει μέρος. The ν of [υμας in l. 159 is fairly certain. A verb meaning ‘avoided’ is expected, but εφιμεν cannot be read.

160—2. Cf. ll. 8—10, nn.

163—71. Cf. Plut. op. cit. 835ι ἐπεθεμένοι δὲ τῶν ἀπὸ Φίλιππα τῷ καθίδρῳ, ἐπὶ χρησμοτάτου ἀπώλετον ὁδήγη, χρήσιμα τὸ παράσχον διαχώρις διακρίνει καὶ ἀσπίδαις διακριόσα περιβαλέται τε σὺν Ἐρμᾶν ἐπικώφους ἐμαυθάτον προκοεῖς διότι τ' ἐπεισε τὰλατα δύονα Θρασυβιάδον τῷ Ἡλείᾳ, ἢν ἡμῶν αὐτῶ (better αὐτῷ) γεγονότα, which is clearly based upon the present passage, not, as Blass (op. cit. p. 339) supposed, upon the speech περὶ τῶν ἴδων εἰργασίων (cf. ll. 177—9 n.). A shorter verb than εμαυθάσατο seems to have occurred in l. 165, though cf. xii. 59 ἐπικώφους μαθοῦσα. With the spelling τ'ε[λη]µ in l. 170—1 cf. ἀναγκή as the nominative in l. 181—2.

173. παρ ναμι: the traces of ι are very slight, but there is no room for ναμι, which is what Lysias probably wrote (cf. ll. 216—19, n.), though later writers, e.g. Dio Cass. Ecc. p. 66. 34, often use the dative with παρὰ in place of the genitive.

177—9. The speech πρὸ τῆς προοδήρασης was probably delivered before that περὶ τῶν ἴδων εἰργασίων, of which the contents and date are unknown.

178. ῆν[μημασκος]: for μημασκος as a form of μημάσκον in the Roman period, but is not likely to have been used by Lysias himself, cf. Porphyry. Vitr. Plotini 13 ἐν δὲ τινὶ λέξειν ἀμαρτών, οὐ γὰρ ἀν ἐπεὶ ἀμαρτηθῆται ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτηθήτω, and P. Hamburg 37. 4 (2nd cent.) μημάσκον, quoted by W. Schmid in Berl. Phil. Woch. 1914. 1568.

184. εἰ δὲ τοιὸτα τοῦτοις: i.e. at the fall of the Four Hundred, when several of the leaders escaped to Decelea.; cf. Thuc. viii. 98.

191—4. That two originally separate fragments, one attributed to the middles of ll. 192—3, the other (Fr. 80) to the ends of ll. 191—4, are correctly placed admits of little doubt.

194—7. The general sense is that Hippotherses took more pride in the destruction than in the building of the walls; cf. xii. 63 καὶ τεσσαράκοντα τοι ὄντων ὡς αὐτῶν ἐμπρόσθεν πολιτείαν πράττειν ὡς ὑδρομισθήσεται τα τείχη, ὡς ἀπεικονίσει καὶ μετὰ Θηραμένου ὡς
καθαρωθήσεται, and xiv. 39 ἤ τῶν τεῖχων καθημερίνων ἄγανακτεί. The first letter of μ[ειω]ν is, however, very uncertain, γ, η, τ, κ, ν, τ, or τ being equally possible. στ[ι] ο[α][ω[α]ν could be read instead of στ[ι] μ[ειω]ν, with κα for η in l. 196 (which as it stands is rather short); but this does not combine well with αυν ο[α][αι]ς επίτιδες in l. 198. τῶν τείχων κτλ. seems to be a genitive absolute.

201. ων: The first letter can be η, τ, or α, but hardly υ.

203. μεταμελεῖ[σα]: cf. the use of the present participle absolutely in Isocr. 382 c and Plato, Phaedo 114 a.

207. ειργαζοῦσα: ειργαζοῦσας is inadmissible. The next word may have been κακα.

212—13. Perhaps πενητηκώτα ταλαντών.

216—19. Though the remains are scanty, the general sense is fairly clear; but in l. 217 βα[ε]ι would be expected to end the line, and there is certainly not room for both ειν and ειν alter it. λο[ν]αι cannot be read. For χαριν] παρα τοι [δημον απολαμβάνειν cf. l. 172 and xx. 30 χαράν παρ’ έμιν απολαμβάνειν.

230. The cancelling of περί is supported by x. 2 συγγυμόνων ἀν εἴχον αὐτῷ τῶν εἰρημένων: but cf. ix. 22 ὑπὲρ τῶν περιερωμῶν ἀδικημάτων συγγυμόνων ποιεσθε, and xix. 50 περὶ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς ... συγγυμόνων ἐγκεῖτα.

239—46. [δι] τοῦ λο[γον το]υς is unsatisfactory, for the slight traces after το[ν]υ do not suit λο, and if the letter preceding το[ν]υ were ν, the tail of it would rather be expected to be visible. [δι] τοῦ λο[γον το]υς λο[γον]υς is also unsuitable, and since this speech is for the prosecution it is not likely to have begun with a reference to a speech by the defendant. [δι] το[ν]υ [αρ]ω[ν]ος το[υ]ς is possible, but we have not been able to restore the whole passage satisfactorily. [ειρηκεναι could be read in l. 242, but like λο[γον]υς is not appropriate, and δι[θηκε]νυ in l. 242—3 is rather short. With επιτροπος and ουτισιον in ll. 244—5 cf. ll. 267—8. The vestige of a letter at the end of l. 244 suggests ε, ι, or ν. κε[λειν ο]λλα is too long.

249. Θεοστορίδης: cf. l. 300. He is not likely to be the same person as the Θεοστορίδης against whom lxx was directed, for the fragments was of that speech in P. Hibeh 14 are concerned with a γραφή παραιτών on account of Th.'s proposals to alter the pay of soldiers and arrangements for benefiting orphans. Nor is he to be identified with the Θεοστορίδης χορηγός τραγανδῶν mentioned by Dem. xxi. 59. With regard to the spelling, Θεοστορίδης is the only form recognized in the Prosopogr. Alt.; but Θεοστορίδης or Θεοστορίδης is commonly found in Byzantine MSS.

266. ...[υ]: or επι[ε],

267—8. Cf. ll. 244—5.

269. The letter preceding το may be ι or ο.

270. ιαι can be read in place of [υ.

271. Perhaps το[ν]ις, unless ο[υ]ς was written twice by mistake. γς is the only alternative to το.

272. αυν μαρτυρων: cf. l. 252.

275. που [μενον]: η, τ, or ω can be read instead of ν.

276. Cf. xii. 35 ἤ τοις σφάς αὐτοῖς ἡγήσατον περιέργους υπέρ ὑμῶν πεσφείνοντες.

293—4. Probably απειρηστισωσ or αποδο[στισωσ.

294—5. ατ[λε]νιει cannot be read without altering the text, though it is the word expected.

297. δουων δαν[τ]ινον: cf. vi. 8, xii. 34.

302—3. Possibly [ειληθερωσι ον] κατ[τ]

312. The letter before τοκον might be ο, but is apparently not υ.

317—18. ο[ειν] δεσπούρα: cf. l. 335, where these words seem to recur. But the ο is lower in the line than would be expected and there might be one or two letters lost after it. The letter following κ, if not ν, is μ.
320. The \(\chi\theta\rho\omicron\) are those of Theomnestus (cf. l. 349), not those of the plaintiff (l. 258).

322. The \(\nu\) of \(\mu\varepsilon\nu\) is corrected from \(\mu\).

325–6. Possibly \(\omega\nu\tau\omicron\sigma\chi\nu\sigma\sigma\sigma\) or \(\omega\nu\tau\omicron\sigma\chi\nu\sigma\sigma\sigma\tau\omicron\) is not a satisfactory reading. The last three letters of \(\alpha\upsilon\omega\nu\) are very doubtful, but the following \(\mu\) is nearly certain, so that \(\pi\varphi\rho\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\sigma\) and \(\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron\sigma\rho\omicron\) are excluded.

330–2. Cf. xxxi. 2 \(\varepsilon\tau\omicron\ \delta^\prime\ \alpha\nu\varphi\alpha\\sigma\iota\varsigma\) \(\chi\upsilon\rho\omicron\gamma\iota\varsigma\) \(\varepsilon\iota\ \Delta\iota\nu\varepsilon\nu\iota\varsigma\...\varepsilon\iota\kappa\iota\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma\) \(\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\delta\iota\varsigma\alpha\nu\iota\sigma\omicron\varsigma\) \(\tau\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\iota\pi\omicron\sigma\delta\iota\varsigma\) \(\alpha\iota\varsigma\) \(\delta\nu\tau\omicron\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\varsigma\) \(\mu\alpha\) \(\nu\omicron\) \(\lambda\varsigma\) \(\delta\nu\sigma\alpha\\omicron\mu\alpha\) could be read.

333a–41. That Frs. 45 and 73 join together and are to be placed near the beginnings of these lines was ascertained after they had been printed in the miscellaneous section.

335. Cf. ll. 317–18, n. \(\delta\epsilon\iota\) could be read. If \(\delta\epsilon\iota\theta\rho\omicron\nu\alpha\) is right, the next word may be \(\tau\omicron\iota\nu\epsilon\iota\).
456. Possibly, but not very probably, κατὰ Θεομηνοῦς: cf. int. p. 48. The two extant orations κ. Θεομ. are distinguished as α’ and β’. There is a blank space above and below γροῦ.

457. Cf. l. 389, n. There is a blank space above προ[, but the lower margin is broken away.

458. The blank spaces above and below this line indicate a title. Υπερ Θανιοῦ παρανόμων was the title of a speech of Lysias according to Atheneaeus xii. 551d, who quotes a long extract from an invective against Cinesias, a writer of dithyrambs and comedies, this being one of the two speeches πρὸς Κωνσίναν mentioned by Harpocration. The speech κατὰ Θεομηνοῦς was also concerned with speeches to the same category. But none of the other miscellaneous fragments of 1608 suggests any of these speeches as its source.

459–60. Possibly a letter is lost before περί[. There is a space below l. 460, but none between ll. 459–60, such as is found elsewhere between the last line of a speech and the title; possibly therefore προοι[. [is a heading like μάρτυρες, and not a title. The vestige of a letter would suit γ, η, ι, κ, μ, ν, π, τ, or υ, and the lacuna between it and προς, if not blank, is likely to have contained o, since any other letter ought to have left visible traces. No speech of Lysias πρὸς α[. is known, and there is no reason to connect this fragment with the title of civ περί τῆς Ὀνοματέως θυγατρός.

468–83. It is not at all certain that Fr. 24 comes from a point near the beginnings of lines; cf. l. 483, n.

472–4. Cf. xii. 77 παλλὰς πίνως αὐτοῖς ἔργα δεδωκός, and l. 716, where πιστὶς perhaps recurs.

481. Apparently not ἱπλούτης.

483. ἐπεν καλὸν: or ἐπὶ ἐκείνος: in which case ἐπί is probably not the beginning of a line.

490. σωμ[ : Σωμ[ιοχή (cf. ll. 92–3, n.) is inadmissible.

493. βεβαιο[. Cf. l. 602 β]βαιοκρημένη S and Lys. Fr. 310 (from Harpocration) βεβαιώσεως δίκης ὄνομα ἐστιν ὡς δικαίως αἱ ὁδηγημέναι τι τῷ ἀποδομένῳ, ἀν ἔτερος μὲν ἀμφισβητής τοῦ πραθήνος, ὁ δὲ μὴ βεβαιοὶ. ἐνίστε καὶ ἀρραβώνας μόνον δοθέντος εἰτα ἀμφισβητήσαντο τοῦ ἔλεγγαν τῷ τῆς βεβαιώσεως δίκην ὧ τῷ ἀρραβώνα δοθεῖ τῷ λάβοντι. Λυσίας ἐν δωτὶ λόγοις. αμφισβητῆται occurs in l. 604 and αμφισβητῆται in l. 547, so that all three Frs. 25, 31, and 39 may have come from one of the two speeches to which Harpocration was referring. In any case they probably belong to an oration different from those against Hippotheres and Theomnestus; cf. int. The colour of Frs. 31 and 39 suggests that they are to be placed near each other.

496. ἦν [ : Περίῳδος (cf. Lysias Fr. 123 and p. 48) might be restored, but cf. the previous n.

506–11. Cf. ll. 118–20 κατο[ ]dikaios αν [ἀρχικ[ ]τας εὐων[ ]ιόρ[ ]τα μετέρα and xxxi. 33 μύου δὴ... , δικαίως ἀπό τον ἄγανα τοῦ ματὶ τιχῶν. Fr. 26 may well belong to the speech πρὸς Ιπποθέραρην, but the proposed restoration of ll. 506–7 makes those lines shorter than usual by one or two letters, and επὶ τῶν παρ[ ]giou seems to be a mistake for επὶ τῶν παρ[ ]giou: cf. i. 1 ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἄγανα τοῖς.

520–9. Fr. 28 probably joins Fr. 29; cf. the next n.

530–5. That Frs. 29 and 30, both from the bottoms of columns, join, as indicated in the text, admits of hardly any doubt; the position assigned to Fr. 28. 524–9 at the beginnings of these lines is attractive, but not certain. A new sentence begins in l. 533 with ἀποδείξει, and ἀποδείξει[ ]ἐπὶ[ ]τῶν ἀ[ ]τοῦ would be expected; but the traces of the letter following ξ suggest no other vowel than α, and ἀποδείξει[ or ἀποδείξει[ is difficult to construct. The o of οι in l. 534 is nearly certain, but the next letter might be ν and the third is quite doubtful.
536. The left-hand part of the τ of τα is missing, and there is no external evidence for τ being the first letter of the line. There is certainly not room for a | αν a|ςτο.

537-8. θερουη [την] | [θαρη] is possible. Frs. 28-30 might belong to the speech προς Ἰπποδιόρου: cf. ll. 171-3.

539-48. Cf. l. 493, n. It is tempting to place Fr. 53 to the left of Fr. 31, so that the tip of the σ of ιμφισι in l. 606 would belong to the bottom of the σ of ινητει in l. 547. The fibres suit well enough, though the two fragments would still not actually join each other. Lines 544-7 would then run [...]αι [...]ολα ηπαρ[τ ... ας (or ]α ει) τις σοι (or τοι οι) μπευ | [...]ειδηκων θερουη[ [...]ημφισιβει τωι, which remains obscure.

554. The letter following ειςεν seems to begin with a vertical stroke and not to be ε.

559. ἴππομενοι: the middle of this verb is used by Plato, but not elsewhere by Lysias.


641-7. It is not certain that Fr. 44 belongs to 1606.


716. Cf. ll. 472-4, n.


735. ιδησι: the η is clear, but επιδειξαι may be meant; cf. l. 348, n.

736-7. For αναμυθην Σωσαιδης cf. ll. 92-3, n. But Lysias made speeches προς Ἀλικείδαθην and προς Ἀρχείδαθην, and either of these two names can equally well be supplied.

773-6. Cf. ll. 333 a-41, n.

781. For Σωσαιδης cf. ll. 92-3, n.

785. Perhaps θεόμυθησις or θεόκοιτης (cf. l. 249, n.).


809-12. Whether this fragment belongs to 1606 is doubtful. There is no other instance of a coronis in the papyrus.

829. ιν ο Λυσιος can be read, in which case Fr. 87 would belong to the speech προς Ἰπποδιόρου.

858-9. Fr. 128 is probably to be placed to the left of Fr. 97 with a slight gap between them, in which case the combined reading is | ιν ποτε επι | and ο αμπραι δικασται.

863. Possibly | ιν ο Λυσιος; cf. l. 829, n.

869. Possibly | Λυσιος; cf. l. 829, n.

934-5. Cf. ll. 858-9, n.

1607. HYPERIDES (?), For Lycophron.

Height 27.5 cm. Late second or early third century. Plate III (Frs. 5 + 4).

These fragments of a lost oration, found with 1606, were originally more than 60 in number, but have been reduced by a quarter through combinations. At least ten columns are represented, the longest fragment (1) containing parts of three with some continuous passages; but of the other pieces only Fr. 5 is of much value, and not more than about 100 lines in all can be restored. The order of the fragments is uncertain; but the similarity in colour and texture of Frs. 2-12 suggests that they are to be placed near each other, and suitable positions have
been found for Frs. 3 and 4 in combination with Frs. 2, ii and 5 respectively. That Fr. 14 belongs to Fr. 2, ii is far from certain (cf. ll. 159-62, n.), for Frs. 13-20 form another group, differing from the rest in colour. The handwriting is an upright, rather irregular uncial of the late second or early third century, the letters being as a rule somewhat widely separated. The script sometimes, e.g. in Frs. 13-20, tends to become more compact; but there seems to be no change of hand. There were 39-40 lines in a column, and 11-18 letters, usually 13-15, in a line. The common >-shaped sign is used for filling up short lines, being duplicated in l. 87. Iota adscript was written. High stops were employed, these sometimes approximating to the middle position, but probably without any intentional distinction. All these, together with occasional diaereses over i and u, a mark of elision in l. 230, and an accent in l. 455, are due to the original scribe, as are certainly most of the corrections; but the alterations in ll. 15, 71, 93, and 424 were possibly made by a different person.

The oration was evidently in defence of a certain Lycophron, who is mentioned several times by name (ll. 28, 106, 160?, and 287), but elsewhere is usually called osuros. He was accused of adultery with a woman whose husband was ill (ll. 180-8), the main subject of Fr. 1 being a denial of the charge that Lycophron had dug a hole in the wall which divided his house from hers. It is also evident that this person is identical with the Lycophron defended by Hyperides in an oration of which a few fragments from the beginning and the whole of the concluding portion are extant in P. Brit. Mus. 115. That speech was similarly concerned with an accusation against Lycophron of adultery with an unnamed woman whose husband was in a dying condition; her brother Dioxippus, a distinguished athlete (Hyperid. Lycophr. § 5), is obviously identical with the Dioxippus of 1607. 285, and the Theomnestus alluded to in 1607. 219 as one of the chief witnesses for the prosecution is no doubt the same as the accuser Theomnestus who is bitterly attacked in Lycophr. § 2, while there is probably a reference in 1607. 283 to Charippus, the second husband of the woman in question (Lycophr. § 3). Since the British Museum oration was composed for delivery by the defendant himself, who speaks in the first person, 1607, in which Lycophron is mentioned in the third person, cannot belong to the missing part of it, though it must have covered the same ground. The Oxyrhynchus fragments therefore belong to another speech delivered in connexion with this cause célèbre of about 340 B.C.

From the British Museum papyrus it is known that the proceedings against Lycophron took the form of an εἰσαγγελία, which in the first instance was brought before the δήμος by the famous orator Lycurgus in the absence of Lycophron from Athens on military service at Lemnos. In the fifth and the earlier half of
the fourth century B. C. έιπαγγέλατ brought before the δήμοι, either directly or through the agency of the βουλή, were usually tried by the whole δήμοι, as e. g. in 388 in the case of Ergocles, against whom a speech of Lysias is extant; but after 361 the normal practice, as illustrated chiefly by the orations of Hyperides for Lycophon and Euxenippus and that of Lycurgus against Leocrates, seems to have been to refer such cases to a court of dicasts; cf. Lipsius, *Attisches Recht*, i. 176 sqq. Lycurgus is known from quotations to have composed two speeches against Lycophon, and it is generally supposed that one of these was delivered by himself before the whole δήμοι, while the other was written for delivery before the dicasts by the chief plaintiff, a certain Ariston, this being the speech to which Hyperides’ oration for Lycophon was the reply (Blass, *Att. Beredsamkeit*, iii. 59). The line of argument adopted in 1607 renders it impossible to regard the speech as the work of Lycurgus, and there is some a priori probability that the author of it was Hyperides. This orator was rather widely read in Egypt, for six of his speeches are preserved more or less completely in four papyri from that country (882, a fragment of a lost oration, may also belong to him), whereas, of his contemporaries other than Lycurgus, Demades and Dinarchus are not represented in papyri, and neither Aeschines, who according to Pseudo-Plutarch 840 e wrote only four speeches, nor Demosthenes, whose orations are nearly all extant, is suitable as the author of 1607. Like Lycurgus, Hyperides may well have taken part in the proceedings before the δήμοι concerning Lycophon in addition to the subsequent trial before the dicasts; but the employment of the phrase ὁ ἄνδρες δικασταὶ in 1607. 221–2, not ὁ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναίοι as in Lysias’ speech against Ergocles, is irreconcilable with the hypothesis that the δήμοι as a whole was being addressed. Lycurgus in his oration against Leocrates uses ὁ ἄνδρες, ὁ Ἀθηναίοι and ὁ ἄνδρες δικασταὶ indiscriminately, but in a speech delivered before dicasts, and if Hyperides was the author of 1607 he must have written two orations for delivery at the same trial, one (the British Museum papyrus) spoken by Lycophon, the other (1607) spoken either by the author himself or by a third person. The British Museum oration concludes with an appeal from Lycophon to a certain Theophilus to speak on his behalf, and it is to this speech, also composed by Hyperides, rather than to a speech delivered by Hyperides in the first person, that we are disposed to attribute 1607. This hypothesis is distinctly supported by internal evidence. Hyperides was censured by several ancient critics, particularly Hermogenes, for carelessness in his choice of λέξεις (cf. Blass, *op. cit.* iii. 25 sqq.), and 1607 has several not strictly Attic expressions, which seem to be taken from common life. Thus ἀπείπασθα with an accusative (l. 28) and παρασιωπῶν (l. 69) are not attested before Polybius, nor is ἐγενήθη (l. 63, n.) with certainty before Philemon. σῶμα in ll. 32 and 76 is used in a manner approximating to its third
century B.C. use as 'slave', and it is possible that διαλέγονται in l. 97 is used de concubitu, which would be exactly parallel to the rare use of διαλέγονται in the sense of πλησίαις τάς γυναίκας ascribed to Hyperides by Moeris, p. 195 (= Blass, Fr. 171). That quotation, together with two similar references in Pollux to Hyperides' use of διελεγμένος, is assigned by Blass to the oration περὶ Φρύνης, but the Moeris quotation might even refer to the present passage. There are also several other agreements with Hyperides in points of diction; cf. ll. 26, 71–3, 82, 86–8, 108, 111, 128, 220–3, nn.

Against the attribution of 1607 to Hyperides it may be urged that the British Museum papyrus has the title at the end (ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Λυκόφρωνος) without the addition α' or β', and proceeds to the speech for Euxenippus, and the ancient references to the speech for Lycochoron (four in Pollux, one in Antiatticista in Bekker, Anecd. p. 97) do not mention more than one. But the British Museum papyrus contains only three selected orations, and since the quotations in Pollux and Antiatticista from the speech for Lycochoron do not occur in it, they might even refer to 1607, not to that speech. If there were two speeches for Lycochoron, sometimes distinguished as α' and β', the ignoring of that distinction by Pollux and Antiatticista would be no more remarkable than the failure of Harpocrates in seven out of nine cases and of Suidas twice to state which of the two speeches of Lycurgus they meant by κατὰ Λυκόφρωνος. Moreover the title of 1607 may have been something different from ὑπὲρ Λυκόφρωνος β'. According to Pseudo-Plutarch 849 d Hyperides composed 77 speeches, of which 52 were genuine. The titles of nearly 70 are known, and none of these is at all suitable for identification with 1607, except possibly a speech which is vaguely described by Pollux as συνηγορικός. But the scholiast on Aeschines, De falsa leg. § 18, gives the number of Hyperides' orations as 170, and though the figures assigned by this scholiast to the speeches of the orators are in general less trustworthy than those of Pseudo-Plutarch, and in some cases (e.g. in regard to Lysias and Isaeus) certainly corrupt, the figure 77 for Hyperides may well be too small, while, even if correct, it leaves a small balance of unknown speeches, of which 1607 may have been one. That Athenian advocates sometimes composed two orations for delivery by different speakers at the same trial is known from the two extant orations of Lysias against Alcibiades, of which the second is not a reply by the speaker of the first, and is not parallel to the second speech of Demosthenes against Aphobus; cf. Blass, op. cit. i. 492. Though open to some difficulties, the view that 1607 passed in Egypt as the composition of Hyperides offers the most satisfactory explanation. Whether it was actually genuine is more doubtful, in view of Pseudo-Plutarch's rejection of one-third of the speeches assigned to Hyperides. While the first oration of Demosthenes against Stephanus is
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generally regarded as authentic, the second is not; cf. Blass, op. cit. iii. 409 sqq., 472–5. But against the hypothesis that 1007 is a later composition ascribed to Hyperides must be set the apparent mention in II. 218–20 of two individuals, Anaschetus and Criton, who are known from an inscription of 340 B.C., the approximate date of the British Museum speech.

We are indebted to Mr. Lobel and Dr. Hude for several good suggestions in the restoration of this papyrus.

Fr. i. Col. i.

13 lines lost
[τουτο]ν δι[ο]μυει τον
15 [τοιχο]ν τη[ς] προς τ’[ν]
[ανθρ]ωπων ομειλιας
[εν]θ’κεν ουδαμως
[πιθα]νον εστιν ουτε
γαρ εις <προς> τους προτερον
20 αυτω λειτουργουν
tας και παν ο τι κελευ
[οι] προβυμως ὑπομε
νοντας διηνεκθη

dεδηλωκεν ουθ ο
25 τι γενομενης προσ
αυτου ασιμαχιας
εκεινοι την χρειαν
[α]πειπαντο οθεν ο Δυ
κοφρων επι το τον
30 τοιχον διαρουξαι κα
τη[π]ειθ’ν ηθειτι
[τον] σωματων [. . .]
[. . .]μοιως τοι[. . . .]
5 or 6 lines lost

21. ν of παρ corr.

Fr. i. Col. ii (complete).

40 [. . .]σθαι ουκ αν διω
[ρ]υξε τον τοιχον το
[θ]εν γαρ ανθρωπως
[μ]ηδεν κατεπειγο
[μ]ενος αλλ εχων την
45 [ε]ξουσιαν και τα παρ ε
κεινης ειδεναι και
τα παρ αυτου λεγειν
[κ]αι τους . . . . . . ους ω
[, . . . . . . .] παεισθαι
50 [. . . . . . .] ον επι;
[. . . . . . .]ον και [. . . .]

Fr. i. Col. iii (complete).

απερ ουτοι π[ρουθεν]?
80 τον νυν δ εκ[ε]μ[ο]υ μεν [.]
εφων κα[θ] υπερβο
λην ασθε[νως δια
κειμεν[ο]υ ταυτην
δε την της ο[ι]κιας
85 μ[ε]λουσαν κυριευ
ε[ι[ν] ητιο]υ προ οφθαλ
μων ανελαμβα
νον μη παθοντος
τι τουτον τιμωριαν
90 ὑποστησων ων αν
1607. HYPERIDES (?), FOR LYCOHRON

[... ... ...] ην επ[ ... ]
[ ... ... ]του τηλι
κ[ ... ] αυ τον ουδεπο

55 τε [ ... ... ...] ατο και
tο[ ... ] ουδεποσ ο
Χρ[ ... ] οικιαι
απ[ ... ?] και μην
αυ[ ... ατο] γε ειχεν

60 ταξιν το τας θερα
παιναι αυτης προσ
tουτου διαφερεσαι.
tι[ ... ] αν ουτως εγε
νηθη δρασεια οστε

65 η τα παρα τουτου
ρηθεντα: [ ... ]
η τα παρα εκεινης
προς τουτον παιρα

70 σιωπησαι της ιδια[ ... ]
εχθας [ ... ]
[ ... ] αν ει[ ... ]]
[ ... ] ο κιν
[ ... ] ει? μεν γαρ
[ ... ] ην συν

75 [ ... ... ...] ειν'
[ ... ... ] τα σω
[ματα ... ... ] γην
[ ... ... ... ] τειν

tεπ[ ... ] ειν' ουκον
ουτε διερυχθηναι
ου του τυ[ ... ]χων υπο του
tου πιθανον ωισε

95 εισθει καθαπ[ ...]
γει ταις θεραταις:
dιαλεγεσθαι τινος
γαρ εισεκεν [ ... ] προς

100 δενευθηναι εδει?
on φιλοφρονεστερον?
δη της [ ... ]
προσφερομενης αυ
τω επ[ ... ]

105 τι ποτ α[ ... ]
o Δυκοφρονον
δοντος [. ... ] και νη Δ[ ... ]
κατεφρονησε

110 τε του με[ ... ]
υπελαβε και
του δη[ ... ] ου
dεποθ υπ[ ... ] και κατε[ ... ]

115 αμφοτερ[ ... ] ου
dετεροι[ ... ] ον
ον συν[ ... ]

92. 1. [ ... ] ορυχθηναι. 95. Second α of καθαπ[ ... ] corr. from ο.

Col. i (top).

118 [ ... ... ... ] οι κυρι
[κ ... ... ] οι κυρι

Col. ii (top) + Frs. 3 and 14?

(v)μεις οι μ[ ... ] ου δικα
160 ζοντε[ ... ] Δυκοφρονος κα
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120 [. . . . . . .] \( \omega \upsilon \nu \)  
[. . . . . . .] \( \nu \theta \varepsilon i \)  
[. . . . . . .] \( \omega \tau \tau \theta \)  
[. . . . . . .] \( \pi \alpha \rho \eta \)  
[. . . . . . .] \( \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \)  
\( \lambda \alpha . . . . . . . \mu \tau \alpha \)  
\( \delta \eta \nu . . . . . . \) \( \eta \)  

125 [. . . . . . .] \( \tau \omicron \omega u \omicron \nu \)  
[. . . . . . .] \( \gamma \alpha \cdot \alpha \lambda \)  
\( \lambda \alpha . . . . . . . \mu \tau \alpha \)  
\( \delta \eta \nu . . . . . . \) \( \eta \)  

130 [. . . . . . .] . \( \varepsilon \nu \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( . \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( . \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \iota \)  

135 [. . . . . . .] . \( \iota \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \iota \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \gamma \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( . \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \alpha \lambda \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( . \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \tau \iota \sigma \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( . \)  

140 [. . . . . . .] . \( . \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \omicron \sigma \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \kappa \alpha \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( . \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( . \)  

145 [. . . . . . .] . \( \omicron \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \omicron \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( \omicron \)  
[ . . . . . . .] . \( . \)  

11 lines lost

Fr. 3.

\( \sigma \)\( \theta \)\( \alpha i \) . . [  
200 \( \kappa \alpha \theta \nu \)
201

Fr. 4.

205 μενον [ . . . . πα
ρ αυτων [ . . . . . .
την επιτ[ . . . . . .
tομενορ [. . .
[ . .] γνωμενην [προς ἢ
210 τους συνπολι[τευ
ομενους διαβολην
tισιν ουν τεκμηρ
ριο[υ]ς χρησαμενος
τουτους κελευει
215 καταδικαζειν χρη
tαι νη Δια τα[ες των
κηδεστων μι[αιν
βλ[αις Άνασακητ[ου
και Θεομυ[σησθ[ου και
220 Κρισονος ας καλος
εχον εστιν ο ά[υν
δρες δικασται μηη
παρεργος εξε[ητα
σαι την [γαρ ολη[ν κα
225 τηνορ[αν] | εκ το[ .
[ . .] τοι[ . .] ησεθι .
[ . .] έεθη [. . .] . . .

Fr. 5 (top) + 4. Plate iii.

195 εφθαρκε[αι την αν
θρ[ε]ωτον [. . . . ε
πιτ[ . . . . . .
ηρ [. . . .

Fr. 6 (top).

γαρ αν αυτ[ . . . . ε
κεινους το[ . . .
230 οβ' ουτοι το[ . . . . ε
πραττον ο[ . . . .
[ . .] ασα [. . . . .
[ . .] θ ετερ[ . . . .
[ . .] η ε[ . .] σ[ . . .

235 [. . . .] βητο [. . . .
[με]νοις πιθανον ε
[στιν ουτε τι[ . . . .
[ . .] η σπευδη[ . . .
[ου]ε τον τι[ . . . .

240 [. . . .] ουντ . η[ . . . .
[ισ]αναι τ[ . . . .
[ . .] πραττε[ . . . .
[ . .] υπ[ . . . .
[ . .] ητε τι[ . . . .

245 [. . . .] [. . . .]
[ . . .] ναι[ . . . .

Fr. 7.

[ο]πος [. . . .
[ . .] λο[ . . . .
σομα[ . . . .

250 γνω [ . . . . . . ακη
κοαι[ε . . . .

Fr. 8.

Col. i. Col. ii.

252 γο[ . . . .
259 [. . .] μα[

Fr. 9.

265 ιο[ . . . .

Fr. 12.

270 [. . . .] εμφ[. . .
[ . .] ποι[ . . . .

G
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Col. i.  Col. ii.  Col. iii.
275  
285  άποδημησα[ι] τὸν Δ[ι]  
280  Κοφρονα δὲ τεως μεν  
295  θεν.  
300  γασµ[  
305  5 lines lost

Fr. 14 (top).

[. . . . . . .] ου δικα  
[. . . . . . .] νος κα  
310  [. . . . . . .] εαυ

Fr. 15.

Col. i.  Col. ii.
330  άι [. . . . . . . . .] ϕα  
νεραν [. . . . . . . . .]  
κοφαν[τ] [. . . . . . . . .]  
σθαυν α [. . . . . . . . .]  
περ ὦν [. . . . . . . . .]  
335  λογο[ι] [. . . . . . . . .]  
375  ἴτι

Fr. 16.

μ[  
375  ντι[  
355  με[  
375  οιο[  
355  στου [. . . . . . . . .]  
375  την ἵ[  
355  δε [. . . . . . . . .]
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tes ka[θαπερ λε?]  
 πον . [  
 Fr. 19.  
  
360 παράδει[
 
  
380 ]δα[  
] 
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Fr. 17.

Fr. 18.

Fr. 19.

Fr. 20.

Fr. 21.

Fr. 22.

Fr. 23.
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406 [το? . . . . . . .] ν ἀλ[ ] 410 η[ ]
[λ . . . . . . . . .] ν μεν[ ] . . .

Fr. 24.
η[ ]
[δη . [ ]
[τον . [ ]
μον[ ] 440 ὁσος δε [ ]
[ανδ . [ ]
μησα[ ]
[βανη[.]ςτι[ ] 441 ἀπισ[ ]
[. αυτοι[ ]
τ[ ] 442 ἁσι[ ]
[φ[ ]

Fr. 25 (top).
η[ ]
[πε . [ ]
ειπ[ ]

Fr. 25 (bottom).
425 η[ ]
θ[ ]

Fr. 26.
α[ ]
[νε . [ ]

Fr. 28.
Ρη[ ]

Fr. 27 (top).
445 μη τι[ ]
λογη[ ]
μηδε[ ]

Fr. 29.
[. ου[ ]
[νε[ ]

Fr. 30.
ρ[ ]

Fr. 32.
470 τ[ ]

Fr. 33.
[. θ[ ]
[. ε[ ]

Fr. 31.
[. θερα[παυ[ ]

Fr. 34.
[. δοι τ . [ ]

Fr. 35.
[. νος μεν[ ]

Fr. 36.
[. ε[ ]

Fr. 37.
[. η[ ]

Fr. 38.
[. η[ ]

Fr. 39.
[. η[ ]

end of col.

end of col.

end of col.

end of col.

end of col.

end of col.

end of col.

end of col.

end of col.

end of col.
That he dug through the wall for the sake of intercourse with the woman is not at all credible. For the accuser has not shown either that he quarrelled with the persons who were in his service and readily submitted to any of his orders, or that owing to an altercation with him they renounced their intimacy, in consequence of which Lycephon was reduced to digging through the wall, since the servants were no longer...

... he would not have dug through the wall. For why should a man, who was not in straits, but in a position both to get news from her and to send messages from himself, ...?

... and Chremes never forbade him the house (?). Moreover that her maids quarrelled with him was as good as impossible. For which of them could have become so bold as to pass over in silence either his messages to her or her messages to him for the sake of private enmity? The danger was close at hand; for ... But, as it was, they saw that he was in an excessively weak state, while she who was about to become the owner of the house was kept before their eyes, for fear that if anything happened to him they would suffer punishment for their revenge. It is therefore incredible that Lycephon dug through the wall, and he was not in the habit, as stated by the accuser, of conversing with the maidservants. Why should he have done so? What need was there for them to quarrel with him when, their mistress being on quite familiar terms with him, they ...?
a verdict of guilty? He relies forsooth on the evidence of his relatives by marriage, Anaschus, Theomnestus, and Criton, which it is your duty, gentlemen of the jury, to examine with special care. For the whole accusation (depends) on . . .

19. [προι]: cf. ll. 61–2.
24. δευτέρων: the subject is ὁ καθήγορος, sc. Aristion; cf. int. p. 76.
30–1. κατη[πι]θεν: cf. l. 43.
32. [σωματι]ς: cf. l. 76 and int. p. 76.
33. τε: or τρ. The second letter may have been corrected.
48. ]: or ρ can be read instead of o.
53–4. τυλικόν τοις. o): the reference might be to the age of dying husband (cf. ll. 80–3 and int.); but it seems more likely that he is the subject not of ἵστα in l. 55 but of the verb in l. 58, and that Lycophron is the subject as far as l. 55. In that case the point of τυλικόν would be that Lycophron was over 50 years of age when the trial took place, an argument used in his defence on the charge of adultery in Lycophr. § 15.
56–8. The restorations are highly conjectural, but τοις looks like a proper name, and a mention of the husband, whose name is unknown, but who is called ἐκείνος in l. 80, is very appropriate here. τοις is inadmissible in l. 56.
63. εὐνοῆς: this form, which is common in the third century B.C., occurs in the MSS. of Plato, Philod. 62 d ἐγενέσθη ἡμῖν (ἐγενέσθη ἡμῖν Stallbaum), and in two fragments of Philemon; cf. Lobeck, Phryn. 109, and int. p. 76.
73. ἐι? μὲν γαρ: μὲν is required to balance νῦν de in l. 80, but may have come in l. 76.
76. σω[ματα] : cf. l. 32.
77–9. τρεν is perhaps διωρ[ε]τερω (cf. ll. 14, 30, 92) and [γ]γρα might be διορ]γνρ or διωρ[γνρ, though neither form is classical, the best MSS. in Dem. vii. 40 having διορνγρω. But προ[νων]το, if that is the right restoration, does not fit in very well with a reference to digging through the wall.
80. ει[ε]μων: cf. ll. 56–8, n. The first husband of the woman is similarly alluded to in Lycophr. xlvι ἐτηδ]ῇ ἐτελεύτησαν ἐκείνος and xlvii ἐκείνος [κυ]μαν τὸν γνωστοκεία ἐξ] αὐτού καταλελύτερα. μὲν already projects for some distance into the margin, and there is no room for [αν after it, if αν ελαμβάνων be read in l. 87; cf. n. ad loc.
82. οἰων διεκείμενοι: cf. Lycophr. § 17 ὁ σπάρω διεκείμενοι.
86–8. πρὸ διδαμόν τῶν ἀναλαμβάνων: cf. Epilaph. 17 πρὸ διδαμόν ὀργώμεναι ἀυτοῖς τὰ δεινά, and Polyb. ii. 35 λαμβάνων πρὸ διδαμόν τὸ παράδοξαν τῶν τούτω γενομένων. There seems to be no instance of ἀναλαμβάνων with πρὸ διδαμόν, but with the division αν ελαμβάνων it is necessary to suppose the omission of αν in l. 80.
97. διαλεγομένως: cf. int. p. 77.
98. The supposed stop after ἐσκεφε might be the beginning of τ. For the supplements in ll. 98–100 cf. ll. 60–2.
108. νη Δια[α]: cf. l. 216, Demosth. i. 7, Eucl. τρ. 12, 14, 27.
111. [νε]πελάζ: a favourite word of Hyperides, occurring 11 times in his speeches.
128. διαφημισ:` cf. Athenog. 10, 16.
159–62. It is very doubtful whether Fr. 14, containing the supposed ends of these lines, is rightly placed here, for the colour of it is different, especially on the verso (cf. int. p. 74), and at a junction with the upper margin of Fr. 2, which becomes necessary, the
fibres of the recto do not harmonize very well. αι με[σθ]ου δικαιοσυνεσε is too short. ου[α] is possible, and ου may be the negative.

170-1. Fr. 3 seems to be rightly placed here. καθ νυπερθαλην is not unlikely in l. 171; cf. l. 81.

198. This line was probably the last of the column, which is already slightly longer than usual (40 lines compared to 39 in Fr. 1).

199—200. Cf. ll. 170—1, n.

201-4. Fr. 4 almost certainly belongs to ll. 224—7.

208. τομαντ: the last two letters are very doubtful; but cf. l. 205. τομαντ cannot be read.

218-20. The very rare name 'Ανάσχετος occurs also in C.I.A. ii. 804 Ba ('Αν. Δημοσέλους 'Αλαιν) in a list of sureties in 340 B.C. for some triremes supplied to the Chalcidians, the preceding name being Κρίτων Δισύνων Κυδάβρατου, who is also mentioned in C.I.A. ii. 807, and included among the καλλιστοι των πολεων by Aeclerin. Contra Timarch, 156. Probably these two persons are identical with 'Ανάσχετος and Κρίτων here. For Θεόμαστος cf. Lycophr. § 2 το δ' αρχών Θεος μινστα διδωθε (sc. Ariston) εξεκον δε λαθιών ανθράποις ἄγοιρη, και παρέχει δοτηρ τους λατοτο ἐπισυναμοι, κι διδωθε τοις ὑπ' ἐκαστον τοῦ ἄνθρωπον διαλογ της ἠμέρας, ὅπως ὑπ' αδιάνεται συνοπήλατη.

220-1. καλιες] εχαν: cf. Demeist. viii. 22 καλός [εχει τω πολλων, Lycophr. § 22 καλός [εχει σε μεν ... την κατηγοριαν ταυτασθαν, Demyarch. i 3 τους τε νόμους εξεταζεν ... πάρεργα τάλλο πάντα παρασάμενον.

228-31. It is not absolutely certain that these are the beginnings of lines.

236. πεδισανω: cf. l. 18.

238. [ται Χερμ]α[ε]νι[ε]ς: the traces of the supposed πω are very slight and indecisive, but a mention of Charippos, to whom Dioxippus gave his sister in second marriage, and who figures largely in the charges discussed in Lycophr. §§ 3—7, is very appropriate; cf. int. p. 75. ἐγδοντα or προ του εγδοναι is to be supplied at the end of the preceding column; cf. Lycophr. § 5 κα τηροντο (sc. Dioxippus) ἐκδοθει δι' το χρμων ἐγδοναιαυτην.

248. ελεις [ο]μην: it is not certain that any letter is missing in the lacuna after ελεις, and the following vestiges would also suit ομην or ουμην or possibly ουμην, but Dioxippus was victorious as a pancratist at Olympia according to Pin. Nat. Hist. xxxv. 139 and others. The date assigned to his victory by Foerster, Olymp. Sieger, no. 381, is 336 b.c., but there is no very definite evidence for fixing the year, except the fact that Dioxippus went to Asia with Alexander (Diod. xvii. 190—1), i.e. in 335 or 334, and died there, so that he cannot have been at Olympia after 336. The oration of Hyperides against Lycophron is generally assigned to 340 B.C., and if [ο]μην is right the victory of Dioxippus was more probably in 340, or even earlier, than in 336.

268-7. στεφανον[α]τα: στεφανον[α]τα does not suit the size of the lacuna.

288. The τ of τους has either been corrected from τ or else been inserted later.

288. The letter before περατω seems to have been σ or υ with a stroke through it, and the vestige of the preceding letter rather suggests ι or λ, so that probably the scribe began to write αυτω or Λυκοφρων, but corrected it.


336-7. For κολλανδρ[ε]υει cf. l. 95.

417-36. These are perhaps the beginnings of lines; but if so, δα projects into the margin of l. 433.
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1608. AESCHINES SOCRATICUS, Alcibiades.

Fr. 4  16 x 9.8 cm.  Late second century.

Plate III (Fr. 4).

The source of these scanty fragments of a dialogue between Socrates and Alcibiades, chiefly concerning the character of Themistocles, is shown to be the Alcibiades of Aeschines Socraticus by coincidences with two of the six extant quotations from that lost dialogue. Aeschines was one of the most important followers of Socrates, being often placed by ancient critics next in rank to Plato and Xenophon. His reputation rested not so much on his own contributions to the development of his master's philosophy, which seem to have been inconsiderable, but on the elegance of his style, which is specially praised by Aristides and Hermogenes, and on the fidelity of his representation of Socrates, which even led to the accusation in antiquity that the master, not the disciple, was the author of the dialogues (Diog. Laert. Vita Aeschinis, ii. 7). The recovery of new fragments of the Alcibiades is therefore a matter of some interest, especially in view of the current controversy initiated by Prof. Burnet concerning the historical character of the Platonic Socrates.

The extant fragments of Aeschines' seven genuine dialogues have recently been collected and discussed by H. Krauss (Teubner, 1911) and more fully by H. Dittmar (Philol. Untersuch. xxi. 1912). Much the longest is Fr. 1 (Krauss) of the Alcibiades from Aristides, orat. 46 (ii. 292 sqq., Dindorf) containing a panegyric upon Themistocles addressed to Alcibiades by Socrates, and concluding with a warning that even Themistocles' ἐπιστήμη was not strong enough to save him from disasters. Another passage in the same oration of Aristides (ii. 369) not only supplies a second fragment (small), which Krauss, following C. F. Hermann, assigns to a position immediately preceding Fr. 1, but gives a general description of the context of Fr. 1, from which it appears that Alcibiades was reduced to tears by the sense of his own inferiority to Themistocles. Before the end of the dialogue, which was put into the form of a narrative by Socrates, as is shown by the use of the first person in referring to him, Alcibiades seems to have left, and Frs. 3 and 4 (from Aristid. orat. 45) apparently belong to the conclusion of the dialogue, being part of an explanation of Socrates' general point of view in relation to Alcibiades, addressed to an unknown third participator in the conversation. Frs. 5 and 6, from Priscianus and Athenaeus respectively, are unimportant; but evidently the general drift of the whole dialogue was similar to that of the (Pseudo-)Platonic Alcibiades, a desire to curb the arrogance of Alcibiades. Aristides in fact contrasts the two dialogues, to the disadvantage of Plato. There are also apparent allusions to
Aeschines' dialogue in Cic. Tusc. iii. 77 and Augustin, De civit. dei, xiv. 8; cf. Dittmar's Fr. 10, and pp. 99-103 of his edition. These indicate that Socrates showed Alcibiades, who thought himself beatus (εὐδαιμόν), that he was really stultus (ἄμωθίς), and as such miser (ἄθλιος), with the result that Alcibiades entreated Socrates to free him from turpitudo (αἰσχρότης) and teach him virtus (ἀρετή).

Of the 19 (originally 25) fragments of the papyrus only six are large enough to be of any value, and the longest continuous passage is less than 20 lines (ll. 34-52). Fr. 5 (ll. 77-87) contains after parts of 5 new lines Krauss's Fr. 2, immediately followed, as he had correctly surmised, by the beginning of his Fr. 1. This is continued after a gap in Frs. 6 and 7, the latter fragment containing the bottoms of two columns. Since the extent of the missing portion of Fr. 7. ii is known to have been approximately 19 lines, there were about 30 lines in a column, and probably Fr. 5, of which the upper margin is broken off, is from the top of a column; for Frs. 5, 6, and 7. i together account for 30 lines. With regard to the position of the other fragments, none of them belongs to the four columns immediately following Fr. 7. ii, all of which must have been occupied by the remainder of the extant panegyric on Themistocles, and internal evidence indicates that at any rate Frs. 1, 2, and 4 preceded Frs. 5-7. Fr. 1 is placed in that position because the reference to Themistocles in l. 3 may be the first introduction of his name into the discussion, which continues to be occupied with him in Frs. 4-7. Socrates seems to have asked a question reflecting on his interlocutor's (presumably Alcibiades') relations to his parents, adding as a parallel the bad relations of Themistocles to his parents—a remark which draws a protest from Alcibiades (ll. 1-6). The next question is concerned with a different subject, whether people are first μοιχικοὶ and ἱππικοὶ or the opposite, the second alternative being naturally adopted by Alcibiades (ll. 7-15), at which point the fragment ceases to be intelligible. The story that Themistocles had been disinherited by his father, which is mentioned by Plutarch and other writers (cf. ll. 38-9, n.), had in any case been alluded to by Socrates before Fr. 4, in which Alcibiades is definitely stated to be the other speaker (l. 50); for in ll. 36-48 the latter expressed his surprise at the supposed disinheritance, and vigorously condemned the character of Themistocles implied by such an incident.

There is an apparent connexion between this speech of Alcibiades and the reference at the beginning of Socrates' panegyric on Themistocles (ll. 85-7) to Alcibiades' boldness in criticizing that statesman; but Frs. 5-7 cannot be combined with the remains of Fr. 4. ii, so that at least one column intervened between Fr. 4. i and Frs. 5-7, though the gap is not likely to be wide. The next question of Socrates (ll. 48 sqq.) is incompletely preserved and somewhat
obscure, as is the point of his remark in ll. 34–6, which preceded the outburst of Alcibiades and mentions Apollodorus' defence τοῦ φαύλου. This Apollodorus is presumably the inseparable companion of Socrates who appears as the narrator in Plato's Symposium, and he seems to have taken part in the conversation in Aeschines' dialogue. Though there is no reason to assign any of the remarks in the extant portion of 1608 to Apollodorus, the two remarks from the end of the dialogue (Frs. 3 and 4 Krauss; cf. p. 88) may well have been addressed to him: Anytus has been suggested there, but as a mere guess. The position of Fr. 2 is more doubtful, since there is no apparent reference in it to Themistocles; but there seems to be a connexion between ἀπολογίας in l. 28 and ἀπολογείσθαι in l. 36, so that Fr. 2 is likely to have preceded Fr. 4 with no very great interval. The first 5 lines of Fr. 5 apparently belong not to a speech but, like the next 3, to a piece of narrative: Alcibiades, who is meant by αὐτῶν in l. 82, is probably also indicated by αὐτῶ in l. 79. Lines 82–136 correspond to Krauss's Fr. 2 and part of 1. Here there are some small variations between 1608 and the MSS. of Aristides, whose quotations do not seem to be exact. In ll. 130–2, where the MSS. are corrupt, 1608 is incompletely preserved, but does not seem to have been right; cf. n. ad loc. The papyrus as a whole is too short to prove much; but such glimpses of Aeschines' style as it affords indicate a close resemblance between his picture of Socrates and Plato's in the earlier dialogues, and so far as they go rather support Prof. Burnet's view that Plato was there giving a true representation of Socrates' teaching.

1608 was found with 841–4, 1606–7, &c. The handwriting is a good-sized elegant uncial of the sloping oval type, with a tendency to exaggerate the size of a and v. It is a somewhat later specimen of this type than 24 (Demosthenes, προοίμια δημιουργικά: Part i, Plate vii) and 665 (History of Sicily: Part iv, Plate i), but earlier than e.g. 223 (Homer E: Part ii, Plate i) and Schubart, Pap. Graecae, 19 b (Hesiod, Catalogue), and probably belongs to the latter half of the second century. Iota adscript was generally written. Changes of speaker are indicated (perhaps not consistently) by double dots with or without paragraphi, and two kinds of stops, a high and a low point, are employed, besides occasional diaereses over initial i and v. A mark of elision in l. 53 seems to be due to the original scribe, but an accent and breathing in l. 37 are probably by the (contemporary) corrector, who has altered mistakes in ll. 10, 37 (?), and 42. A critical mark against l. 138 probably refers to a lost marginal note. The scribe seems to have been rather prone to omissions; cf. ll. 10 and 48–50. The fragments are or may be from the middles of columns, except where it is stated otherwise.
1608. AESCHINES SOCRATICUS, ALCIBIADES

Fr. 1.

[.. ....... peri tou

σεαντον γονέας γεγερ

νησθαί. οιος περ [ο Θε

μιστοκλῆς ληστείτα [τε

5 µι τους εαυτον γονέας :

eυφήμει εφή ο Σωκρα

tερον δε δοκεί [

σοι το[ις] ανθρωπος αν[αγ

και[ν] ειναι αμοι[σους

10 ποτε[ρο]ν η μουσικής γι

νεσ[θαι]· και ποτερο[ν] α

φ[ππο]ν η ιππικο[ν]· α

ναγ[και]ν μοι δοκεί [

αμοι[σους] προτερον κ[αι

15 αφιν[τους]· ουκ[ον]ν ...

[.]ξ[.]...[.]ν[.]...

[.]..[.]παρ[.]

Fr. 4. Col. i. Plate iii.

[.. .......]µ[.] ......

καλώς δε κα[ι] ο Απολ[λο

35 δωρος υπερ του φαγ[λου

απολογεισθαί· αλλ εξε[ι

νο δ δ δ εγω ουκ αν ομη[ν

tον Θεμιστοκλεα ύπ[ο

τον πατρος αποκηρω[θη

40 ναι· φαντος γαρ και πορ

ρω ανοιας ηκοντα τα

gε τοιαντα· [ω]στις εις δι

αφορας τοιαντα και ε

θήρας τας μεγιστας

45 προς τους εαυτον γον[ή

ας κατέστη· ο και παι

Fr. 2.

[.. .......]µ[.] ......

[.. ]ηρίους [..]

20 [ο]πωδετερους δε[ι]

α· ουτε γαρ τους [..]

[ουδ]ωτιουν δε[ι]

γησθαί ηπε[ι]

[.. ] ωστε α[ι]

25 [.] των δικ[.] ....... δι

απραξασθα[ι] ... ε

παγείων υστ[ε]

νες δια τας τοι[αντας] απο

λογιας απεγνωσαν αν

30 θροπων με[ι]

[.. ]τω [..]

Fr. 3.

32 ]μτ[ι]

Frs. 5, 6, 7. Col. i.

εν τους [..]

μεγαλ[ι]

αυτω ειχ[ε]

80 κομειν[αι]

αν αμαρτη[ι]

γνους ουν αυτον εγω

οτι χιονοτην[ως] εχει προς

Θεμιστοκλ[εα] ειπον ε

85 πειδη του [Θεμιστοκλε]

ους βιου επιλαμβανες

[θ]ιακε τολμη[n]αι σκεψαι

5 lines lost

[ω Σωκρατες τα] τοιαυτ[α]

ειρεται: η[θη] ουν πωπ[ο
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65 [the soi emelhson en] 95 [the soi emelhson en] 90 [the soi emelhson en] 100 [nu men ouv ephi ou r]e me

[delta] B[ionep]i
[epitux] B[ionep]i
[. . . . .] tout' epi[. . . . .] epi
[. . . . .] s' [. . . . .] [. . . . .]

55 [12 letters ]tau[.]
[11 '' ] tau phau
[lokatow ] epe tiv eiv de
[. . . . .] ] poliv te
end of col.

Fr. 7. Col. ii.

19 lines lost.

126 [pevou kai xehmatou]n
[ta tow E]llhنوν πragyα
[ta polv e[le]i]πeto ta de
[basile]vαs προει[ex]v αλ

130 λ [ηδ]ei oti ei μη autous το
[bouli]vαι σανα ekeinos [πε]
[mei]n[ac] ta ge alla av[tov]
tosauta ousta to meγe[bos]
[ou] [ev] mega emel[le]v [o

135 felhsew kai touto e[gwou
kei ara oti o[stoperov] av
end of col.

Fr. 11.

160 [riov ad] προ[. . . . .]
[τα] 165 do . [

Fr. 12.

166 kai[. . . . .] 170 [ri]
1–6. Probably, as Prof. Burnet, to whom we are indebted for several suggestions in the interpretation of 1608, remarks, Socrates asked ‘Would you be willing to have behaved to your parents as Themistocles is said to have behaved to his?’ Alcibiades replies ‘Hush, Socrates’.

7–15. ‘Do you think that men have to be unmusical before they are musical, and unskilled in riding before they are skilled?—I think that they must first be unmusical and unskilled in riding.’ For ἀμαντος in conjunction with ἀφιπποι cf. Plato, Rep. 335c. Burnet thinks that this was part of an argument intended to show that Themistocles did not achieve what he did φόνει (which Alcibiades considered sufficient for himself). Since Themistocles was so unsatisfactory in his youth, he must have become great and acquired ἐπιστήμη by care and practice.

16. [...] : or [a]ολος.
19. Perhaps δικαστήριον εἰ.
34–51. ‘... and Apollodorus also to make a good defence on behalf of the mean.

43–51. Ἀπολλονίδης: cf. int. No orator of this name who was contemporary with Socrates is known. τὸν φαλακοὺς can be masculine or neuter. As Burnet remarks, Alcibiades may have been relying on his natural gifts, so that the question of καλος arose. Apollodorus may well have championed the cause of ‘the ugly’ (e.g. Socrates); for he certainly stands for the more cynical aspect of Socraticism, as appears from the beginning of the Symposium.

36. Of the double dots after ἀπολογισάμενοι only the upper is preserved.

αλλ’ ἐκείνῳ: Burnet compares Ἡρίκρα ταιόν 283d ἀλλ’ ἐκείνῳ, μῶν μὴ λακεδα-


48. [av] εὖροντα: this reading is not very satisfactory; but εὖρον is preferable to εὖροι, the active not being used with an infinitive in classical times, and there is a change of speaker before οὔτω, so that [av εὖρον with the omission of double dots before οὔτω, though a possible reading, is open to still greater objections.

50. γονεῖον: γονεῖον is inadmissible.

52. σπευδεῖοντος was suggested by Burnet.

55–9. The fragment containing these lines was originally separate, and is not quite certainly placed here.

61. Probably av[θροφι: cf. l. 52.

77. This line is probably the top of the column; cf. int. p. 89.
82–4. γνών ... θεματολογία = Aeschin. Fr. 2; cf. int. The MSS. of Aristides have ξιλούτσας έχουσα instead of σιλιχνοὺς εχει, and before θεματολογία some of the deteriores insert τών, which was certainly omitted in the papyrus.

84–5. εὑρέθη τοῦ: from this point up to l. 136 the papyrus corresponds to the beginning of Aeschin. Fr. 1; cf. int. After εὑρέθη the MSS. of Aristides insert τόινυ, which is evidently due to looseness of quotation.

93–8. These remains are on a separate fragment, and there is no external evidence for their being near the ends of lines.

94–5. αὕν ποιήσατε σαί: αὕν αὐτοί πώποτε MSS. 1608 may have omitted αὕν. The ε of εμελέθη comes above the α of χωρείν in l. 96.

97. αὐτοί: so the ‘deteriores’, followed by Dindorf and Hermann. AET, which are considered the best MSS., have δοὺν, which is adopted by Fischer, Krauss, and Dittmar. δοὺν is, however, supported by Aristides xiv (i. 325, Dindorf) ὅπερ γάρ τις ἐφε τῶν λογοποιῶν περὶ τῆς Ἀσίας λέγων δῆτε ὁ ἡλίων πορεύεται ταύτης πάσης τρέχειν ἄνδρα ἑα.

100. γ??: om. MSS.

105. παλέζε: so MSS. πάλει Krauss and Dittmar, following Herodian, ii. 2, p. 696 ὡς παρ’ Λαξιήν τῷ Σωκράτικῳ τοῦτο τῷ πάλει: πάλε Ηρμανν, following Choenoboscoius.

130–2. εἰ μὴ αὐτοῦ τῷ βουλευόντα έκείνου (έκείνου Ε') περιέσται, τά γε ἄλλα αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν Ε') MSS. Dindorf: εἰ μὴ αὐτοῦ τῷ βουλευόντα έκείνου ... αὐτῶν Hermann: εἰ μὴ αὐτοῦ τῷ βουλευόντα έκείνου ... αὐτῶν Reiske: εἰ μὴ αὐτοῦ τῷ βουλ. έκείνου ... αὐτῶν Krauss, Dittmar. Whether 1608 had τό ορ γών and αὐτῶν or αὐτῶν is uncertain; but it apparently agreed with Ε in reading έκείνου (though έκείνου is just possible), and certainly differed from all the MSS. and editors in having αὐτῶν instead of αὐτοῦ—a novelty which seems to be erroneous.

134. εμελέθη [ο]πόλεσιν: ὁψελέθη MSS.

136. αἴ: om. MSS.

138. For the critical mark cf. int. p. 90.

154–7. Fr. 10 resembles Fr. 7. ii in colour, but does not occur in the text of the missing portion of that column.

159. The supposed low stop after π might be the lower of two dots marking a change of speaker, in which case καρπός is not improbable.

162–5. This fragment is very likely to be placed above Fr. 9, but there is no actual join.

1609. PHILOSOPHICAL WORK (EUDORUS ?). METROLOGICAL FRAGMENT.

8 × 10.2 cm. Second century.

The recto of this papyrus contains 13 nearly complete lines from the middle of a column of a lost philosophical work, with a few letters from the preceding and following columns. It is written in a clear compact semiuncial hand of the second century, which somewhat resembles that of 410 (Part iii, Plate iv) and is not later than the reign of Marcus Aurelius, more probably belonging to the reign of Trajan or Hadrian. A stroke in the middle of l. 12 indicates the beginning of a new section. The subject under discussion is έδωκα in mirrors, and the authors, who alluded in l. 13 to his commentary on the Timaeus of Plato, and objects in ll. 16 sqq. to the views of Democritus, Epicurus, and Empedocles, evidently belonged to the Academic school. The first commentator
on Plato, was according to Proclus, In Tim. p. 24, Crantor of Soli in Cilicia, whose discussion of the Timaeus is mentioned several times by Plutarch in his De animae procreatione. But since Crantor was a contemporary of Epicurus and died before him, he is unsuitable as the author of the papyrus, in which Epicurus is ranked with Democritus and Empedocles. Another philosopher of the Academic school, also mentioned by Plutarch, op. cit., in connexion with the Timaeus, is Eudorus of Alexandria, who flourished about 25 B.C. and is generally thought to have written a commentary on that dialogue, besides an encyclopaedic work upon philosophy in general and a treatise on Aristotle's Categories. The encyclopaedic work, of which a few fragments survive, is described by Stobaeus, Ecl. ii. 46 as Εὐδώρου τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρέως Ἀκαδημικοῦ φιλοσόφου διαίρεσις τοῦ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λόγου, βιβλίων διόκτητων ἐν ὑ πᾶσαι ἑπεξελήλυθε προβληματικῶς τὴν ἐπιστήμην. It was used extensively by Arius Didymus of Alexandria, a Stoic philosopher with eclectic tendencies, and seems to have been a work of some importance. The account of it given by Zeller, Gesch. d. griech. Philos. i. 612, who considers that it collected the answers of the chief writers on the main problems of philosophy, is quite in harmony with the papyrus. A difficulty with regard to the attribution of 1609 to Eudorus, who naturally wrote in Attic, arises from the occurrence of an Ionic form, περιευοῦσα, in l. 21. The context there, however, and the occurrence elsewhere of several non-Ionic forms (ὁν, τούτων, Ἑμπεδοκλῆς) indicate that the author was in this case using Empedocles' language, though περιευοῦσα cannot itself have occurred in hexameters.

On the verso in a different and larger semiuncial hand, which is not earlier than A.D. 150 and may even be later than 200, are the ends of 11 lines from the middle of a column of metrological tables, similar to e.g. 9. verso and 669. Some abbreviations and the usual symbols for drachma (l. 31) and ½ (l. 36) occur. The amount lost at the beginnings of lines is uncertain, but seems to be considerable in most, if not all, cases, and not much can be gleaned from the fragment. As far as l. 37 it is concerned with liquid measures, especially in relation to the cyathus, weights being expressed in drachmae; the last 2½ lines deal with the mina and its subdivisions. The κόχυτη, an uncommon measure, is mentioned in l. 30, with a novel weight assigned to it. Details are discussed in the commentary.
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'if? ... and it (the image) seem to appear there. For it is not seen on that mirror, but the reflection to the person seeing (is seen). This, however, has been discussed in my commentary on the Timaeus. An image ought not to be described as it is in the systems of Democritus or Epicurus, or as Empedocles would say that emanations come off from each of the objects shown in the mirror and ... surviving ...

12. ὁρωτας: v is practically certain and the very faint traces of the two preceding letters suit ρα, but joining o is a descending stroke which is superfluous and seems to be merely a ligature. The stroke after ὁρωτα is a mark of punctuation.

13. εις των Τιμαίων: i.e. in connexion with τι οἶν ἐκ τοῦ τρίγυμα διεχομένον τόπου καὶ κατὰ διόν εἴδωλα παρέχοντι: cf. 72 c.

14. δι: ει is very cramped, and the i was probably omitted originally.


19. καταπτριζομένων is passive; cf. Plut. De plac. philos. 894 f καταπτριζόντος αὐτήν (sc. ἥλιακήν περιφερεγγείαν) ἀστέρος. The middle is the form commonly used.


Verso.

27 [αι... Κοιαθ( ) ... ]
    ] κοιαθ( ) ει [ι[ν
    ]τον καὶ η μεγ[α]

30 [λη]
    ] κονχη η μεγ[α]
[λη] εχ?κι ιη η δε τετ[η]
    ] φαι εισιν δε οηβ
    ] ουν μεγα κοιαθ(ου ?)
    ] το δε] μικρον κοιαθου
27. κυαθος is thus misspelled throughout, a circumstance which raises a doubt whether some other forms are correct. The cyathus was regularly ⅓ of a κοτύλη, but of varying weights and subdivisions.

29. ]του : or ἴνον.

29–31. The doubtful γ of μεγ[αλη might be ν in both l. 29 and l. 30, but in neither place is με[κρα admissible. The restoration η με[ν κόγχη η μεγ[αλη ε[χε] would suit ll. 34–5, where ογδοον μερος might follow immediately after κοιαθον, but ll. 31–2 do not seem to be concerned with the μικρό κόγχη, and, since the break along the left side is practically vertical, it would be necessary to suppose that the beginning of l. 31 projected by several letters beyond ll. 30 and 35, while it is very difficult to restore the other lines, especially ll. 32–4, on the hypothesis of a short lacuna or no lacuna at all at the beginnings. The κόγχη occurs together with κόγχη χρησιμος as a medicinal measure in Hippocrates (Hultsch, Metrol. Script. i. 75–6), and is equated by Hesychius and Photius to the χώμα, which is treated variously as ⅔, ⅓, ⅓, or ⅓ of a cyathus. In the Cleopatrae tabula (Hultsch, i. 235; cf. 256) the μεγαλη κόγχη is equated to the δεξιαβοφ and contains ⅔ cyathi, weighing 15 drachmae, while the ἐλάπτων κόγχη contains ⅔ cyathus, weighing 5 dr. The papyrus evidently gives the weight of the μεγαλη κόγχη as 18 dr.: the initial lacuna in l. 31 may well have contained a statement of the relation of this κόγχη to a cyathus, which presumably stood in the ratio of 1: ⅜ to it, especially as a cyathus of 12 drachmae is indicated by ll. 35–6; cf. n.

31. ε[χει : or αγγει or ἴνοι or εστρέι.

31–2. τετρ is presumably τετρ(αρη), but there is room for a letter between ε and the vertical stroke which is supposed to represent the second τ. τετρατη is not known as a liquid measure, but τάταρων μέρος or τεταρτημόρων κοτύλης occurs in Hippocrates (Hultsch, i. 75”), and τεταρτην is common in the sense of ¼ εξίστρω or quarartarius, i.e. ¾ κοτύλη or 3 cyathy. The connexion of l. 32 with the preceding line is obscure. Only κανων is certain. κόνων suggests αμφορας, but αμφορειν is the regular Greek form: δοραμα is inadmissible. δ of δε is fairly certain (no figure in the thousands or hundreds will suit), but the following letter, if ε, is very cramped. δ, i.e. δεραμαι, could be read; but in l. 31 the ordinary symbol for drachmae occurs and in l. 36, where the figures seem to refer to drachmae, the preceding abbreviation was different. The figure οβ (δ) probably refers to drachmae, and perhaps gives the weight of a κοτύλη; cf. l. 31.

33–6. If the genitive κυαθον in l. 34 is right, these lines are clearly concerned with a subdivision of the cyathus, the smaller measure being apparently ⅓ of it and weighing ⅓ drachmae, which is in accordance with the weight ascribed to a μεγαλη κόγχη in l. 31, if the cyathus in 1609 is, as usual (cf. ll. 29–31, n.), ⅔ of a μεγ. κόγχη. The smallest measures for liquids were the χήμι, κόγχη (ἐλάπτων), κοχλιάρων, μιστριον or πλαταρων, μύστρων, and κάρων, but since the measure in question is neuter, the first two need not be discussed. The κοχλιάρων is sometimes, e.g. in the Cleop. tab., treated as weighing 1 drachma, i.e. ⅛ of a cyathus there, but ⅛ of the cyathus in 1609; elsewhere (e.g. Hultsch, i. 238. 7) it weighs 3 γράμματα, i.e. 2 drachmae. The terms μεγαν and μικρων do not occur in connexion with it, but something like κοχλιάρων ονω μεγα κοιαθον [εκων (or τεταρτων, if it weighed twice the μικρων) μερος το δε] μικρον κοιαθον [—] ογδοον μερος can be restored in ll. 33–5, though how the
lacunae in ll. 35–6 were filled in any case obscure. μίστρον (Hultsch, ii. 198–9) is somewhat less suitable than κολλιάριον. The μέγα μίστρον has sometimes 2, sometimes 3 cyathis, but elsewhere is 1/6 or 1/8 κοτύλη i.e. 3/16 or 1/8 cyath, while the μικρὸν μίστρον is 1/3 or 1/6 κοτύλη, i.e. 1/9 or 1/8 cyathus, which is not very close to 1/6 cyathus. The μιστριον or λιατριον, which is rarely mentioned, is the same as the μικρὸν μίστρον, and unlikely to be distinguished as μέγα and μικρὸν: but two kinds of κάρνα are known, the βασιλικῶν, which weighed 4 drachmae in the Cleop. lab., but elsewhere 7 drachmae (Hultsch, ii. 243. 8), and the Ποιατίων, which weighed 1 drachma (Hultsch, i. 243. 9), so that καρων] is as good as κολλιάριων] in l. 33. οὖν is not very satisfactory, and the o is uncertain; but to καρων(φ)ν there is the objection that the tail of a ρ ought to have been visible. In the absence of any known measure of which the smaller size was 1/8 cyathus and weighed 1 1/2 drachmae, the name to which μέγα and μικρὸν refer and even the supposed connexion between ll. 34–6 remain doubtful. The stroke before the figures in l. 36 is smaller than that after τετ ἐν l. 31 and may belong to a letter (e.g. θ or μ) above the line.

36–8. Cf. the Cleop. lab. (Hultsch, i. 234) ᾧ Πτολεμαϊκή μιά ἔξει o(γ)γος η, (δραχμάς) μιδ ... ἡ σύγγια ἔξει δραχμᾶς η.

1610. Ephorus, xii (or xi).

Frs. 12 + 13 15-2 x 9-1 cm. Late second or early third century. Plate III (Frs. i, 4–6, 15).

These 60 fragments (originally about 70) of a lost historical work were found with 1611, 1619, &c.; cf. 1619. int. They are mostly quite small, the longest containing less than 20 complete lines; but owing to frequent correspondences with Diodorus xi. 50 sqq. a large amount of restoration is possible, and about 100 lines in all are intelligible. In at least 16 cases the context of the fragments can be established, and in spite of their unpromising appearance they constitute a valuable find, especially since they deal with events in the Pentecontaetia, which are for the most part outside the scope of Herodotus' history, and are only briefly sketched by Thucydides.

The handwriting is a handsome upright uncial approximating towards the biblical type, like 1234, 1365, and 1606, but more calligraphic than the first two. 1012 and 1611 are also written in similar hands, but smaller. The date of the papyrus is not later than the early part of the third century and may go back to the latter part of the second, being approximately A.D. 200. There are no lection-marks except the common angular signs for filling up short lines, paragraphi, and high stops. Pauses are sometimes also indicated by blank spaces. The only correction is the deletion of the iota adscript of απέθανον in l. 104: elsewhere (ll. 105 and 198, but not in l. 60?) iota adscript was generally written, and, so far as can be judged, the scribe was more careful than the average. The lines were short, ranging from 12–17 letters and usually consisting of 14 or 15. The height of the columns is uncertain. All the fragments come or may come
from the middles of columns, except where it is otherwise stated. There is no external evidence to show their order, and the chronology of the twenty years following the battle of Plataea is in many points uncertain. The arrangement of Frs. 1–16 in the text is based on the order of the corresponding passages in Diodorus, and admits of little doubt. That Frs. 1–5 preceded 6 is clear from the reference to a change of subject in l. 37.

Of the three groups into which Frs. 1–16 fall the first, containing Frs. 1–5 (ll. 1–35; cf. ll. 36–7), is concerned with Themistocles. The most intelligible of them is Fr. 3, which comes from an estimate of his character and agrees very closely with a passage in Diod. xi. 59, no fewer than 13 consecutive words being identical; cf. p. 102. In Frs. 2 and 4 + 5 the division of lines is uncertain, and the resemblances to Diodorus are less marked, especially in the second half of Frs. 4 + 5, which does not correspond at all; but the points of agreement with Diodorus (cf. ll. 15–17 and 18 sqq., nn.) are sufficient to show that these fragments refer to other parts of the same chapter as Fr. 3, and are to be placed Fr. 2 shortly before Fr. 3, and Frs. 4 + 5 almost immediately after it. The small Frs. 26 and 38 also may belong to the character of Themistocles; cf. ll. 192–4 and 237–9, nn. Fr. 1, in which Themistocles is mentioned in l. 7, presents greater difficulties, since not only are the ends of lines missing, but no direct parallelism to Diodorus is traceable. Probably ll. 7 sqq. refer to the reception of Themistocles by Xerxes at the Persian court, which in Diodorus precedes the character of Themistocles, and the allusion in l. 8 to the statements of of μέν is to be connected with the ancient discrepancies among historians as to both the reigning king (Artaxerxes according to Thucydides and Charon, Xerxes according to Ephorus, Dion, and others), and the circumstances attending Themistocles’ arrival; cf. ll. 7–12, n. That our author, like Diodorus but unlike Plutarch, favoured views opposed to that of Thucydides is clear from his general support of Diodorus, especially with regard to the accession of Artaxerxes (Frs. 15–16); but the influence of Thucydides’ language is apparent in ll. 11–12 and evident later in Fr. 6. It is also possible that Fr. 31 is to be connected with Thucydides’ and Diodorus’ accounts of the presents of land made by the Persian king to Themistocles (ll. 213–14, n.), and Frs. 18 and 41 with Diodorus’ account of the adventures of Themistocles in Persia. Fr. 41 in that case comes shortly before Fr. 1 (ll. 246–8, n.), while Fr. 18, if the context has been rightly caught (ll. 140–5, n.), may be placed between Frs. 1 and 2, preceding Fr. 31, if that fragment too refers to Themistocles.

The second group, consisting of Frs. 6–14, is concerned with Cimon’s operations in the Aegean and Southern Mediterranean against the Persians, which are summarized by Thuc. i. 98–100 and more fully treated by Diodorus and Plutarch.
The end of a digression (i.e. the excursus upon the career of Themistocles) is announced in ll. 36-7, and in l. 37 a new section begins, just as in Diodorus, with the departure of the Greek fleet from Byzantium. This town had evidently already passed out of the possession of Pausanias according to our author, as is also implied by Diodorus and Plutarch, but not by Thucydides, whose indefiniteness as to the date of Pausanias' expulsion (i. 131), coupled with a statement in Justin ix. 1 that Pausanias held the city for seven years, has led to a controversy whether the transference of Byzantium to the Athenians took place in 476 or 470 B.C.; cf. Busolt, Griech. Gesch. iii. 961. 1610 supports the earlier date. Our author's account of the capture of Eion on the Strymon is clearly borrowed with hardly any variation from Thucydides, Herodotus' story of the heroic defence of the Persian governor being ignored. Diodorus here adds a sentence about the Athenian projects, which is probably his own invention (cf. p. 103); but his description of the capture of Eion is apart from some unnecessary verbiage equally brief, being somewhat closer to our author than to Thucydides and having the same general construction of the sentence (ll. 37-49, n.). Plutarch's account, based on Herodotus, is much longer.

The next event recorded is the capture of Scyros (l. 46), which is briefly mentioned by Thucydides and Diodorus. Our author, however, seems to have, like Plutarch, devoted much more space to this episode, which led to one of Cimon's most popular exploits, the recovery of the bones of Theseus. After l. 46 Fr. 6 breaks off; but it is practically certain that Fr. 7, which mentions 'king Lyco[medes]', is from an account of the Theseus story introduced, as by Plutarch, in connexion with Cimon's capture of Scyros (ll. 49-51, n.), and probably Fr. 35, which mentions the Pelasgians, is to be placed between Frs. 7 and 8. It is significant that Diodorus' reference to the Pelasgians at Scyros is not only the sole mention of them in Book xi, but is also, except the mention of Byzantium, the one detail in his account of the operations at Eion and Scyros which is not ultimately traceable to Thucydides.

After the capture of Scyros Thuc. i. 98. 3-4 proceeds to describe a war with Carystus in Euboea and the revolt of Naxos before coming to the twofold battle of the Eurymedon by sea and land (i. 100. 1). Diodorus on the other hand, ignoring the first two events, but mentioning Cimon's return to Athens in quest of reinforcements, narrates the operations in Caria which led up to a naval battle off the coast of Cyprus on the same day as the land-battle of the Eurymedon. The inherent improbability of Diodorus' account of the double victory, especially on account of the distance of Cyprus from the Eurymedon and the night-attack, which is a favourite stratagem in Diodorus' battles, has been generally recognized and ascribed to his use of Ephorus; cf. e.g. Busolt, iii. 1465. Our author's
account evidently agreed closely with that of Diodorus, but probably narrated some events omitted by him; cf. Fr. 39 for a possible reference to the Euboean war. Fr. 8 is with the exception of a couple of words and a difference of order identical with a passage in Diodorus’ description of the Carian operations, while Frs. 9 + 10. i + 53, which narrate the sea-fight off Cyprus, are also couched in very similar language. The numbers of the ships on both sides taking part in the naval engagement agree exactly with the figures of Diodorus, the figure of the Persian ships being practically in accordance with that ascribed to Ephorus by Plutarch (350 Ephorus; 340 1610 and Diodorus; Phanodemus’ figure, 600, is an obvious exaggeration); but the number of ships captured by Cimon is stated to have been 100, as in the metrical inscription which is quoted (no doubt from Ephorus) by Diodorus and is perhaps represented by Fr. 48 (cf. p. 102), and in Lycurgus and Aristodemus, whereas Diodorus himself gives the number as ‘more than 100’, being perhaps influenced by the different figure mentioned by Thucydides (ll. 62–76, n.). A detail omitted by Diodorus, the capture of a Persian admiral, is recorded in ll. 75 sqq., and the remains of Fr. 10. ii do not clearly correspond to any passage in Diodorus near this point, being too slight for certain reconstruction (cf. ll. 77–8, n. for a suggestion). Probably they belong to the early part of the description of the land-battle of the Eurymedon, and are to be placed not long before Fr. 11, which records the killing of the Persian general of the land-forces, Pherendates, in language practically identical with that of Diodorus. This coincidence is of great importance for deciding the question of the authorship of 1610, for from Plutarch it is known that Pherendates’ name occurred in Ephorus, from whom Diodorus no doubt obtained it; cf. p. 106. Frs. 12 + 13 continue the account of the land-battle, and since they constitute the longest connected piece, afford the best material for a comparison between our author and Diodorus. The general resemblance between them is very marked, ll. 94–101 presenting only trifling variants (cf. pp. 103–4); in ll. 101–12 1610 gives the more precise details about the destruction of the Persians, while Diodorus enlarges upon the absence of the moon and its effects; cf. p. 124. The small Fr. 14 probably came immediately after Frs. 12 + 13 (l. 114 can even belong to ll. 112 or 113), and describes one of Cimon’s tactics in the land-battle in terms similar to but not identical with those of Diodorus. Concerning the date of the battle of the Eurymedon, which has been ascribed to various years between 470 and 465 B.C. (autumn of 468 Busolt), the papyrus gives no new information beyond its general support of Diodorus, who assigns the engagement to 470, but is very confused throughout the Pentecontaetia in adapting his authority, Ephorus, to his own chronological system (cf. p. 110). It is noteworthy that 1610 agrees with Diodorus and Frontinus as to the locality of the two battles, while
Polyacenus, who has been sometimes supposed to represent Ephorus on this point more exactly than Diodorus (Busolt, l. c.), inverts the scene, ascribing the land-battle to Cyprus, the sea-fight to the Eurymedon (ll. 62–76, n.). The battle of the Eurymedon tended in ancient times to become confused with Cimon’s later operations at Cyprus in connexion with the Egyptian expedition, and all details of later historians concerning it which are inconsistent with the statements of Thucydides are usually rejected. The small Fr. 48, if it belongs to the inscription about Cimon’s victories which is quoted by Diodorus, is to be placed after Fr. 14 (ll. 267–9, n.), and Fr. 28 also perhaps refers to the land-battle of the Eurymedon, coming shortly before Fr. 11 (ll. 200–2, n.).

After the battle of the Eurymedon Diodorus (xi. 63–8) proceeds to narrate first the revolt of the Helots and Messenians from Sparta, secondly the war between Argos and Mycenae, and then turns to Sicilian affairs before reverting to Persian. The corresponding portion of 1610 is missing, unless Fr. 43 refers to the revolt of the Helots (ll. 252–4, n.), and Fr. 41 to the Argive-Mycenean war (ll. 246–8, n.).

The third section of the papyrus consists of Frs. 15 and 16, which both refer to Persian affairs. Fr. 16, which relates to the plot of Artabanus to kill Xerxes and seize the throne, is almost verbally identical with Diodorus. The context of Fr. 15, which mentions Artaxerxes, is not quite certain owing to the incompleteness of the lines; but most probably this fragment too is concerned with the plot of Artabanus, and immediately preceded Fr. 16, affording apparent points of contact with both Diodorus and Justin (ll. 119 sqq., n.).

With regard to Frs. 17–62, Fr. 53 has been assigned to ll. 67–9 (p. 101), and the most likely positions for Frs. 26 (p. 99), 35 (p. 100), and 48 (p. 102) have been indicated, while suggestions have also been made for the possible context of Frs. 18 (p. 99), 28 (p. 102), 31 (p. 99), 38 (p. 99), 39 (p. 101), 41 (p. 99), and 43 (p. 102). Fr. 17 seems to belong to a geographical description of some place in connexion with a battle, being comparable e.g. to Diodorus’ description of Platea, but referring to a different place (ll. 134–9, n.). The remaining fragments contain hardly any complete words, and no more instances of a clear correspondence with Diodorus have been detected.

The relation of our author to Diodorus will be made clearer by the following table of agreements and contrasts.

(1) Exact correspondences of 1610 with Diodorus. ll. 18–22 (ἐκείνοι μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἱμασμένοι τὴν δὲ πόλιν διὰ τῶν ἐκείνων πράξεις); 30–1 (χαλεπωτάτην ... πρὸς ἐκείνων); 56–61 (παραβαλαστὶων ... πόλεων δοσι μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἱσον ἀφαιρισμένα παραχρῆμα σωζέσεις, with a slight alteration in the order; v. infra); 63–9 (τὸν Περσῶν στόλον περι τῆς Κύπρου ... [διακοσμάεις πεντήκοστα π]µ[θ]ο[ς]
1610. **EPHORUS, XII** (OR XI) 103


(2) Inexact correspondences with Diodorus (additions of Diodorus other than verbal changes are in round brackets).

**Line.** 1610.

16–17 tίς δὲ τοσοῦτοι[γ διὰ τ]ῶν ἐργῶν
22–5 τῆς μεγίστης τιμῆς ὑπὸ τῶν 'Ελλῆνων ἀξιωθέσιν
27–9 σο[φ]ωτάτην καὶ δικαιοτάτην . . . . . 
30 [γεγομένην]ν
37 ..] παρεξ[έβ]ημεν
37–46 Ἀθηραῖοι δὲ Κύμωνος τοῦ Μιλτιάδου στρατηγοῦσιν ἐκπλεύσατε ἐκ Βυζαντίου μετὰ τῶν συμμάχων 'Ἡώνα τήν ἐπὶ Στρυ- 
μοίν Περσῶν ἐχοιτων εἶλον καὶ [Σκῦρον], ἦν νήσον . . .

**Diodorus.**

tίς δὲ τοῖς ἐργοῖς . . . τοσοῦτοι
σοφωτάτην καὶ ἐπιεικεστάτην

58–60 ἐκ τῆς 'Ελλάδος ᾧσαν ἀπφικσιμέναι
63–6 τοῦ τῶν Περσῶν στόλον περὶ [τὴν] 
Κύπρον σύμπε[τ[α]θαί]
66–7 διακοσίαις πε[η]τ[ήκουτα]
69–75 παραταχεῖσας δὲ πολὺν χρῶνον 
πολλὰς μὲν τῶν κυνδυνοσούσι βαρβαρ- 
κῶν νέων διέφθειρεν ἐκατὸν δ’ αὐτοὶς ἀν-
δράσαν ἔλεε

85 αὐτῶν

diak. καὶ πεντήκ. ναυς

58–60 Diodorus says ἀπφικσιμέναι (cf. 93 and 94.5–6).
93 ἐξεδροῖ? ὁ διετέλεσεν διονυσίου
94 ἔφοβον αὐτοῖς γεγονότα
96 μεν ὑπὸ ἐπικής 
98—101 ἐφευγὼν ὑπολαμβάνοντες εἶναι φιλίας
101—12 οὗ δὴ πολλοὶ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν καταλειφθέντων ἐκεῖ φιλάκων ἀπέθησικον ἐν τῇ ἐποχῇ πολλοὶ δὲ ξώτες ἥλιοκύτο
περιπλάνητες τοὺς Ἕλληνας διὰ τὴν ἄστρα
πάν ὑπὸ τράπουτο καὶ τὸν ἐξ ἕκαστῆς αὐτοῦ 
114—18 restoration uncertain
124—6 αὐτὸς κατοικεῖ τῇ βασιλείᾳ 
128—32 ἔπειρον ἔτη . . . ὅπερ 
161—17 ὑπολαμβάνει τῇ διαστάσει 

(3) Omissions in Diodorus. ll. 7—14 (different accounts of Themistocles' reception by Xerxes); 15, 25—6, and 32—5 (sentences in the estimate of Themistocles); 47—51 and 228—30? (the episode of Cimon's recovery of the bones of Theseus); 57 (καλοκαιρίων); 75—6 (capture of a Persian admiral); 87 (ὁπίσθα); 119—22 and 125—7 (details of the plot of Artabanus). Besides these ll. 1—7, 52—5, 77—83, 111—13, and 134—9, all of which are incomplete and obscure, seem to belong to passages not corresponding to anything in Diodorus, as is also the case with many of the minor fragments.

Where 1610 and Diodorus agree as to the sense, but express themselves differently, sometimes one, sometimes the other is longer; but on the whole Diodorus in the chapters covered by 1610 is distinctly the shorter of the two, details and even whole episodes which occur in 1610 being absent in his work. We postpone the discussion of the few passages in which he is fuller than 1610, until the question of the authorship of the papyrus has been decided (cf. p. 111); for the present it is sufficient to point out that none of Diodorus' additional sentences or phrases contains anything striking or implies any real divergence from 1610, except perhaps in l. 74 (πλείονας τῶν ἐκατόν for 1610's ἐκατόν with regard to the number of ships captured by Cimon off Cyprus). Beside the conspicuous points of agreement the differences between 1610 and Diodorus, apart from his omissions, in any case appear trivial.

The remarkably close resemblance between our author and Diodorus must
be explained in one of three ways. Either one of the two writers was copying the other, or they derived their common information from the same source, i.e. from the historian who is now always supposed to underlie Diodorus' account of the Pentecaetia, Ephorus. Between these alternatives the choice admits in our opinion of hardly any doubt. The agreements between 1610 and Diodorus, which sometimes amount to the identity of a whole sentence and extend over not only the narrative but moral reflexions upon the character of individuals, are too marked to be explained satisfactorily by the hypothesis of a common source; and there is no historian among Ephorus' contemporaries and successors who has any particular claim to be regarded as the author of 1610. Theopompus, apart from the great antecedent improbability that he would slavishly copy Ephorus (or Ephorus him), dealt with the Pentecaetia in an excursus upon Athenian demagogues in Book x of the Philippiaká (Fr. 90 Grenfell-Hunt), whereas 1610 has all the appearance of belonging to a comprehensive history of Greece. The detailed description of the plot of Artabanus (Frs. 15-16), which is probably in part derived from Ctesias (ll. 119 sqq., n.), does not at all suggest an Ἄρθις, and Phanodemos at any rate is excluded by his divergence from 1610 as to the size of the Persian fleet in the sea-fight off the Euromedon or Cyprus (ll. 62-76, n.). Callisthenes—apart from the fact that his histories primarily dealt with the fourth century B.C.—is excluded by his disagreement with 1610 on the subject of the name of the Persian general of the land-forces in the battle of the Euromedon (ll. 84-8, n.). Of the historians (other than Ephorus), who according to Plut. Themist. 27 (cf. ll. 7-12, n.) represented Themistocles as a suppliant to Xerxes, like 1610, Dinon and Heraclides wrote histories of Persia, not of Greece, Clitarchus an account of Alexander's Asiatic campaigns. Cratippus, whose claims required to be considered in connexion with the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia (842), wrote a continuation of Thucydidès. 1610 might conceivably be the work of another historian of about the age of Diodorus, following Ephorus with equal fidelity; but it is much more likely that the agreements between 1610 and Diodorus are due to the circumstance that one work was the immediate authority for the other.

The hypothesis that 1610 is based upon Diodorus may safely be dismissed. The papyrus was written only about two centuries after him, and the view that it represents the work of a historian of the Roman period, who was copying Diodorus, is open to several objections. Of Diodorus himself there are no extant papyri and Plutarch is equally unrepresented. The circulation in Egypt of the works of the later Greek historians was evidently rather limited, and about A.D. 200 people still preferred the more famous writers (cf. p. 110). The partial survival of Diodorus, who is never cited by heathen writers, though the title of
his history was known to Pliny, is due to the circumstance that his work happened to suit the Christians (Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencycl. v. 664); and to suppose that he served as the main authority for another and still more elaborate history of Greece composed not later than A.D. 150 is to attribute to him an importance to which he has no claim. 12, a historical composition of the Roman period in Egypt, illustrates the kind of synchronistic Graeco-Roman annals which were utilized by Diodorus (cf. Schwartz, op. cit. v. 665), but bears no resemblance to 1610. A survey of the differences between our author's and Diodorus' accounts of the same events (cf. pp. 102-4) is distinctly unfavourable to the hypothesis that 1610 is the later of the two. Thus in narrating the capture of Scyros our author is much more detailed, describing incidents which are ignored by Thucydides and Diodorus, but not by Plutarch. The new details in 1610 concerning the sea and land battles near the Eurymedon, though perhaps of no great historical value, at any rate indicate a serious historian of a higher calibre and distinctly better informed than Diodorus. There is every reason to suppose that our author was earlier, not later, than Diodorus, and the way is now clear for a discussion of the remaining hypothesis, that Diodorus was copying our author, who is no other than Ephorus himself.

The identification of our author with Ephorus is supported by many considerations. (1) Ephorus was a well-known and popular writer, extensively used by writers of the Roman period, so that his works would be expected to turn up in Egypt.

(2) The most important argument of all is that 1610 coincides with Ephorus and Diodorus both as to the visit of Themistocles to Xerxes, not Artaxerxes (cf. p. 99), and the name of the Persian general Pherendates (II. 84-8, n.), while 1610's and Diodorus' figure (340) of the ships in the Persian fleet in the sea-battle off Cyprus is practically identical with the figure (350) ascribed to Ephorus (II. 62-76, n.). The slight difference may well be due either to a corruption in the MSS. of Plutarch (v for μ), or to a rounding-off of Ephorus' figure by that writer. These three are the only extant pieces of direct evidence concerning Ephorus' narrative of the events covered by the papyrus, and the coincidence with regard to Pherendates, whose name is a certain restoration in l. 86, is particularly weighty.

(3) The close relationship between 1610 and Diodorus, though this resemblance often extends beyond the point which with the scanty available evidence could hitherto be proved as regards Ephorus and Diodorus, is in the main such as has been generally considered to exist between those two historians; cf. pp. 105 and 111-2 and Schwartz, op. cit. v. 679.

(4) The general relation of 1610 to Plutarch, who has been thought (e. g. by
Busolt) to have followed other historians, e.g. Theopompus, Heraclides, and Callisthenes, more than Ephorus in dealing with the Pentecontaëtia, is also quite in keeping with what would be expected to be found in Ephorus. Particular statements of Plutarch with regard to Ephorus are verified (all three pieces of evidence discussed in (2) are obtained from Plutarch); but as a rule Plutarch preferred a different authority, though his account of Cimon's recovery of the bones of Theseus may have been obtained from 1610 (ll. 49-51, n.).

(5) The traces of connexion between 1610 and (1) Justin (ll. 119 sqq., n.), who certainly used Ephorus, (2) Polyaeus, (3) Frontinus (ll. 62-76, n.), and (4) Aristodemus (ll. 7-12, 62-76, nn.), are such as would be expected to occur, if Ephorus is the author.

(6) The account of the capture of Eion in 1610 (ll. 37-46, n.) is borrowed straight from Thucydides, whom Ephorus is supposed to have used. Elsewhere he differs conspicuously from Thucydides, as was known, with regard to two incidents which occur in 1610, the appeal of Themistocles to Xerxes and the sea-fight off Cyprus (ll. 7-12 and 62-76, nn.), an apparent indirect allusion being made to Thucydides' account of the former incident.

(7) The arrangement of the narrative in 1610, in which events are evidently grouped not annalistically as in Thucydides, but rather according to subject, is in accordance with the definite statement of Diodorus v. 1 concerning the arrangement adopted by Ephorus (κατὰ γένος: cf. p. 110).

(8) The disposition of our author to digress and moralize, which is illustrated by his excursus upon Themistocles, is quite in harmony with Polybius' reference (xii. 28) to Ephorus' fondness for παρεκβάσεις and γνωμολογίαι.

(9) The interest shown by our author in antiquarian lore, exemplified by the excursus on Theseus (p. 100), accords very well with Ephorus' known interest in that subject (cf. Schwartz, op. cit. vi. 13).

(10) The prominence of the Athenians in 1610 is in keeping with the supposed sympathies of Ephorus (cf. Schwartz, op. cit. vi. 14), though these have been disputed (cf. Walker, Hell. Oxy. 107).

(11) The historical arguments are to some extent reinforced by linguistic evidence, for there is a general similarity of style between 1610 and the extant fragments of Ephorus. Actual quotations of his words are very few, but there are occasional agreements in them with 1610 in points of diction (cf. ll. 26, 94-9, 102-4, 114-16, nn.), though these are not very striking. The careful avoidance of hiatus (cf. ll. 59-60), the monotonous frequency of antitheses, and a decided tendency to verbosity, especially in the reflexions upon Themistocles, accord very fairly with the judgements of ancient critics upon Ephorus' style; cf. Cicero, Hortens. Fr. 12 quid ... Ephoro mitius inveniri potest?; Brut. 204 lenissimum.
Ephori ingenium; Dio Chrys. xviii, p. 283 "Εφορος δὲ πολλὴν μὲν ἱστορίαν παραδίδωσιν, τὸ δὲ ὑπὸν καὶ ἀνεμένον τῆς ἀπαγγελίας σοι ὤν ἐπιτήδειον. The digression on Themistocles, ii, as is practically certain, the whole of Diod. xi. 58. 4–59 was taken with very little change from our author, contains somewhat more rhetoric than would be expected to appear in Ephorus, and is nearer to Frs. 217 and 283 (Grenfell-Hunt) of Theopompus, which also have a series of rhetorical questions, than to anything in Ephorus' extant fragments. But for reasons which have been given (p. 105) Theopompus is quite unsuitable as the author of 1610, and in spite of the well-known saying of Isocrates about his two illustrious pupils that Ephorus required the spur, Theopompus the bit, the two disciples of that master probably had many rhetorical devices in common.

Our conclusion therefore is that at last there is a papyrus which, especially in view of its coincidences with fragments of Ephorus, and its close agreements with Diodorus, can be ascribed to Ephorus with overwhelming probability.

The books of Ephorus 'Ἱστορίαι which dealt with the period round that which is covered by 1610 were x–xiii; cf. Schwartz, op. cit. vi. 5. Fr. 107 (Müller) from Book x is concerned with Miltiades at Paros and belongs to the interval between Marathon and Salamis. A fragment from Schol. Aristid. p. 515. 22 (Müller, FHG. iv. 642) refers to the fine of 50 talents imposed on Miltiades and paid by Cimon when a young man (Plut. Cimon 4), i.e. before the events recorded in 1610. The scholiast gives as his source "Εφορος ἐν τῇ πρῶτῃ, which is usually corrected to ἐνδεκάτῃ. There is also a difficulty about the number of the book in Eph. Fr. 109; for his discussion of various opinions upon the causes of the rise of the Nile is ascribed by most MSS. of Theo Progymn. to Book xi, but one MS. has ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ in the margin, and Joannes Lydus, in referring to the same discussion, attributes it τῇ πρῶτῃ, which has been usually corrected, as in the other case, to ἐνδεκάτῃ. Müller accepts πέμπτῃ as right on the reasonable, and in our opinion sufficient ground that Book v was geographical and is known to have been concerned with Asia and Libya; but Schwartz (l. c.) accepts ἐνδεκάτῃ, suggesting (what does not seem very probable) that an excursus on Egypt may have occurred in connexion with the revolt of Inarus, which is narrated by Diodorus in the chapters immediately following those corresponding to Frs. 15–16 of 1610. After Fr. 109 there is no fragment of Ephorus which can be assigned with certainty to a particular event and book until Fr. 126 from Book xvii is reached. This records the death of Alcibiades and corresponds to Diod. xiv. 11. Fr. 110, however, a mention of a Sicilian island Τυχά in Book xii, is doubtfully connected by Schwartz (l. c.) with the expulsion of Thrasybulus from Syracuse in about 466 B.C. (Diod. xi. 68), and Fr. 124, a mention of Ἐντέλα in Sicily in Book xvi, is thought by him to refer probably
1610. *EPHORUS, XII (OR XI)*

to the early history of Dionysius (cf. Diod. xiv. 9). It is therefore not clear to which book 1610 belonged; but evidently xi or xii is the most suitable.

The new discovery in any case adds fresh fuel to the controversy concerning the authorship of two other papyri from the same site, the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (842) and a fragment concerning the Orthagoridae in Sicyon (1365). In our first edition of 842 we discussed the claims of Ephorus, Theopompus, and Cratippus to be regarded as the author, and eventually decided doubtfully in favour of Theopompus, a hypothesis which was advocated by E. Meyer and found considerable favour in Germany, but very little in this country. The claims of Cratippus were formerly advocated by Walker (*Klio* viii. 356–71) and are still supported by the latest editor of the *Hell. Oxy.*, J. H. Lipsius. The case for Ephorus has been well stated by Judeich (*Rheiin. Mus.* 1911. 94–139), and more fully by Walker (*Hell. Oxy.* 1912), whose able advocacy has gained many adherents. With regard to 1365 our view that Ephorus (or Aristotle?) might be the author has been disputed by M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis (*Atti Acc. Torino*, li. 290–305), on the ground that the oracle mentioned by Diodorus referred to Andreas himself, implying that he was to be the first tyrant, whereas 1365 states that Andreas' son Orthagoras was the first tyrant. This objection, however, does not seem to us insuperable, for Diodorus' words are ὅτι Σεικωνίους ἔχρησεν ἡ Πυθα ἐκατὼν ἔτη μαστίγονομήθεσαί αὐτοῖς. ἐπερωτησάτων δὲ αὐτῶν τίς ὁ ταῦτα ποιήσων πάλιν ἀπεκρίθη οὗ ἤν καταπλεύσατε πρῶτο γεγενημένον ὑών ἄκοψωσιν . . . , which points to the νιός (Orthagoras) as the important person.

The authorship of 842 is too large a question to be adequately redescribed here, but the main bearings of the new find upon the problem, assuming that we are right in attributing 1610 to Ephorus, may be indicated. Firstly, the agreements between 842 and Diodorus, which could only be explained by his direct or indirect use of the author of 842, and which constituted the most solid argument in favour of the view that Ephorus was the writer in question (cf. Part v. 125–7; Walker, *op. cit.* 50 sqq.), are less marked indeed than the correspondences of 1610 with Diodorus in Frs. 3, 8–11, 16, but are on much the same level as those in Frs. 4–6, 12 + 13, 15. Secondly, the relation of 842 to Plutarch and Justin is similar to that of 1610 to those authors. In both papyri the connexion with Plutarch is slight, but their influence upon Justin is traceable. Thirdly, the scale of the history in the two papyri is not dissimilar, when allowances are made for the comparative paucity of evidence for the more ancient period. 1610, though its account of the capture of Eion reproduces the brevity of Thucydides, not the details of Herodotus (cf. ll. 37–46, n.), was evidently on a large scale, being even more detailed than Diodorus, so far as can be judged. Hence the discovery of 1610 goes some way to remove the supposed difficulty (cf. Part v,
l. c., and in answer to it Walker, op. cit. 32 sqq.) that Ephorus' history was less detailed than 842. Fourthly, while in 842 the narrative was arranged chronologically in the style of Thucydides, in 1610 the arrangement bears no sign of being annalistic, and was evidently to a large extent according to subject; cf. p. 107. Here 1610 rather damages the position of Judeich, who (op. cit. 110) minimized one of the chief difficulties in the attribution of 842 to Ephorus, the fact that according to Diodorus v. 1 Ephorus' history was arranged kara yévos, and maintained that Ephorus did write more or less annalistically. Walker's position, on the other hand, is less affected, for he had acutely divined (op. cit. 30-1) from Diodorus' account of the Pentecontaëtia that Ephorus' account of it was arranged according to subject, not annalistically, just as in fact 1610 shows it to have been with regard to two of the three incidents selected by Walker as evidence (Themistocles in Persia, and Cimon's operations up to the battle of the Eurymedon). This divergence, however, between 1610 and 842 (which belongs to Book xviii, if it is by Ephorus) remains something of a difficulty in spite of Walker's arguments (op. cit. 32 sqq.) for the view that in the later books of Ephorus greater respect was paid to the annalistic method. Fifthly, speeches in the style of Thucydides do not occur in either papyrus, but each of them has at least one excursus (842 on the Boeotian constitution, 1610 on Themistocles; that in 842 x on the character of an individual is too incomplete to be at all intelligible). Lastly, there are rather more agreements in diction between 1610 and 842 (cf. 15-17, 56-61, 73-4, 94-9, 101, 104, 121, 123, nn.) than between 1610 and the extant fragments of Ephorus (cf. p. 107), which owing to the length of 842 is not surprising, and the general style of 842 is not unlike that of 1610.

With regard to 1365, the circumstance that the parallel account in a fragment of Diodorus breaks off just before the point at which the papyrus begins prevents us from knowing the extent of their resemblance; but they combine in most respects remarkably well. The fondness for the genitive absolute and the repetition of the article with an adjective placed after a substantive, which were noted (Part xi. 107) as characteristics of 1365, do not appear in 1610, but the general style is not at all dissimilar. The wide range of the library to which 1610 belonged and, to a less extent, that of the library containing 842 (1365 was found with only a couple of Homeric fragments) render us unwilling to lay much stress on the circumstance that all three papyri, which are approximately contemporaneous, come from the same site. In about A.D. 200 copies of most of the Greek authors of the first rank and many of the second and third were probably still in circulation at Oxyrhynchus. But the historian who would be expected to come next in popularity to Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon
is Ephorus, not Theopompus, whose works had already begun to perish in Diodorus' time (Theop. Fr. 28 Grenfell-Hunt, βυβλος ἐκτὸς πρὸς ταῖς πεινίκαιτα ἐξ οὐ πέντε διαφωνοῦντι); and if, as we are rather disposed to infer from the joint connexion with Diodorus, 842, 1365, and 1610 are the work of one author, he is certainly Ephorus.

To summarize the chief points of value in 1610 from the point of view of our identification of its author with Ephorus, (i) the most important is that it enables us to realize for the first time at all adequately the debt of Diodorus, particularly in Book xi, to that author. That the younger historian was under great obligations to the older has long been supposed, but, since Diodorus also used various other authors, the extent and method of his use of Ephorus, whose name he rarely mentions, had nearly always to be guessed rather than proved. That he sometimes incorporated whole sentences or even chapters with little or no change, at other times merely paraphrased or abbreviated his main authority, compressing some details and omitting some episodes altogether, but adding, so far as 1610 goes (cf. pp. 102–4), hardly anything of his own, is not only new but very valuable information. Where Diodorus is perceptibly longer than or different from Ephorus in 1610, the new matter is probably in the main an amplification introduced for the sake of variety (ll. 37–46, 101–10) or a mere rhetorical exaggeration (ll. 69–75), though in regard to the latter passage some of Diodorus' variations may be due to deference for Thucydides (ll. 62–76, n.). It is particularly instructive that Diodorus' account of the twofold battle of the Eurymedon, which is just one of the cases where his precise relation to Ephorus was most in doubt owing to the divergent evidence of Polyænus (ll. 62–76, n.), proves to be on the whole a very faithful reproduction of the older historian, and that a digression such as that in Diod. xi. 58. 4–59 on Themistocles is now shown to have been borrowed almost verbally from Ephorus. Evidently Diodorus was a writer of very slight originality, and a future editor of Ephorus' fragments will be able to include most of Diod. xi with confidence. His debt to Ephorus in that book is almost as great as are his obligations to Agatharchides in iii. 12–48, where a comparison of Diodorus with the excerpts of Agatharchides Περὶ τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης preserved by Photius shows that everything in Diodorus down to the most minute details is borrowed from the older writer. Theopompus on the other hand, so far as the Pentecontaëtia is concerned, does not seem to have been utilized to any serious extent by Diodorus. The effect of 1610 upon the criticism of other books of Diodorus, especially xii–xv, is also likely to be considerable, but the discussion of these falls outside our present scope. It is clear, however, that much of Diodorus' work, which could be ignored, so long as his statements were regarded as merely those of a writer of the Augustan
age, will henceforth have to be treated with the respect due to the celebrated fourth century B.C. historian whom he was to a large extent copying.

(2) There is now much more material for estimating the scale of Ephorus' history of the fifth century B.C. Diodorus seems to have incorporated most of the essential parts, but by no means all the details and digressions, and Ephorus, as is shown by the account of the land-battle of the Eurymedon and the plot of Artabanus, evidently wrote at very considerable length, though his account of the capture of Eion ignores the material available from Herodotus, and the sea-fight off Cyprus is described in a few lines. His system in dealing with the Pentecontaetia was to group events by subjects, not by definite years, an arrangement which led Diodorus into great confusion about the chronology of this period. But in dealing with the fourth century B.C., which occupied the second half of Ephorus' ἱστορίαι, he may have employed a different method.

(3) With regard to the sources of Ephorus, 1610 exhibits one clear case of direct borrowing from Thucydides (ll. 37-46, n.), and an apparent reference to him in an allusion to authorities vaguely described as οἱ μὲν (l. 8, n.); but in other respects 1610 comes into marked conflict with him; cf. p. 107. Herodotus is not utilized in connexion with the capture of Eion, and Frs. 15-16 do not display any verbal connexion with the Περὶ τικῆς of Ctesias, though Diodorus' language in a passage in this context betrays a use of that author; cf. ll. 119 sqq., n. There is now more reason than ever to suppose that the metrical inscription upon Cimon's victories was quoted by Diodorus from Ephorus (ll. 267-9, n.).

(4) Of later writers, other than Diodorus, who dealt with the Pentecontaetia, Plutarch kept Ephorus' history in view, but preferred to follow other authorities, while echoes of Ephorus are found in Justin, Aristodemus, Polyaenus, and Frontinus (p. 107).

(5) For Ephorus' style the evidence is still scanty, and it is difficult to judge it fairly from fragments so discontinuous and brief as those in 1610. But it does not seem to have been much better than that of Diodorus, the leading characteristics of it being easiness, verbosity, and tameness, with a tendency to break into rhetoric (cf. pp. 107-8).

(6) The discovery of 1610 affects many points in the controversy concerning the authorship of 842, and to a less extent that of 1865. On the whole it rather supports the attribution of 842 to Ephorus, since it tends to remove the difficulty caused by the elaborate scale of that work, and reinforces the most solid argument for ascribing it to Ephorus, the evident traces of connexion between 842 and Diodorus. In the light of 1610 it is increasingly difficult to explain those agreements with Diodorus from the point of view that 842 is the work of Theopompos or Cratippus. On the other hand the resemblances between 1610
and Diodorus often reach far beyond the point attained by 842, and the principal obstacle to the attribution of 842 to Ephorus remains in a somewhat accentuated form, the strictly chronological system imitated from Thucydidès, which is found in 842, as contrasted with Ephorus’ arrangement according to subject, which is well illustrated by 1610. With regard to 1365 there is less evidence for the extent of its resemblance to Diodorus, but the hypothesis that it came from an early book of Ephorus still remains attractive.

Ephorus, in spite of his celebrity and wealth of new information not to be found in Herodotus, Thucydidès, or Xenophon, was not a great historian, and to judge by 1610 it may be doubted whether in his treatment of the fifth century B.C., which brought him into frequent conflict with Thucydidès, many of the novelties were of real historical value. The servility of Diodorus, who, as it now appears, followed Ephorus almost blindly through that period, and was practically incapable of original composition, has probably prevented us from losing very much when Books x-xv of the older historian perished. With his history of the fourth century B.C. the case is different. Here Ephorus is likely to have been as well informed as Xenophon, Theopompos, or any other, and if he was the author of the account of Agesilus’ and Conon’s campaigns and the excursus on the Boeotian constitution in 842, his merits were by no means inconsiderable. Even with regard to quite early Greek history he was sometimes, if 1365 is from his work, distinctly independent of Herodotus and rather valuable.

It is in any case satisfactory that with the recovery of these fragments of Ephorus’ history of the Penteconetaetia the ‘higher criticism’ of Diodorus not only can point henceforth to several substantial verifications of the methods of modern research in ancient history, but enters a new phase.
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...it is necessary to (return?) to what (happened) then concerning Themistocles. Some say that he reminded him of his warnings about both the sea-fight and the bridge; but with regard to the sea-fight..."
the beginning of l. 5 project, and λ could be read in place of α. ἐναγγέλεων (cf. l. 12) is excluded by the fact that only the plural of this word occurs in Attic. Buzy suggests ἐπαγγέλεων as an alternative, referring to a previous account of the flight of Themistocles (Fr. 1-5). Are themselves part of a digression anticipating the chronological order of events; cf. l. 37 and p. 99. The letter following κ can be ε, but the hiatus -αι ανα- is an objection to this restoration; cf. p. 107.

6. εἰς τα Monroe of the letter following εις all that survives is the tip of a stroke which might be vertical or horizontal. έστι or έστια could be read, but suggests no suitable word.

7-12. Cf. p. 99, Thuc. i. 137 ἐσφίσμεθα γράμματα πρὸς βασιλέα Λυκασάξερν ὁ Σέρβων νεωτὶ βασιλεύσαντα. ἐβιβάζει δὲ ἡ γραφὴ δὴ Θεμιστοκλῆς ἢ γαρ παρὰ σὲ, δὲ κακά μὲν πλείονα Ἑλληνών εἰργασμὸν ὄνομαν, δοὺς χρόνου τὸν σὸν πατέρα ἐπέδεικν ἐμοὶ ἀνάγκη ἡμιόπαιν, πολὺ δὲ ἐν πλείω ἀγάδα, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀσφαλεῖ μὲν ἐμοὶ, ἐκεῖνο δὲ ἐν ἑπτακινδύνῳ πάλιν ἡ ἀποκομμὴ ἐγένετο. καὶ μοι εἰργασίας ὦθησεται (γράφας τῆς τῇ ἐκ Σαλαμίνος προδρόμους ἡς ἄνω κατὰ ἔκτην τῆς ἐποίησιν ἁρματοφυλακῆς, ἢ προσωπίστατο, τότε δὲ αὐτὸν ἰδίως ἀδιαλυτίως, καὶ τῶν ἔχων... Plut. Themist. 27 Θουκυδίδης μὲν ὁδὸν καὶ Χάρων ὁ Λαμπυκράτος ἵστασθαι τιθητόντων Σέρβῳ πρὸς τὸν ὁδόν αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεμιστοκλεί γενέσθαι τὴν ἐποίησιν ἐναγγέλεως, δὲ καὶ Δεινών καὶ Κλειταρχοῦς καὶ Ἡρακλείδης; ἢ 8. ἀλλοι πλείονες, πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀδιαφορεῖ τὸν Σέρβῃν. τοῖς δὲ χρωμισὶ δοκεῖ μᾶλλον ὁ Θουκυδίδης συμμερεσθαί, καθήκεν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν γέρουντος τῶν παραμετρίων. The following account of the reception of Themistocles by Artabanus the Χλαρχαῖος, who is identical with the Artabanus to whom Frs. 15-16 refer (cf. ll. 119 sqq., n.), is stated by Plutarch to be derived from Phanias, with a few extra details obtained from Eratosthenes περὶ πλοίων, and Phanias too, as is observed by Busolt, iii. 132, seems to have represented Xerxes as still reigning at the time of Themistocles’ arrival; cf. l. 8, n. Plutarch does not state his source for the two next chapters (28-9), which relate in detail the reception of Themistocles by the Persian king and the honours paid to him, being partly derived from Thucydides, partly from some other source (Heracleti? Busolt, iii. 129). A different version of the letter recorded by Thucydides is put into Themistocles’ mouth, ἦκο σοι, βασιλεί, Θεμιστοκλῆς... τὸ πολὺ μὲν ἑδέονες Πέρασα κακὰ, πλεῖον δὲ ἀγάδα καλώντα τὴν διόμητα, ὅτι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐν αὐτοῖς γεγομένη πορεύεται τὰ ὄνομα συζύμων καρισματικὰ τι καὶ ἱμαν. Diodorus xi. 56. 8 shows more interest in the stratagem by which Lysithides introduced Themistocles to Xerxes (cf. ll. 246-8, n.) than in ‘Themistocles’ defence of himself before the king, which is described quite briefly καὶ πλείων ἀνδρῶν τῷ Θεμιστοκλεῖ λόγον καὶ μαθήσας ἡμῖν ἔδειχνεν. Aristodemus 10 καὶ ὄντων ἀνδρῶν (sc. Αρταξέρξης) τῶν εὐκρίσεων δὲ ἑδόκει καταθέσθαι εἰς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Σέρβῃν, λέγω καὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης αὐτῷ γεγονόσας αὐτὸς [ἐνδικεῖσθαι λόγου τοὺς Ἐλλήνας τὸ κέραμα, though primarily based on Thucydides, shows traces of a knowledge of Ephorus; cf. ll. 62-76, n. Nepos (Themist. 9) follows Thucydides, scit plerosque ita scripsisse, Themistoclem Xerxe regnante in Asiam transisse. Sed ego polishissimum Thucydidi credo... quoting the letter to Artaxerxes Iden multi multa proncauna fecerit postquam in luto ipsae ille in periclo esse coepit. Nam cum in Asiam revexit vellet, proelio apud Salamina facta, litteris cum certiorum fecit id agit ut pons quem in Hellesponto fecerat dissolvi, restituet atque ab hostibus circumiretur: que munito ille periclo est liberatus. The earliest authority for the view that Xerxes, not Artaxerxes, was the king in question is Aeschines Socraticus quoted by Aristid. ii. 293 (cf. 1608). The date of Themistocles’ arrival in Persia continues to be a matter of dispute: Busolt, i. 132, sides with Thucydides, and assigns that event to a period shortly after the spring of 464.

8. οἱ μὲν: cf. the previous n. Thucydides is probably included, for the expressions in ll. 11-12 seem to be derived from him, though σημείωσα is apparently Xerxes, not Artaxerxes, cf. the next n. Dinon may also be meant, for he was approximately Ephorus’ contemporary. Clistarchus and Heracleti, who were younger, can hardly be referred to by Ephorus, nor can Phanias (cf. the previous n.), who was the disciple of Aristotle.
8—9. νυν ἑμὲν ἀντιον: we prefer ὑμὲν ἀντιον to ἑμὲν ἀντιον on account of the parallel in Aristodemus 10 cited above. His work, the date of which is unknown, is based mainly on Herodotus and Thucydides, but its frequent resemblances to Diodorus, especially as to the causes of the Peloponnesian War, suggest the use of Ephorus, and ὑμὲν ἀντιον appears as if like a reminiscence of the present passage. ἀντιον, however, here is, we think, Xerxes not Artaxerxes, because (1) there is no mention of the king’s father (cf. Thuc. l. c.); (2) the accession of Artaxerxes is described by Diodorus in a much later chapter, to which Fss. 15—16 refer; (3) Ephorus is definitely known to have agreed with the majority of historians that Xerxes was the reigning king. The difficulty is that owing to the loss of the second part of the sentence from l. 14 onwards it is not clear whether our author accepted the opinion of αὐτὸς or not. If he rejected it, then ἀντιον might be Artaxerxes and Fr. i would be more suitably placed after Fr. 16, with a backward reference in ll. 5—7 to the account of Themistocles in Persia which must in any case have preceded Fss. 2—5. This would have the advantage of making the suggested connexion between ll. 7—12 and both Thucydides and Aristodemus closer; but we are unwilling to separate Fr. i so widely from Fss. 2—5, seeing that Themistocles is the subject of them all. To retain Fr. i where it is, and make ἀντιον Artaxerxes, with a possible forward reference in ll. 5—7 to a subsequent mention of Artaxerxes, is a possible compromise; but with [προ]γγέλει the most natural dative to be supplied is αὐτῷ, i.e. Xerxes, not τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ which would be required by the identification of αὐτοῖς with Artaxerxes.


11. τῆς ζεφυρας: cf. Hdt. viii. 110 τὸν ἐν Ἑλλησσάρων γεφυράς λίου, Thuc. l. c., Diod. xi. 19. 5 τῶν παδαγγον τῶν ἱδιῶν ὑδῶν ἀποστείλει πρὸς τὸν Ζερέξκη δηλώσαντα διατέ μελέσασιν εἰ "Ἑλληνες πλέοντας ἔπι τον ξύμα λίου τῆς γεφυρᾶς, and the next n. Diodorus’ employment of the singular (Hdt. and Thuc. they have the plural) confirms ζεφυρας here; but the stroke following τῆς might be round just as well as straight.


Fr. 2. τίς δε ... λέν ἐπούδασε; τίς;?] δε τοσοῦτον ε δι;?] τῶν ἐργῶν ... 15—17. Cf. p. 99 and Diod. xi. 59. 2 τίς δε πρὸς ἄπαν τὴν εκ τῆς Ἀθηνίας δήμων ἀνάστατο τῇ πόλει παρατεθεὶς ἐκίπτει; τίς δε τοὺς ἐργοὺς εν εἰρήνῃ την παρασφαλείαν κατασκεύασε τοσοῦτος (τοσοῦτος MSS.; τοσοῦτον or τοσοῦτος Reiske). ων can be a participle or the end of a phrase like δε τῶν ἐργῶν. With ἐπούδασε cf. S. 842. xiv. 7 ἐπούδασαν ἐκπολέμησαν.

Fss. 3—5. ... εἰςείνον μὲν ἕπι τῆς πόλεως ἱγμασμένον, τήν δε πόλιν δὴ τῆς εἴκουν πράξεως τῆς μεγίστης τιμῆς ἕπι τῶν Ἑλλήνων εὔχεσθαι, ἢ μεγάλην ἱγμασμένον; ἢν ἄλλον ... σοφολάττων καὶ ἔκακοτάτων τῆς ... τῆς ἱγμασμένης πρῶς ἑκτον. οἷς τῇ δ’ ἐστολομάζων ὅτι εἰπὲ ἵδιν;[θη ἐκ; δο]ναι τήν ἱγμασμένην; ην ... 18 sqq. Cf. p. 99 and Diod. xi. 59. 3 διάπερ ὅτιν τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἐργῶν αὐτοῦ θεωρήσωμεν καὶ σκοπούσατ τὰ κατὰ μέρος εὐρομένην ἐκείνου μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἱγμασμένου, τὴν δὲ πόλιν διὰ τᾶς ἐκείνου πράξεως ἐπαρμένη, εἰδότως τὴν δακοίαν εἶναι τῶν ἀπασών πόλεως σοφοτάτην καὶ
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έπιεικεστάτην χαλεπωτάτην πρὸς ἐκείνου εὑρίσκομεν γεγενημένην. εἰ[ρ][ο][μ] is inadmissible in l. 18.

21-2. τ[α] εκείνου προτέες: cf. ll. 193-4, where the phrase perhaps recurs, suggesting that Fr. 26 belongs to this context.

22-5. Diodorus has only one word here in place of seven: cf. p. 103.

26. [γεγομ]αι: cf. Ephorus Fr. 67 τελευταίαντος γὰρ ἐκείνου (Eraminondas) τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀποβαλεῖν εἴθες τοῖς Θηβαίοις. ovis is inadmissible.


32. υ[π]ο[λ]αμβάνων[ς]: cf. ll. 94-9, n. The adopted restoration of ll. 32-5 was proposed by Bury. εβαβαλθήθη ἐκδολονοι produces a hiatus, which is unsatisfactory (cf. ll. 4-5, n.); but προσδοκεῖ seems too long, if χαλεπωταστhai is the beginning of l. 30. With the division χαλεπωταστhai, however, προσδοκεῖ could be read; cf. ll. 27-31, n. The division χαλεπωταστhai would create a great difficulty in l. 31, for there would not be room for ι(o)υ or ι(α)υ and a participle is wanted there, the ν being nearly certain.

34. The vestige of a letter before νιι suggests γ, τ, or υ, so that τ[α]υτ[ε]ν with ν is unsatisfactory; though the doubtful η may be i. αποταν is possible, but with another word than γεγομαι, for which cf. l. 26, n.


. . . from which we digressed. The Athenians under the command of Cimon son of Miltiades sailed out from Byzantium with their allies, and captured Eion on the Strymon, which was in the possession of the Persians, and Scyros, which island . . .


37-46. Cf. pp. 99-100, Hdt. vii. 107, where the heroic defence of Eion by Βούγγας is described in some detail, Thuc. i. 98 (the source of the present passage; cf. p. 107) πρῶτον μὲν ἤνωσα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμώνα Μύρων ἐκόμισεν πολιορκὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ ἠδρασίαν, Κύριων τοῦ Μιλτιάδου στρατηγοῦντος. ἐπείκε ταύτην τὸν ἔν τοῦ Λυκαίω νῆσον, ἵνα μὴν ἔδοξεν, ἡ πόλις ἠλισθήσατο καὶ φῶναν αὐτοῖς, and Diod. xi. 60. 1-2 Ἀθηναίοι στρατηγοῦν ζηλωμένοι Κύμαν τοῦ Μιλτιάδου κτλ. (cited on p. 103), which is longer than 1610, but adds nothing new about the capture of Eion, and bears distinct traces of derivation from 1610, especially the mentions of Byzantium and Pelasgi (cf. p. 100). Plutarch's account (Cimon 7) Κύμαι δὲ τῶν συμμάχων ἤδε προσακοϕορηκότων αὐτῷ στρατηγός εἰς Ὀρμην ἐπέκειτο, προσακοϕορῶν Μυρωνόν άνδρας ἐδόξασα καὶ συνγενεῖς βασιλέως Ἦδων πόλιν παρὰ τῷ Στρυμῶνα κευμένην ποταμῷ κατέχοντος ἀναλεῖψε τῶν πόλων τοῦ Ἑλληνα, πρῶτον μὲν οὖν αὐτοῖς μακὴ τοῖς Πέρασοι ἔσκειρε καὶ κατέκλεισεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπείκε ταύτα ὑπὲρ Στρυμώνα Θαρσίας κτλ., which proceeds to narrate the story of Βούγγας (here called Βούτη) told by Hdt., is based on other historians than Ephorus.

46. [Σύνο][ν]υ: cf. Thuc. and Diod. ll. cc. Our author was much more detailed; cf. Fr. 7.
Fr. 7. 49-51. Cf. p. 100 and Plut. Cimon 8, where the story of Cimon's recovery of the bones of Theseus is narrated in detail, especially the mention of Lycomedes, πυθανόμενος δὲ τὸν παλαίων θησία τὸν Αθηναίος φυγόντα μὲν εἰς Ἀθηναίος εἰς Σκύρον, αὐτὸν δ' ἀποθανόντα δὲ δίᾳ φόβον ὑπὸ Λυκομήδους τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπισκόπαδε τὸν τάφον ἀνευρίσκων. αὐτῷ[ν ὁ δὲ πρὸς] would make it 1.30 rather short, but perhaps αὐτῷ[ν (sc. Theseus)] δὲ[ν] μὲνος should be read. Fr. 35, which mentions the Pelasgians and a κακουφύ[η], is probably to be connected with the episode; cf. p. 100.

55. ηπαί[υ]: the last letter might be γ, η, κ, or π, but not ε, so that a reference to Theseus (cf. the previous n.) is inadmissible.

Fr. 8. τῶν παραβαλαττίων καλὸν μείναι[ν] πόλεως δοί[μ]ι μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἐλλάδος ἡσαύρισμάς ἐπισκόπαδε τῷ Λυκομήδῳ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπισκόπαδε τὸν τάφον ἀνευρίσκων. τάσσεις αὐτῷ[ν (sc. Thisbe)] δὲ[ν] μένος should be read. Fr. 35, which mentions the Pelasgians and a κακουφύ[η], is probably to be connected with the episode; cf. p. 100.

55. ηπαί[υ]: the last letter might be γ, η, κ, or π, but not ε, so that a reference to Theseus (cf. the previous n.) is inadmissible.

56-61. The division of lines in this fragment is practically certain. Cf. p. 101 and Diod. xi. 60. 4 πλεύσασθα ἀνὴρ μετὰ παρθίδος τὸν στόλον πρὸς τὴν Καρίαν, τῶν παραβαλαττίων πόλεως δοί[μ]ι μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἐλλάδος ἡσαύρισμάς, τάσσεις αὐτῷ[ν (sc. Thisbe)] δὲ[ν] μένος should be read. Fr. 35, which mentions the Pelasgians and a κακουφύ[η], is probably to be connected with the episode; cf. p. 100.
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The page dimensions are 423.0x685.0. The page contains text in Greek, Latin, and English. The text is a discussion on the works of Thucydides and Diodorus, referencing various ancient historians and scholars. The text is dense and technical, discussing ancient accounting practices, sea-fights, and the influence of Ephorus. The text is a continuation of the discussion on the sea-fight, with references to Plutarch, Cassius, and other ancient authors. The text is a continuation of the discussion on the sea-fight, with references to Plutarch, Cassius, and other ancient authors. The text is a continuation of the discussion on the sea-fight, with references to Plutarch, Cassius, and other ancient authors. The text is a continuation of the discussion on the sea-fight, with references to Plutarch, Cassius, and other ancient authors. The text is a continuation of the discussion on the sea-fight, with references to Plutarch, Cassius, and other ancient authors.
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Diodorus' reference to the absence of the moon seems to be his own invention, since there
is no indication in 11. 105-7 of anything corresponding to it and no further reference to the
darkness is in fact expected after 1. 104.
Possibly, however, the absence of the moon may
have been mentioned earlier in Ephorus' account.
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can be restored in
1. 133.
Probably Fr. 16 followed Fr. 15 wiih a very slight interval (cf. p. 102), which is in
accordance with the general appearance of the recto of these two fragments, though the
verso does not suggest their propinquity,
in 1. 123 we refer to Artabanus, the phrase
(cf
in Diod. xi. 69. 4 quoted bclow,
and
in Ephorus Fr. 29) being very close to both Diodorus'
and Justin iii. I J^erxes
quippe Artabanus praefectiis ems
in spem regni
adducius cum septem robustissimis filiis regiam vespert ingreditur, which is likely in any case
to have been partly derived from Ephorus.
The chief difficulty is that hop)Jpo would be
expected in 1. 120, but the bottom of the letter preceding
(which is practically certain)
does not come below the line, nor is the tail of a preceding visible. The word is therefore,
we conjecture, a synonym for
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and [κτητήρ]ιος is possible in l. 125, the other parallel is closer and more satisfactory. It is just possible that, while Fr. 15 refers to the plot of Aratabus, the parallel section in Diodorus is not 69. 1 but 69. 3–4 δ' αυτ' Ἀρτάβανος παραγωγόμενος ἔτι νυνές οὖσιν πρὸς τὸν Ἀρταβάζεργη έφησι Δαρείου τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ φωνα γεγονώς τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς ἀυτὸν περιστάνῃ, συνεβολήσας αὐτῷ πρὸ τοῦ κατασχῆν ἐκείνου τὴν ἀρχήν ἐκείνην ὅσοι μὴ δουλεύοντα διὰ ἐμφανῶν ἀλλὰ βασιλεύσαν τὸν φωνα τοῦ πατρὸς τιμωρησάμενος' ἐπιγγείατο δ' αὐτῷ συνεργοὶ παρέξαθαν τοῦ[ν] δορυφόρου τῆς βασιλείας. But this too, in spite of some resemblances, seems to suit Fr. 15 less well than does 69. 1. The plot of Aratabus is also described by Ctesias Frs. 29–30 Ἀρτάβανος δὲ μέγα παρὰ Ζέρβη δυνάμεις μετ" Αστραπίτου τοῦ ἐνοχίτου και αὐτοῦ μέγα δυνάμεις βούλευσαν ἀδελφὴν Ζέρβην, καὶ ἀπιστόν ετώς. This is evidently one of the ultimate sources of Diodorus' statement, which in any case must be derived (with some variations, if our explanation of Fr. 15 is correct) from Ephorus, who was probably responsible for the change of 'Ἀστραπίτου' to Μειρῆδάρης: cf. the variation between Justin's Bacabasus (from Ephorus or Dinon?) and Ctesias' Megabazos (Fr. 30), each representing the Persian name Bagabukhsa (cf. Gilmore, ad loc.), the subsequent betrayer of Aratabus to Artaxerxes.

121. αὐτός is probably a participle. [γεγονὼν] αὖ is possible; but Aratabus himself, not Artaxerxes, was in command of the ὄρφηρος: cf. the previous n. ἐτυχεῖα μεν: cf. l. 178 ἢργῳ/χαν? A fondness for τυχανῶν characterizes 842; cf. Part v. 124.

122. [αὐτῷ καὶ] τῷ τὴν...: cf. l. 125 αὐτῷ δὲ and the same contrast in 842. x. 2.
128–9. αὐτῷ καὶ[τῷ τὴν...]: cf. Diod. l. c. ἀνακοινόσαμεν δὲ τὴν ἐπίβουλάν and 842. i. κοινόσαμοι... περὶ τοῦ πράγματος. αὐτῷ καὶ[τῷ τοῦ βασιλείαν can be read, but is unlikely, the middle being much commoner than the active. The letter before ω is γ, ε, σ, or τ. πρ' ἐν would be the right length.

133. Cf. ll. 119 sqq., n.
134–9. Cf. p. 102 and Diod. xi. 30. 4–5 μετὰ δὲ ταύτα ἐκ τῆς ἑπορείας μετεστρατοπέδευσαν εἰς ἑτερον τόπον εὐθεῖαν πρὸς τὴν ἀναχερή τείχην. ἦν γὰρ ἐκ μεν τῶν δεξιῶν γεώλοφος ὕψηλος, ἐκ δὲ τῶν εὐωδίμων ὁ 'Ἀστραπός ποταμός' τὸν δ' ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἐπείχεν ἦ στρατοπεδόνει, περιφρενεῖν τῇ φύσει καὶ τοῖς τῶν τόπων ἀσφαλείας, where τόπος (cf. ll. 135 and 138) occurs thrice, though in the context is different. στρατ[οθ]εύον is possible in ll. 136–7, and ['εὐς ή] τ[ις] (Bury) in ll. 137–8, but hardly τ[ις] (p) Ο in ll. 134–5. The dividing-point of the lines in this fragment is uncertain.

140–5. Fr. 18 perhaps corresponds to Diod. xi. 57. 3 αὐτὴ (Xerxes' sister) πυθμένη τὴν παρουσίαν του Θεομοκολόνει ἠδὲ εἰς τὰ βασιλεία πεθαίνων ἑσόθη λαβούσα καὶ μετὰ δικρόνων ἱκτεύει τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐπιστείων τιμωριῶν τῷ Θεομικολεί. δ' ὡς δ' οὖ προειχέν αὐτῇ, περμε... Lines 143–5 can be restored on a[δι]κ[ε][φ][ων τιμωριῶν (οι κολασία) προτρεπέμεν] α[θ] τιμωρικ[λεί] [ας] [κε][τ][ε] [τ]. The ν in l. 142, which is nearly certain, would then be expected to belong to δικρών rather than to ἱκτεύει, but the vestiges of the letter following it do not suit ω, whereas ε is possible. επετε]ιν [κλαμότων τον ε]δικ[ε][φ][ων would be suitable, but the remaining two lines 140–1 present difficulties. η[θεν in l. 141 is unsatisfactory, for the preceding letter seems to be λ, not α, and η[θ] must be the accusative plural of a word meaning 'clothes' or, as there seems to be none available, an adjective in agreement with e.g. ιματία. The supposed correspondence with Diodorus therefore remains very uncertain, especially since the supposed λ of a[δικ[ε][φ][ων can be α, and η[θ]ι can be read for [τε]ιν.]

192–4. If τοις [εκείνοι] πρώτες is (cf. l. 20) is right, Fr. 26 may well belong to the estimate of Themistocles. The doubtful ε can be ι. Ελληνισμός suggests that the corresponding passage in Diodorus is xi. 59. 2–3 ἄστρι εὐχαριστών γενότατος τοῖς Ἐλληνσι. διόπερ ὅταν τὸ μέγαθος
213-14. The or φην can be read. For ἔδωκε ... χώραν as a possible reference to Xerxes' presents to Themistocles cf. Thuc. i. 138. 5 ταύτης γὰρ ἤρχε τής χώρας, δάντος βασιλέως, and Diod. xi. 57. 7 ἵδρυσαν δ' ἀυτῷ πόλεις τρεῖς ... Λάμψακον δὲ ἀμπελόφυτον ἔχοντα χώραν πολλὴν. But the words might come in many other contexts, e. g., Cimon's distribution of land in Thrace to the Athenians; or Plut. Cimon 7 τὴν δὲ χώραν ... παρέδωκε τοῖς Αθηναίοις, and Diod. xi. 60. 2 καὶ κτίσθην 'Αθηναίων καταστάσεως κατεληφθήσει τὴν χώραν (cf. p. 103).

218. ἦδων: cf. ll. 237-9, n.

219. [ἔδωκε]: Fr. 32 does not seem to be connected with any of the references to the Phoenicians in Diod. xi.

223. Perhaps ἅλον as in some forms; cf. l. 201.

228-30. The mention of the Pelasgians and κατ' ἀνθρώποιν? suggests that Fr. 35 refers to Scyros and Cimon's discovery of the bones of Theseus, who took refuge there; cf. ll. 49-51, n., and p. 100.

237-9. Cf. p. 99 and Diod. xi. 59. 1-2 (Themistocles) τῆς γὰρ ἑτέρος ... ταῖς ἱδίαις πράξεσιν ἀφείλετο τὴς Ἐπάρτης ταύτης τὴν δόξαν; τίνα δ' ἄλλον ἱστορήκαμεν μᾶλλον πράξει ποιήσαντα διενεχείται αὐτῶν μὲν τῶν ἡγέμονῶν, τὴν δὲ πόλιν τῶν Ἑλλήνων πόλεως, τοῦ δ' Ἑλλάδας τῶν βασιλέων; The fact that ἦδων was either actually or approximately the end of a sentence, as is shown by the paragraphus, renders the connexion of this passage with Fr. 38 very probable. Bury suggests δο[ὶς ἔρις ὑπὲρ τοῦ καὶ καὶ ἐκτεθείροσι πραττόν μιαὶ πράξει ... It is tempting also to connect with this fragment Fr. 32, where Ἑλληνικὸν can be restored in l. 218, and Fr. 39, where πολι[ῶν τοῖς Ἑλληνικῶν πόλεως is possible in l. 241; but the other lines in those two fragments do not harmonize easily with either that context or each other.

241-2. Cf. the previous n. There is a slight blank space between α and α' in l. 242, which, however, is not fatal to ἔοιμομν, and with τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν in l. 241 there might possibly be a connexion with the expedition of Cimon against Carystus in Euboea (Thuc. i. 98. 3); cf. pp. 100-1), which was presumably mentioned by Euphorus.

246-8. There is a possible connexion with Diod. xi. 65. 4 ἄλλων δ' αὐτὸ ἦταν συμβάλλων ἐρημία τῶν ἐπίκουρων κατὰ κράτος ἢκώνα (sc. the Myceaneans), or better with xi. 56. 7 κομίζειν ταύτῃ ἐπί ἀνέρ αἱκερμαμένην καὶ τῶν ἀποικιῶν μηδὲν πολυπραγματεύετο μηδὲ ἀρνώντα ἡ ἄργον (Lysidhides' device for the introduction of Themistocles to Xerxes; cf. p. 99); but if so, Diodorus' version is longer.

252-4. Possibly so[ντα]ς ἐν Ἀρχάδαμος ο[ί] / ἐδα[μεῖς τοίς ἄρεσ] ἔτι [κοινο: cf. Diod. xi. 63. 7 τῶν τρίτων ἀγοράς ἐποιήσαν, τοὺς συνιτάξας ἐν βασιλείας Ἀρχάδαμος παρασκευάζοντο πολεμίου τῶν ἀφετηρίας. But between ll. 253 and 254 is a spot of ink which, if not accidental, may belong to a paragraphus, implying a change of sentence, and η can be read for την.

255. εὐριτεῖς, εὐρεγήτης, and εὐρεγέστης occur several times in Diod. xi, but the rest of Fr. 44 does not suit the context of any of those passages.

257. [ἔοιμο: perhaps ἔρωι: a].

267-9. Fr. 48 exactly suits Diod. xi. 62. 3 αἵρες εἴναι εἴρηται αἰῶν: ἔως ἐπαλαγεῖν ἐναθέσις με] (a, from the metrical inscription concerning Cimon's victories, which is in any case probably quoted from Euphorus; cf. ll. 62-76, n. But the fragment is too small to be identified with
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certainty, and in l. 260 π can be read in place of γ. Another possible parallel is xi. 54. 4

Παυσανίας μὲν κρίνων προδιδῶν τὸν Ἑλληνος ἐξήλωσεν τὴν ἴδιαν ἐπίθετον θεματοκλῆι καὶ παρεκδέχεσθαι.

τὸ[ν] Εὐλήνος τὴν ἴδιαν διήλωσεν would account for ll. 267–8, and ἤ[ (or ἦ)] might belong to
ἐπίθετον or a synonym for it, or to παρεκδέχεσθαι.

282–4. Fr. 53 is to be combined with Frs. 9 + 10. i, though not actually joining them, and belongs to ll. 67–9; cf. ll. 66–9, n. The fibres on the verso harmonize excellently with those of Fr. 10, and the vestiges in l. 284 can be the top of παραγωγὴν[θεωσίαν].

1611. EXTRACTS FROM A WORK ON LITERARY CRITICISM.
Fr. 1 18.6 × 26.5 cm. Early third century.

These seventy fragments of a work on literary criticism, evidently composed by a grammarian, were found with 1610, &c. The largest piece, Fr. 1, contains after a few letters from the ends of lines four nearly complete columns, while the other pieces are much smaller; about 130 lines in all are complete or can be restored. Various literary topics, which have no apparent connexion with each other, are discussed, being illustrated by frequent quotations from lost or (in two cases) extant works—a circumstance which lends the papyrus considerable interest. The two sections of which the beginnings are preserved (ll. 38 and 101) both commence with οἱ, so that probably the text is a series of extracts from a longer work.

In Fr. 1 ll. 28–37 give the conclusion of a discussion of a contest of comedies and of the number of the judges. There is perhaps a contrast drawn between the practice of the writer's own day and that of earlier times, and the Bacchae of Lysippus and Πανωτοί of Cratinus are cited as authorities for a number (apparently that of the κρίσεων) being five; but the context is obscure in several points; cf. ll. 30, 35, nn.

The next section (ll. 38–100), which is practically complete, is mainly concerned with Caeneus, the mythical king of the Lapithae, who was first a woman, but was changed into a man by Poseidon, and rendered invulnerable, then incurred the enmity of Zeus by making his subjects worship his spear instead of the gods, and was ultimately buried alive by the Centaurs. The explanation of Caeneus' spear, which became proverbial, is given in connexion with a reference to it in Book ii of Theophrastus' Περὶ βάσιλεᾶς (ll. 38–46), the whole story of Caeneus being related in an extract from Acusilaus of Argos, an early writer on mythology who was probably older than Herodotus (ll. 55–83). Since the thirty-one extant fragments of Acusilaus (FHG. i. 100–3) contain hardly any professed quotations of his actual words, the papyrus for the first time affords an opportunity of estimating the character of that author's ιστορία or γενεαλογία. The dialect proves to be in the main Ionic, as had generally been surmised, although no trace of it has been preserved in the extant.
fрагменты; и стиль в целом примитивный. А дорийская форма аористого инфинитива, τεκέω, встречается в стро. 59, и кривоволосое выражение, μάλιστα χρημάτων, в стро. 67-8. Влияние варианта Акусилая версии Кеяниусу мифа на его достоверность в обозрении на Хомера и Аполлоний Родий, которые могут быть известны их владение текстом через нашего автора; см. стр. 56, н. A rather naive remark of the ancient logographer, that it was not λέρων for gods to bear children by mortals, leads our author first to the citation of two lines from the Αλκμέων ὁ διὰ Κορινθοῦ of Euripides, spoken by Apollo, which illustrated this subject, and later to a short discussion of it, the last four lines being fragmentary (ll. 85-100).

In the third section (ll. 101-20) the first four lines are fragmentary, the ends of lines are missing throughout, and the conclusion is not reached, so that the reconstruction is somewhat difficult. The subject is the various persons called Thucydides, of whom three are distinguished, the politician (son of Melesias and father of Stephanus), the historian (son of Olorus), and the Pharsalian, as in Marcellinus' life of the historian. Polemon's treatise Περὶ ἀκροτόλεως, which is known from Marcellinus to have discussed the second and third Thucydides, is here mentioned with reference to the first, apparently as the authority for a statement based on epigraphic evidence that he was the father of Stephanus, which is to be connected with an extant quotation from another work of Polemon (ll. 101-11, n.). In confirmation of the paternity of Stephanus, which seems to have been disputed, a passage from the Μένο of Plato is quoted, and Fr. 1 breaks off where the writer was about to add fresh evidence on the point from a lost comedy, the Ιαπετός of Hermippus.

The order of the smaller fragments is quite uncertain except in a few instances. Fr. 2. i is concerned with a βόρειος οἶπος, two lines from the beginning of the Ομφαλή of Ion being quoted as an illustration (ll. 121-7), but how the subject was introduced does not appear. The difficulty, whatever it was, is stated to have been solved by Mnaseas of Patara in his work Περὶ χρησμῶν (ll. 128-30). Fr. 4 is concerned with a female character in epic poetry (Πενθέσιλα?), part of a hexameter line referring to her being cited (ll. 146-7), besides two mentions of her by authors whose names are imperfectly preserved, one of them being perhaps Arctinus, who wrote the Αἰθιοπίς (ll. 148-52). Frs. 5, 6, and 43 are to be combined, as appears partly from external evidence, partly from the resulting satisfactory restoration of ll. 160-4. The main subject of this section, of which the beginning and end are not preserved, is the authorship of a celebrated ancient ode to Pallas. The first three words of this ode Παλλάδα περσέπαλω δεινώ were quoted by Aristophanes in l. 967 of the Κλούδες, and from the extant rather confused scholia on that passage and another in Aristides it is
known that according to Eratosthenes Phrynichus (i.e. the comic poet) attributed the authorship of the ode to Lamprocles, an early Athenian dithyrambic poet, while others assigned the ode to Stesichorus. Our author, who refers to an inconclusive discussion of the claims of Lamprocles and Stesichorus by Chamaeleon (a disciple of Aristotle), and possibly, but by no means certainly, mentions Eratosthenes (l. 158-9, n.), also adduces the evidence of Phrynichus in favour of Lamprocles as the author, and quotes the passage in Aristophanes (ll. 160-76).

Little can be made of the remaining fragments. There is probably a reference in Fr. 8. ii to Hellanicus on Kriseis (ll. 212-14, n.) ; but the context is obscure. Fr. 9, which is more considerable, relates to a person with a name beginning with probably Α or Α and ending in ὅμοιος (e.g. Aristodemus), who, after adventures in which the Naxians and Thracians were apparently concerned, was carried off and put to death after a trial by the Parians (ll. 218-28). The Orestes of Theodectes (?) is quoted in Fr. 17, and apparently a play of Lysippus in Fr. 21, while Fr. 16 perhaps has another reference to the Omphale of Ion, and Fr. 14 possibly mentions Simonides. Other proper names which occur are Ἀσσω[ (l. 247, n.), Lycia or the Lycians (l. 251), Odysseus (l. 272, perhaps in connexion with his descent to Hades), and Ptolemaeus (possibly Ptol. Philopator or Philadelphus; ll. 369-70, n.). The names of the grammarians Aristarchus and Didymus can be restored in ll. 231 and 283 respectively, but in neither place with any confidence. That Frs. 31-2, 42, 44-5, 63-5, and 68 belong to 1011 is not at all certain. All the fragments belong to the middles of columns, except Fr. 1 and where it is otherwise stated.

The handwriting is a small neat uncial closely resembling that of 1012, a treatise on literary composition, written soon after A. D. 205 (Part vii, Plate iv). 1611 also probably belongs to the first two or three decades of the third century, and is approximately contemporary with 1810, of which the script is similar, but larger. The columns are short, consisting of 24 or 25 lines of 14-20 letters, generally about 17. The end of a section is marked in l. 37 by a coronis, which is employed after l. 115 and probably l. 138 to divide a quotation from the main text. Paragraphi also occur after ll. 90 (where it is misplaced), 165, 214, and 231 to indicate quotations. Strokes against the margin of ll. 83-4 call attention to the recommencement of the author’s commentary at the end of the extract from Acusilaus, of which the beginning is distinguished by the sign χ (l. 56, n.). The obelus against l. 116 apparently also indicates a quotation, and the two flourishes after l. 138 seem to be merely supplementary to the neighbouring coronis. High stops were used, but not at all regularly; one doubtful instance of a stop in the middle position occurs in l. 442. Occasional marks of elision and quantity and accents are found in the poetical quotations (ll. 91 and 127), and there are some K
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diaereses over i and v. An abbreviation, κ' for kal', is used in l. 216. Iota
adscript was not infrequently omitted by the first hand, but when ignored was
inserted by a contemporary corrector, who might even be the same scribe. The
insertion, however, of two words omitted in l. 59 and similar additions of omitted
letters in ll. 281, 338, and 350 all seem to be in a second hand, especially the
cursively written ε above l. 281; in ll. 169 and 223 the alterations are most
probably due to the first hand. The revision of the papyrus was in any case
not very thorough, and several small mistakes remain uncorrected, ll. 45 o for ov,
46 ἀξιόν for ἀξιῶν, 57 Ποσίδων for Ποσείδων, 61 αὐτόν for αὐτὴν, 80 ορθον for ὀρθὼν,
84 τι for το, 91 απ' for από, 107 the apparent omission of καλοῦν after Κοινέμουν, 127
αὐτεία for αὐτεία, 222 μεθίκαν for μεθηκαν: cf. also ll. 123, 146, and 172–3, nn.

The date of the papyrus itself excludes a later period than about the middle
of the second century for the composition of the work from which 1611 was
excerpted. On the other hand the date is not earlier than 200 B.C. is indicated by
the references to (1) Polemon, who was a Delphic προφήτας in 177–6 B.C.
(Susemihl, Gesch. d. Alex. Lit. i. 667128), and according to Suidas a contem-
porary of Ptolemy Epiphanes (204–181 B.C.), and (2) Mnaseas, who according
to an ambiguously worded statement of Suidas was a pupil of Eratosthenes.
The striking resemblance between the discussion of the authorship of the ode
to Pallas in 1611 and the views attributed to Eratosthenes by the scholia on
Aristophanes' Clouds 967 (cf. pp. 128–9 and ll. 162–5, n.) at first sight suggests that
the papyrus may consist of extracts from Eratosthenes' celebrated work Περὶ
ἀρχαίας καμάριας. The first of the three sections in Fr. 1 seems to be concerned
with the Old Comedy; the second, about Caeneus, deals with a subject which
was the basis of plays by two writers of the Middle Comedy, Antiphanes
and Araros, and may well have been utilized earlier, while the third, about
Thucydides, leads up to a quotation from Hermippus. The two statements
attributed to Asclepiades of Myrlea by Suidas that Polemon (1) synchronized
with Aristophanes of Byzantium (the successor of Eratosthenes as librarian at
Alexandria; cf. p. 131) and (2) was the disciple of Panaetius (about 180–110 B.C.)
are scarcely consistent with either of these, and the second has usually been regarded
as corrupt; cf. Susemihl, i. 666133. Since Eratosthenes according to Suidas
was born in 276–2 B.C. and died at the age of eighty in the reign of Ptolemy
Epiphanes, it is possible that his Περὶ ἀρχαίας καμάριας quoted Polemon's earlier
works. The suggestion of Knaack (Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. vi. 360), that the
treatise on Comedy was written in the early part of Eratosthenes' life before
he left Athens for Alexandria, is not based on any evidence, and Theophrastus,
a writer utilized in it (cf. Strecker, De Lycochrone, Euphrönio, Eratosthene, &c.,
Fr. 75), is also quoted in 1611 (l. 38). Polemon, who joined the Pergamene
school, wrote a treatise against Eratosthenes (Susemihl, i. 670\(^{153}\)) \(\Pi \epsilon r \iota \varsigma \; \Theta \eta \nu \sigma \varsigma \iota \tau i o \nu o s \; \varepsilon \pi \iota \delta \mu \iota \varsigma \), denying (probably ironically) that Eratosthenes had ever been at Athens, and two of the six extant fragments of that treatise (Frs. 47–8, FHG. iii. 130) apparently refer to statements in the \(\Pi \epsilon r \iota \delta \rho \chi \alpha \lambda \alpha s \; \kappa \omega \mu \rho \delta \varsigma \), which was therefore earlier than Polemon’s attack on Eratosthenes. It is, however, not quite clear that Polemon is mentioned in 1611 with approval (cf. ll. 101–11, n.), and the controversy between him and Eratosthenes may have been begun by the latter. As regards Mnaseas, whose date mainly depends on that of Eratosthenes, the fact that he is quoted with approval in 1611 (l. 128) is not inconsistent with the hypothesis that he was the author’s own pupil; but it is not quite certain whether Suidas meant to call Mnaseas the pupil of Eratosthenes or of Aristarchus. The latter interpretation, which would of course be fatal to the view that 1611 was the work of Eratosthenes, is rejected by Susemihl, i. 679\(^{209}\). The date of Eratosthenes’ death (196–4 B.C.), which is accepted by Susemihl mainly on the evidence of Suidas, thus leaves a narrow margin of time available to which the \(\Pi \epsilon r \iota \delta \rho \chi \alpha \lambda \alpha s \; \kappa \omega \mu \rho \delta \varsigma \). could be assigned on the assumption that 1611 belongs to that work; but most of this margin tends to disappear, if with Knaack (Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. vi. 359) Strabo’s statement that Eratosthenes was the pupil of Zeno of Citium be accepted; for Eratosthenes’ birth and death must then be put back about ten years earlier than Suidas’ dates. 1241, which settles the order of the Alexandrian librarians from Apollonius Rhodius to Cydas and rectifies some errors of Suidas, is apt to be mistaken or corrupt in its chronological references to the Ptolemies with whom the librarians were associated. But the position assigned to Eratosthenes, next after Apollonius Rhodius and before Aristophanes of Byzantium, whose successors were (omitting \(\kappa \alpha i \; \' \Lambda \rho \iota \sigma \tau \alpha r \chi \varsigma \iota \) in 1241. ii. 8 as an interpolation) Apollonius the \(\epsilon i o \gamma \omicron \rho \omicron \delta \phi \varsigma \) and Aristarchus of Samothrace, suggests that Eratosthenes’ literary activity hardly continued as late as the reign of Epiphanes, and if the corrupt \(\Phi \iota \lambda \omicron \pi \alpha \tau \alpha \rho \varsigma \) in 1241. ii. 15 is corrected to \(\' \Sigma \pi \varphi \alpha \nu o \varsigma \) instead of \(\Phi \iota \lambda \omicron \mu \iota \theta \omicron \rho \varsigma \), as is possible, Eratosthenes’ period of office at Alexandria must have ended soon after the accession of Philopator in 222–1 B.C. Hence, though the difficulty caused by the mention of Mnaseas can be got over, that caused by the reference to Polemon \(\Pi \epsilon r \iota \; \alpha \kappa \rho \omicron \rho \omicron \pi \alpha \lambda \varsigma \omega s \) is a much more serious and probably insuperable obstacle to the attribution of 1611 to Eratosthenes \(\Pi \epsilon r \iota \delta \rho \chi \alpha \lambda \alpha s \; \kappa \omega \mu \rho \delta \varsigma \). Moreover it is possible that the scholium on Aristophanes which gives Lamprocles’ version of the ode to Pallas is nearer to Eratosthenes’ actual words than are the other scholia, which agree with 1611 in quoting Phrynichus’ version (cf. ll. 162–5, n.), and the ode to Pallas was evidently the subject of much discussion. Lastly, in 1611 the sections about Caeneus and Thucydides are not, so far
as can be judged, specially concerned with Old Comedy, so that a later author than Eratosthenes is distinctly more probable. Eratosthenes may even have been referred to by name in the discussion of the ode to Pallas (ll. 158–9, n.), and he is in any case likely to have been the main source of that section of the papyrus.

The hypothesis of the Eratosthenean authorship of the section concerning the ode to Pallas might be combined with the attribution of other sections to different grammarians; but though it is not certain that the various extracts are all from the same work, there is more to be said in favour of the view that they come from one of the miscellanies (σύμμικτα), which were composed by several grammarians of the Alexandrine and Roman periods. Of these miscellanies the earliest known is by Callistratus the pupil of Aristophanes of Byzantium and composer also of a work Πρὸς τὰς ἀθετήσεις (sc. of Aristarchus) and commentaries on Cratinus and Aristophanes; cf. Athen. iii. 125 c–d, where the 7th book is quoted, R. Schmidt, De Callistrato Aristophaneo, and Susemihl, i. 450. Another composer of miscellanies was Herodicus ὁ Κρατήτειος, who is chiefly known from quotations in Athenaeus from his three works, Πρὸς τὸν Φιλοσοκράτην, Σύμμικτα ἐπομνήματα (Athen. viii. 340 e), and Κομψόθυμενοι (in at least six books). His date is disputed: Gudeman in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. viii. 974, assigns him to the first century B.C. That the celebrated Didymus, who died in the reign of Augustus, wrote Σύμμικτα is attested by the Etym. Gud. 124. 2, where it is stated that Alexion (a first-century grammarian of Alexandria) made an epitome of them. The Σύμμικτα are generally identified with the Συμποσιακά of Didymus, which were also of a miscellaneous character; cf. Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. v. 470. Suidas’ list of the works of Seleucus, the Homeric critic, who lived in the time of Tiberius (Gudeman, l. c.), ends καὶ άλλα σύμμικτα, and Seleucus εἰ Συμμίκτοις is cited by Schol. Apoll. Rhod. ii. 1055. Pamphila, who lived in the reign of Nero, wrote according to Photius (Cod. 175) thirty-three books συμμίκτων ἵστορικῶν ἐπομνήματων λόγων, which were largely used by Aulus Gallius and Diogenes Laertius. 1611 may well belong to one of these five writers of miscellanies; but Didymus has the strongest claim to be regarded as the author, since in his case the existence of an epitome is also attested. In the absence of any clear reference to grammarians later than the second century B.C. Callistratus is more suitable as the composer than Herodicus, Seleucus, or Pamphilus, and 1611 seems to be somewhat earlier than 1012, which mentions both Didymus and Caecilius Calactinus, and was not composed before A.D. 50. Dionysius ὁ μουσικός, who is known to have discussed the authorship of the ode to Pallas (cf. ll. 162–5, n.) and lived in the time of Hadrian, is not at all likely to be the author of 1611, for his known works are all concerned with μουσική in some form or (if he was identical with Aelius Dionysius) lexicography, and
the Caeneus and Thucydides sections are not at all appropriate to him. Rufus, who is coupled with Dionysius (cf. II. 162-5, n.) and is thought to have epitomized his Μουσικὴ ἱστορία (cf. Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. v. 986), is, apart from other considerations, unsuitable on account of his date, which is probably third century or later.

We are indebted to Mr. T. W. Allen for several suggestions in the reconstruction of this papyrus.

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

[.]τον 35 ρ[α]ς και τους κρίτας δῆ ιστοριας απολυσα[ι]
[.]α 50 ληγει γαρ περι Καινεα [κ] ουτως Καινη δε τηι
[.]ει 55 λεγει γαρ περι Καινεα [κ] ουτως Καινη δε τηι
[.]αις Ελατου μισγεται Ποσι
10 30 Καινεων έν Πλου [δων επειτα ου γαρ ην]
[.]τοις 55 λεγει γαρ περι Καινεα [κ] ουτως Καινη δε τηι
τοις λεγει
toις ηλειον παίδας ή[τ]α εξ
12 lines lost 60 κεινου ουτ εξ αλλου ου
> [ο]τι το παρα Θεοφραστῳ
toις έν ου]
35 Βακχαίς έ ομοιος δε [κ] ουτως Καινη
tος λεγει
cαι Κατρινος έν Πλου
60 Θεοφραστῳ ποιει αυτον Πο
gε[ς]ι[ς]εων ανδρα ατρω
65 των τοτε και αυτες της αυ
tον κεινον σιδηρων

59. τε οτι τεκέων corr. from ou. 72. i of επειτα added later.
Col. iv.
[τινον εν αγοραί τουτοι;]
[κελευει θυειν; θειο]
75 σι δ ουκ ἦς; [... και;]
Ζευς ιδων αἰτ[ον τα]υτα
ποιουντα απευει και
eφορμαί τους Κενταυρος
κακεινι αυτον κατα
80 κοπτουσιν ορειαν κατα
γης και ανοθεν πετρην
επιτεθεισαν σημα και
\apobνισκει; τουτ ε[σ][τιν
\γαρ ισως τι τοι δορατι αρ
85 χειν τον Καινεα δυνα
tαι δε δια τουτοι και το
παρ Ευριπιδην εν Ἀλκμη
ων του δια Κ[ο]ρινθου
λεγομενον υπο θεου
90 καγο μεν ατεκνο εγε
νομην κεινης απι; Ἀλ
κμενου δ ετεκε διδυ
μα τεκνα παρθενοις
eαν τις ζητη ποις η
95 του θεου μειζεις αγονο
εστιν δια του προκει

Col. v.
[μενου ...............;]
λη[. ...........;]
τα; [. ...........;]
100 χειν [. ...........;]
οτι ουχ [. ...........;]
δη; [. ... και; Πολεμων
εν τωι [. Περι ακροπο
λεως δι. ................]
105 αναγραφ[. ...........]
του Μελησιου [ιουν Στε
φανου δε του Κο[αλεμου (καλου]
μενου πατερα [ουτοι;
δε του συγγραφεια μεν
110 φασιν Ολορου υιου τρι;
τον δε τον Φαρο[αλιου
περι μεν ουν του [του Στε
φανου πατρος και Πλα
των φησιν εν τιοι Με
115 νωνι ουτως [οτι Θου

87. κ οφ ολκμεουν κοτι.

Fr. 2 (tops of cols.?).

Col. i.
[. .] το εν την Ἰων[ας Ομφ]λα
λη κατ αρχην λεγομε
[ν]ος Ἡρακλεους βορειος
[π]τος ουτως ορον μεν
125 [η]ον Πελοπος εξελεω

Col. ii.
131 [ ποι[ o de θαι]
135 ... [ ον πατι

Fr. 3.
131 [ ποι[ o de θαι]
135 ... [ ον πατι

135 ... [ ον πατι

135 ... [ ον πατι

135 ... [ ον πατι

135 ... [ ον πατι
1611. WORK ON LITERARY CRITICISM

[νο]μεν Ερμη βορειον
[ιπτ]ηναι ἀινεται ὁ ὁδός
[διαλ]γλυκε ὁ ἀυτὸ Ἔμα
[σεας ὁ?] Παταρ[ειν] ε[ν] τῳ[ι]

130 [Περὶ χρησμο[ν] . . . .

Fr. 4.

Col. i.  
145 δὴ [ . . ] . . . . . . . καὶ ?    155 σὶν[ 
ς γνω οι τινος εγγον[ος]    α[δ][ 
κα]ι[ι]ς καὶ ος εκτιθε[ι]αι Ἀρ[ 
νησ[ε][

144 ]ς  

\[.]

Fr. 5 + 43.

Col. ii.  
140 πος πο[ι][ 
θαρσει π[ 
ος ε[ν][ 
ω ε[ε]]

Fr. 6.

Col. i.  
165 πον οὔτω παρα[π]οιεῖ;    180 αμφ[ 
διαπορον[σ]ι γαρ οὐ[κ] ὦ;    α[ν] μο[ν][ 
λιγοι π[ε]ροι [τ]ου[ν] κα[ 
θ]α[π]ερ Χαμαίλεων πο[ 
τε]ρον ποτε Στῆ[σι]χορον  
λα[β][ 
170 εστιν η Λαμπροκλ[ε][ 
[ο]υσ κ[αίτ]τ[ε][ρ][ι] τοῦ Φρυ[ 
[Μιδωνος?] προσνεμον[ 
[τος και?] Δαμιστοφάνης  
[δε?] παραπ[τ]ο[ε]ι λεγον[  
[Παλλαθά] π[ε][ρο[ς][π][ο][λιν]  
190 ε]ι γε καὶ [ 
end of col.

Fr. 7.

Col. ii.  
195 ]ως πυρ[ 
τοις [ 
\[.][ 
]

end of col.

169. ν of Στῆ[σι]χορον corr. from s.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 8.

Col. i. Col. ii.

[... .]ev
[... .]v π . [ ]

210 ἥρπε [ ]
τοι συμ[ ]
βιων π[... . . . Ελλανι
kos δ eν [ταis Εθνoν?
κτισει [ ]

215 δη περψ [ ]

206 ] . ἵππον [. ] . ροι κ [. ]
[ ]γει [. ] . συμ[ ]

Fr. 9.

220 ταυχ[μιων ? . . . . . . . .
τα των Θρη[κων . . . .
μεθικαν α[ποκομισα]
[μ]ενο[ν] de τον Α[ριστο?]
δημον εις την Π[αρον?]

225 ητιοντο περι τον[ων
οι Παροι και εις δικα
στηριων ειςαγαγοντες
απεκτειναν κ[αι? . .
[. . . . . . . .]πς δ eν [. . . . .

Fr. 10.

230 δ[ ]

245 . . . . ] αρις εσχατοι[ . . . . ]

235 την ερυθ[ραν
ou ἕ[ενον [ ]
παρατρ[ ]
ma ε[ην]
γαρ την . . . [ ou?

240 κ αν ειτεν [ ]

Fr. 11.

250 μους ό[ ]

255 ι[ ]

Fr. 12.

[. . . . . . . .]τιν[ ]

Fr. 13.

270 ] ναδο[ ]

Fr. 14.

275 ] ησω[ ]

Fr. 15.

260 λ[ ]

Fr. 16.

265 πρωτον [ ]

270 ] Αἰδον τι[ ]
φη σι[ ] de [περι? ]

260 ] [ ]

275 ] ης Ιων [ ]

[. . . . . . . .]ο[ ]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 37.
]. ν[ ] . τ[ ] ]νοσ[ ]ερ[ ]τ[ ] ητ[ Fr. 43.
]. τ[ ] . ]ε[ ] . τ[ ] ]στ[ Fr. 44.
]. τ[ ] . ]ε[ ] . τ[ ] ]στ[ Fr. 46.
]. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 47.
]. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 48.
]. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 49.
]. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 50.
]. τε[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 51.
]. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 52.
]. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 53.
]. τε[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 54.
]. τα[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 55.
]. τα[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 56.
]. τα[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 57.
]. τα[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 58.
}. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 59.
]. τα[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 60.
]. τα[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 61.
]. τα[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 62.
]. τα[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 63.
}. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 64.
}. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 65.
}. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 66.
}. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 67.
}. τ[ ] . ]ε[ Fr. 68.
and the judges four", thus evidently forty; but Lyssippus in the Bacchae says that they were five, and so does Cratinus in the Plouton.'

That what Theophrastus says in the second book Concerning Kingship about the spear of Caeneus is as follows. "And this is the king who really rules by his sceptre, not by his spear like Caeneus." For Caeneus claiming to govern by his spear, not by his sceptre as is the fashion of most kings, failed, because he had no power, according to the story related by Acusilaus the Argive, to release. He describes Caeneus as follows. "Caene daughter of Elatus was united to Poseidon; afterwards, since it was impious for them to have children either by him or by any one else, Poseidon made her an invulnerable man, possessing the greatest strength of any person then living, and when any one stabbed him with iron or bronze, he was conquered most certainly of all. So Caeneus became king of the Lapithae, and waged war with the Centaurs. Afterwards he set up his javelin in the market-place and bade people sacrifice to it. But this was not (pleasing?) to the gods, and Zeus seeing him doing this, threatened him and stirred up the Centaurs against him; and they cut him down upright below the ground, and put a mass of rock above as a tomb; so he died." That is apparently what is meant by Caeneus ruling by a spear, and it also explains what is said by the god in Euripides' 'Alkmeous ' ὁ δὲ Κορινθὸν "And I was not without child by her, but she bare to Alcmaeon twin children, a virgin." If the inquiry is made how union with a god is without offspring, (it is shown) through the aforesaid ..."
of Stephanus Plato also says in the *Meno* "That Thucydides brought up two sons, Melesias and Stephanus; these he educated." And Hermippus the poet in the *Iapeus* says ..."

"... the northern horse of Heracles mentioned at the beginning of the *Omphale* of Ion thus: "At length from the boundaries of Pelops we drive forth, Ô Hermès, the northern horse, and the road is finished." Mnaseas of Patara in his work *Concerning Oracles* has solved the difficulty ..."

"... and thou, lady, from whom dost thou boast thy descent?" and so on, and that Arctinus relates her death in full, and ... des in the 5th book of ..."

"... Phrynichus relating ... "To Pallas destroyer of cities I call, to the sustainer of war, the pure, the child of great Zeus, the horsetamer" thus introduces (?) it. For not a few, like Chamaeleon, are in doubt whether this was formerly written by Stesichorus or by Lamprocles, though Phrynichus attributes it to Lamprocles the pupil of Midon (?). Aristophanes also introduces it saying "To Pallas destroyer of cities, the terrible" ..."

"... the Naxians ... is a disputed frontier ... the Thracians ... released him. The Parians carried off Aristodemus to Paros and censured him for this, and after bringing him to trial put him to death."

23-7. Fr. 26, where in l. 329 Ἄρες[τα] can be restored (cf. ll. 31-2), is perhaps to be placed at the bottom of Col. i, as Allen suggests.

η: the division of these letters is uncertain. η can be read instead of ι.

ε: can equally well be read. All that is visible before ν is a spot of ink in about the middle of the line. Ἀνεπιστημον is impossible, and other vowels are improbable.

ε, η, ι: except in pa, only the bottoms of the letters are preserved. The first seems to be ι or σ and [ι] may be lost between it and the second, which is rather more like ε, θ, or ι than e.g. γ or ι, and does not come below the line as far as τ usually does in this hand. The third must be ε, ι, or σ, and the last can be γ, η, ι, κ, μ, ν, or π. Cf. the next n.

ξ: the first person is not found elsewhere in 1611, and ξας διωκται can hardly be right, though possibly the participle is to be corrected to λαβοσ or οκ(λ)ωται: cf. l. 128 διωκται. The present active of διωκω is very rare outside epic poetry. μα suits the vestiges very well; the lacuna between these two broken letters could take [ι], but not [ρ]. As was suggested by Prof. Rostowzew, it is better to divide δι(α) οκ(λ)ωται and regard ξας ... κριται as
a quotation from a comedy. The preceding words can also be an iambic line, ending ἰππον στο ορα. Cf. also ll. 23–7, n.

35. ἦ: for 5 judges at contests of comedies cf. Schol. Ar. Birds 445 ἐκραν κρατεῖ τοῦ κακικός, οἴ δὲ λαμβάνοντες τὰς ἐπὶ φύσου εἰσδομάσεις, Ἑσύχ. πέντε κρατεῖ τοῦ κακικός ἐκρανοῦ ποὺ δῆνο Ἀδριάνον ἅλα καὶ ἐν Σκελῆσι, Ζενοδότος, Cent. iii. 64 ἐν πέντε κρατῶν γυναικεία κεῖται: ...πέντε κρατεῖ τοῦ κακικός ἐκραν, ὃς φησὶν Ἐπίκηρος, which is copied by Suidas. The difficulty is that 4 judges (l. 32) at contests of comedies are not attested at any period, and what ἵππον refers to is very obscure. Apart from the references quoted concerning Comedy, the question of the number of judges at dramatic contests and the method of selection is not yet very clear; cf. Müller, Lehrb. d. griech. Bühnenall. 368–72. In Plut. Cimon 8 the ten strategi appear as judges in a contest at which Sophocles won the first prize; but it is generally supposed that there were normally 5 judges for tragedies at least. Theophrastus, the first of whom 5 are attested in the time of Aristophanes and in the second century B.C. (cf. Müller, op. cit. 321), and these might be connected with τοῦ 7]κ κατρα in l. 29 and be contrasted with μετὰ αὐτοῖς, not with τοῦ κατρα καὶ τοὺς κρατεῖ. Owing to the loss of the beginning we are unable to suggest a satisfactory explanation of the passage; but in view of (1) the common use of κρατεῖ in connexion with dramatic contests in particular, and (2) the two references to Old Comedy, it remains probable that contests of comedies are in some way meant. Of the Bacchae of Lysippus, which seems to have been his most popular play, six fragments are known, and of Cratinus' Μένοις nine.

38. οὖς: cf. l. 101. The papyrus is not broken, but no trace of σ is visible; it has more probably been obliterated than omitted by mistake. τή might be the beginning of a section of a work in the style of Aristotle's Problems, but does not suit τοῦτο in l. 42; cf. the next n.

42. τοῦτο, we think, refers to the following quotation, like αὐτός in ll. 56 and 115. There is no marginal indication of the beginning of a quotation here, as there is commonly elsewhere (cf. p. 129); but καὶ αὐτός is unintelligible as part of our author's commentary. Where the Theophrastus quotation ends is not quite clear. It might stop after Καινος in l. 46, or αἰσχυλουα in l. 54, or αἰσχυλουα in l. 83, where the Acusilaus quotation in any case ends and there are strokes in the margin, or even after Καινος in l. 85. That ll. 85–100 belong to Theophrastus is very unlikely; their subject being irrelevant to his treatise. We adopt l. 46 as the dividing-point between the Theophrastus quotation and our author's comment. If Theophrastus had quoted the long Acusilaus extract, which is not in itself likely, an allusion to the latter would rather have been expected at the beginning of the section, and below l. 46 a paragraphus or other critical sign may have been lost.

46. ἀξιον is a mistake for ἀξιον. Cf. p. 130.

49–52. The ends of these lines are on a fragment which was originally separate, but is very suitably placed here, though there is no external indication that it belongs to the top of a column. θηλη is admissible in ll. 49–50. το[πο]τη in l. 51 is not at all satisfactory in the apparent sense of κατα with the accusative, but το[μο] is no improvement, and a preposition is required. μ and ν are the only alternatives to π, ἵππον being thus excluded and μ'τερα being also unsatisfactory.

53. οὐ can equally well be read in place of τ of κατα[πομενος], but καὶ θηλη (with τοῦ instead of τοῦ in l. 52) makes l. 53 much shorter than the preceding lines, though not much shorter than l. 54 if αἰσχυλουα there is right. αἰσχυλουα is possible as far as the size of the lacuna is concerned, but would make l. 54 unusually long.
Kaive: or Kaueis.

56. in the margin, marking the beginning of the quotation, probably, as Allen suggests, means χρ(ης), i.e. ‘passage’; cf. Dion. Hal. De rhet. 4 and Apoll. Dysc. De synt. i. 119. It also occurs in Anecd. Oxon. ii. 452. 19 ο’Ἀρτοσάβρων (＝ Birds 1180), and in the Anecd. Parisinum de notis (Bergk, Zeitsschr. f. Aller. 1845, 88) along with the obelus, which occurs in l. 116 of the papyrus, also apparently to indicate a quotation, for which the usual sign in papyrus is the diple, e.g. in 405 (Part iii, Plate i). The obelus is explained in the Anecd. Paris. in accordance with its usual sense of indicating an error; of the writer says chi et ro: habe sola vix ad voluntatem antiuisciusque ad aliquid notandum ponit.

Kaih: Kaih, not Kain, is the feminine form of Kaiao elsewhere; cf. Phleg. Fr. 34 οι αυτηι (sc. Hesiod, Dicaearchus, Clearchus, Callimachus and others) ιστοροει κατα την Λασιθων χορον γενεσθαι Ἐλαττω το βασιλει βυγατερα δυναμεωμενη Καιναια· ταυτη δε Ποσειδαιων μεγεντα επαγγελθαιας ποινεσ αυτου δε ανθη, την δε αξιωνια μεταλλαξει αυτου εις ανδρα, πραγματι τα άτρατον. τοι δε Ποσειδαιων κατα την αξιωθεν ποιησαντι μετανοηθηκε Καιναια. Ovid, who describes at considerable length Caeneus’ death in Metam. xii. 172 sqq., also has Caenis. Acusilaus’ work was largely based on Hesiod, and the story of Caeneus may have been derived from the poet, though in the extant remains of Hesiod Caeneus is mentioned only in Scut. 179 among the list of the chiefs of the Lapithae. Homer also has only one mention of him, A 264 Kaδαι τ’ Εξαδια τε και αενιου Ποληφρων, on which Schol. A remarks οι Καιναιος Ἐλαττων μην ἡ ποιη, Λασιθων δε βασιλευς, προτερον εν παρθενοι επιρρησης, μεγεντος δε αυτης Ποσειδαιων, αοηγουμεν μεταλλαξει εις ανδρα η νεανια άτρατον γινεται, γενεατοτατος των καβ’ αυτουν οπαραξια. κα δε ποτε πιθης διακονον εν τη μεσαια της αγορας θεων τοτο προστατησεν αρμυρια. δε ι’ αυτων ανακατησεις ο Ζευς ομωρων της αναξιας παρ’ αυτου εισεπραττε. μοχυκωνον γαρ αυτου των Κενταυρων και άτρατον οτα υποχειρων επολησεν’ βαλοντας γαρ αυτου οι προιαμενα βραται τα και ελαιας ξερενον εις γην. μεμειναι δε αυτου και ‘Απολλωνος εν τοις Αργοσωνικοις (i. 59), λεγων ανιωσ’ Καιναια γαρ δε πραξεν οτι κλεινουν αυτοι τοις Κενταυροι διελθενα δει σφης αιων ελας άριστηνοι δε’ εμπαλων ορμηνευται οτα μεν αγκληινον προτερον ος έν θαλα βαζει, αλλ’ αρρηκτον άκαμπτου εδουσα νεαθε γαιης, θεουναιον στιβαρης καταγωγη ξελατρυν. Eustathius’ comment on the verse is very similar δε μενος φοσικ ετρων αυτου εινα εφας, πλατον και δε παρθενος επιρρησης ποτε γεγονος, και Ποσειδαιων αυτε μεγεντος, αιτησαμεν ανη γενεσθαι και άτρατο τεις, ων ήθελεν ετος. λεγεται δε και ιπτροφυρεσα. ικανον γαρ, φασιν, εν αγορα μεσε η πιθης εις θεων θεω τοτο προστατησεν αρμυρια. οθεν δε ηθελη ποιην αυτουν ανεβεσιας ειπρομενης πεποιηκεν υπο τοις Κενταυροις, οι δραυνε τε και ελαιας εις γην ζερενον αρρηκτον και άκαμπτον δυτικε δυτικε γην, θεουναιον στιβαρης καταγωγης ελατρυν, δε φαεσιν ‘Απολλωνος. Schol. Apoll. Rhod. i. 59 has μιθολογουν δε τοις Καιναιοι προτερον γεγονος γαιης, ετε Ποσειδαιων αυτη πλησιαναντος μεταλληκειαν εις ανδρα, τοτο γαρ εθηκε και αρρηκτον. έχανε δε και ‘Απολλωνι και ενεκδη, ουτον έκελε τους παρασατον ομιλεαν εις το δαμι αυτουν έθεεν η παραμα τοις Καιναιοι δαμι. τως δε φαες Καιναι αιτιελευται τοις Αργοσωνικοις, ου Καινων, δε Απολλωνοι παρα Πουδαρου ειδρει λεγωντο, δ χρυση ελατρη τυπεις χετος Καιναιος σχισος ορθον τοτη γην (= Pind. Fr. 167 Schroeder). τοτο δε αυτη ευξηθε δια το μενος θεων ήμεν επηεσθαι τοις θοις, αλλα το εκατου δαμι. διο Ζευς εφορμα αυτου τοις Κενταυρους, αυτες κατα γην αυτουν οθοιον. Agatharchides’ description (De mar. Ερυθ. 7) is eti Καιναι τον Λασιθων το μεν απ αρχης γεγονα παρθενοι και γαιης, ήσασανε δε εις ανδρα μεταστηθη, το δ’ έστατον εις την γην ιδον των Κενταυρων καταθηκε τοις ολαταις τυποθεμενοι, ορθον τε και ζωτα. The connexion between some of these passages and the Acusilaus extract is very close, especially in the earlier part of Schol. A on A 264 (followed by Eustathius), and the later part of Schol. Apoll. Rhod. i. 59, where Acusilaus is either slightly paraphrased or reproduced. Evidently Acusilaus was the chief authority for the Caeneus legend, though e.g. the details about the request to be made into a man, which are absent in Acusilaus and are elaborated in Schol. Luc. Gall. 19 somewhat differently, are probably derived from another mytho-

logist.
59. ἑρον: a diaeresis above ε may be lost. Acusilas' remark seems very naïve in the light of the number of legends about children of the gods by mortals; and it is no surprising that in ll. 85–100, the union of gods and mortals is further discussed by our author with a parallel from Euripides.

τέκεν: most of the fourth letter has disappeared in a lacuna; but after κ is part of a stroke which suits the beginning of ε, and the end of a horizontal stroke joining the middle of τ survives, which excludes τέκεν, the ordinary Ionic form, found e.g. in Hdt. vi. 131, but of course with a circumflex accent. τέκεν is an altogether impossible reading, though parallels for such a form are not wanting in Hdt.; cf. Smyth, Ionic Dialect, § 602. τέκεν is just possible as a reading, but much less probable than τέκε, because (1) the lacuna is not large enough for ee with cross-bars as long as that in the ε after τ, (2) the accent, with the reading ee, would really be on the second ε, not the first, where it ought to have been placed, (3) though the Ionic second aorist infinitive in είν is ultimately derived from τέκε (cf. Smyth, l.c.), that form of the infinitive is not found in either Hdt. or Ionic inscriptions, any more than in the MSS. of Homer, so that Acusilas, though a writer of considerable antiquity, is not at all likely to have used the form τέκεν, nor would the corrector of the papyrus have been likely to ascribe it to him by error. τέκε is a Doric form, parallel to τέξλύν, ἤγεῖν, &c. (cf. Kühner-Blass, Gramm. i. 2, p. 58), and, the present extract being the sole authority for Acusilas' dialect, does not require to be altered to τέκε, especially since Dorisms tend to occur in Ionic, and the corrector has put the right accent on the form, not merely omitted i.

τέκενον: i.e. Poseidon, as is clear from εξ ἄλλων αὐτῶν, in spite of the confusion of genders in l. 61. Cf. also Plut. Thet. 20 τέκεν ἐκ Ὄρθεως Ἀριάδνην Οἰνοπόλιαν.

61. αὐτὸν: l. αὐτην.


66. κερτοί: or κερτο η. Herodotus avoids optatives in -ι and does not contract -ει after a consonant, so that Acusilas' usage was in any case not parallel to his. φοροῖ occurs in Homer i 320, πλούτων in Tyrtaeus, συμμαρτυρή in Solon, δοκεῖ in Heracitus, while Hippocrates prefers -οιν to -εια. On the other hand Theognis has φιλέω, and 'even in prose there is ample support for αi after consonants as well as after vowels' (Smyth, op. cit. p. 531; cf. § 651).

67–8. μαλιστα χρυματων: the lexicons do not afford any parallels for this expression.

73–4. For the suggested restoration of these lines cf. the scholiasts quoted in l. 56, n.

75. The letter following η can be ν. σι δ' ουν και ε. [is inadmissible, ei being the only alternative to η. No word meaning 'worshipped' seems suitable, and θεοὶ]σι δ' κτλ. is apparently to be connected with what follows rather than with the preceding sentence, so that a word meaning 'pleasing' would be appropriate (ἡς [ἡν; ην]).

80. ορεινων is evidently a mistake for ορθαν, as remarked by Allen; cf. ορθφιι παλι in the Pinard fragment and ορθων in Agatharchides, both quoted in l. 56, n. The Ionic form of ορεινων would be ορθεινων, and that word is quite inappropriate here.

84. τι is for το. 85–6. A predicate for διανται would be expected in place of δια τουτο, e.g. τοτον or ισον.

87–93. Of Euripides' Ἀλκείων δ' διὰ Κορηνθῶν only three fragments are known with certainty (Frs. 74, 75, 77 Nauck), but the argument of it is described by Apollo in Apollodorus iii. 7, 7, who calls the children in question (Amphilochus and Tisiphone) ταῖδας διόν, not twins as in l. 92. Their mother (the παρθένοι of l. 93) was Manto, daughter of Tiresias, and the θεός of l. 89 is evidently Apollo; cf. Apollod. iii. 7, 4 πέριποτον ἀπόλλων καὶ τῆς Τιρεσίου θεγατέρας Μαντώ, and Ἐρ. 6. 3, where in a different legend Mopsus is called the son of Apollo and Manto.
97. The verb in the apodosis may well have been δηλοῦται, as Rostowzew suggests.

101-11. The restoration of ll. 102-3 Πολέμων ... ἀκροσθεὼς is due to Stuart Jones; cf. int. and Marcellinus, Vita Thuc. §§ 16-17 ᾧ γὰρ ὁ οἰκός ἐστὶν ἡ στήλη δὴ διαλεῖ ἐν τούτῳ τάφῳ αὐτοῦ κείμενον, ἔστη κεκάρασθαι Θουκυδίδης ὁ Ολόρων Ἀλμούσιος (in § 55 the inscription is quoted on the authority of Antyllus). πρὸς γὰρ τὰς Μελεσίας πύλας καλομενίαις ἐστίν ἐν Κολή τὰ καλὸν μνήματα, ἔστη διεῖκται ὁ Προδότος καὶ Θουκυδίδου τάφου. εὑρίσκεται (δὴ?) δῆλον ὧν τοῦ Μιλτιάδου γένομαι ἄν· ἐξόνο γὰρ αὐτίκει ἐκάθεστο. καὶ Πολέμων δὲ ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἀκροσθεῶς τοίνυν μαρτύρει, ἔσται καὶ Μιλόσιον νῦν αὐτῷ γεγενήθη προσιτορικ. καὶ § 28 ἐγένετο Θουκυδίδου πολὺν, οὕτως τὰ τοῦ Ὁλόρου πάνω καὶ δεύτερον δημαγωγὸς, Μαρκίου, ὁς καὶ Περικλῆι δεισολεντάτο κτῆσις δὲ γένει θαρσεῖον, ὁδ. μένηται Πολέμων ἐν τοῖς Περὶ ἀκροσθεῶς, φάσκονι αὐτῶν ἐστιν πατρὸς Μένιος.

There were four books of the Περὶ ἀκροπ. according to Strabo ix. p. 396. The letter following δῆ in l. 102 is very uncertain, only a spot of ink at the bottom of the line being preserved, which indicates an angular letter (α or λ) or else one beginning with a vertical stroke (e.g. μ, ν, or ι) rather than a round letter such as ς. ἀναγραφή in l. 105 (ψ is the only alternative for φ) suggests an inscription about Thucydides son of Melæias and father of Stephanus, parallel to that apparently mentioned by Polemon in the same work with reference to the historian; and in fact Athen. vi. 234 d states that Polemon γράφη περὶ παρασιτῶν φιλῶν οὕτως ... ἐν Κομαράρι μὲν υἱὸν ἐν τῷ Προδότῃ στήλῃ τῆς έστιν; ἐν ὥφοιο μὲν αὐτῆς Αλκιβίαδος, γραμματεύς δὲ Στέφανος Θουκυδίδου ... This stele may well be identified with or connected with the ἀναγραφή here, especially since the paternity of Stephanus seems to the point with which our author is most concerned (cf. ll. 112 sqq.); but the Athenaeus quotation is generally assigned to Polemon's Περὶ ἀνωνύμων ἀδόξων ἑστιοτη (Athen. ix. 409 d), and Polemon was there clearly concerned with the meaning of παράσιτος, not with Thucydides, so that in any case our author's reference to Polemon Περὶ ἀκροσθεῶς was not to the passage quoted by Athenaeus. For Κομαράρι in l. 107 (suggested by Allen) cf. Plut. Σίμων πο Κώμω δὲ ... καὶ τῷ πάσης Κώμω προσεκόους τὴν φύσιν, ἐν δὲ εὐθείαν ται Κωμών προσαγωγέρθησα, καὶ Αεχείνης Σocrætīcus quoted by Athen. v. 220 b Ἱππαύκων μὲν τὸν Κωμήν Κωμῶν προσαγωγεῖν. The o is nearly certain, but it is necessary to suppose the omission of καλων owing to homoioteleuton. Upon the restoration of the end of l. 108 depends the sense of the whole passage. Starting from the fact that Polemon according to Marcellinus mentioned both Thucydides the historian and Thuc. the Pharsalian (a prolocus of the Athenians in 411 B.C.; cf. Thuc. viii. 92) in the Περὶ ἀκροπ., we think that φασι in l. 110 includes Polemon (l. 102), and therefore in ll. 101-2 the name of another author is to be supplied, to which δῆ, [ in l. 102 may belong, [ουτοι in l. 108 referring to both names. For τριήμερον in l. 110 cf. Marcellinus § 28 quoted above. The general sense of ll. 101-11 seems to be that Polemon Περὶ ἀκροπ. and another author referred to not one Thucydides only (ἐν δὲ εὐθείαν μὴν γὰρ ἔχωμεν) but three in all. A mention of Thucydides by name is expected before l. 106, and Θουκυδίδης]δὴ can well be restored in ll. 101-2 (in which case there is room for only a very short name after it before καὶ, and τον in l. 106 is probably μνεῖν], or Θουκυδίδης] τον can be read in l. 105-6; but a restoration of the whole passage is scarcely possible. The hypothesis that φασι qualifies the whole sentence and the point is that Polemon did not mention (ὅμως could be read in l. 102) the son of Melæias, but only the other two persons called Thucydides, is unsatisfactory, for though Marcellinus does not refer to Polemon in connexion with the son of Melæias, Polemon of course knew about the politician, and ἀναγραφή does not at all suggest that φασι is to be connected with a verb meaning 'mentioned'. A different sense would be obtained by restoring [ἀλλα in l. 108 as the subject of φασι, contrasted with Πολέμων in l. 102, who would then stand by himself. To get rid of the supposed author coupled with Polemon is an advantage, but with τριήμερον in l. 110 the passage would then produce a marked conflict with Marcellinus' statements that
Polemon referred to the historian and the Pharsalian in the Περὶ ἀκροτ. This difficulty could be somewhat lessened by restoring του [του] instead of την [την] in l. 119, and supposing the general sense to be that Polemon identified a certain Thucydides with the son of Meleas, while others maintained that he was the Pharsalian. But the reference to the son of Olorus then becomes rather pointless, especially in view of the circumstance that Polemon is known from Marcellinus to have produced evidence for the ancestry of the historian.

113-19 Cf. Μένος 94 εὐθυμίδης ὑπὶ Θουκίδης κτλ. One MS. (F) has ὁ Θουκ., which is possible here, and before τούτων in l. 118 the MSS. insert καί. A similar passage occurs in the Pseudo-Platonic Περὶ ἀρετῆς 378 a, where it is stated with regard to Meleas and Stephanus τῶν υἱῶν μέχρι γῆς τῶν, τῶν δ’ ἄνδρων πάνω πάνω. Meleas is a character in the Laches, but nothing more is known about Stephanus, except the inscription discussed in the preceding n. For the obelus against l. 116 cf. l. 56, n.

119-20. Ἐρμα[ποιος ο ποιής]; the title is added to distinguish him from the philosopher, ὁ Καλλιμάχος. The poet was older than Eupolis and Aristophanes according to Suidas. The titles of nine of his comedies are known, but not the Τατέλειος.

121. ιωνος ομφάλης: the Ομφάλης was a satyrical drama, of which sixteen fragments are known. Another quotation from it perhaps occurred in ll. 277 sqq.

123. (ὑπὸ) Πραξιλέους should perhaps be read, Heracles being then the speaker of the two lines; cf. l. 89 λεγομένοιν ὑπὸ δικαίως. As the text stands, the subject of ξελατο[μεν] may be the satyrs, not Heracles. With βορείοις [ἐπὶ] οι (so Allen) cf. Homer γ. 221 Σ. τῆς τριάχθαι ἄπιν. τῶν καὶ Βορείων ἡράσατο βοσκομένων. Perhaps βορείοις should be written.

124-5. ὀρον... Πλήσης: cf. Fr. 24 (Nauck) of the Ομφάλης καὶ Σαρδανών κόμμων εἰδών χρόνος ἁμείναι ἡ τῶν Πλήσης ἐν νήσῳ τρόπον. The scene of the Ομφάλης was laid in Lydia (cf. Frs. 22, 23, 27). Possibly Heracles had been sent by Omphale to fetch one of the horses sprung from Boreas which belonged to Pelops; cf. the legend of the capture of the horses of Diomedes, which Heracles gave to Eurytheus (Apollod. ii. 5. 8). But the plot of the Ομφάλης is very obscure.

127. αἰνεία, which would mean 'is winnowed', is obviously an error for ἀντία: cf. e.g. Homer Κ. 251 μαλὰ γὰρ νῦν ἀντία.

128. [διαλ][δικὼ] δέ: on the analogy of the preceding lines two letters before λίκυκε would be preferable, but probably the column sloped away a little to the left, though 6 in l. 129 can be omitted. [καὶ διαλίκως δ is also possible, the simple verb as well as διαλίκως being used for solving difficulties. Cf. for καὶ ... 62 l. 174-5, n.

128-9. Μικράς σε ὁ? Πατρα[ρειος]: cf. int. and Susemihl i. 679. 1611 agrees with the scholia on Hesiod, Pindar, and Lucian in giving Patara (in Lydia) as his birthplace, while the MSS. of Athenaeus and Photius call him ὁ Πατραίος, i.e. from Patrae in Achaea, but in the light of 1611 are to be emended to ὁ Πατράρχος. With regard to the title of his work on oracles Schol. Pindar, Ολ. ii. 70 calls it Περὶ χρησμῶν, while Schol. Hesiod, Θεωρ. 117 calls it ὁ τῶν Δαφνίδων χρησμῶν συναγωγή. 1611 seems to agree with the former, but τῆς τῶν χρησμῶν συναγωγῆς is a possible reading.

135-43. The coronis after l. 138 probably indicates a following quotation (cf. l. 115 and int. p. 129), to which ἄνθρωποι in l. 141 may well belong. Allen suggests Πεπειδευτεία ... in l. 139 and ἄνθρωπος Πεπειδευτεία in l. 141, i.e. a quotation from the Αἰθιόπες of Arctinus, which is perhaps cited in ll. 145-50; cf. ll. 148-9, n. But 6 (probably 6τ) ἐπί in l. 142 does not suit this hypothesis, and the colour of Frs. 3 and 4 is different, so that a connexion between them is unlikely. Lines 136-8 might also be hexameters, as Allen remarks, e. g. οὐ τοι[ὲ] γα λήπισσα(α) ο ὁ δι θεῷ ...—

146. εγγονος: this spelling of ἐγγονος occurs in Attic inscriptions down to 300 B.C. and in Ptolemaic inscriptions and papyri (cf. Mayser, Gramm. d. gr. Papyr. p. 228); but is not legitimate in hexameters.

1611. WORK ON LITERARY CRITICISM
148-9. Ἀρ|τιτε ἤνος: [Ἀχ χίμος can equally well be read, or possibly Ἀ. χιός. Achaeus wrote tragedies entitled 'Ἀδράστος, Ἀζάντ, Ἀθάν, Ἀλκείδος, Ῥητεί, Κόστος, Μαίρας, Μέσος, Οἰδίπους, Πειρίδος, Φιλοκτήν, and Φίλος, one of which may have described the death of the woman in question; but if the author mentioned in l. 149 also wrote the hexameter verse quoted in l. 1.46 (which is probable, but not clear), he is not likely to have been Achaeus. With Ἀρ|τε τιτος (Allen) the quotation would come from the Ἀλιθθοις, the woman being Penthesilea and the speaker presumably Achilles; cf. ll. 135–33, n. ἐκτεθ[καί μόν]ν may, however, end l. 148.

150–2. It is not possible to restore Σμωνινθ... το[ν] ἔτει [παμφων].

154. More not to one line, if any, is lost before the top of the column, twenty-four lines being accounted for; if Fr. 43, which is referred to the middle of ll. 160–2 a, is rightly placed, as is practically certain. That Fr. 5 belongs to the upper part of the column of which Fr. 6 is the bottom is indicated by the colour of the verso besides the suitability of the resulting restoration.

158–9. καὶ δο[λ]είρε φρον Ἑρατοσθένης (Allen) can be restored; cf. ll. 162–5, n. and int.

160. ἐν [ταις Φιφυ[ν]ξ[ων οδοις | σφηνογ[υ]με[ν]ος is unlikely on account of the verb in l. 165 (παρα[πται 7]).


162–5. Cf. Ἀτ. Κλούδας 967 ἢ 'Παλλάδα περιστόλοι δεινῶν' ἢ 'τιλήπρων τι βδομά', where Schol. RV have ἄρχη ὁμοτος Φρονίσσω, ὡς Ἑρατοσθένης φρονίσ (φρ. ὡς Ἐρ. Φρον. V), Φρονίσσω (ἢ V, om. R) αὐτοῦ τοῦτον τὸν ὁμοτός μηματεύκα ὡς Λαμπρόκλεως ὡς Παλλάδα περιστόλοι κλῆξι πολεμαδόκοι ἄγων πάθα Δῶς μεγάλος, and Schol. Ald. has... Λαμπρόκλεως εἶναι φρονίσ Ἀθηναίου, τοῦ Μίδωνος νιό. ἔχει δὲ οὗς' Παλλάδα περιστόλοι κηλ., as in Schol. RV, but adding δαμάσιτον απομ. Αὔλος, οὗς Ἑρατοσθένης' Φρόνισσω αὐτοῦ τοῦτον τὸν ἱματός μέρισαι ὡς Λαμπρόκλεως ὡς τοῦ Μίδωνος νιό ή μαθητῷ ἔχει δὲ οὗς' Παλλάδα περιστόλοι δεινῶν τον ἔργον πολεμαδόκοι ἄγων πάθα Δῶς μεγάλον δαμάσιτον, κατὰ Λαμπρόκλεως ἔποιήθη κατὰ λέξι. Schol. Aristid. 217 Dindorf (in reference to the Aristophanes line) has εἶδος τοῦτον ἱματός καὶ ἄρχη τῶν δὲ ποητῶν αὐτοῦ 'Ῥοίδας καὶ Διώνυσος (time of Hadrian) ἱστορίαιν εἰς τὴν Μουσική (sc. ἱστορίαι) Φρόνισσῶν ταύτα, ἄλλους δὲ φασὶ Λαμπροκλῆς δι' Στράτηχον, τὸ δὲ 'δεινὴ' αὐτὸ τοῦ κλῆς κατηγορεί παρὰ τῶν κωμίκων τῷ γὰρ δομα οὕτως ἔχει 'Παλλάδα περιστόλοι κλῆς πολεμαδόκοι ἄγων πάθα Δῶς μεγάλον δαμάσιτον (δαμάσιτον οἱ δαμασίτοι MSS.) μέτων (corrup.) παρθένων. These passages are discussed by Wilamowitz, Textgesch. d. grisch. Lyr. 84–5. There were evidently at least two versions of the hymn. 1611 agrees with the version in the first note in Schol. Ald., which is really the same as that of Schol. RV and Schol. Aristid., the former scholium merely omitting δαμάσιτον and the latter having κλῆς and adding two words at the end. This, the shorter of the two versions, was that of Phrynichus, as is clear from 1611, and was rightly stated by Schol. RV and Schol. Aristid., whereas the first note in Schol. Ald. wrongly assigned it to Lamprocles. The longer version, i.e. that of Lamprocles, with which Aristophanes' citation, so far as it goes, agrees, was given in the second note in Schol. Ald., where the authorship is not clearly indicated. None of the scholiasts makes it clear which Phrynichus is meant. The lyric and tragic poet was formerly supposed to be indicated, but now the Phrynichus in question whether understood or not by the scholiasts (cf. Wilamowitz, l. c.), is generally considered to be the comic poet. 1611 also makes no clear sign on this point, but the way in which Phrynichus and Aristophanes are coupled (παραμονὶ is apparently used with regard to both; cf. the next n.) favours the identification with the comic poet. The brief statements in Schol. RV may be derived from our author's fuller discussion, if he was reproducing Eratosthenes or, as is possible but not likely (cf. int.), was Eratosthenes himself. The other scholia do not seem to be specially connected with 1611.

165. παραφυκε: cf. l. 175 παραφυκε. The word can mean either 'imitate' or 'introduce'.
168. Χαμάλεως: cf. p. 129. His work Περὶ καμψίδος is cited by Athen. ix. 374 a.

171. The omission of the superfluous is indicated by both a dot above it (cf. e.g. 1824) and a stroke through it.

172-3. μεθοθητήτηται: ματ may be at the end of the line, but ματ[θητήτηται] does not fill the lacuna and is unintelligible. The suggested restoration is very doubtful, but brings the passage into connexion with Schol. Ald. on Ar. Clouds 967 (quoted in ll. 162-5, n.) Μίδωνος ντοι η ματητήρ, and there is no objection to ματ[θητήτηται], if the last two letters were written small, as often happens at the end of a line. Schol. Plat. Alcib. i. 387 makes Lamprocles the pupil of Agathocles and teacher of Damon. ματ can hardly be an adjective of place, for Lamprocles was an Athenian.

174-5. For καί... δε cf. ll. 128, n., 150-1, 228-9.

183. λοδι: or λοδι.

195. πνυ: cf. l. 306. But Fr. 7 does not belong to the same column as Frs. 21-2.

202. γηγη[τοι cannot be read, ρ or ν being the only alternatives for τ.]

212-14. Ελλανικός δ εν ταις Εθνοις? κτήσει: the restoration is due to Allen. The works variously entitled Περὶ Εθνών, 'Εθνών ὁμολογία, Κτίσεις, Κτίσεις Εθνών καὶ πόλεων (Hellan. Fr. 109 from Steph. Byz.; 1011 seems to have had ἑθνῶν or πόλεων alone), and perhaps Περὶ Χων κτήσεως, are all considered to be identical by Gudeman in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. viii. 136-7.

216. κ for κ(ν) occurs as early as the first century in the 'Αθηναῖον Πολεμία papyrus.


222-3. μεθεκνων δ[ποκομίσα]νιοι δε: the vestige of the letter following καν is too slight to be a real clue, but suggests α or λ more than a letter beginning with a vertical stroke, or round. μεθ(e)κνων = μεθεκνων is much more likely than μεθ(κ)καν. [i.e. some part of διαινότις], for there is hardly room for a substantive in l. 222 as well as the beginning of a participle. In Dittenberger, Or. Gr. Inscr. 55. 6, αφάκες is apparently a mere variation of spelling for ἀφάκες, which occurs in l. 13, not a perfect, as regards by Mayser, op. cit. p. 331.

223. The correction is by the first hand; cf. p. 130. The reading of the letter after τον is very doubtful, but α or λ suits better than any other letter.

224. Π[σαρω]: cf. l. 226. But η, κ, μ, ν or γ. [or ι. ] can be read in place of π.


231. If the paragraphus is rightly placed (cf. however ll. 90-1, where it is not), αριστα is not to be connected with ll. 232 sqq., so that Αρισταρχά is not very likely. Αρισταρχάς cannot be read.

245. εσταργο: the second letter might be γ or τ, the third ά or λ, the last ν.

247. ο δε Λασις: no personal name beginning thus is known, but there might be a reference to the places "Ασπαρα or Λασπάρα or Λασπαράδε or adjectives derived from them. Neither Λασίς nor Λασιδής is admissible; Λασινάρας (a river in Sicily so spelled in Thuc. vii. 84) is possible, but seems too long, even with εκ στρατιωτικός in l. 248, while Λασινάρας[στρατιωτικός], which is possible as a reading, gives no construction. The division as στρί[ς or στρι] does not suggest any suitable word.

268. Perhaps Σιμώνιον.

270. ηνεδι: the third letter could be read as λ. The division πα?ν νεδι[ is more probable than πα?ν καδι[.

278. Possibly Ωμπάλιον: cf. l. 121, n.

280. [Θεοδ[ες[ης]: the tip of a vertical stroke below the line suits τ, and is inconsistent with the terminations of Καρκίνος, Ευπήθος, or Τυμπάθος, who are the only other tragic poets known to have written an Orestes. Of Theocrites' play with that title only one line is extant.
1612. Oration on the Cult of Caesar.

This papyrus, which was found with 1606-8, &c., and concludes the publication of the first of the three large finds of literary papyri in 1905-6 (cf. 1606. int.), belongs to a speech of a novel character, the subject of it being the cult of a Roman Emperor, who is called simply ‘Caesar’. One column of forty lines is fairly well preserved, and there are beginnings of lines of a second column, besides a small detached scrap, which does not seem to belong to Col. i. The handwriting is a not very elegant specimen of the sloping oval third-century type. The beginnings of the lines, which contain 15-20 letters, slope away to the left in a marked degree, and the ends are decidedly uneven. Paragraphic and frequent high stops occur. A subscript is written in l. 27, but in l. 11 its insertion is doubtful. A correction in l. 12 is in a different hand, which used lighter ink, but seems to be not appreciably later than the first. In ll. 22-5 apparent corruptions have not been altered.

The main purport of the oration, so far as it can be ascertained, was the opposition of the speaker to the cult of Caesar as practised in his own city (l. 26 ἐν θάδει), or rather to certain extensions of it or novelties (cf. l. 1, n.) proposed by his adversaries. To Caesar-worship in general he does not seem to have been opposed, for in ll. 22 sqq. he expressly deprecates ἄσπεια towards Caesar, and disclaims any wish to deprive him of the ‘glory of immortality’. In addressing his audience he habitually used the second person plural (ll. 30 sqq.),
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while his opponents are also spoken of in the plural (l. 11 φασὶ); but in l. 10 \[β'νύλωτο\] a single adversary seems to be indicated, and in l. 1 the second person singular is apparently used, with reference to an opponent more probably than to himself in an objection placed in the mouth of an adversary. The first six lines are too incomplete to be restored: a new sentence began in l. 7, as is shown by the paragraphus. The speaker refers to the rites performed in honour of Caesar, and strongly asserts his satisfaction that these were not invented by his fellow countrymen (ἡμεῖς), but at Nicaea by an individual whom he declines to describe (ll. 9–17). His argument is that this cult ought to be left to the Nicaeans, and that the observance of it at his own city would be as impious to Caesar as the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries at any other city than Athens would be to Demeter (ll. 17–29; this interpretation rests on two rather violent alterations in the text, which are, we think, absolutely necessitated by the context; cf. l. 22, n.). Evidently conscious that he was treading on dangerous ground, the orator then declares his intention of proving that his own views were not really derogatory to the immortality of Caesar (ll. 30–5); but the text becomes fragmentary at this point, a contrast being apparently drawn in ll. 35–40 between the previous and the existing cults at the city in question. From Col. ii nothing of importance can be gleaned.

The boldness of the speaker in dealing with so delicate a topic as Caesar-worship is striking, and one would gladly have learnt more of his views on this interesting subject. As the fragment stands, it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to reconstruct the background of the situation with any approach to certainty. The first questions to arise are (1) what place was meant by \\textit{ἐνθάδε} in l. 26, and (2) which, if any particular emperor was meant by ‘Caesar’? The reference to Nicaea as the starting-place of the cult to which the speaker objected suggests a connexion with the well-known description of the origin of Caesar-worship in Dio Cassius li. 20 Καίσαρ δὲ ἐν τούτῳ (sc. 29 B.C.) τά τε ἄλλα ἔχριματίζει καὶ τεμένη τῇ τε Ῥώμῃ καὶ τῷ πατρι τῷ Καίσαρι ἦρωα αὐτῶν Ἰούλλων ὄνομάσας ἐν τε Ἐφέσῳ καὶ ἐν Νίκαιᾳ γενέσθαι ἑφήκεν. αὐτοὶ γὰρ τότε αἱ πόλεις ἐν τῇ Αἰγίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Βιθυνίᾳ προκατέρχοντο. καὶ τούτων μὲν τοὺς 'Ρωμαίοις τοῖς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἑποικούσι τιμᾶτ' προσέταξε τοῖς δὲ δὴ ἔνοιοι ('Ἐλληνας σφᾶς ἐπικαλέσας) ἐνυπη ὑπα, τοῖς μὲν Ἀσιανοῖς ἐν Περγάμῳ, τοῖς δὲ Βιθυνοῖς (ἐν Ἔλληνας σφᾶς ἐπικαλέσας) τεμενίσαι ἑπτρέψε. καὶ τοῦτι ἐκείθεν ἀρξάμενοι καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλων αὐτοκρατόρων οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς Ἐλληνικοῖς ἔθεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ὅσα τῶν 'Ρωμαίων ἀκούει ἑγένετο. Dio’s statement that the temples at Pergamum and Nicomedia were dedicated to Augustus alone requires modification, since it conflicts with the statements of Tacitus, \textit{Ann.} iv. 37, that the temple at Pergamum was dedicated to Augustus and Rome, and of Suetonius, \textit{Aug.} 52, that Rome was regularly associated with Augustus in the provincial cults; cf. Kornemann,
The correspondence between the papyrus and Dio would be made most exact by supposing the speaker in 1612 to be a Roman (which is in any case probable), and 'Caesar' to be Julius throughout. ἐνθάδε, with which Nicaea is so vehemently contrasted, might well be Nicomedia; for the two cities were long engaged in feud on the question of the headship of Bithynia, and the dispute was sufficiently important to be the subject of an oration by Dio Chrysostom (no. 38), recommending his compatriots of Nicomedia to come to terms with Nicaea. The hypothesis that the speaker in 1612 was a Nicomedian would also accord very well with the reference in l. 24–8 to Demeter; for that goddess appears on the coins of Nicomedia (Wroth, Catal. of Greek coins of Pontus, &c., pp. 181, 183, 186), and Arrian, the most famous citizen of Nicomedia (cf. Steph. Byz. s.v.), was perpetual priest of Demeter and Kore there (Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. ii. 1230). With this interpretation of 1612, which is based upon the identification of 'Caesar' with Julius and the existence of a close connexion with Dio, the oration was presumably delivered during the reign of Augustus, when Caesar-worship of any kind was still a novelty. But there are several other possible modes of interpretation. The references to 'Caesar' in 1612 do not necessarily indicate that he was dead at the time when the oration was delivered (though cf. l. 31 n.), and if he was alive, 'Caesar' must be Augustus or one of his successors, not Julius. The date of the papyrus practically excludes the possibility of a later emperor than Severus Alexander being meant (Diocletian, who made his residence at Nicomedia, is quite out of the question); but, especially in view of the rather compromising character of the contents of 1612, it would be more satisfactory to diminish the interval between the supposed date of composition and that of the papyrus, which if 'Caesar' is Julius or Augustus seems to be about 200 years. Caracalla and Heliogabalus both wintered at Nicomedia, and festivals in honour of Commodus and the brothers Caracalla and Geta are mentioned in the coins of Nicaea (Wroth, op. cit. pp. 162, 166). It is also just possible that in ll. 35–6 there is a reference to 'Caesars' in the plural, and that these are the reigning emperors. Not only is the hypothesis that the scene of the speech was Bithynia quite compatible with the identification of 'Caesar' with a much later emperor than Augustus, but the provenance of the papyrus rather suggests Egypt as the scene, though 1612 is hardly parallel to e.g. 471, a speech before an emperor directed probably against a praefect of Egypt, which is also arranged in literary form, with punctuation, &c. Against, however, the advantages to be gained by making 'Caesar' throughout a second or even third century emperor has to be set the consequent impossibility of connecting the reference to Nicaea with the passage quoted from Dio Cassius. If 'the Nicaean' was the author of the proposal mentioned by Dio, as the
coincidence with regard to the place-name suggests, Ka[ία]ραπι in l. 11 ought to be Julius, and there is no indication that in ll. 9, 24, and 32 a different Caesar is meant. Moreover the use of the present tense ἔστιν in l. 15 in place of ὦ, though explicable as a mere piece of rhetoric, rather indicates that the Nicaean in question was still alive, and if so he cannot have been a second or third century individual, unless the circumstances alluded to in ll. 14–16 were quite different from those described by Dio.

A third line of interpretation was proposed by Sir W. M. Ramsay, who, taking Caesar as 'the Emperor' in the widest sense, i.e. including the dead as well as the living, suggests that 1612 deals with the degradation of true Caesar-worship, as expressing Roman patriotism, by superstitious admixture, as e.g. the Nicaean cult of the βωρότοιος ἴππος illustrated by the coins of that city (cf. Drexler in Roscher's Lex. d. grisch. u. röm. Mythol. ii. 2693–6), and regards the papyrus as a speech made in opposition to some such proposed degradation in the second or early third century. The horse with human feet figured in Nicaean coins of Antoninus Pius and Gordian is generally supposed to be connected with the horse possessing humanis similes pedes in the equestrian statue of Julius Caesar before the temple of Venus Genetrix at Rome (Pliny, Nat. Hist. vii. 155; cf. Suetonius, Julius 61); but whether the rider represented on the coins, who seems to be the god Men, was also identified with Julius Caesar, is more doubtful, and there are no indications in 1612 that the superstitious element to which the speaker objected was concerned with a horse.

On the whole we are disposed to regard 'Caesar' throughout 1612 as Julius, not Augustus or a later emperor, whether dead or reigning; but the mention of 'the Nicaean' seems more likely to refer to some unknown innovation connected with the worship of Julius, than to either the establishment of that worship at Nicaea as recorded by Dio or the cult of the βωρότοιος ἴππος. In view of the date of the papyrus the speech was probably composed and delivered (or supposed to be delivered) not earlier than the second century, and it is safer to make the scene of it Egypt (i.e. Alexandria) than Bithynia. The author may well have been a sophist of the age of Aristides or a little later, objecting to the introduction of some new kind of Oriental cult into the worship of Julius; but such a speech might also occur in a historical work in the style of Dio Cassius.

Fr. 1. Col. i. Col. ii.

σὺ δὲ νεαρὰ Γ. ........................ []
ταύτα ὑπερ-chief ........................ Π
καὶ τὸ στοῖνοι. ........................ Ζήλ
καὶ μετατηρ. οὐ.] 45 ἂν[.] οὐ.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
κ ἐνεπεθέεις oun;? 45 ἄν[.] οὐ.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
οἰσι οὐ[.] οὐ[.] οὐ[.] μ[.]? 45 ἄν[.] οὐ.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
tα το τό[t.] τό τό τό τό[t.] ποιητευον 45 ἄν[.] οὐ.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
tαυτά [Κα][σαρά καὶ σεμνοι] 45 ἔλκων[.] γον[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]

10 νειν αν [β]ουλοιτον λεγω 50 ἀσο[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
δε α το[.] Κα[.]ισαρι φασι τε 55 ον[.] εξ[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
λειν[.] οἱ[.] γαρ[.] ἄρχης οὐχ οὐχ ευρομέν ημείς αυτὰ καλὸς 55 ἄν[.] αυτ[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
τοιουντες· ἀλλα Νίκα 60 πορ[.] τό[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]

15 ευς εστιν ο πρωτος κα 65 πο[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
tαστησας· οποιος μεν αν 65 πο[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
θρωπος ου δει λεγειν· εντω ουν εκεινου και 65 πο[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
παρ εκεινοις τελεισθω

20 μονοις· ὡσπερ παρα τοις 70 Χ[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
Ἀθηναῖοις τα τον Ελευ 70 Χ[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
σεινων· ει βουλομεν[θ]α 70 Χ[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
αυτον ἀσβειν το[.] [αυτο]ν 70 Χ[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
Καισαρα· ὡσπερ αν και την['] 70 Χ[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]

25 [Δ]ημητραν σεβ[ο]μεν 75 προσα[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
[αυτο]ν ενθάδε τελοντες

[α]υτο[.] την[.] εκει[.] σε τελε [α]υτο[.] την[.] εκει[.] σε τελε
[την]· ου γαρ εθελει αρει [την]· ου γαρ εθελει αρει
[να]· τον τοιουτον ουδεν [να]· τον τοιουτον ουδεν

30 [οτι] δ ουκ αφαιρησεσθε[ε] 70 του δ[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
[την] δοξαν της αθανατα 70 του δ[.] 81 ὑπερ[.]η[.]τ[.]το[.]
[τις] του Καισαρος εαυ[ν] εν [τις] του Καισαρος εαυ[ν] εν
[μου] πεισθητε παραδειξ[ι] [μου] πεισθητε παραδειξ[ι]
[γη ρωμει]ν εμοι το τυφων τη[.] [γη ρωμει]ν εμοι το τυφων τη[.]

35 [.] τα γαρ των κ[.] τα γαρ των κ[.] τα γαρ των κ[.] τα γαρ των κ[.]
[.] ει[.] ετελευμενε[ν] [.] ει[.] ετελευμενε[ν] [.] ει[.] ετελευμενε[ν]
8–37. ... papyrōn, ταῦτα [Kai]παρα καὶ σεμνόνεν ἄν [β]ούλοιτο, λέγω δὲ ἢ τῷ Καίσαρι φασὶ τελεῖν. καὶ[.] γὰρ ἐξ[.] ἄρχη τοῖς δύο ἡμεῖς αὐτά, καλὸς τιοῦτος, ἀλλὰ Νικαίος ἐστίν ὁ πρῶτος καταστήγας. ὅπειρος μὲν ἀνθρωπος, ὅ δὲ γένεστ' ἐστὼ δ' ὧν ἔκεινος καὶ παρ' ἑκείνοις τελείσθω μάνοις, ὄσιος παρὰ τοῖς Αθηναίοις τὰ τῶν Ἐλευσινίων, εἰ (μὴ) βούλωμεν θα' αὐτῶν ἁγιανεῖν τὸν[.] Καίσαρα, ὃπειρον ἄν καί τῇ['] ἐμίσταν (ἄ)τεκ[.]ί(ο)μεν ἐνδάβα τελεύταις ἄμη['] τὴν ἐκεί['] σε τελεί['] τὴν[.] οὐ γὰρ ἐθέλεις ἀκείμην[,] τῶν τιούτων οἰδέν[,] ὠτι[.] δ' οὐκ ἀφαιρήσας τὴν[.] δόζαν τῆς ἀδιαμο['] σίας τοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ν' ἔμι[.] πεποθήθη, παράδειγμα θεὶ[.] ὧν ἐπὶ τὸν[.] τῷ[.] ... τὰ γὰρ τῶν κ[.] . . . .[.] ντ' ἐτελεί['] οὶμεν[,] [.] κ' αἱ τῇ[.] οὶ[.] οἰδέν[,] ...
than the Nicaean. The next word is presumably an infinitive ending in [. a] or [σθαύ], or perhaps [αν] or [ει]. The last letter is more like ε than ν, and no alternative is possible. ν before ε is almost certain, η being the only alternative. The first letter must be α, γ, δ, λ, μ, ν, π, or τ: a spot of ink between this and ν probably, if the first letter is a, belongs to that, not to a distinct letter, and is in any case inconsistent with a broad letter or one coming below the line. avei[να], 'to allow', is difficult, but suits the vestiges better than αυει[νασθαυα]. In τονν certainly, and possibly in τοντονον also, the ω is closed at the top, as if the scribe intended to alter it to o; but he certainly did not write τον τοντον originally, and is more likely to have intended τον τοντον. ουδεν suits the vestiges better than ουδεν (cf. l. 37). The supposed stop after it is uncertain; the surface of the papyrus is damaged and ουδεν is a possible reading.

31. αβαν[ειονας]: cf. Dio lii. 36 ἰδιὲ αὐτὸν ἀδάματος ὅστις ἐπιθυμεῖς γενείωθαι in the speech of Mæcenas to Augustus. Lines 30–2 seem more appropriate to a dead than to a living Caesar, who did not become technically θεός till his death; cf. int. p. 150.

34. The letter following νυν, if not τ, is probably γ or π.

35–6. It is rather tempting to read τονν K[γον][νν]νων (cf. p. 150); but the letter at the end of l. 35 is much more like ε than α.  [υ might be the end of προ ταυ].

1613. LIST OF EARLY ATHENIAN ARCHONS.

4·6 x 4·4 cm. Second century.

This small fragment from the middle of a column belongs to a list of the earliest Athenian archons with the numbers of their years of office, like the lists in Eusebius (Schöne, Euseb. Chron. i. 188 and App. 1 a. 11), Jerome (op. cit. App. 1 b. 31), the Excerpta Latina Barbari (op. cit. App. 6. 217), and Syncellus (ed. Dindorf i. 368, 399); cf. v. Schoeffer in Pauly-Wissowa, Realenc. ii. 582–3. Such lists were no doubt common in Egypt; cf. the chronological list of Olympic victors in 222, and A. Bauer’s Alexandrinische Weltchronik (Denkschr. d. Wien. Akad. li). The handwriting is a small uncial of the Roman period, probably of the second century. After the abolition of the Athenian monarchy archons according to tradition were appointed at first for life, afterwards for ten years, and from 683 B.C. onwards annually. The change from archons for life to decennial archons began according to the Exc. Lat. Barb. with Alcmaeon, but the other authorities make him the last of the first category. The papyrus contains the name of Alcmaeon (l. 5) with the names of his four predecessors and six successors in the best supported order (cf. ll. 3–4, n.); but the numbers of the years of office are missing throughout, and there is nothing to show which view was taken with reference to the chronology of Alcmaeon. One name is quite corrupt (l. 6. n.) and another is misspelled (l. 8. n.). Only one more name after l. 11 is required to complete the list of decennial archons: before l. 1 eight names of archons for life are probably lost; cf. ll. 3–4, n.
### List of Early Athenian Archons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἀρείφον</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>΅εατίς</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀγαμήστωρ</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀιοχυλός</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀλκεέον</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαῖος</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀισιμίδης</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κλεοδίκος</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἡππομενης</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λεακρατης</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀψανδρος</td>
<td>ην</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-3. That the originally separate fragment containing ην (three times) is correctly assigned to these lines is not quite certain.

3-4. Between Agamestor and Aeschylus the Exc. Lat. Barb. insert Thersippus, who is placed by the other authorities (cf. int.) 4th in the list of archons for life, Arphiron (l. 1) being 9th, as he presumably was here.

5. Ἀλκεέον: cf. int.
6. Χαῖος: Ἰ. Χαροψ. From this point onwards the figure lost was presumably ι in each case; cf. int.
8. Κλεοδίκος: so also Syncellus; but Eusebius has (Κ)λειδίκος or Κλιδίκος, Jerome *Elidicus*, and Exc. Lat. Barb. *Celdicus*. Κλειδίκος is the correct form; cf. Paus. i. 3. 3.

---

### III. Fragments of Extant Classical Authors


28.8 x 27.2 cm.  
Fifth or sixth century.

The lost poems of Pindar occur in several papyri, chiefly from Oxyrhynchus, Dithyrambs in 1604, Paeans in 841 and P. S. I. 147, Partheneia in 659, odes of uncertain character in 408 and possibly 426; but the extant epinician odes have not hitherto been represented in Egyptian finds, so that a special interest attaches to this fragment of a codex of the Olympian odes. It consists of a single sheet forming two leaves, the first of which contains i. 106–ii. 45 (when complete i. 104–
ii. 50), the second vi. 71–vii. 20 (when complete vi. 68–vii. 26). The lines are for the most part short, being divided much as in the extant MSS., and of the four columns two (i and iii) are fairly well preserved, but the other two have only the ends of lines. The upper margin is not preserved anywhere, but in Col. iii l. 150 (= Ol. vi. 95) is the last. 20 more lines corresponding to vi. 96–105 are required to complete the ode, but these must have been omitted in Col. iv, for l. 158 (vii. 6) is at the back of l. 111 (vi. 72), and that the number of lines lost at the top of Col. iv did not exceed 7 is clear from the size of the corresponding interval between the last extant line of Col. i (l. 51 = ii. 17) and the first of Col. ii (l. 57 = ii. 21). How the 5 missing lines were distributed between Cols. i and ii is not quite certain, for, as far as Col. i by itself is concerned, there is room for 1 or 2 more lines at the bottom. But if, as seems not improbable, Ode vii began at the top of Col. iv, the top of Col. ii can be made fairly even with the top of Col. iv only on the hypothesis that l. 51 was the last of Col. i. Otherwise, if e.g. there are only 3 lines instead of 5 lost at the top of Col. ii, there will certainly not be room at the top of Col. iv for the first few lines of Ode vii, especially since the writing in Cols. iii–iv is by a different scribe from that of Cols. i–ii and less compact. Neither scribe employed a formal uncial, the hand of the first being rude and irregular, while that of the second tends to become cursive, particularly in ε at the ends of lines. Black ink was used by the first scribe as far as l. 67, brown ink by him in ll. 68–95 and by the second scribe, whose pen was thinner. Iota adscript was rarely written. Both scribes inserted marks of elision and diaeresis and occasional stops (high points), the second also occasional breathings and an apostrophe after γαπ in l. 144; but a breathing in l. 37 in brown ink was not written, originally at any rate, by the first hand. That is the only trace of a subsequent revision apart from corrections clearly due to the two scribes themselves. The date of the papyrus is certainly fifth or sixth century, more probably the former, but the Byzantine documents found with it have not yet been unrolled.

The MSS. of Pindar's epinician odes are divided into two families, called the Ambrosian and the Vatican. Of the first group the chief representatives are A (13th cent.), C (late 14th cent.), N (13th–14th cent.), V (late 13th cent.); of the second B (12th cent.), D and E (14th cent.). In Ol. i this classification has to be modified, since A there combines with the Vatican group, D with the Ambrosian. The archetype of both families is assigned to the second century, to which the extant scholia are also referred. The text is generally thought to have been preserved with considerable care owing to the efforts of grammarians, and to have undergone comparatively little corruption since the second century, before which, as is shown by quotations, it was far from being fixed. This view is borne out
by the papyrus, which carries back the evidence some seven centuries and is very close to the text of the best MSS., agreeing sometimes with the Ambrosian family (Ii. 79, 112, 116-17, 121, 146, 169), somewhat oftener with the Vatican (Ii. 8, 24, 30, 36, 59, 82, 85, 92, 95, 126, 175). The difficulty in ii. 6 (Ii. 32-3, n.) and the interpolation in ii. 29-30 (Ii. 70-1, n.) recur. A number of slips are found, as is usual in Byzantine texts; cf. e.g. 1618. Of the new readings the most interesting occur in ii. 39 and vi. 77; cf. Ii. 88 and 119, nn.

Col. i (Fol. 1 verso).

3 lines lost

3 Θεος επιτροπος i. 106

5 εών ἦν εαυτί πμδεται εχον [το]ν κόσμου Ιερων μεριμαίας[ν] εἰ δὲ μὴ ταχύ λιποί ετί γλυκυτερὰν χέν ελπομαί χον αρματε θου κλεῖ i. 10

10 δι επικουρον εὐρων.

15 ρυθουται βασιλευσι μικείτι παπαίνει πορσιον ειν γε γε τούτον υψου χρονον πατειν εμε τε τοσσαδε νικαφοροις

20 ομιλειν προφαιτον σοφία καθ Ελ λανας ευνα παντα

1 Θηρωνι Ακρογαντινω αρματι? αναζ[α]ν[ω]ομμίγγγ[ε]ς υμνιον ii. i
τινα Θεον τιν' ἡρωα

25 τι[α δ'] ανδρα κελα[δησομεν ητοι Πισα μεν Διος

Ολυμπιαδα δ' εστα σειν Ἡρακλες
ακροβυα πολεμου []

30 Θηρωνι δε τετραφιας εικει νικαφορον γεγονητουν οπι δικαιον ξενον ερειπυ' Ακραγαντιος

35 ευνυμον δε πατε[ρων αωτον ορθοπολιν καμοντες οι πολλα [θυμω ιερων ευχον οικημα []

40 πονταμου. Σικελιας [τ εσαυν

45 ὅφθαλμο[ν]α. αιόει δ εφε τε μοφον[ω]ος πλουτον τε και χα[ρ]ιων αγων γνησιοις επ αρεταις αλλ' οι Κρονιε παι Πεας

Col. ii (Fol. 1 recto).

[ἐν δικα τε και παρα δικαν] 75 [μετα κοραισι Ν]ηρεις
[ἀσοὶ τον ουδ' αν]  [ἀλαις βιοτον] αφθιτον
[Χρονος ο παντων πατηρ]  [Ἰνοι τεταχθαί] τον ο
[δυνατο θεμεν εργον τελος]  [λον αμφι χρονον ητοι
[λαθα δη ποτιμο σων ευδαιμονι γενοτ αν]  [βροτων γε κεκριται
ii.20 [εσλων γαρ υπο χαρματω]ν [περας ου τι θαν]γενος
[πημα θνακει παλιγκοτον δαμασθεν [ουδ ον αυκιχιμον] αμεραν
[οταν θεου Μοιρα] πεμπη [σπετα με τα ιμεραινεαν
[ανεκας ολθον υψηλον [ατειρε ιν απιγαθω
[εσταται δε λογος ευθροναις [τελευταιοιν]евν
[Καδμιοι κουραις] τις επαθον [ευμιμιαι]ν τε μετα και
[αι μεγαλα]πενθος δε [πονον ει αυθρας εβαν
[πετηται δε λογος ευθροναις [ουτω υπ Μοιρ] α τε πατρωιαν
[πανθε εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον [τονδ εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον
[πανθε εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον [τονδ εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον
[πανθε εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον [τονδ εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον
[πανθε εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον [τονδ εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον
[πανθε εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον [τονδ εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον
[πανθε εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον [τονδ εχει τον ευφρονα ποτμον

Col. iii (Fol. 2 recto).

5 lines lost

2nd hand εξ ὧν πολυκλειτων καθ Ellanav vi. 72

111 γενεσ Παμιδαν

ολθος αμ' εσπητον τιμωτες δο αρετας

es φανερον οδον [ερχονται τεκμαι

ρει χρημ' εκατον μωμος δε εξ

115 αλλων-κρεμαται φθονον[οντων
tois ois pote πρωτως περι; [δωδεκατον 75

δρομον ελαυνοντεσσιν α' ιδοια ποτι

γλωσσαί· ακονας λιγυρας

α μ' εθελοντα [προσήπει

cαλλιρασα[ϊν] πναις ματρομα[κ]
tωρ εμα Στυμφαλις ευανθης Μ[ε]τωπα

135 πλαξιππον ἀ [Θηβα]ν ετι

a kev τς εραι[εινο]ν υδωρ

πιοραι ανδρ[αιον] α]χρ[ατα]ϊ[σι πλεκων

ποικιλον υψον ο[τρικ]ον υνν ε[παιρουσ
PINDAR, OL. I, II, VI, VII

σταξὶ Χαρὶς εὐκλεὰ μορφ[α]ν
εὶ δ’ ετυμοὶ ὑπὸ Κυλλανας ὁρος
120 Ἀγγεία ματρωεὶς αὑδρείς
ναιεταοντες ἐδώρησαν θεῶν
καρυκα λ[ε]ιταίς θυσίαις
πολλα δὴ πολλασίν Εμμᾶς ευσέβειων
ος αγώνας εἴχε
125 μοιράν τ’ αέθλων Ἀρκαδιαν
τ’ εὐανορὰ τι
μάϊ· κίνως ὁ παι Σωστρατοῦν
α[ν]υ βρυγγοῦνου πατρὶ
κραίνει σεθεὶν ενυν]επι[εί]
130 δοξάν εξώ τιν’ επὶ

Ἀλεοϊ τε νυμφαν
Ῥοδον εὐθυμαχαν
135 ο[φρα] τελω[ρ]ιον αὐ[δρ]α παρ[ ]Ἀλφειῶ
στεφάνωσαμενον
[αισχων πυγας αποκα] και
[παρὰ Κασταλία]
140 [πατερα τε Δαμαγητον α]δοντα Δικά [ ]

7 lines lost
[νυν ζαλωτον ομοφρονος ευν]ας
[και εγω νεκταρ χυτων Μοισα] ν
160 [δοσιν αεθλοφοροις ]
[ανδρασιν πεμπον γυλκιν] κιρπον
[φρενος ιλακομαι]
[Ολυμπια Πυθοι τε νικογ]ν
[πεσον ο δ’ ολβιος ου ]
165 [φαμαι κατεχο]ν’ αγασθαι
[αλλοτε δ’ αλλον] εποπτευει Χαρις
[κοβαλμους α]βυμελει
[θαμα μεν φορ][μιγγε γαμφω]
[νουι τ εν εντε]σ[υν αν][lambda]
170 [και νυν υπ αμφωτερο]φων
[σων Διαγορα κατεβαν] Ποινοντιαι

7 lines lost
[υμνεων παιδ Αφροδιτας]
[Αελιοι τε νυμφαν ]
[Ροδον ευθυμαχαν ]
15
175 [οφρα πελωριον ανδρ]α παρ[ ]Ἀλφειω
[στεφάνωσαμενον]
[αισχων πυγας αποκα] και
[παρὰ Κασταλία]
180 [Άσιας ευρυχορου ]
[τριπολιν νασον πελ]ας
[εμβολω ναιον]ας Ἀργειας [σμυν α]ξιμα]
[εθελησω τοιαν] ξέ
[αρχας απο Τθαπολ]εμου
10 lines lost

8. The second ν of γυλκερεταν is corr. from ε: i.e. the scribe began to write γυλκερεταν, which is found in DN.

κεν: so ABE; all that remains is the tip of a vertical stroke, which would also be
reconcileable with τε, as proposed by Schr(oeder), but not with ἂνομαι, the reading of CDN.

9. ἡθν: this form is not certainly attested in Pindar; cf. 1604, II. 13, n.

10. αλλαί: so CE, Schr.; κλεισίων BADN.

11. αλλαί: so most MSS. rightly; αλλάν DE.

12-14. αλλαίντι: this passage is corrupt in the MSS., which all have ἄλλωσι against the metre, except V (ἐν δ'). The Byzantine correctors read ἐπ' ἄλλωσι, but Schr. conjectures ἀμφι ἦ.

17. σ' γε: σ' τε MSS., except V (om. τε). The scholl. remark ὅ νοσ' εἰγ' δι σ' ἔν τούτον τῶν χρόνων ... ἄλλωσι' ἄλλ' εἰγ' σ' τούτ. τ. χ. κτλ., from which it has been supposed that there was a reading σι δι. τε, which connects with τε in l. 19, seems preferable to γε, but may have arisen from the second τε.

18. ψώοι: so MSS. except D (ψούσ).

19. τε: δὲ DN. Cf. l. 17, n.

22. l. ἀκραγαστρίω. If ἀρματι, which is usually added by the MSS. after it, was written, the end of this line projected very considerably; but cf. l. 145.

24. θέοι: θέων EV.

25. τίν' ἡθν: τίνα δ' ἡθν AE against the metre.

32-3. ὅτι δικαιόν ἄνων: so MSS. (mostly ὅτι, but a few ὅτι). The second syllables of ὅτι and ἄνων ought to be long, and Schr. follows Hermann in reading ὅτι (= ὅτιδι) δικαιόν ἄνων. The division between the corresponding lines 68-9 comes a syllable earlier.

36. ὁρθοδοξίων: ὁρθότεστων against the metre ADN.

41. μέρας ἐσ' πλοῦτον: so MSS.; μ. ὅ πλοῦτον (Hermann) or μ. ἐπ' ἄλβων (Heyne) has been suggested on metrical grounds.

52-7. These lines are restored so as to correspond to ll. 89-94. The traces of the supposed ν in l. 57, which comes above the second α of δαμωθεν in l. 58, are very doubtful, and the first syllable of εἰσ(θ)λων, the reading of the MSS. in l. 57, is against the metre; there is also an uncertainty about l. 94; cf. n. ad loc. The reason for the assignment of all ll. 52-6 to Col. 2 is explained in int.

59. περιήγη: so most MSS., Schr.; περιήγη A.


65. o of [κρείσσων] is corr. from o.

66. μ of μεν is corr. εν has been omitted by mistake after it; cf. l. 169, n.

70. αἰα: l. αἰα.

70-1. φίλ[ε]ιτε μ' λοιςαι: a superfluous verse which was athetized by Aristophanes, but is found in all MSS. except those of Triclinius.

75. Νηρίως: so CE; Νηρίως ADBN; Νηρίος, required by the metre, occurs above the line in CDN.

79. [βροτον γε: γε, which is omitted by B, must have been written.

80. Considerations of space make the unmetrical form περας, found in all ancient MSS., more probable than περας, which was introduced by the Byzantine correctors.

82. ἄλλως: so BE; ἄλλων against the metre ACDN.

85. ἄλλοι: ἄλλως against the metre C'DN.

88. a τε πατρων: τι τε πατρών MSS., which is generally retained by edd., though Hermann conjectured άτε (or άτά) πατρών, and Mommsen ά το πατρών from the schol. κατέχε τῶν εὐφρονον πάσην ή τίχη καθάσει το πατρών κατέγευε. πατρων must be wrong, but two other scholia oύτω δέ έπι τούτων ... ή πατρική μοίρα κακὸν φέρει ... and oύτω δέ καὶ επί τούτων ... ή
πατρώια κακῶν ἡγεὶ Ῥώμα would be compatible with an ancient reading πατρωια, of which πατρωιαν might be a corruption, due to ἔσων at the end of the previous line. The last syllable of l. 88 can be either long or short. It seems, however, more likely that, as suggested by Lobel, the scribe has omitted an elision-mark and πατρώι ἄν was really meant, ἄν belonging to ἓχειν. ἀνέχειν ‘support’ is more suitable here than the simple verb; cf. πυ. ii. 89 θέων . . ὡς ἅνεις τότε μὲν τὰ κειών τότε ἀβίτ εὔροις ἥδωκεν μέγα κύδος and Ἕλειν. vii. 89 εἷς οὗτος καὶ θεὸς ἀνέχω, and κατέχειν in the schol. quoted above. πατρώι(a) would be an adverbial accusative or in apposition to τῶν ἐφθασεν πότεν. This reading is probably right.

89. 8-10 letters would be expected in the lacuna, where the ordinary reading of the MSS. gives 12, and perhaps there was an omission. εἰκι may well have been written; cf. l. 127.

92. αλλακχρώων: ἄλλος χρόνος Α.

93. Considerations of space favour the correct forms Λοῦν (i.e. Λόν) and μορφοῦ (α v. l. in the scholia and introduced by the Byzantines) against Λαῖον and μορφόμοι which are found in the MSS.

94. This line, if written, must have been rather cramped, for woς in l. 93 presents the appearance of belonging to the line immediately above τέλεσαν (l. 95).

95. τέλεσαν: so B rightly; τέλεσαν ACD; τέλεσα E; om. N.

112. αἰτός αἰτ: so ACD; ΑΦδος δ' ἄμ' the rest against the metre.

114. μέμοιοι δ' εἴ: 1614 may of course have omitted δ, which is found in the MSS., but was deleted by Boeckh on metrical grounds.

116. πρωτόν: so ACDDE, Schr.; πρῶτον BCN.

117-18. ποτείοτατον: so CD (-ζη), Schr.; ποτείοτατον ABE.

119. ὄρος: so Callierges (Rome, 1515), as is supposed, from the scholia (e.g. in D; cf. also Homer, B 603 ὑπὸ Κυλλήνης ὄροι αἴτω; ὄρος ABCE; ὄρος DE (lemmā); ὄρεων conj. Schr. The objection to ὄρος is that the second syllable is expected to be long here.

121. ἐδιδόσα: so AB2 rightly; ἐδιδόσα the rest.

126-7. τμαί: so MSS. except A (τμαί)

131. γλωσσαία: the accent ought to have been paroxytone. Editors generally place no stop after γλώσσα, explaining ἀκόνιν λεγουσά as a genitive of quality. The papyrus agrees with Boehmer, who connected ἀκόνιν with πνοάσα.

132. προ[τε]τε: so most MSS. and edd.; προτεῖντοι D; προσέλκει Triclinius.

133. κυλλήρουσαίνυ: the μ εὐθυμικά is wrong; cf. l. 142, n.

135-6. στεν: l. στεν. τος is merely an error.

142. ὀλάθητει: so ABD; l. ὀλάθεσαν with EN.

144. ὑπαί: ὑπάτε MSS.; ὑπαί Wilamowitz, objecting to the poet's address to his poem, and avoiding the three predicates without a connecting particle. The second letter of ὑπαί was not corrected, but the third was not σ originally, being corrected from a letter with a tail, probably ι or ρ.

146-7. Συρακοσσάναν: Συρακοσσάνα (BDE) is the form preferred by edd. The division of these lines does not correspond to that in ll. 110-11, where there are two more syllables in the earlier line.

149-50. Cf. ll. 113-14, where there is a syllable more in the earlier line.

150. On the omission of the end of Ode vii see int.

165. αγάθιτι: l. αγάθι.

167. That 1614 had ζωοφθαλμοῖς with most MSS. rather than ζωοφθαλμοῖς with CNO is not certain.

169. Considerations of space favour the insertion of ειν which is omitted by BDE before εντερκαίνυ.

170. The stop after μφοτεργαν is misplaced.

171. πανωστίαν: l. ταυ πανωστίαν with the MSS. The scholia mention a v. l. πανωσίας.

175. Ἀλφεως: so most MSS.; Ἀλφεως(α) A. Schr.
1815. Sophocles, Ajax.

4·2 × 3·9 cm. Fourth century. Plate IV (recto).

This small fragment from the middle of a leaf of a papyrus codex of Sophocles, containing the beginnings of ll. 694–705 and ends of 753–64 of the Ajax, was found with a number of other literary pieces which date from the third or fourth century. The writing is a small sloping uncial with a tendency to cursive forms and to exaggeration of the final letter of a line, and there is little doubt that it belongs to the fourth century, probably to the earlier half of it. Breathings, accents, marks of elision and quantity, and high stops were freely inserted by the scribe himself. The circumstance that this is the first papyrus fragment of the Ajax to be discovered gives it a certain interest, but it is too short to be of very serious value. A new variant in l. 699, which has apparently left a trace in Suidas, is likely to be right, as is another new reading in l. 756, and the quality of this text seems to have been distinctly high. The division of lines in the choric passage is the same as that in the Laurentianus (L).

Recto,

695 ὃ Πᾶν Πᾶν [Πᾶν
λάνιας χισσοκτυποῦ
πετραίας [ἀπὸ δείραδος φανῆθ᾽ ὡ
θεῶν χοροποι ονακος ὀπο ὦ
Μύσια Κυνοσι ὀρχηματ αὐτοῦ

700 ξύναν ᾧ[αφῆς
νν νῦν γὰρ εμοί μελεί χορευσαί
İκαρίων [ὁ ὑπὲρ πέλαγενων
μόλων [αναξ Ἀπόλλων
ὁ Δάλιος [ἐγνωστός

705 εμοὶ ξύνειη διὰ παντὸς εὐφρῶν

Verso.

753 [εἰρέαι κατ ημαρ τομμαφάν]ς [το νῦν τοιε
[Διανθ ύπο σκῆραιτι μηδ] ἀφ᾽ ἐντ᾽ εᾶν
755 [εἰ ξόντ εκεῖνον εἰς ιδίαν ὥθειθο ποτὲ·
[ελα γαρ αὐτον την ἑθ ἦ] ἡμεραν μονήν·
[διὰς Αθάνατο μηνίς ὦ] εφὶ λέγουν.
1615. SOPHOCLES, AJAX

[ta gar perissos kanonvix]a swymata
[piniten bapraiys prose vreov dwnstrapiavis]

760 [efasx o mantis ostis aiv]ropon fusi
[blaston epeita mi kat] anatropo[on] aironp:
[keinos & ap oiky euyv]{x|y}orormwenos
[ainous kalos legyontos] eurethi patros:
[o mev gar aitov ennepeiv te]x[ioyn]y dory

699. Nysia: Nysia MSS., a reading which seemed appropriate enough in view of the close connexion between Pan and Dionysus. But, as was observed by Mr. A. C. Pearson, Nysia is probably right. Pan was the cult-companion of the Mother of the gods (Schol. Pind. Py. iii. 137), and in Strabo 466 the Curetes are connected with ierouergias... peri te tyn tou dido pайдosofian tyn en Krptih kai tov tis mpyrov ton theou drynemnov en tyn Frygih kai tov peri tyn 1dovn tyn Trokhn stonov. The region of Trojan Ida was in Mysia (Jebb on Ai. 720), and Knossia in l. 699 is no doubt rightly referred to the Curetes. In the scholia on l. 699 as quoted by Suidas s.v. Nysia is the following note: Nysia: dyrkmatos eidos, twn gar dyrx- seon h mno Berekyniak legeta, h de Kryptih, h de Parikh (1. h k parikh with L). Nysia ein tata Berekynia: Nysias gar eitei h Berekyniak, Knosia de h Kryptih, en Nysia gar kai Kynosv ipmelos h dyrkhas. Nysia there has been corrected to Nosa, but in the light of 1615 Nysia and Nysias are to be corrected to Nysia and Noxias, for what has Nysa to do with the Berecynthia Mother? If Nysa and Dionysus are got rid of, everything fits together, and Sophocles is brought into line with Strabo; cf. also Virg. Aen. ix. 619 buxus... Bere- cyntia Matriis Idaeae, and Lucr. ii. 611 sqq. Idaeam vocitant Matrem, etc., the Curetes being mentioned in l. 633.

754. ad'etp: the supposed elision-mark and breathing are uncertain.
755. deth: so L; dethi the recentiores.
756. tyn di e8] hemarou monyn: or tyn e8] hemarou L; tyn e8] hemarou the recentiores; some editors, objecting to the crisis of ty hemar in Tragedy, write tyn e8] hemarou or tyn e8] hemarou: tyn e8] hemarou Jebb. The accusative is quite as good as the dative, but whether the scribe understood the passage is doubtful, for no stop is required after monyn.
759. bapraiys prose vreov dwnstrapiavis: so MSS.: but whether the supposed traces of w are really ink is not quite certain, especially as the preceding a is rather large, so that baprai... dwnstrapiav may possibly have been the reading, at any rate originally.
761. aironp: so originally L, corr. by a later hand to aironi, the reading of the recentiores. Jebb prefers aironp.

1616. EURIPIDES, Orestes.

4.2 x 7.8 cm.  
Fifth century.

A fragment from the middle of a leaf of a codex of Euripides, containing parts of Orestes 53-61 and 89-97, written on thin vellum with brown ink in a round calligraphic uncial hand of probably the fifth century. Elision-marks and high stops at the ends of lines are probably due to the first hand: a corrector, who used black ink, has altered the reading in ll. 60 and 91 and added occasional
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

accents and stops (in l. 56 in the middle position). This is the fifth fragment of the Orestes which has been obtained from Egypt; cf. 1370. int. It is too short to have much bearing on the divergences of the MSS., but has a new reading which may be right in l. 61. The verso is in much worse condition than the recto. 1623 was found with 1616.

Recto.

53 [ηκει γαρ] [ε]σ γην Μενελεως Τροιας απο
[λιμένια] δε Νάυπλιειον εκπληρων πλατη

55 [α]κταισιν ορμει δαρον εκ [Τροιας χρονον
[δ]ιασι πλαγγεις· την δε δη πολυστον
Ελευνην φυλαξας νυκτα μη [τις εισιδων
μεθ' ημεραν στειχουσαν [ων νπ Ιλιω
πα[δε]ς τεθνασιν εις πειρων ελθη βολας

60 [πρ]ουπεμψεν εις δωμ' ημετερον εστιν δ εσο
[κλαιουσ] α]δελφην συμφορας τε δωματων

Verso.

89 [εξ ωτερ αυμ ηναθειαν κατ]ηνη[σεν

90 [ω μελεος η τεκουσα θ] ας διωλ]ετο·
[ουτως ε]χει ταδ οτοι] απειρηκεν κακοις·
[προς θεων πιθοι] αν δητα μοι τι παρθενε·
[ως ασχολος] γε συγγο]ποιο προσεθρια·
[θωλει ταφον μοι] προς καισινητης μολ[ε]υν

95 [μπρο]ς καιειεις] της εμης τινος χαι[ν
[κομης] απαρχας κα] γραφαις φερουσα εμας
[σοι δ ουχι] θεμιτον προς φιλα[ων] στειχε[ειν ταφον

53. [ε]ς: is edd., as in l. 59 and 60.
58. The supposed accent on στειχουσαν is somewhat uncertain, being really over the χ: but in l. 59 the accent on πειρω (which is also not quite certain) is above the τ.
59. πειρων: πειρων Cod. Parisinum 2713; πειρων other MSS.; πειρων edd. Cf. l. 58, n. Whether 1616 had ελθη with most MSS. or ελθω with Vat. is of course uncertain.
61. συμφορας: συμφοραν MSS. Cf. int.
91. The first hand may have written 3 letters where ηκ was substituted by the corrector. The MSS. vary between ἀπειρηκεν (so 1616 corr., the Marcianus and edd.), ἀπειρηκα, and ἀπειρηκεν ευ, but the original reading here seems to have been different.
97. φιλα[ων]: the MSS. vary between φιλον and φιλων: φιλων edd. φιλων suits the size of the lacuna here better than ο.
1617. ARISTOPHANES, PLUTUS

1617. Aristophanes, Plutus.

Part of a sheet containing two leaves of a papyrus codex of Aristophanes, one of which has most of the first 60 lines of the Plutus, a play not hitherto represented in papyri, while of the other leaf only a small fragment is preserved, which is insufficient for purposes of identification. The script is a mixture of uncial and cursive in a style resembling that of 1599, but somewhat later in date, and probably belongs to the fifth century, like most of the extant fragments of Aristophanes upon papyrus. The breathings and most of the accents, which are fairly numerous, are by the original scribe, who used brown ink; but some accents were added in black ink, presumably by a different person. The stops, consisting of double dots marking a change of speaker or single high points, are, except at the end of l. 35, by the first hand, as are probably the name of the speaker against l. 22, the glosses on ll. 34, 39, and 51, the iotas adscript, which were usually omitted in the first instance, and all the corrections except perhaps that in l. 13 and the correction or gloss in l. 17. An omission of two lines after l. 19 seems to have been made good by an addition at the bottom.

The corrected text is fairly accurate, and shows the same tendency as that observable to a marked degree in 1374 (Wasps) to support the Venetus (ll. 17, 22, 32, 33, 40) rather than the Ravennas (ll. 38, 43, 51, but all points of minor importance). In two places (ll. 4 and 50) it agrees with the Parisinus (A) against both R and V. The only new variant occurs in l. 49, τῶθ for τῶθ', which makes no difference to the sense. The difficulties in ll. 17, 46, and 48 are not affected, the reading of the MSS. being apparently confirmed in each case. The circumstance that the Plutus begins at the top of a page suggests that this play was the first of the codex, as in R and V; the same argument applied to 1371–4 made the Clouds the first play of that collection; cf. 1371. int.
os thespoioudai trpodoi ek xov[sqhlatov

10 meypyn dikaian mephoimai t[autin oti
iatroso on kai mahtis ws fashin [sofos

γ
melaixholon apsepmeyen μ[ν toun thestophn

ostis aklylothei ka[i][i]th[τ][a] an[vrapon tuflon
[ounanion dron η] prsθik autw [poiein

15 [oi yap bpleontes] tous tuflous [g]onoθeia
[utos δ akoloubheie k]amε prsob[α]zetai

] [i
kai taut ἀποκρινομενον to par[απαν oude yφv
eg[υ] muv ouv ouk] esd ὀπ[ως ανήγορομαι

19 T[η] η[υ] fφaθης o [t] τωδ akoloubthome potot

22 xpm μα Di' all afe[λ]ov των σ推荐阅读ν ην λυπης τι με

[ινα μαλλον [α]λγης] η[υ]ROS ou yap πανσομαι

πριν αν φρασης μοι της ποτε εστιν ουτος

35 [eunous yap ων] σοι [πυθανομαι παν uφοδρα
6 lines lost

Fol. 1 verso.

32 [epeperhso]menos onv enxamvn ws ton theon

[ton emov] μεν αυτω του ταλεπτωρον σχεδου

[ηθη νυμ[ι]αυν] ektepdo[ν]σθαι bion:

35 [ton d] υν] δπστρ ων μονος μοι τυχανεi

[pesosme]νος ει χρη μεταβαλοντα του[ς] τροπους

[ienai pανουργον] adiko[υ]ν υγεις μηδε εν

[ws το τριω του] autο νομισασ συμφερειν:

40 [ti dheta Φο]jsios elαkei ek των στεμματων:

[pesosi σαφι]ov yap δ theos eispe moi tadi:

[stov xvnai]t[η]σεμι πρωτων εξιων

[ekelwse to]υτου μη μεθιερθαι μι' [ημι] έτι

[pieidei δ] εμαυτω εξινακολουθειν οικαζε[ι]

[kai to xvn] ανταις δ[ή]τα πρωτωι; του[τ]ωι:
1617. ARISTOPHANES, PLUTUS

45 [εἰς οὐ ἐξεις τὴν επὶ(νοιαν τοῦ θεοῦ)
[φραξούσα]ά ν δ' σκαίντατε σοι σαφεστάτα
[ασκειν τον] ύμνν τον επὶ(χωρίον τροπόν
[τω] τουτο κρίνειεις; δηλ[α]ν στις καὶ τυφλῶν
tαυθὲ
50 [το µῆθες ασ]κείν υ[γίεις εν τω νυν] χρόνων;
[οὐκ εἰσθ] οπως ο] χρησιμος εἰς τοιτο ρέπει ψηφίστω
[αλλ' εἰς ετερν] τι[ς] με[ζον]; 
[ην δ' ημιν φράση]
[οστις ποτ εστιν ο]υτοσι καὶ τ[ι]ον χαριν
[και του δεοµενος] νηλθε µετ]'α νοιν εφ[θαδε
ημων
55 [πυθοµεθ] αν του χρῆσιμον ο τι [νοει
[αγε δη αν ποτερν σαυτον οστ]ις ει] φρασεις

4 lines lost

Fol. 2 verso.
11 lines lost

72 α [ 100 ]
17 lines lost

Fol. 2 recto.
10 lines lost

17 lines lost

4. ταυτὰ: the accent is due to the corrector. ταυτὰ A; α' αυτὰ U; ταυτὰ RV.
12. απέπεμψε: I. απέπεμψε.
17. αποκρισοµενον: or αποκρισµοµενον, which is equally difficult; αποκρισµοµένον R; αποκρισµοµένον VAU; αποκρισµοµένος Bentley. The interlinear writing does not seem to refer to the termination of the word and may be a gloss, as in l. 39; but it is not certain that anything was written before αν, and, as Dr. R. T. Elliott remarks, αν may be merely a variation of spelling of ε; cf. ll. 33, 41.
19. The partly obliterated sign against this line seems to be distinct from the abbreviation of χρῆσιµον (οιος) immediately below and to refer to the omission of οι. 20-1, which were presumably supplied in the lower margin.
22. αφε[λ]ιον: so VAU; R. adds γε.
33. τοῦ: so VAU; om. R.
34 marg. Similar but not verbally corresponding notes on εκπεφειόθαι occur in the extant scholia.
37. There was possibly a stop (one or even two dots) after εν, but none is required.
38. αντα: so RAU (αντά): αντάι cor. from ανταί (?) V.
συμφερέων: so RV; ἰσοµφ. AU. Cf. l. 43, n.
39. εἰςεν is an explanation of ελακέν, not a variant. Double dots are expected at the end of the line, and perhaps the lower one has been effaced.
40. τοίς; so V; τοίς RAU.

42. Whether the papyrus had εκθέσει with VAU or εκθέσει with R is uncertain.

43. ξινακολοινθείν : so RAU; συνεκ. V. Cf. l. 38, n.

45. ξινακολοινθείν : so RV; ξινακοινθείν AU.

46. φραζουσαίν : so MSS.; φραζουσαίν Cobet. The traces of the last letter suit v, but not r.

48. τυφλὸν : so MSS.; τυφλὸν Hemsterhuys. The reading of the vestiges is very uncertain, and possibly there was a stop at the end of the line.

49. ταυθ : ταυθ' MSS. ταυθ' would be more likely to become ταιθ' in view of the following συμφέρων than vice versa.

50. χρῶνον : so AU; θλω R; έτει (with γ, γάνει καί χύνων in the marg.) V.

51. μί : so RAU; τί V.

51 marg. For φερέται (a note on ρητει) cf. Schol. Junct. φέρεται, ἀπαθήτει ετλ. But the vestiges are very doubtful.

52. μέρον : R also marks a change of speaker here, assigning ἦν δ' ἡμών κτλ. to θερ(άμων), i.e. Καρίων, and l. 56 originally to Χρ(μίλιος).

1618. THEOCRITUS, Idyls v, vii, xv.

Fr. 7 24.4 x 24 cm. Fifth century. Plate IV (Col. x).

These fragments of a papyrus codex of Theocritus, originally about 40 in number, combined with the exception of a few minute scraps, which are not printed, to form parts of four leaves, of which two containing Id. v. 53–end and vii. 1–13 are successive, and a third (vii. 68–117) is only separated from the second by an interval of one leaf, while the fourth (xv. 38–110) may have come much later. A narrow selis of the third leaf (Cols. vii–viii) was joined so that the verso corresponds to the recto of the rest of the leaf. All the leaves are much damaged, especially the first, of which the recto is barely legible anywhere owing to the discolouration of the papyrus, and the second, which is in almost the last stage of decay, so that decipherment is sometimes precarious. The script is a good-sized somewhat irregular uncial with a tendency to cursive forms, especially in a and λ, and resembles the Cairo Menander Plates D and E and 1865 (Oedipus Tyrannus; Part xi, Plate vii): it most probably belongs to the fifth century rather than the early part of the sixth. Iota adscript was generally omitted. The height of the column varies from 32 lines in Col. ix to 25 in Cols. vii–viii. The first hand was responsible for a few corrections, for the marks of elision throughout, and in Id. vii for a number of accents and breathings, besides a breathing in v. 114. Elsewhere in Id. vii, i.e. in Col. viii frequently and more sparsely in Cols. iv and vii, accents and breathings were inserted by a corrector, who was not appreciably later than the first hand and revised Id. v and vii (not always very intelligently; cf. vii. 101, n.), but apparently not xv, altering a number of readings and adding a few interlinear glosses (vii. 110) and stops (vii. 77).
The published fragments of Theocritus from Egypt have hitherto been very
exiguous, being limited to 694, which contains parts of xiii. 19–34 (2nd cent.),
some tiny vellum scraps of Id. i, iv, v, xiii, xv, xvi, xxii (Wessely, Wiener Stud.
1886, 220 sqq. and Mittheil. Pap. Rain. ii. 78 sqq.; 5th or 6th cent.), and of xi and
xiv (Berliner Klassikertexte v. 1, p. 55; 7th? cent.), and a small piece of scholia on
v. 38-49 (op. cit. v. 1, p. 56; 1st or 2nd cent.), all of them being practically
worthless. Hence, pending the publication of the nearly contemporary and very
much longer fragments of a Theocritus codex found by Johnson at Antinoë, 1618
is in spite of its lamentable condition the first papyrus contribution of any
value for the text of that author. The Greek Bucolic poets are thought to
have been collected two centuries after Theocritus by Artemidorus, whose son
Theon edited Theocritus alone with a commentary. Additions to the collection
were made by other grammarians down to the second century, and in the fifth and
sixth centuries the Bucolic poets were much studied, but afterwards they suffered
a long period of neglect. When in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries MSS. of
them make their appearance, the collection of Artemidorus had been reduced to
a nucleus of poems of Theocritus (Id. i, iii–xiii) accompanied by varying additions.
The leading position in the MSS. is assigned to K (13th cent.), which contains
Id. i, vii, iii–vi, viii–xiv, ii, xv, xvii, xvi. . . . Other important MSS. or groups of
MSS. are (1) B, a lost codex which was the basis of the edition of Callierges
and the Juntine (both 1516), and apparently had i–xvii in nearly the same order as K;
(2) PQT (all 14th cent.), which have the order i, v, vi, iv, vii, iii, viii–xiii, xv, xiv,
ii . . . ; (3) H (13th–14th cent.) with the order i–xv, xviii . . . ; S (14th cent.)
with the order i–xiv, ἐπιτάφιος Βιώρος, xv–xviii; (4) M (13th cent.), considered to
be the second-best MS. for the earlier poems, with the order i–xvii; (5) V (late
14th cent.) and Triclinius (c. 1300) with the same order as PQT up to xiii,
followed by ii, xiv, xv . . . ; (6) AEU (all 14th cent.) with the order i–xviii; (7)
O (12th cent.; the oldest MS., but still imperfectly collated) containing only
v. 62–viii, allied to AE. In Id. xv, where the divergences of the MSS. are much
greater than in v and vii, L (14th cent.), containing v. 55–xv . . . but imperfectly
collated in the earlier poems, supports V Tricl.

1618, as would be expected from its comparatively late date, does not present
a very correct text; cf. 1614. Apart from the usual difficulties arising out of the
dialect and minor errors such as μερ’ for μεγ’ in vii. 100, ωστ’ for ωστ’ in vii. 103, συ
for ου in xv. 54, αυτας for αυτα or αυτα in xv. 67, more serious corruptions occur
in vii. 73 τα Ξανθα for τας Ξανθας, xv. 99 φθεγξει [τι] σφ’ for φθεγξεια τι σφ’. In v
1618 tends to support K against M (ll. 111, 115–16, 118, 148; 57 and 146 are
doubtful); but in vii the opposite tendency is just as noticeable (ll. 79, 90, 109;
against ll. 81–2, 85, 112), and in general the eclecticism of the papyrus is evident.
In v and vii new readings are rare, being confined to vii. 75 αὐτ’ ἐφόντω for αὐτὲν ἐφόντει and vii. 112 Ἑβρῷ πάρ ποταμῷ for Ἑβρῶν πάρ ποταμῶν (both easier than the reading of the MSS.), and vii. 92 ἐὰν δ’ ἰδοὺ for ἐὰν ἰδοῖ, which makes no difference to the sense. The difficulties in v. 118 and 145 recur, though in v. 116, where all the MSS. except S have gone astray, 1618 has the right reading. In xv, however, where the text of Theocritus is in a much more unsettled condition, there are several novelties of importance. Chief of these is [πέρῳ]σω in l. 98, confirming a generally accepted conjecture of Reiske for the corrupt σπέρῳν or πέρῃν of the MSS. Other valuable readings are ὀχλοι ἀλαθέως in l. 72, which seems to account for the variants of the MSS., and ὁ κύν Ἀχέροντι ἔπειθεσι which removes a difficulty in l. 86; but in l. 38 κατεφύεσε does not solve the problem of that corrupt passage. μὴ ἀποπλαγχθῆσαι for μὴ τι πλανηθῆσαι in l. 67 is also attractive, and ἔθει for ἐτ’ τι in l. 70 may be right, as possibly λαλέεσαι for λαλεῖμεσι in l. 92. Considering the fragmentary condition of Cols. ix–x, the gains are not inconsiderable, and 1618 as a whole is an interesting specimen of a text which stands apart from the existing families of MSS. and seems to have been at least as good as that of K. That in the later poems, from xiv onwards, the condition of the text has suffered considerably since the fifth century is now probable, but the earlier poems do not seem to have undergone much change between the fifth and thirteenth centuries. On this subject, however, much fresh light may be expected from the Antinoë papyrus, which does not overlap 1618, and consists largely of the later poems.

With regard to the order of the Ἰδύλλων, the placing of vii immediately after v is without parallel in the later MSS., but the arrangement in the contemporary vellum fragments published by Wessely, in which v followed iv and xxii followed xiii, xv being also represented, was possibly identical. The occurrence of fragments of xv in conjunction with v and vii suggests that xv occupied an earlier position than usual, but the absence of revision in xv supports the natural presumption that this poem followed, not preceded, v and vii, whether the interval was large or small.

Col. i (Frs. 1–2 recto).

v. 53 [στασω δε κρατηρα μεγαν λεικου χαλιατοσ
[ταις Νυμφαις στασω δε και οδο]ις αλλον ελαιω
55 [αι δε και και τι μολης απαλαν πτεριν οδε πατησεις
[και γαλαχων ανθευσαν ντεσαςεται δε χιμαιραν
[δερμα ταν παρα τιν μαλακτερα πολλακις αρνων
[στασω δ οκτω μεν γαυλως τω Πανι γαλακτοσ
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[σκαφίδας μελίτος πλεα κηρ]ι' εχουσας
60 [αυτοθε μοι ποτερισθε και αυτοθε βουκο]μισθεν
[ταν σαυτω πατεων εχε τας δρυας αλλα τ]ις αμμε
[tis κρινει αιδ ενδοι ποθ ο βουκολος ωδη] Δυκωσας
[ουδεν εγω τηνω ποτερισθομαι αλλα τον ανδρα]
[αι λης τον δρυτομον βωστρησομεν ος τας ερεπικας
65 [τηνας τας παρα τιν ξυλοχιζεται εστι δε Μορσων]
15 lines lost

Col. ii (Frs. 1–2 verso).

81 Δαφνιν εγόδε ους αντιφροι δυο πραν ποκ εθυσα
και γαρ ειμ Ωπολλον [φιλει μεγα και καλον αυτω]
[κρι]ου εγω βοσκω [τα δε Καρνεια και δη εφερει
πλαν δυο τας λοιπας διδυματος αιγας α]μελγω
85 και μις παϊς πιθορευσα ταλαν λεγει αυτος] αμελγεις
φεν φεν Δακα[ν τι ταλαρος σχεδον εικατι πληροι
τυρο και τον [αιηθον εν ανθεσα παιδα μολυνε
βαλλει και μαλλοισι τον αιπολον α Κλεαριστα
τας αιγας πα]βελωντα και αδυ τι ποτηριασθει
90 κημε [γαρ ο Κρατιδας τον ποιμενα λειος υπαντων]
εκμα]αι λιπαρα δε παρ αυχενα σειετ εθερα,
[αλλωυ συ]μβλητ εστι κυνοσβατος ουδ ανεμωνα
προς ρ]οδα των ανδρα παρ αμασιασει πεφυκει
15 lines lost

Col. iii (Frs. 3–6 recto).

1 line lost

110 τοι τεττιγείος οξητε τον αιπολον ως ερεθιζω
[ουτως χυμες θην ερεθισθει τος καλαιμενα]
[μισεω τας δασυκερκος αλωπεκας αι τα Μικωνος]
γης
[αιει φοιτοσαι τα ποιθεσερα ραδοντι]
[κας] γαρ εγω μισεω τως καν]βικος οι τα Φιλωνδα
115 [συ]σα κατατρυγοντες υπανεμιοι φορευονται
[η ου μεμνηι ότι εγων τι κατηλασα και τι σεσαρως]
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[en] ποτεκλήθεν καὶ τας δρύοις ἡχεο πηγας
touto mev ou mevnav' o)ka man poika teide tu δησας
Εμφαρας εκάθερε καλ[ωs μαλ]α touto γ' ισαμι

v. 120 [ηδη] τις Μορσ[ωn π]ικρα[ινεται η ουχι παραισθευ
[σκιλλ]ας ιον γραιας απο σαματος αυτικα τιλλειν
κηγω μαν κυ]ειζω Μορσων τιμα κα τυν δε λευσε[εις
4 lines lost

127 [α πα]i]s αρ[θ υδατος τα καλπιδι κηρια βαψαι
[ται με]υ εμαι κυτισον τε και αιγιλον αιγες εθουντι
και σιχοιον π[ατεοντι και εν κομαροια κεοντι
130 [ταις δ]ε εμαις [ιεςαει παρετι μεν α μελιτεια
[φε]μβεσθαι [πολλος δε και ως ροδα κισθος επανθει
[ου]εραμ' Α[λκιτπας οτι με πραιν ουκ εφιλησε
[των]ων οτων καθελοισ οκα οι ταν φασταν εθωκα
αλλ εγω Ευμηθευσ εραμαι μεγα και γαρ οκ αυτω
135 ταν συργηγ [ωρ]ηεξα καλον τι με καρτ εφιλησεν
ου θεμιτον Α[κων ποτ θηονα κισαν ερισθειν
ουδ εποπας κικνοιτι τυ δ ω ταλαν επαι φιλεχησ

Col. iv (Frs. 3–6 verso).
1 line lost
[δωρειται Μορσων ταν αμινα δαι και τυ] δε θυ[ς]
140 [τα]ις Νυμφαις Μορσωνι κα]λον κρα[α αυτικα πεμψον
[κατω Α]κωνος τ[ω] ποιμενοι οττι ποη[η]η
[αιν]ισμαν τον αμην εο φωραν [υμην] αλευμαι
145 αιγες εμαι [θαρσηει]ς κερουχιδες αυριδον νμε
πρας εγο λου]σα] Συβαριτιδος ενδοθε[ις] λυμινας
τας Νυμφαις [ταν αμην ο δ αυ παλιν αλλα] γενομε[ια
150 αι μη τιν φλαςαμαι Μελ[ανθιος αμτι Κοματα]α
... ... ...
(sic)

3 lines lost
vii. 4 [κ Αντιγένης δυο τεκνα Δυνατέος ει τε πε]ρ [ε]φι[λον
5 [χαον των ετ ανοθεν απο Κλωτιας τε] και αυτω [7]
6 [Χαλκωνος Βορυναν ος εκ ποδος ανυ] κραναγ
7 [ευ γε ενερειαμενοι πετρα γονι ται] δε παρ αυταν
6 [Χαλκωνος Βορυναν ος εκ ποδος ανυ κραναγ [8]
8 [αγειριν πεδε]αι τε ευσκυγιον αλσος εφαιµιον
[χλωροισι]ν πεταλοισι κατηρεσεω κορµ]ωσαι
10 [κουπω] ταιν [μεσαται οδον ανµεσε ουδε το σαιµα
[αµιν το Β]ρασ[λα κατεραινετο και το]ν οδιταν
[ερθθαιαν αυ]ν[M]οισαι Κυδωνικου ευφρµιες άνδρα
ουµ[οµα] µε[ν Λυκιδαι ης θ αιπολος ουδε] κε τις µιν

Cols. v–vi lost

Col. vii (Fr. 7 recto).

68 [κυνα τ]α άσφοδελιον τε πολυγυµνητω τε σελινω
[και πιο]µ[α]λακας µεµυμ]ενοις Λυγνικοτας
70 [αυταις]ν κυλικ[ε]ςι και εις τρυγη]α χειλος ερειδων
[εις δε] Λυκοπιτας [ο] δε Τητυρος εγγυθην αιςει
[ως πο]κα τα Σανις γράσατο [Αλφιης ο βον]τας
[χωσ] ροσ αµφ οποιειτο και ως δρυς αυτον εβρην]ευη
75 [I]µε[ρα αιη] εφυτο]ν παρ ωρθαιαιν ποταιναι
[εν τε] χων ως τις κατεκατο µακρην υφ Αιρη[ον
η] Αθων η Ροδωπαν η] Καυκασου εσχατω[ν]τα
[ως δε] ως ποκ [ε]θεκτο τον αιπολον ευµερι λαρνας
[ζων ενται κακ[α]ςων ατασθαλισων ανακτος
80 ως τε ων αι σιµαι λειμωνδε φερθων ισαια
[κεδρον εις αδειαι] [µα]λακως ανθεσει µελισαι
[οι
ουικη γυ]λικη] Μοισια] κατα [στουµατος χεε νεκταρ
[ω] µακρωτε Κοµατα τυ θην τα]δε τερπνα]ν τεσπονθεις
[κα]ν τυ κατεκλασθης εις λα[ρ]µακα και τυ µελισσαι
85 [κηρια] φερθωμενοι ετος [ωρ]α]ν εξεσπονησας
[αιθ επ]] εμοι ζωοις οναρι[θ]µιοι ωθελες ηµεν
[ως τοι εγ]ων ενομενον αν ώρεα τας καλας αιγας
[ϕωνας εἰςαίων τυ δ' υπο δρυσιν η' υπο πενκαίς
vii. 90 [χω μεν] τοσο' εἰπὼν απεπαύσατο [τον δ'] μ[ε]τ] αἰθήσ
[κηγών τ]μι εφο'μα'ν τυκήδα φίλε πολλα [μ]εν αλ[λα
[Νυμφ]αι κη' εδίδιαζα'ν εν ὀφεῖςι βουκ][ο]λ[ε]ουτα

Col. viii (Fr. 7 verso).

[αλα τον εκ] πα[ι]ν[τ]ων μέγ' υπεροχον οττι γ' αείδειν
95 [αρβεμ]
Σιμιχιδαι [μεν] Ερωτε επέπαρον. ἤ γαρ [ο] δεῖος
[τοσο]ν [ερα Μ'] τροτους [ο]σον] ε'αρος αίγες εραν'τι
Αρατος δ' [τα] πάντα φιλαιτατος ανεπ' τήνω
παιδος υπο σπλάχνουσιν εχει πόθουν οίδεν [Αριστ]
100 εσθλος αν' η μετ' αριστος δν ουδε' κεν αυτος αείδειν
Φοίβος σων φόρμυγιν παρα τριπόδεσοι μεγάροι
ως εκ παιδος Αρατος υπ οστην αθη' ετ' ἔροτι
τον μοι Παν Ομώλας ερατόν [π]έδον ὡστε λέογχας
ἀκήτων κε[ιν]ο]ν φίλας εφ' α]εράς ερείσαις
105 ειτ' εστ' αρα Φιλίνος δ' μαλ[θ]ακός είτε τις αλλος
κει μεν ταϊθ' ἔρδοις ο[π]αν] φίλη· μη τι σν παιδες
Αρκαδίκοι σκίλλα[ε]ιν υπο πλευρας τε και ομ[ου]ς
[π]ανίκα μαστίζοιεν οτε κρέα τυτ[ά]παρείη []
ε δ' ἄλλως νευταίς κατα μεν χρόνα παντ' [ον]υχεσσι
εγ ακαλήφαις
110 δακνύμενος κρα[σαιο] και εν κνίδαιαι [καθενδοιο
πετρα[υν] Βλεμύων θεν ουκετι Νε[ι]λος ορατος
115 μμαεις δ' Τητιδοις και Βυβλιδος αδ' λιστοντει

Some columns lost
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Col. ix (Frs. 8–16 recto).

xv. 38 [αλλα κατα γ]νωμαν απ[εβα τοι τ]ο]ντο κατειπ[ες]
[tομ]πεχ[ο]νον φερε μοι κ[αι ταν] θολιαν κατα [κοσμον]
[δα]κρε] [α][στα θελεις χωλον [δ] ου διε τυ χειν]εσθαι
[ταν κυν' ε]σω καλεσον τι[αν αυλειαν] αποκλαξον
[εξ' ο] εν αθανατοις ο τεκνων ουδεις κακοεργος]
3 lines lost

51 [α]διστα [Γ]οργοι τι γενομεθα τοι πολεμισται
[ιππο] [ο]ι τ[ω] β[ασιλης ανερ φιλε] μη με πατησης
[ο]ρ[δος α]νατ[ια] ο πυρρος ιδ ος αγριος κυνοθαρσης
α]
Ευνυ συ φευ[ν]η διαχρηςεται τον αγοντα

55 ωνα[θ]ην μι[γαλωσ στι μοι τ]ο βρεφος μενε ειδον
θαρσηι Πραξινοα και δη γεγενημεθ οπισθεν
τοι δ [εβαν ε] χοραν κα]ντα συναγερομαι ηθη
1 line lost


εμαρε]ς εις Τροιαν περισομε[να η]θ]βον Αχαιοι
[κα]λισται παιδων περιαι θην παντα] τελειαι
[χρη]μοιας α περεβυτισ αποιχε]το θεο[π]ιγασα

[θεσπειος Γ]οργοι δος] ταν χερα μ[οι λα]βε και τυ
[Ευνοα Ευτυχιοσ πο]ι]ε' αυτας μη [α]ποπλαχθης
[πασαι αμ ειςεθομε]σ] απριξ εχευ Ε[υ]νοα αρων
[οιμοι δει]λαια διχα μεν] το θεριστριον η[θ]ή
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Col. x (Frs. 8-16 verso). Plate iv.


80 [το] γη] Αθηναια ποιαι σφ επονασαν εριδοι

3 lines lost

[αυτος δ] ως θατος επ αργυρεασ κατακειται


100 δεσπουν] [τι] Γολυος] τε και Ιδαλιον εφιλεσας

v. 53. The vestiges of ll. 53, 56, 58, 60-2, and 65 are too slight to give a real clue.

57. πολάκες: so KHΠΑΛ (and O according to Wilamowitz, who, however, elsewhere states that this MS. begins at I. 62); τεράκες MPQTH. There are fairly distinct traces of λ, but possibly it was corrected from ο or to ρ by the first hand.

87. τερω: the ω seems to have been corrected from ων.
111. χόμησ: so K; κ' ὀμησο or χ' ὀμησο the rest.
ep'εδαπτεί: so most MSS.; ἐπ'εδαπτεῖ KMP.
114. εγώ: so MSS.; ἐγώ eod. since Brunck. Cf. l. 116, where 1168 has ἐγώ, but
most MSS. and eod. ἐγώ.
115. φορέουσαι: so KOKAI; ποτεύουσαι MPQT, v.l. in schol.
116. [η η] v. η is omitted by OPTQ' Tricl., but must have been written here.
[με]μηστ: so KP (μεμυστ) according to Hiller; but according to Wilamowitz KP have
μεμιστ like MHA'E, others reading μεμυστ'.
ος: so MSS.; δε' Tricl., eodd. For ἐγώ cf. l. 114, n.
117. ηχεο: l. ειχεο.
118. μαν ποκα: so K γρ. (δια μαν ποκα τιν του δησατ) Μ'PQ'T'HS' Tricl.; μαν the rest;
μαν του Wilamowitz.
τείδε: so K; τείνε P; τήδε Q; τήδε MOAS.
121. ο[καλλα]ς ιων: the reading is uncertain, but no variant is known.
129. ομαινο: so ASL; ομινο other MSS., eod.
144. τον: so MSS. except K² (ταν; so eod.).
145. κερουχίδε: so MSS. κερουχίδες and κερουλκίδε are vv. 11. in the scholia; κερουχίδε
Ahrens.
146. λρ[ίον]: so MAE; but the vestiges are too slight to decide with certainty between
this and κραμα (KOP).

vii. 5-6. The ν of αυτω has a stroke through it in the black ink used by the corrector,
and it is not clear whether he rewrote that letter or was making a flourish at the end of
κραμα when inserting l. 6 in its proper place. Line 7 was placed before l. 6 by the first
hand. The final letter of κραμα is not much like ν in either place, but no variant is known.
8. ἐφανον is the reading of the MSS., corrected to ἐφανον by Heinsius, comparing Virg.
Ecl. ix. 42 lentae lexiunt umbracula uiles. All that survives in the papyrus is an accent by
the corrector (as is that in l. 12) and traces which are reconcilable with φα and ν.
10. The first hand apparently wrote σημα.
12-13. It is not certain that the fragment containing ε[ and ον[ at the beginnings of
lines is correctly placed here.
13. μαν: apparently corr. from μνν, rather than vice versa. μαν MSS.; μνν eod.
69. The first hand perhaps wrote ἀγανακτος like P.
70. αυτας[ν]: so (or αυτας[ν]) MSS.; αυτας Schaefer; αυτας ἐν Valckenaeer.
The traces of a letter preceding ν do not suit ε.
71. The ν of αυτας[ν] seems to have been corrected or added by the second hand,
which crossed out the superfluous ν at the end.
73. τα ξενίς: I. τας ξενίας (or ξενία) with KMO &c.; ξενία PS; a v.l. ξανάς (i.e.
ξανάς) is recorded by the scholia.
74. αμφ' επονεῖο: so Ahrens; ἀμφεπονεῖο Wil. with KPH; ἀμφεπονεῖο OSQAE
Tricl.; in M ν is corr. from λ. The apopthoe does not necessarily imply that the scribe
regarded αμφ and ἐπονεῖα as two words; cf. e.g. v. 116 κατ' ἡλασα.
75. αυτ' εφοντο: αὑτε φοντε MSS. The intrusive use of φονυ is very rare in
early writers, but occurs again in Theocr. iv. 24 καλα πάντα φοντε (where, however, HS
read φοντα) and in Mosch. iii. 108. αυτ' εφοντο removes a difficulty, but may be only an
emendation or a slip due to the other imperfects; cf. xv. 86, n.
78. The first hand wrote αυτει and seems to have omitted ε of λαρναξ.
79. απασθαλίσα: so M; ἀπασθαλίσασ Wi.
80. ἱερομόναχος: λειμανάθει ΚΡ; λειμανωθεὶ Μ; λειμανωθε the rest (?) Above the νο the corrector has apparently crossed out a grave accent by the first hand, which at the end of the line seems to have written ὑποται like P.

81. ἄνθεσι: so Κ; l. ἄνθεσιν.

82. [στ]ματος χει: so KP &c.; στόμα ἔχει Μ.

83. Κοινά: the MSS. wrongly accentuate this paroxytone. πεπονθ[ε]: or else is very doubtful, and πεπερ... might be read; but no variant is known.

85. εξεπόνησα: so most MSS. (εξεπόνησας); εξεπόνησας OM and v. l. in the scholia.

86. ημιο: so most MSS.; εμι P, edd.

88. η γ' νπο: η ὑπὸ MSS. There is room for two letters between η and ν, and γ' is uncertain; but cf. v. 148.


en ὀφρεί: en ὀφρα MSS., a reading which may well be due to the proximity of ἀν' ὀφρα in I. 87. Cf. int.

94. οτρι γ' αείαοι: so O Tricl. and v. l. in the scholica. The vestiges are very faint, but do not suit ὣ το γεραυρ(ι), the ordinary reading.

96. η: l. η.

98. Αρατος: so KMPQA; Αρατος SA² Tricl. Μο' με: l. Με. Cf. the next note.

101. μεταφοι: μεταφοι MSS. except P (μεγαφει). Probably the first hand wrote μεγαφοι, and the corrector altered it wrongly, being apparently under the influence of the incorrect μερ' in I. 100. The τ is clear; με-γαφοι (cf. l. 102, n.) cannot be read.

102. The first hand had divided wrongly αυθ' ετ, which the corrector altered by a stroke connecting θ and ε; cf. xv. 70, n.

103. ομλος: so KΜ; ομλο ΗΟ; ομλον with ω suprascr. P; Μαλέας Ahrens.

104. κεινον: so KMP &c.; τῆνον H. Above the κ is a superfluous accent added by the corrector.

επετασα: the corrector apparently added an accent above επ, but crossed it out, adding one over ιω, though that is really more like a rough breathing.

105. ε'(ετ) αρα Φιλίνος: so MSS. except S (ετε Φ. ιρ εστίν). 1618's accent on Φιλίνος should have been circumflex.

106. κει: so S, edd.; κηρ the rest.

ταῖθ: so Η &c.; τά[θ] ΚΜΡ.

έρθος: so KMP²; ἐρθε HSE². ου: so Κ²; το most MSS. and edd.

108. μετατίκους; μετατίκους MSS. apparently.

109. νεώς: so most MSS.; νεώς K; νεώς PS. What the first hand wrote instead of ἀλλως is obliterated.

110. With the gloss on εν κεδάει cf. schol. κεδά υ' ἡμών, ἄκαλήφη δὲ ετ' Ἀττικῶν.

111. άρεστ: άρεστ, KMP &c.


113. The first hand wrote Λίθιστοις.

116. οικεύτα: so S and schol.; οικεύτα O; οικεύτες the rest; οικεύτα Hecker.
1618. THEOCRITUS, IDYLS V, VII, XV

XV. 38. ταῦτα κατ' εἰσίν: τούτο κα ἔ. KL; τ. καλῶν ἐ. PHS*ÆE; τ. καλ' ἐ. some late MSS.; τοὺς τάκα ἐ. or να καλῶν έσσον the old edd. Cf. int.

41. [δι']κρινε : so MSS.; δικριν edd.

42. παῖρνε : so most MSS.; παῦνa K.

43. ἐνδανούσα δήλει : so KP &c.; ὅσα ἔδειξε HS. θ is corr. from λ or π by the first hand.

44. τοιέ : so most MSS.; παῦνa K.

45. Ἐνδανούσα φιλανθρόποι : so KP &c.; ὅσα ἔδειξε MSS. It is possible that θ was added above the line after δ, but the τ of τν was not corrected.

50. επιμετρά : these two letters are on a separate fragment of which the position is uncertain.

58. εὐκομοε : The supposed ἓ is represented by the tip of a stroke above the χ of ἀκαόι in 1. 61, which suggests ο or ρ. The MSS. vary between τέκνα εἶναι π. HSW Trich., δ τέκνα εἶναι π. AEL, and δ τέκνα π. KPH. The objection to the restoration of either of the first two readings is that παρενθέθην would not come at the right point and with παρενθέθην the last letter or two would be expected to be visible, whereas a vestige of ink at the end of the line is too near the supposed ρ to be the final ν of παρενθέθην and seems to be the accent of ἀκαόι.

59. [εἰ]στα : so D and another Paris MS. according to Ahrens, and a Venetian MS. according to Ziegler; καλλιστα P; καλλιστα K &c., Wil.

60. Ἰππώρ : so KP; Ἰππόρ most MSS.

61. αὐτα : αὐτά(ι) or αὐτά MSS.; αὐτά Wil.

62. μῆν [α]πολαγχέρν : μὴ τι (or τυ) πλαγχέρν MSS. ἀπολαγχέρν, an aorist often found in Homer, may well be right. For the hiatus cf. e. g. the reading of the MSS. in vii. 88.

63. εἰς : so most MSS.; εἰς KH.

64. ἄμων : so most MSS. rightly; διμώ K; διμώ P.

65. Γοργις : so most MSS.; Γοργώ KE. For the stroke connecting ποτ and τω (by the first hand) cf. vii. 102, n.


67. φιλανθρόποι : so S; φιλανθροιο the rest.

68. τι ὀπέταπον : τι τῷ ὀπέταπον ν.

69. φιλανθρόποι : the ancient editions.

70. τοιετέρων Αριστοφα |: so MSS.; φιλανθρόποι the ancient editions.

71. αἰσθάνεται : so Κ; ἀισθάνεται ΑΛ; ἀισθάνεται ΚΛ; ἀισθάνεται ΠΛ; ἀισθάνεται AHR; ἀισθάνεται ἈΡ. φιλανθρόποι Reiske, which comes near the reading of the papyrus. δ for δς relative, though common in Homer, seems to be very rare, if found at all, elsewhere in Theocritus; but φιλανθρόποι would be a natural emendation to some one who misunderstood ο... φιλανθρόποι.

72. ἀκαότα : so MSS. Accounts satisfactorily for the reading of Κ and the attempt to emend it. The traces suit ε a very well.

73. κατακότα : if κατακότα, the usual form in the MSS., had been written, part of the ν would have been expected to be visible; but this is not certain.

74. Ἀδωνις ο κριν Αναραριφτείς : "Αδωνις δ κριν ᾧ Αρ. φιλείται most MSS. apparently (φιλήται Κ); "Αδωνις δ κριν Αρ. φιλείται ΕΒ; "Αδωνις δ κριν ᾧ Αρ. φιλείται Αρ. φιλήται Reiske, which comes near the reading of the papyrus. δ for δς relative, though common in Homer, seems to be very rare, if found at all, elsewhere in Theocritus; but φιλήται would be a natural emendation to some one who misunderstood ο... φιλείται. Cf. int. and vii. 75, n.

75. λαλεύει : λαλεύει MSS. Cf. int.

76. εἰσ : οτ εἰσ.

77. ποτε : so Reiske for στέρχων or στέρχων (Κ). The restoration is fairly certain, for though ε (but no other letter) might possibly be read instead of σ, there is not room for five letters in the lacuna, and the traces suit ε better. Cf. int.

78. φεσύτα : φεσύται ε κακά Π; φεσύται ε κακά Σ; φεσύται ε κακά Σ; φεσύται other MSS. rightly.

80. Γοργις : so Κ; γοργίς or γοργίς the rest.
1619. Herodotus iii.

Fr. 10 10.8 x 13.5 cm. Late first or early second century. Plate V (Fr. 10).

These portions of a roll containing the third book of Herodotus belong, like 1092 (fragments of the second book in a different hand), to the large find of literary papyri made in 1906 which produced 1082–3, 1174–6, 1231, 1233–5, 1359–61, 1610–11, &c. About 40 pieces, subsequently reduced by combinations to 25, have been identified; but several of the still more fragmentary texts accompanying the Herodotus were written in hands so similar that small pieces of the various texts can hardly be distinguished, and two of these MSS., Homer, N–Ξ and a tragedy (?), seem to have been actually written by the scribe of the Herodotus: we have therefore ignored for the present a large number of unidentified scraps. Parts of about 220 lines scattered over chs. 26–72 are preserved, the earlier columns being better represented than the later. The hand is a well-formed round uncial of medium size, of the same class as P. Brit. Mus. 128 (Homer Ψ–Ω; Kenyon, Class. Texts, Plate viii, there dated too early), 8 (Alcman?; Part i, Plate ii), and the Berlin Alcaeus (Schubart, Pap. Graecae, Plate xxix b), and no doubt belongs to the period from A.D. 50 to 150. Some documents of the Domitian-Trajan period, e.g. 270 (A.D. 94; Part ii, Plate viii) and P. Fay. 110 (A.D. 94; Plate v), are written in practically uncial hands of a similar type, and the care with which iota adscript is inserted also supports a late first-century date. K is written in two pieces separated by a space, and Τ is Ψ-shaped. The columns had 39–40 lines, and the beginnings of lines tended to slope away slightly to the left. The lines range from 21–6 or 27 letters, with an average of 23–4. The common angular sign is used for filling up short lines. Punctuation was effected by short blank spaces and paragraphi, which in the case of longer pauses are combined with a coronis, as e.g. in the British Museum Bacchylides papyrus. A few stops (in the middle and low positions) which occur (ll. 177, 332, and 410) are not due to the original scribe; but he was responsible for the breathings in ll. 180 and 434, the occasional diaereses over initial ἢ or ὅ, as well as for the insertion above the line of an omitted word (l. 446), and probably for the corrections or alternative readings added above the line between dots in ll. 143, 327, and 380. The MS. has undergone considerable revision, for at least two cursive or semiuncial hands, which are different from that of the main text but approximately contemporary with it, can be distinguished in various notes in the upper margin or between the columns, either correcting or explaining the text (ll. 69, 131, 355, 379, 410, nn.).
1619. *HERODOTUS III*

1619 is nearly 1 1/2 times as long as 1092, which is much the longest Herodotean papyrus published hitherto; the others, most of which also come from Oxyrhynchus (18, 19, 895, 1244, 1375, P. Munich in Archiv, i, p. 471, Ryl. 55, Brit. Mus. 1109 in Viljoen, *Herodoti fragmenta in papyris servata*, p. 44; cf. also the lemmata in P. Amh. 12), are quite small. Since 1619 is also the earliest or one of the earliest authorities for the author (P. Munich is ascribed to the first or second century, the rest to the second or third), it is of considerable value for the history of the text. The mediaeval MSS. are divided into two groups known as (a) the Florentine, headed by A (tenth century) and B (eleventh century), and (b) the Roman, headed by RSV (all fourteenth century): C, an eleventh century MS. of group (a), P (fourteenth century; mixed) and E (excerpts only; thirteenth century) and other late MSS. are unimportant. Stein gave a decided preference to (a), regarding unsupported readings of (b), which had been preferred by Cobet and other scholars, as in most cases conjectures. Hude puts the value of the two families almost on an equality, with a slight preference for (a). 1619 bears practically the same relation as 1092 to the two groups, the agreements with (a) being nearly twice as numerous as those with (b). A similar relation is traceable in two of the other Herodotean papyri (19 and 1244; the others, so far as they go, support (a), except P. Amh. 12); and the evidence is now sufficiently extensive both to afford a substantial justification of the eclectic method pursued by Hude before the appearance of 1092, and to confirm the natural superiority on the whole of the older group. The tendency to attest the antiquity of suspected interpolations, which is so often exhibited by papyrus texts and is already traceable in regard to Herodotus (cf. Viljoen, *op. cit.* p. 59), is illustrated by 1619 in ll. 28 and 69, where τῶν κακῶν probably and καλομένων certainly occurred, though in both cases bracketed even by Hude, who is more conservative in this respect than his predecessors. Other passages in which the text of the mediaeval MSS. is confirmed against changes introduced by modern scholars are ll. 17, 147, 168, 333, and 411. Here the traditional reading can generally be defended without much difficulty, but not in l. 168, nor perhaps in l. 333. With regard to new readings, in l. 108, a passage in which the repetition of the same word σκύλας had caused a difficulty, 1619 omits the word in the third place in which it occurs in the MSS., while modern editors have proposed to omit it in the second, and in l. 267 the redundancy of the expression οὖ πολλῶν μετέπειτα χρώμφ ὑστερὸν is remedied by the apparent omission of ὑστερὸν. The addition of τῆς before ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ in ll. 383–4 may well be right, but the omission of ἄν after τοῦτον in l. 320 may be merely a slip. The solution of the crux in l. 319, where the MSS. are corrupt and 1619 had a shorter reading, is barred by a lacuna; cf. ll. 443–4, n. The other new readings concern the dialect,
in which respect 1619 is not conspicuously more correct than the MSS., as is shown by e.g. the forms ἐδικαίωμαι (l. 19), κρίει (l. 175), and σφε (l. 344). πρῆχμα, an alternative reading in ll. 327 and 380, though not found in the MSS., is known in the fifth century B.C. from a Chian inscription; cf. Smyth, Ionic Dialect, § 350. For Καμβύσην, a new form of the accusative as far as Herodotus is concerned, see l. 176, n. Regarded as a whole, the text of 1619 is free from scribe’s errors (one seems to have occurred in l. 374, another in l. 131 to have been corrected subsequently) and generally sound, presenting not many novelties, but combining most of the good points in both the families (α) and (β). Of an alternative recension with great variations, such as that indicated in 1092. ix, there is no trace.

Before the discovery of Herodotean papyri the origin of the two lines of tradition represented by the MSS. was naturally not the subject of much discussion. Editors of Herodotus from Wesseling to even Hude were content to assume the existence of an archetype of the two families, and to aim at reconstructing it without much regard whether it was Alexandrian, Roman, or Byzantine. In 1909 Aly (Rhein. Mus. lxiv. 591 sqq.) put forward the hypothesis that (α) mainly represented the Alexandrian text as edited by Aristarchus, (β) the pre-Alexandrian vulgate in a redaction of the time of Hadrian; but this view, which would cut the ground from the archetype-theory, has not gained much acceptance, and is controverted by Jacoby in Pauly-Wissowa’s Realencycl. Suppl. ii. 516–17. 1619 certainly does not lend it any support. Jacoby himself is also sceptical about the validity of the current archetype-theory, and is disposed to regard the two families as quite ancient recensions, parallel to the papyri. But the most natural inference to be drawn from the eclectic character of 1092 and 1619 is that these first–second century papyrus texts were older than the division of the families (α) and (β), which seems to have taken place not earlier than the fourth century; cf. 1092. int. and Viljoen, op. cit. p. 56. By the first century the text of Herodotus had reached a condition which is only slightly better than the text recoverable from a combination of (α) and (β).

Frs. 3, 7, 10, and 20 are from the tops of columns, Fr. 14 from the bottom, the rest from the middles. The point of division of lines is quite uncertain in Frs. 1, 2, 13, 23, and 24, and the proposed arrangement of Frs. 9, 20, and 25 is only tentative.

Col. i (Fr. 1).

αγωγοῖς ἀπὸ πυκομενοί 26 ἔτη ἐσχῆμα

Col. iii (Fr. 2).

ἐξίσι ἐφίς
] τοῦτο παντ[ες

27
HERODOTUS

5 exò|sai mién

Col. iv (Frs. 3–6).

10 [μων αἴ|ξοι μεν γε Ἀἰγυ|πτίων 29
[οὐτος γε ο θεός ἀταρ τοῖ] ύμεις
[γε οὐ χαίρωντες γελώτα] εμε θη
[σεσθὲ ταῦτα εἰτας ενε|τειλατο]
[τοὺς ταῦτα πρήσσουσι τοὺς μεν

15 [ιρεας απομαστιγωσαι Αἰ|γυπτι]
[οι δὲ τῶν ἄλλων τοὺς ἁν λαβὼ-
[ατι ὁρταζον] α κτεινειν ὀρθη μεν
[δὴ διελευκυτο Αἰγυπτιω|ιαι] οι δὲ
[ιρεας εἰκει]νυτο ο δέ Ἀἰ|πις

20 [πεπλη|γμε]νοι τον μη|ρον εφθι
[νε ἐν τοι] ι]ροι κατακε|ιμενος
και [τον μεν] τελευτήσαντα εκ
tοῦ τρώματος ἑβαψαίν οἱ ιρεες

λαβρηκα Καμβυ|σε]ω Καμβυσης 30

25 ὁ|ς [λεγοντι Αἰγυπτιον αυτικα
dia τ]οῦτο το ἀδικημα εμανη
eων [οὐδε προτερον φρενηρης
και π]ρωτα μεν των κακων ε]ερ
[γασατο τον αδ]ελφε]ν Σμερδιν e

30 [ντα πατρος και μ]ητ]ρος της αν
[της τον απεσ]μυνε [es Περσας
[φθονι |ε] Αἰγυ|πτου ο]τι το ταξι
[μονος Περσας]ν ορον [τε επι δυο

15 lines lost

kechar]koses orna]œion
] o Καμβυσης

Col. v (Frs. 7–8).

50 [τοτοτος αποκτενεον]τα μιν ο 30
[δε αναβας ες Σουσα α]τεκτεινε
[Σμερδιν οι μεν λεγοντι ετ δη]
[γρην εγα]γενοιτα οι δε ες] την Ε

ουβρην θα]λασσαν προσογαγον

55 [τα κατ]αποτυσοι προι]τον μεν 31
[δη λεγ]οντι Καμβυση η]ων κα
[κων αρ]ι]ζαι τουτο δευτερα δε ε
[ξεραγασατο την αδελφη]ν επι
[σπομε]νυν οι ες Αἰ|γυ[πτον τη]

60 [και συνοικε]και και ην οι απ αμ
[φωτερων αδ]ελφη]ν [εγημε δε αυ
[την αδ]ε]ν ουσι unstable γαρ εωθε
[σαν προτερον τη]ς αδε]λφη]σιο

[συνοικει]νε Περσα πραισθη

65 [μη]ς των αδε]λφων Καμβυσης
[και επε]ιτα βουλομενοι αυτην
[γημαι στι ο]υ με εσωβοτα επενοε
[e ποισειν ερει]πο καλεσας

[τους βασιλι]ους κα]λεμενους 70
[δικαστας ει τις εστι κ]ε]λευκον νο
[μοις του βουλομενον α]δε]λφη]ν

[συνοικει]νοι δε βασιλη]οι [δι

About 16 lines lost

Col. vi (Frs. 9).

About 15 lines lost

105 ]φεου αυτι]ου αλλον σκυλακα απο

ρ]ηζαντα [του δεσμον παραγε

ν]εσθαι οι δι]νο δε γενομενοι ου

τι]ω δη επικρατησαι του σκυμ

νου κα]λι τον [μεν Καμβυση]ν ηδη

About 18 lines lost
Col. vii (Frs. 10. i, 11). Plate v

128 [κα εμμησαο τον Κυρου] οικον [αποψιλωσα αυτον] 130 [τα εμμηδησαι αυτη εχουσης] [εν γαστρι και μιν εκτρωσαν α εκτρωσασι] [ποθανειν ταυτα μεν] es touts oi kei[s]otous o Kαμβυσης εξεμα νη ειτε δε δια του Απιου ειτε και


140 νυν τοι αεικεΣ ουδεν ην του σω ματος νουσων [μεγαλην νοσε]ν τον μηδε τας φι[βενας υγιαινειν]

145 [την] προς Πρη[δαςπεια τον εθεια τε μαλιστα και οι τας αγγελιας εφορε αυτος τον αυτον το το παις ουνοχοους ην τωι Καμβυσης τι μη δε και αυ]τη ου σιμικη εισεν [16 lines lost]

150 δε λεγει το[δε] Πρηδαςπεις κυ[δι]νου [με τηνα νομιξουσι Περ]

16 lines lost

Col. viii (Fr. 10. ii). Plate v

32 [ναι προσ του] [πατερα] τελεσαι Κυ

34 [ρον οι δε αμειβοντο ως ει] 

170 μεινων του [πατρος] τα τε γαρ ε 

κεινου παντα [α] εχειν αυτο]ν και [προσεκτηθαι Αι[γυ]πτου τε και 

την θαλασσαν Περι[πο]ια ην τα 

tα ελεγον Κροισος δε παρεον 

175 τε και ουκ αρεσκομενος την κρι 

σει ειπε προς τον Καμβυσην τα 

de εμοι μεν [η]ν ο παι Κυρου.

208 ουτα Πρηδαςπεια δε οροντα [ανθρα ου 

θεν ρεφε]ρεα και περι ε [210 ου]τωι δειμαινοντα εισεν 

dε [σπα]τα ουδ αν αυτον εγαγε 

δε κει[φ] τον θεον ουτο αν καλο 

βαλλειν τοτε μεν ταυτα εξερ 

γαλ[α]το ετεροθι δε Περεον [215 ομη]νος τοις προςοι διωκε 

κα [επ ουνιεμι αιτηι αξιο 

χρειωται ελων ξωοτας επι κεφα] 

7 lines lost

Col. ix (Frs. 10. iii, 12. i). Plate v.


[αιτηι αξιοχρεω α]λων κτει 

[ιε]ς δε παιδια την δε πολλα του 

[αυτα] ποιηισ ορα οκως μη] σευ

19 lines lost

256 Καμβυσης τον Κροισον ου κολ 

δωι μετεπειτα χρονων και οι θε 

ρασιντες μαθοντες τουτο επη 

γελ[α]ντο αυτωι ως περιειν 

270 Καμβυσης δε Κροισωι μεν συνη

145 [την] προς Πρη[δαςπεια τον εθεια τε μαλιστα και οι τας αγγελιας εφορε αυτος τον αυτον το το παις ουνοχοους ην τωι Καμβυσης τι μη δε και αυ]τη ου σιμικη εισεν [16 lines lost]

150 δε λεγει το[δε] Πρηδαςπεις κυ[δι]νου [με τηνα νομιξουσι Περ]

16 lines lost
About 15 lines lost

Col. xii (Fr. 13).

286 βοηθεωντι[ς] 39]
] κρατη[σας
tαφρο[ν περί]

Col. xviii (Fr. 14).

About 28 lines lost

317 κεφ [της αιτης νυν δε αιει επει 49
tε εκτισαν την νήσου εις αλλη
λοισι διαφθοροι . . . . . . . . . . . του
320 των ενικεν απεμηνιακακε
ον τοις Σ[αμοιοι οι Κορινθιοι οι
πεμπε δε [εσ Σαρδις επ εκτομη
Περιανθρως των πρωτων Κερ
κυραων [επιλεζας τους παιδας
325 τιμωρειμενοι προτεροι γαρ οι
Κερκυρα[ιοι ηρξαν ες αυτων πρη
χι γ\[a\]πασθαλων ποιησαντες ε

Col. xxii (Fr. 16–17).

342 [σειν] και [του] ωκεν του πατρος δι 53
[αφορ]ηθεντα μα[λλων η αυτος
[σφε απελθων ε]ξειν απιδι εσ τα
345 [οικια] παιναι [σεωτυν ζημι
[ων φι]λοτιμη [κτημα σκαιον
[μη τωι] κακωι τιο κακον ιω πο
[λλοι] των δικαιων τα επιει

Col. xxiii (Frs. 18. i, 19. i).

355 [επι της ραχιως ε]πι του α 54
5 lines lost
361 [σπομενοι εκτει]γον ει μεν 55

230 [αποστησιναι Περσαι ει]μοι δε
[πατηρ σος Κυρος ευετελλη]πι[ο]
About 15 lines lost

Col. xx (Fr. 15).

328 [η]ισι συμ[ις]ετονοτα [οικτερα 52
υπ[ε]ις δε της [ορ]γης ηι[ε [αςον
330 και ελεγε [ων παι κοτερα την [ου]
αιρετωτερα εστι ταυτα τα[ν νυν
[ε]χων πρησσεις την τυρανν[
[δα και αγαθα τα νυν εγω εχω ταυ
[τα ε]ντα του πατρι επιτηδεον
335 [παρ]αλαμβανεις ος ει[ω εμος
[τε παις και Κορινθων της ευδαι
[μονος βαθ]ιλευσ αλητηπ [βιω ει
[λευ αντι]στατων τε και οργη
[χρεωμεν]ος ες τον [σε] ηκιστα εχρην
340 [ει] γαρ τις συμφορη [ες αυτοι
[σι γεγ νε] ειξε ησ ὑποψιν εσ

Col. xxiv (Frs. 18. ii, 19. ii).

350 [κεστε]ρα [προτειεισ] πολλου δε
355 [η]η τα μηπρωια διε]μενου
[τα πατροια] απεβαλων τυραν
360 [υ]ς χρημα [σφαλερον πολλου δε
[α]υ]της ερασται ειςι ο δε γερων τε [η]
[δη] και [τι]αρηθηκως μη δωις τα

ναι σφι τους δε δεξαμενους 56
370 ὡσι δη α[πι]αλασσεθαι ται
tην πρωτην [στρατιου ες την
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

[νον οἱ παρεντες] Δακεδαιμόνιοι 55
[νον ομοιοι εγνωντο ταυτην] εσ εποιησαντο [ οι δε τον Πο 57
[την ημερην Αρχη]υ τε και Δυκων] 4 lines lost
365 [πη αιρεθη αν Σαμιωι Αρχης] ης
[γαρ και Δυκωνης μουνοι συν] εσπεστεντες θευγον[τι ε]ς το
[τειχος τοιοι Σαμιωιοι] [και απο

Plot 380 γιματα ημιμαξε τουτον τον χρο
νου και νησιωτεοι μαλιστα ε.
πιλοτεον ατε εοντων αυτοις

Col. xxvi (Frs. 20–1).

σαν ες το ιρο[ν] της Αθηναις της [59
εν Αιγυπτι ταυτα δε εποιησαν] εσ
385 εγκοτον εχοντες Σαμιωις Αγι[ι
ηται προστρον γαρ Σαμιωι επ Α[υ[υ]
μυκραιτεος] βασιλεων[ος εν
About 18 lines lost

Col. xxix (Fr. 22).

422 στρατευομαι επι του μαγον και 64
οι αρχείρικοντι επι τον υπον
του [κολεον του εξίφεος ο μυκης]
425 αποσπεισε γημοδοθε δε το[ν]
ξ[λο]φος παει τον μηρον τρομα

Col. xxxv (Fr. 24).

430 παραγινεται Τοτασσεος [κοικου] 70
τουτον γαρ δε η[ν
υπαρχοις επει ων [κα]
tου Περσον]
435 Δαρειον προσταιρισσασθαι υπελθοντες [ε]διδοσα[ν
ε]πε[λε]τη

Col. xxxiii (Fr. 23).

427 την αυτ[ην]
tο]τε ο μαγ[ος]
sυνοικες και [κα]

Col. xxxvii (Fr. 25).

πωι περησο]με[ν] αμε[βε]ται Δαρει 72
440 οι τουσδε] Οτανη πολλα εστη
tα λογοι μεν ουκ οια τε [δηςωςαι
εργωι δε αλ]ξαν εστι τα [λογοι μεν
οια τε ερ]γων δ ουθε[ν λαμπρον
απ αυτων ?] υμεις δε ιστε φυ[λακας

Col. xxxviii (Fr. 26).

χαλεπας παρεθειν τουτο [γαρ η

Col. xxxix (Fr. 27).

πωι περησο]με[ν] αμε[βε]ται Δαρει
1619. HERODOTUS III

\[\text{μεων εοντων τοιωνδι ουξεισ σε τις ου παροσει τα μεν κοιν καται δεομενοσ] ημεας τα δε κου και} 450 \text{δεμαινων} ταυτο δε εχω αυτος σκηψιν ευπρεπεσταιν τη}

7. παρεις; om. R.
15. The size of the lacuna favours \text{απομαστηγωσαι (ABC) rather than απομαστηγωσεων (RSV).}
17. \(\text{ογ]η} (\text{η}) \text{δρτη \text{Schaefer, Hude. There is certainly not room for η in the lacuna.}}\)
19. \text{εικουντο: a 'hyper-Ionic' form due to false analogy; cf. Smyth, Ionic Dialect, § 690. \(\text{εικουντο (so RSV) is unlikely.}}\)
21. \text{ιρων: so RSV, edd. There is room for ιρων, but cf. l. 139 ιρων.}}\)
28. \text{1619 probably agreed with the MSS. in having των κακων, which is bracketed by Stein and Hude; but ll. 29–33 are on a separate fragment of which the exact position is not certain.}
31. \([\text{ες \text{Περσος: om. S. The size of the lacuna makes it certain that 1619 agreed with the}}\)
34. \text{other MSS.}}\)
39. Cf. l. 69, n.
54-5. \text{προσγαγοντα (R, edd.) is slightly preferable on grounds of space to προσγαγων|τα, the ordinary reading.}
58-9. \text{επιστομειον: so R, Hude; επιστομινενr SV. επιστομε} \text{(ABP, Stein) is too short.}
69. \text{The two strokes after καλομενον presumably refer to the marginal note (l. 49), where they may have been repeated at the beginning of the line; cf. 1620. ii. καλομενον, which is omitted by ABP and apparently erased in C, is omitted by Stein and bracketed by Hude; but if the corrector wished to omit it, \text{βασιλησ δικασταί, not βασιλης δικασταί, would be expected in the note. Probably one or more words are lost before βασιλης and the note is explanatory, like that in the margin of l. 355, which is in the same hand. That the note refers to l. 72, where \text{βασιλης δικαστο} occurs in the text (1619 is defective at this point), is unlikely in view of the critical mark against l. 69.}
103-4. \text{εισκομενων: so κομενον BR.}
105. \text{αυτων αλλον σκυλακα: so ABC, edd.; αλλον αυτου σκ. PRSV; om. αλλον σκ. Naber; cf. the next n.}
108. \text{After δη the MSS, have των σκυλακας, but 1619 is probably right in its omission; cf. int. and l. 105, n.}
131. \text{The cursive marginal note εκρωσουσαι(αυ) is possibly by the writer of the scholium on l. 410, but is certainly not due to the writer of notes on ll. 69 and 355, and seems not to be by the first hand. The size of the lacuna suits the hypothesis that the first hand had omitted αυ.}
132-3. \text{αι\(\text{εισκομενων: so κομενων (ABCP, edd.) is too short.}}\)
135. \text{[κιδει]: so RSV (κιδει), edd.; [κιδει] (ABC) is too long.}
136. \text{καταλαβωνιεν: before this edd. insert κατα with RSV.}
137. \text{και: om. ABC, edd.}
143. \text{ABC agree with the original reading τα δε εσ, while RSV rightly have τα\(\text{δε δι} (or δε?) εσ, agreeing with the superscibed reading.}
147. \text{εφορει: so MSS., Stein; e\(\text{σε} \text{εφορει Naber, Hude. eσ]εφορει is unsatisfactory, for the supplement in l. 146 is already long enough.}
149. \text{και: om. P.}
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150. δι: Krüger's conjecture δη is not supported.
168. τελεσα: so ABRSV; om. E; καλεσαι (= -ευσαι?) C; εικασαι? Stein. Hude brackets this inappropriate word.

172. προσκήνθαι: προσκήνησαθαι RSV.
175. τη διάφια: τῇ γενομένῃ διάφει RSV.

176. Καμψίσην: Καμψίσσει MSS. here as elsewhere in Hdt., though in the other cases the word belongs to the first declension, and the Attic accusative is of course Καμψίσσην. With regard to ειφήνη, 'Εραίας, and some other proper names in -ης both forms of the accusative are found in MSS. of Hdt.; cf. Smyth, op. cit. § 438.

176-7. ταθ: om. RSV.
181. ακονη[η]ο: om. ABCE.

231. Whether εντελλ[η]σο (ABCE) or εντελλα[η]σο (RSV) is to be read is not certain. There is no reason for supposing that in 1619 δ was inserted before σο, as suggested by Bekker.

267. μετεπείτεα χρονοι: μετεπι. χρ. υστερων MSS., which is too long. The vestige of a letter following λωι suits μ very well, but χρονοι followed by μετεπείτα or υστερον could be read. υστερον is superfluous; cf. v. 7. χρόνο μετεπείτα.

268-9. επηγ[η]ελλοντο αυτοι: επηγγελλον το αυτο (V), επηγγελλον αυτω (S), επηγγελλον αυτοφ (Schweighauser) are all unsuitable.

286-8. The position assigned to this fragment is far from certain, περιθ in l. 288 being doubtful. η or οι can be substituted for π, and τη, τη, τη or π for ρ.

319. διαφοροι: ...: the MSS. are corrupt, having διαφοροι εώτες εωτοίαι (εωτοί RSV). Krüger suggested ἐρίγοντες for εώτες, Reiske supplied οἰκίοιων before εώτες, Valckenar suγγενεῖς after εωτοίαι. 1619 was clearly shorter, and the sentence may have ended with διαφοροι, for in l. 320 δω, which occurs in the MSS. after τούτων, is omitted, and the new sentence may have begun ... ον τουτων εισεκεν. A connecting particle is, however, not necessary with τούτων (cf. e.g. l. 13), and the absence of a paragraphus below l. 319 suggests that ll. 317-21 may have formed one sentence in the papyrus, though the scribe is not very regular in the use of paragraphi.

320. For the omission of δω after τούτων, which may be merely a slip, cf. the previous note. Rv have ονεκεν for εισεκεν.

321-2. εὶ περιη: there is not room for απε[πε]ριη (ABC, edd.), unless οι before κορυάσιον was omitted.

325. τιμωροθεμοιον: τιμωροθεμοιον RSV. Cf. Smyth, op. cit. § 684. 2. The restoration προτεροιο (προτέρου RSV) is supported by the parallel in l. 380; cf. n.

326-7. For the alternative form πρῶχα, which is ignored by the MSS. of Hdt., see int.

328. οπερια: so MSS.; οπερη, the form preferred by edd., would be long enough.

333. αγαθα τα: so MSS.; τα αγαθα τα edd., since Aldus.

339. εί: εῖ AB less correctly. At the end of the line, where the supplement is rather long, producing a line of 27 letters, the division was perhaps ειχρην, but only 8 or 9 letters are expected in the lacuna at the beginning of l. 340.

344. σφη, the reading of the MSS. corrected by edd. to σφεα, is rendered certain by the size of the initial lacuna. ανθι suits the space better than απελθε (RSV).

346. ψιθυμιη: for η ψιθυμιη (RSV, edd.) there is not room, if, as is probable, there was a space after αω.

351. Either απεδιδον or μετεξιαλον (ABC) can be restored.

353. The supplement, based on AB, is rather long, producing a line of 27 letters, and perhaps either η should be omitted with K (SV om. ηδη), or τε, or even both.

355. The marginal note is in the same hand as that in l. 49.

391-2. RSV have εκτεινοτες instead of εκτεινου ... παρεινετες.

365. αὐτῆς ἀν Σαμ. [οί; αὐτῆςαν Σαμίας RSV.
370. ὑ: om. RSV.
372. Λακεδαίμονιοι (PRS; -νηί V) suits the size of the lacuna better than Λακεδαίμονιοι (AB, edd.).
373-4. Πο]λυ[ρα]σα]σ ιποτ. : the lacuna ought not to exceed 4 letters, but the omission may have been supplied above the line, as in l. 446.
378-9. εἴς κοστο : the supposed vestige of δ may belong to a paragraphus. In the margin are traces of a note, which might refer to ll. 361-2, but is nearer to col. xxiv.
379-80. For the alternative spellings πρη[γμα], πρη[γμα] cf. l. 327 and int.
383. τῆς: om. MSS. But cf. e. g. v. 82 τῇ 'Αθηναίῃ τε (te om. SVU) τῇ Πολιδί, vii.
43 ἑ' Ἀθηναίῃ τῇ Ἰλιάδᾳ.
386. προτερον RSV.
406. τοῦ ὀργα[νο]τοῦ: τοῦτο τοῦ ὀρ. RSV.
410. The supposed stop after λ[μ]ήνα, which is not wanted, might be the bottom of a critical sign referring to the marginal note, which begins π(ρι) λυ[μ]ή(να) and seems to be of an explanatory character. In the second line ωσεν π[τ] or π[τ] (i.e. παρά) or ως ευ[τ]α can be read; the third line does not seem to be λ[μ]ή[ν]υ... The ink is lighter than that of the main text and the marginal note on l. 131, and the hand certainly different from that of ll. 49 and 355 marg.
411. κατά: so MSS., which continue εἰςοιτὶ ὁργανοὶ. Stein and Hude follow Eltz in reading καῖ for κατά, which is not satisfactory. As Lobel remarks, κατὰ would be expected here to mean 'about', especially since most of the dyke was under water; cf. the frequent examples of κατὰ with numerals quoted by Schweighauser, Lex. Herod. ii. 16. Hence the mistake may well lie in ὁργανοὶ, for which we suggest ὁργανας, unless there was a substantive εἰκοσὶὁργανας, meaning a 'length of 20 fathoms'.
423. ωι: om. C.
427-8. 1619 no doubt had δῆ τοντὶν εὐχε (om. RSV) between an[ην and το]τε.
430. παραγ[ε]τα[μ]: or possibly εἰς τα [Σωμα.
434. Of the supposed breathing over εἷ only the tip of a horizontal stroke is left, which might be interpreted as belonging to a paragraphus. Lines 433-4 would then begin [χ]ως and [ο]ς εἷ, but this arrangement does not suit ll. 432 and 435-6 very well, and εἷ is a very natural word on which to place a breathing; cf. l. 180.
438. εἰς[τε]ρον or εἰς[τε]τε can be read.
440. ὅτως: 'Or. Ἡ ΑΒ, edd. ; 'Otr. Ἡ C.
443-4. ἐργαν δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν λαμπρὸν γίνεται MSS. 1619 was shorter and presumably omitted γίνεται οτ’ αὐτῶν rather than λαμπρὸν.
445. κατεστ[ε]σας: κατεστ[ε]σας (RSV) can equally well be read, but is somewhat less suitable to the supposed length of the initial lacuna.
446. μέν, inserted above the line by the first hand, is read by all the MSS.
447. τοιοῦτο: so Hude with RSV; τοῖον ABCP, Stein.

1620. THUCYDIDES i.

14 X 14.3 cm. Late second or early third century.
Plate VI.

This fragment consists of the upper portion of two columns and a few letters from the beginnings of lines of a third column of a roll containing the first book of Thucydides, and covers chs. 11-14 with considerable lacunae.
The script is a medium-sized uncial of a second–third century type, resembling 843 (Part v, Plate vi) and 1175 (Part ix, Plate iii). That it is more likely to have been written before A.D. 200 than after is indicated by the notes referring to alternative readings, which have been added later in the upper margin by a different and curious hand. These notes are very like those in 1234 (Part x, Plate iv), of which the main text is not dissimilar in style to that of 1620, though in a larger hand, and suggest a date not later than the reign of Caracalla. The main text may therefore well be ascribed to the reign of Commodus or even M. Aurelius. The columns are rather tall, containing about 54 lines of 18–22 letters. High stops accompanied by paragraphi (which are to be restored after ll. 3, 10, 14, and 21) are frequent, and there are occasional diaereses, but no breathings or accents. Iota adscript was written in l. 13, but apparently not in l. 62. An omission in l. 3 is supplied by the original scribe, who also superscribed a variant in l. 67; but a slip in l. 8 is corrected by the writer of the marginal notes, which seem to be variants obtained from a different and older MS., not corrections; cf. ll. 67–8, n. Critical signs are placed against the notes and the corresponding line of the text, four different signs being found in Col. ii.

The relation of the papyri of Thucydides to the vellum MSS., which are divided into two families, CG and BAEP, M approximating to a middle position, is discussed at length in 1376. int.; cf. also Hude, Bull. de l’acad. royale de Danemark, 1915, 579–85. Of the five best papyri the first century specimens tend to support C, those of the second century B, especially in the later books. In the chapters covered by 1620 both C and F are defective, the lost portions having been supplied by later hands, in both cases from MSS. of the C family (c and f), so that F and f represent different families. 1620, a careful and elaborately revised text, agrees with B against cfG four times, and with the C family against B twice. 1621, however, which is about a century later than 1620, inverts the relationship to the two families, agreeing five times with C, twice with the B group. 1622, which is about fifty years earlier than 1620 and agrees twice with either group, and 1623, which is three or four centuries later and agrees twice with the B group, once with CG, are both too short to show their real character. But the customary eclecticism of papyri in relation to the mediaeval MSS. is apparent throughout the four Thucydides fragments in the present volume, and the division of the MSS. into two families is no doubt later than the papyrus period; cf. the parallel case of the MSS. of Herodotus discussed in 1619. int.

New readings in 1620 occur in ll. 1, 73–4, 76, and side by side with the traditional readings in ll. 61, 67–8, 72 (cf. also Col. i. marg., ll. 58, 109, 112, nn.).
Some of these are concerned with trivial differences, such as the omission of the article or the order of words; but in 1.67 the traditional participle is no better than the hitherto unrecorded infinitive, and, especially since the marginal readings tend to be superior to those of the main text, the new reading proposed in the marginal note on II.67–8 may well be right. A tendency to smooth slight irregularities and roughnesses of style is traceable throughout 1620–3, especially in 1621, which confirms two modern emendations; and, although some of the novelties can be explained as editorial improvements, and omissions may be merely due to accident, the four new fragments seem to represent texts of rather high quality, and distinctly support the impression gained by a survey of the longer Thucydidean papyri such as 16 and 1876, that without resorting to the drastic changes proposed by Rutherford there are many improvements to be made upon the tradition of the mediaeval MSS.
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12. 2. [χμωσε] και στασεις εν ταισι
13. 4. μ'αολατα τη παλαμοσταην
14. 1. τωτατα γαρ ταυτα τον ναυ

20. [πολειςω] οσ επι το πολ' αν ελη
25. [νουντο α]νφ ον εκπειπτον
30. τες τας πολεις εκτιζον
35. Βοιωτοι τε γαρ οι νυν εξης 193
40. 32 lines lost
45. 3 lines lost

Col. iii.

10. [οις εποιησατο και Ρήνει]
115. τωτατα γαρ ταυτα τον ναυ

13. 6. [τωτατα γαρ ταυτα τον ναυ]
14. 1. τωτατα γαρ ταυτα τον ναυ

Col. i. marg. και αο(λα) 'and so on' recurs in the third marginal note at the top of Col. ii. The preceding word apparently does not occur anywhere in the known text of ll. 1–54, and an unknown variant seems to be indicated; cf. ll. 67–8, n. ι ει or ιασι or ιολει can be substituted for ιλει.

1. προνην: την τροιαν MSS. Cf. ll. 58, 61, 73–4, nn.
2. το, supplied by the first hand, is in all the MSS.

3. το[πο] τωτων: so AεFΓM, edd.; το[πο] τ. (A1BEF3) is unsuitable to the size of the lacuna.

4. γε: om. cf.G.

5. το, the reading of the first hand, is a mere error.

6. ην, which has a line above it to indicate deletion, is not known as a variant here.

7. μη τηνχασα (οι): the traces of α are very slight, but ν is fairly certain, and there is not room for more than 7 or 8 letters in the lacuna. μη τηνχασα cf1, Hude; μη τηνχασα ABEMF3, Stuart Jones.

8. 17–18. ενα[χμωσε]: so ΑΕΜ; ενεχμωσε Bcf, edd.

9. ιετο το πολ' αν so cEf, Hude; om. το ABM, Stuart Jones.

10. το[πο] πολεις: so MSS., Stuart Jones; νιας (Madvig, Hude) does not suit the size of the lacuna.

11. Gertz wished to omit γαρ.

Col. ii. marg. Cf. ll. 58, 61, 67–8, 72, nn., and for και αο(λα) Col. i. marg. n.

58. Which word or words in this line were referred to in the lost marginal note at the top of Col. ii is uncertain. The only clue afforded by the MSS. is the circumstance that in the i of πρωτα is by a later hand, perhaps indicating πρωταν as the original reading; cf. πρωταν in l. 62. If not πρωταν, the lost variant may have been αι Καρυθεια; cf. ll. 1, 61, 73–4, nn.
1620. THUCYDIDES I

61. ἡνώς: τὸς νασὶ MSS., agreeing with the reading in the second marginal note. τριήρεις immediately following has no article, and τὸς can be dispensed with; but the omission may be due to the accidental collocation of νασὶ and τριήρεις which belong to different sentences. Cf. ll. 1, 58; 73-4, nn.

62. πρωτον ἐν Κορονω: so BeEF, Hude; ἐν Κ. ἥρ. AGM, Stuart Jones. Cf. ll. 73-4, 76-7, nn.

63. καπηγηθηναι: so ABEGM, Stuart Jones; ἐνθοπ., cfG suprascr, Hude.

67. ποσάς: ποσᾶς MSS., agreeing with the superscribed reading. The infinitive makes the statement less definite and is quite appropriate.

tēταίοω, with the marginal variant τετοσάμας: cf. the superscribed σσ in the case of 16. 1. 4 επιλαττων and 38 μηθεῖον.

67-8. [τη] δ εστὶ μαλατα: so all MSS.; the marginal variant καὶ ταυτα ε[τη] εστι μαλ. is unknown here, but at 1. 76, where 1620 like ABEGM has ετη δε μαλ[ιστα], cfG add. have ἤτη δε μαλ. καὶ ταυτη και Bekker’s N ἤτη δε μαλ. καὶ ταυτα. The most probable explanation of this duplicate set of variations is that the original reading was that of 1620. marg., but καὶ ταυτα was omitted, δ being inserted in its place (so 1620. 67, ABEGM); καὶ ταυτα was, however, supplied in the margin, from which the words were restored to the text in the wrong place (as in N), resulting in the subsequent emendation of ταυτα to ταυτη (cfG add.). If the reading of the later MSS. (G is 13th cent.; cf are later than CF), which editors have hitherto adopted, be supposed to be original, it is almost inexplicable that neither the scribe nor the corrector of 1620 knew of the reading καὶ ταυτη in 1. 76, and that the corrector should make matters worse instead of better. The source of the marginal variants in 1620 is probably older than the main text, and may well have been a Ptolemaic papyrus or at any rate as old as the archetype of 1620. In view of the great antiquity of the reading καὶ ταυτα and the very late character of the evidence for καὶ ταυτη we much prefer to explain the variations in the light of their chronological arrangement, and to regard the readings of (a) 1620. 67 and the older MSS. and (b) N as intermediate steps in the process by which the reading preserved in 1620. marg. became corrupted into that of cfG add.

71. ἤδει: so MSS.; ἤδειν edd. The earlier papyri of Thucydides as a rule omit ν επιλαττον at the end of a sentence; cf. e.g. 1622. 81, 84.

72. παλαιστατη: so some of the detersiores; the earlier MSS. have παλαιτάτη here, as has the marginal note, but in e. g. ch. 1. 1 παλαϊδέρα occurs.

73-4. ο[ν] [π]αλαιστ[η]ταν [θ]αμεν καὶ Κοροφων[ν] γ[α]φ[ε]τα Κορ. MSS. (G at first inserted γένετα before ον ισμεν, but erased it). ον is fairly certain, and the preceding letter can be η, μ, or ν, while the letter after ο[ν] may, if not η, must be ν: the traces of ην and of a letter after ο[ν] are very slight and indecisive, [ι]γ[α]φ[ε]τα Κορ. might be read, but before it ον [η]μεν is not long enough and ον [η]μεν is inadmissible. ι[ν]εν is not very satisfactory, but preferable to ο[ν] [ι]γ[α]φ[ε]τα [μ]εν. The insertion of the article before Κοροφων[ν] may be right (cf. ll. 1, 58, 61, nn.); the loss of it may be due to the hiatus created when γένετα was placed before instead of after γοροφων. That 1620 had the form γ[α]φ[ε]τα [αι] (with cf) is uncertain, for γ[α]φ[ε]τα [αι] can be read.

75-6. μαλιστα: μαλ. καὶ ταυτη cfG add., edd.; cf. ll. 67-8, n.


109. To what the critical sign refers is uncertain. The only variants in the MSS. at this point concern the spelling Ὀρνηαν or Ὀρνηαν (in other authors spelled Ὀρνηαν or Ὀρνηαν), except for the dittography Ὀρνηαν Ὀρνηαν in cf.

112. The critical sign perhaps refers to a variant concerning the spelling of Μασσαλίαν (Μασσαλίαν, Μασαλίαν, Μαστίλιαν, or Μασσαλίαν MSS.).
1621. Thucydides ii (Speeches).

This leaf of a vellum codex is of a somewhat novel character, since it belongs to a collection of the speeches in Thucydides. The fragment contains the conclusion of the speech of Archidamus at the beginning of the war (ii. 11) and the beginning of the funeral oration of Pericles (ii. 35). There are 21 lines on a page and 20–5 letters in a line. Traces of the pagination are visible on both sides, but the figures are illegible. The hand is a calligraphic uncial of the same type as the Codex Sinaiticus, and the fragment has a special palaeographical interest, for some omissions by the first hand (ll. 18 and 26) have been supplied in darker brown ink by a cursive hand. These cursive additions are not later than the fourth century, and the main text is likely to belong to the early or middle part of that century. Stops occur in the high, middle, and low positions, but are partly due to the corrector. A stroke for punctuation (l. 2) and occasional diaereses and elision-marks are due to the original scribe, a breathing to the corrector. Iota adscript was generally written: where omitted, it has been supplied in at least one place (l. 16) and perhaps two others (ll. 10 and 15), apparently by the corrector.

The text as corrected is on the whole a good one and has several interesting novelties, which are in most cases superior to the readings of the MSS. The omission of the unsatisfactory ὅνω in l. 4 confirms a conjecture of Madvig, though confidence in the omissions in 1621 is somewhat shaken not only by the two mistaken omissions of the first hand, which are supplied by the corrector, but by a third (l. 36), which has escaped his notice. ῥῆμα for ῥῆμα in l. 25 confirms the conjecture of Hude already substantiated by 585. vii. 15, the confusion between these words being of course common. ἀμφίφθησθαι for ἀμφύπθαι in l. 4 and the omission of τῶν before ἄλλων in l. 19 may well be right. C is supported against B five times, B against C twice; cf. 1620. int.
[ελ]πίζειν δια μαχής ἑναι αὐτο[ν
[ελ] μη καὶ νυν ὁρμηται εν ωι; εν τι
ουπω παρεσμεν ἀλλ’ οταν εν
τη γη ορωσι ημας δηονταις
τε κα τα εκεινων φθειροντας
πασι γαρ εν τοις ομμασι και εν τη
παραυτικα οραν πασχουτας
τι αθης οργη προσπιτει
και οι λογισμοι ελαχιστα [χρ]ων
μενει θυμος πλειστα εσ [εβ]γο
καβισταναι: Ἀθηναίους δε
και πλειον των αλλων εικοσ
τουτο δρασαι οι αρχειν τε αλλω
[αλ]ιζουναι και επινοεις την το
πελας δοην μαλλον η των
πη αν τις ἔγηται· κοσμο[ν
και φυλακη περι παντος π[οι
ουμενοι και τα παρ[αγ]γειλ[ο
μενα οξεως δεχομεν[ο]ν καλ
[λιστον γαρ τοδε και ασφαλεστα]
τον πολλων ουτα [ενι κοσμοι
χρωμενους φαινεσθαι·}
επιταφιος
35 οι μεν πολλοι των (εν)θαδε ηθη
ειρηκοτων επαινουσι τον
προσβεντα τω νομω τον λο
γον τονδε ως καλον επι τοις
[εκ των πολεμων βαπτομε]
40 νοις αγορευνεσθαι αυτων· εμ[ου
ἀρκουν αν εδοκει ειναι αυ]

4. [α]μίνεσθαι οὗτος MSS., Stuart Jones; ἀμινεσθαι omitting οὗτο Hude, following Madvig. For other variations between ἀμίνεσθαι and ἀμίνεσθαι cf. e.g. i. 96. i.

II. τα εκειναν: so C; τα θεινων A; ταθεινων BEFM, edd.,

12-13. και εν...οραν is deleted by Hude, who alters πασχουτας to πάσχουσι.

14. τι: τε C.

15. Usener wished to delete αι.

18. τι, supplied by the corrector, is in all the MSS.

19. αλλων: των ἄλλων MSS.; but των ἄλλων has just occurred in 1. 18 and ἄλλων is quite defensible.

21. των: την MSS., rightly. It is certain that των was first written, but the second half of the ω is incompletely preserved, and ω may have been corrected to η.

22. αυτων: αυτων C, Hude, Stuart Jones; ιαυτων ABEMp. αυτων was probably meant by the papyrus and is likely to be right.

22-3. τοσαυτην: so CEG marg. B γρ. F γρ. Mα ex corr., edd.; την ἄλλην ABEMp; τοιαυτην some late MSS.

24. ιαυτωνοι: ιαυτωνοι B.

25. νμω: so 853; ημω MSS. Cf. int.

35. οι μεν: so ABEM with Tiberius, Syrianus, Dionysius, Castor, and Max. Plan. Hude (but not Stuart Jones) formerly carried his preference for CG to the length of reading μεν αυτω, but now (ed. maior) brackets αυτω.


39. πολεμοι: πολεμων ABF.

40. Dobree wished to omit αυτων.

41. δε: δε CG, edd. ἄρκουν αν: ἄν ἄρκουν M.
1622. Thucydides ii.

17-5 x 21-2 cm. Early second century. Plate IV.

The chief interest of this much damaged fragment, which consists of the lower halves of two columns and a bit of the column preceding, and contains parts of chs. 65 and 67 of Thuc. ii, is palaeographical, for on the verso is part of a contract for loan dated in Mecheir of the 11th year of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 148), so that the recto must have been written before 148, probably in the reign of Hadrian, and is an unusually well dated specimen of second-century uncial writing. Other papyri which more or less approximate to it in style and date are 9 (Part i, Plate iii, which was there dated somewhat too late), 841 (Part v, Plate iii), 1233 (Part x, Plate iii), and 1619 (Plate iv). A >-shaped sign is used for filling up short lines, and pauses are indicated by occasional blank places, paragraphi, and stops chiefly in the middle position (the high stop at the end of l. 51 is not certain). A mark of quantity occurs in l. 53, and a correction of spelling, possibly in a different hand, in l. 81. The column contained 29–30 lines of 16–22 letters. Iota adscript was written. 1622 agrees with C twice and with the other family twice; cf. 1620. int. The only new reading occurs in the very compressed sentence beginning in l. 84, of which the end is not preserved. Here the text of 1622 is apparently corrupt as it stands, but is perhaps nearer the original than the reading of the MSS., which may be only an emendation; cf. n. ad loc.

Col. i.

17 lines lost and traces of 7 lines

| 25 | [σουτον των Περικλε]ει ετε 65. 13 |
|    | [μισευσε τητε] αφ ων αυτοσ |

Col. ii.

16 lines lost

| 50 | πρεσβεις Αντιππα τους Κορινθιων και Λακεδαιμονιων |
|    | και Τεγεατης Τιμαγορας και Αργειος ιδιαιτε Πολια |

Col. iii.

16 lines lost

| [δως] πε[ρ][γερεθαι την] |
| [πολι]ν Π[ε[λ]τοπερης] |
| 30 | [ων αυτων] των πολεμων |

[δως] πε[ρ][γερεθαι την] |
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The chief interest of this much damaged fragment, which consists of the lower halves of two columns and a bit of the column preceding, and contains parts of chs. 65 and 67 of Thuc. ii, is palaeographical, for on the verso is part of a contract for loan dated in Mecheir of the 11th year of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 148), so that the recto must have been written before 148, probably in the reign of Hadrian, and is an unusually well dated specimen of second-century uncial writing. Other papyri which more or less approximate to it in style and date are 9 (Part i, Plate iii, which was there dated somewhat too late), 841 (Part v, Plate iii), 1233 (Part x, Plate iii), and 1619 (Plate iv). A >-shaped sign is used for filling up short lines, and pauses are indicated by occasional blank places, paragraphi, and stops chiefly in the middle position (the high stop at the end of l. 51 is not certain). A mark of quantity occurs in l. 53, and a correction of spelling, possibly in a different hand, in l. 81. The column contained 29–30 lines of 16–22 letters. Iota adscript was written. 1622 agrees with C twice and with the other family twice; cf. 1620. int. The only new reading occurs in the very compressed sentence beginning in l. 84, of which the end is not preserved. Here the text of 1622 is apparently corrupt as it stands, but is perhaps nearer the original than the reading of the MSS., which may be only an emendation; cf. n. ad loc.
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17 lines lost and traces of 7 lines

| 25 | [σουτον των Περικλε]ει ετε 65. 13 |
|    | [μισευσε τητε] αφ ων αυτοσ |
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16 lines lost

| 50 | πρεσβεις Αντιππα τους Κορινθιων και Λακεδαιμονιων |
|    | και Τεγεατης Τιμαγορας και Αργειος ιδιαιτε Πολια |
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16 lines lost
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| [πολι]ν Π[ε[λ]τοπερης] |
| 30 | [ων αυτων] των πολεμων |

[δως] πε[ρ][γερεθαι την] |
1622. THUCYDIDES II

147 x 5.5 cm. Fifth or sixth century.

This fragment of a leaf of a vellum codex contains part of Thuc. iii. 7–9, with fairly numerous stops (in all three positions), paragraphi, accents, breathings, and diaereses. The only correction preserved, the insertion of a ν ἐφέλκιστικῶν in l. 45, is due to the original scribe, who wrote a good-sized upright oval uncial hand of the fifth or sixth century. Iota adscript is omitted once and written once. Traces of ruling are discernible on the recto, which is the hair side. The text in spite of its comparatively late date stands somewhat apart from the
mediaeval MSS., agreeing once with CGM, probably twice with the B group (cf. 1620. int.), and presenting several new readings. Of these the omission of τῶν νεῶν in l. 1 and τὸ πεζὸν for τῶν π. in l. 11 are quite defensible. More interesting is the variant ἀνεψε for ἔπεσε in l. 8, where the simple verb was rather ambiguous. The precise nature of the variation in ll. 19–20 is obscured by lacunae. 1616 was found with 1623.

Recto.


10 lines lost

Verso.


45 εχουσιν· νο[μισοντες δ ει] ναι προδωτας των προ τον φιλων Χειρο]ν ηγουνται και ουκ α[δικος αυτ]η η αξι 2 [ωσις εστιν ει] τυχοιεν προς 

50 αλλα[λους οι τε αφιστα] μενοι και αφ αυν διακρι [νυντο [ισοι μεν τη γνω [µη οντες και} εννοια 

αντιπαλοι δε τη] παρα 10 lines lost

1, πλειους α]ποστημει: πλ. αποστημει των νεων MSS. Since al νες occurred in the previous sentence, the repetition is unnecessary.

8–9. αν]πλευσε: ἀπλευσε MSS. ἀναπλευσε occurs only once in Thuc. i. 104. 2 και ἀναπλευσαντες απο διδάσκετον ες των Νελου. where it implies sailing up stream. If this was also implied here, και[ων ες τον Αχ]ελων αν. may have been the reading; but an]πλευσε may simply
mean 'sailed out', in which case it hardly differs from the simple verb and \kata\ means 'in the direction of' or 'off' or perhaps even 'on'. Oenidae was situated near the mouth of the Achelous, surrounded in winter by marshes into which the Achelous flowed (Thuc. ii. 102. 2), and of which one connected with the Gulf of Corinth according to Strabo, p. 459. The ships may therefore have been taken a little way up the river. A compound verb has this advantage over the simple one that it is not open to the interpretation 'he sailed down the Achelous', which is inadmissible here; cf. iv. 25. 8 ταύς μὲν ναυσὶν περπλευ-σαντες κατὰ τὸν Ἀκεσίνην (in Sicily) ποταμὸν τὴν γῆν ἔδοχεν. That ἀνέπλευσε here means 'sailed back' (Asopius had already passed Acarnania on his way up the gulf to Naupactus) is less likely.

I. to: τὸν MSS. Thucydidcs uses both the masculine and neuter of \πετάω\ substantially.

18-19. \ποτάμον (ABEFM, edd.) suits the length of the lacuna better than \ποτάμῳ\ (CG). The supposed accent is very doubtful.

19-20. τιμών;] \οὐ\ \υστέρων \[\ποταμοῦς \: τιμών \οδίσῳ καὶ \υστέρων \ιπ. MSS. There is certainly not room for both \τιμών\ and \οδίσῳ\ and there is no trace of \καὶ,\ but \οὐ\ instead of being \δε\ might be the termination of \τιμώ]ον or \οδίσ]ον with \δ\ before \ποταμοῦς in l. 20, though the supplement there is quite long enough. \ν\ and \οι \υστέρων\ are fairly certain; the \σ\ is cramped and seems to have been corrected, probably from \π,\ and \δ\ is not a very satisfactory reading. \οὐ\ is not in accordance with Thucydidean usage in this context, \καὶ \υστέρων \ποταμοῦς being common.

37-8. \ν\[δρεῖ: so ABEFM; om. CG, edd.

41. \πολεμοῖς: so CGM, edd.; \πολεμοῖς ABEF.

1624. PLATO, Protagoras.

Fr. 1 10.5 x 1.7 cm. Third century. Plate VI (Cols. lxiii-lvi).
so far as can be judged. Paragraphi were employed by the first hand, but in the four places in which they occur have been placed in brackets by the corrector. Stops in all three positions occur, besides double dots marking a change of speaker, but in many cases are due to the corrector, who was apparently responsible for a breathing in l. 169 and accent in l. 285. Wedge-shaped signs for filling up short lines, occasional diaereses over \( \iota \) and \( \upsilon \), and probably the accent in l. 16 and elision-mark in l. 227 are due to the first hand. The corrector's omissions, apart from the bracketing of paragraphi mentioned above, are indicated in ll. 114, 272, 589 by a stroke, elsewhere by dots, above the letters in question.

Papyri of Plato are now fairly numerous, \textbf{1624} being the 19th known; but no fragments of the \textit{Protagoras} have been discovered previously. For this dialogue the chief MSS. are B (the Clarkeanus), T (the Marcianus), and W (Vindobonensis 54); but \textbf{1624} happens to cover very few passages in which they differ seriously. A mistake of BT is avoided (l. 360), but in ll. 629 and 663 the papyrus apparently supports BT against W. In ll. 319 and 435 the first hand agrees with the reading of W, the corrector with that of BT (in l. 435 not exactly). Some agreements between \textbf{1624} and Vaticanus 1029 are noticeable (ll. 435, 592, 632, nn.) and the text of Stobaeus is supported in l. 396, so that with regard to the existing tradition there is no reason to suppose that \textbf{1624} was less eclectic than the longer Plato papyri from Oxyrhynchus, \textbf{843} and \textbf{1016-17}. In the new readings, which are frequent, the first hand and the corrector usually took different views, the only instance in which they agreed upon a hitherto unrecorded variant being the insertion of the article \textit{before} \( \mu \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \iota \) in l. 288. In ll. 6, 594, 632, and 637 the corrector has restored the ordinary reading of the MSS. by inserting words omitted either intentionally or by inadvertence by the first hand; cf. also ll. 176-7, n. The first hand was not a very accurate scribe, to judge by several apparent repetitions of syllables; cf. l. 114, n., and \textbf{843} (\textit{Symposium}), which has numerous mistakes of this character. The most striking of the new readings rejected by the corrector is the addition of \( \alpha i \) before \( \iota o u \) in l. 589, a reading which had been generally adopted by modern editors from a conjecture of Heindorf, but is hardly rendered more convincing. More often it is the first hand, not the corrector, who agrees with the MSS.; cf. ll. 15, 431, 481, 486, 490, 590, 592, 640, 665, 666, 672, nn. In several of these places there is an obvious difficulty in the ordinary reading, and in l. 672 the corrector's reading had already suggested itself to some of the Renaissance editors of Plato as an improvement, while in ll. 15 and 640 his readings seem to be superior; but the changes proposed in ll. 592 and 666 are of more doubtful value. The other novelties are all of the nature of omissions from the ordinary text, in revising which the corrector, presumably on the authority of a different
MS., exhibits an unwonted and perhaps exaggerated tendency to solve difficulties by excisions. His text is, however, as a whole distinctly better than that of the first hand, and interesting as a specimen of a recension which was probably due to some Alexandrian grammarian, and possibly connected with the corrector's text in 1017. A proneness to omissions of words found in the traditional text is one of the characteristics of the *Phaedo* and *Laches* papyri of the third century B.C., but these of course differ from the ordinary text much more widely than 1624.

Col. i (Frs. i, i, 2).

337 b

Col. ii (Frs. i, ii, 3-4).

337 d

15 \[\psi\]υδομενων \ η 337 c

16 lines lost

35 \[\delta\] Τροις Προδικον

337 e

70 \[\tauους\] ψαυλοστατους

2 lines lost
The Oxyrhynchus Papyri

Col. iii (Fr. 1, iii).

10 lines lost

86 τὸ κατὰ βραχὺ λι

338 a

γοις [να μεγαλο

πρεπεστεροι και

ευσχημονεστε

About 20 lines lost

Col. ix (Fr. 5).

[[υστερον]] ωυκ ὀρθως

339 d

153 πειν ει βουλεί λα

βειν μ'ου πειραν

About 36 lines lost

Col. xvii (Fr. 7).

12 lines lost

167 νυ και οι αλλοι εγω

342 a

[πιστης οστε [φαι

νεσθαι τινον προσδια

225 [λεγω]μενον παι

[δος μηθεν βελτει

[ω του]ν ου[ν] αυτο

[και των νυν] ειαν

[οι κατανοηκα

320 [οι και των παλαιω]ο

About 30 lines lost

Col. xvi (Fr. 6).

341 e

About 30 lines lost

Col. xix (Fr. 8).

342 b

231 [τι το λακωνιζειν

πολυ μα]λιον εσ

[τι φιλοσοφειν η

[φιλογυμος]ας[τειν

235 [ειδοτες δη]τι τι[νι

About 33 lines lost

Col. xx (Frs. 9–10).

342 e

About 7 lines lost

185 λοι ωοιν [οι] σο

About 7 lines lost
Col. xxiii (Fr. 11).

269 τοντο γε φανειν 343 c
270 αν [καὶ οὐ Σίμω
νῦ[δεν [] . . . . . .] 344 d
[[το[. . .]] ἀλλ ὑπερ
βαίτων δεὶ θειναι
[ε]ν τοι αἰσματι

Col. xxxv (Fr. 13).

280 ο[]?τε ψαλτ[?][α]σ· ἀλλ[α] 347 d
[α]υτοὺς εαυτοῖς ι
κανοὺς οντας ξυν[
ἐ],[[.]]ναι ανευ των η
[ρ]ων τε και παδι-
285 δῶν τοιτων δια
της εαυτων φω
νης λεγοντας τε
και ακονοντας εν τω[ι]
μερει εαυτων κο
About 26 lines lost

Col. xlvi (Fr. 18-19).

[απο τε]χινης γ[ι]γνε 351 a
395 [ται α]νθρωποι ζ [και
[απο θυμο]ν γε και
[απο μανια]ς [ως]

Col. lix (Fr. 21).

About 27 lines lost
428 τα[η]λον εσται ε
αν μ[η] πολλοις ο

Col. xxxi (Fr. 12).

275 [μος] τον γαρ ηλι 346 c
θιον [απειραν γε
νεθλα ωτ ει τις
χαιρει ψεγων εμ
πλησθειν αν ε

Col. xxxvii (Fr. 14).

318 [ποιειν ο]νκ εθε 348 b
[λον ειτε δ]ωσει[ν] [λο
320 [γυν ειτε] μη δια
[σαφειν ε]μοι [γ]ρ [ρ]
About 34 lines lost

Col. xlv (Fr. 15-17).

356 γαρ [ει] ουτω μετιων 350 d
εροι με· ει ισχυροι
[δ]υνατοι εις εις φαι
[η]ν αι[ι] επ[ειται
360 [ει] οι επισταμενει
[π]αλαιειν δυ[να
[τω]τεροι εις αι το[ν
[μη επισταμενε]φών
About 30 lines lost

Col. Ivii (Fr. 20).

398 κοβις[εφυ ο 354 d
]Πρωταγορας αλ
400 λο] τ[ι ουν παλιν

Col. lixi (Fr. 23).

477 [μι]ν, των αγαθων 355 d
[τα κακα· η αξιων;
φησομεν δηλον ο
430 νομαζει χρωμεθα
[[αρα]] ηδει τε και α
νιαρου [και αγαθοι]
και κα[κοι αλλ ε]
πειδη [δυο εφανης]
και[

435 ταυτα δινοιν ονο
[[ονο]]μαζει προσαγο
ρε[ναιςεν αντα]
τ[πω]τ[ων μεν αγα]

Col. lx (Fr. 22).
5 lines lost
[μεν οτι γεγρω] 355 c

445 [κων ο ανθρωποις]
[τα κακα οτι κα]
About 30 lines lost

Col. lxii (Fr. 24).
About 20 lines lost
535 νον και ηδος και
λυπηρ[ου μων α]
λω τωι φαινη
αν εγω[ε] η ηδο
About 13 lines lost

Col. lxiv (Fr. 25. ii). Plate vi.
και αι φωναι [[αι]] 
590 σαι εγνυθεν [[μεν]]
μειζους πορρωθεν
ελαττους
dε σμικροτερα[[::]] φαι
[—]
eν αν: ει ουν εν του
[—]
ημειν υν
[[του]]τωι το εν πρατ

480 τι αποκριομενοι
[[οτε]] ουκ αξιων ον
[των] ου γαρ αν εξη
[μα]ρτανεν ον φα
[μεν] ηττοι ειναι

485 [των] ηδονων: κα
[τα τι] δε φησει [[ισως]]
[ανα]εια εστι οταγα
[θα τον κακουν η]
[τα κα]τα τον αγα

490 [θων] [[τ]] κα[τ αλλο] τι
[η οται] τα [μεν] μει
[σω τα δε σμικροτε]
About 22 lines lost

Col. lxiii (Frs. 25. i, 26). Plate vi.
552 [δεια ιστης]. τα μει
[δω αι και] πλειω
[ληπτεα εα]ν δε

555 [λυπηρα προ]ρου λυπη
[ρα τα ελαττω και]
[σμικροτερα] εα[ν]
About 22 lines lost

580 [κρυν]ασθε φη[σω]
[φαιν]εται υμιν
[τη] οψει τα [αυτ]
[μεγαθη] εγνυθεν
[μεν μειξων. πορ]

585 [ρωθεν] δε ελαττω
[η ου φησουσι: και]
[τα παχεα και τα]

356 a
356 b
356 c
356 d
1624. PLATO, PROTAGORAS

595 [τειν ἐν τω τα μεν] [πολλα] ὡσαι[ων]
[μεγαλ]α μηκη [και πρατ]τειν [και]
About 28 lines lost

Col. lxv (Frs. 27, 28. i, 29–32).

626 πι τωι α[λ]ηθει και[ε] εσωσεν [αν] τον β[ιον]
[αρα αν ο]μολογοι [εν ανθρ]ωποι προς

630 [τα]μτα η[μ]ας την
[με]τρητικην σω
[ον]
[κειν τεχνην] η αλ
[λην τη]ν μετρη
[τικη]ν οι[μο]λογει;

635 [τε] δ ει εν τη]ν τον πε
[η]
αιρεσει [η]μιν η σω
τηρια [του βιοφ ο]
[ποτε το πλεον ο]πως
[η]

640 ε[θε]ι ελεσθαι και ο
ποτε το ελατ]τον η
αυτο προς ε[α]υτο]ν η
τη]ν ε]τερου π[ρ]ος το
[eτε]ρουν ειτ [εγγυς

645 ειτ]ε πορρω [ει]η τη
About 17 lines lost

Col. lxvi (Fr. 28. ii). Plate vi.

663 [π]ειδη δε ηθονης 357 a
tε και[ε λυπης εν ορ

665 θη [τη]ς αιρεσει εφα
νη η[μιν η σωτη
ρια τοιυ βιου ουσα
του τε πλεονος και
ελατηνος και μει

670 ζωνος [και σμικρο
τερου [και πορρω
ου
τεραι και εγγυτε
ου
ρων αρ]α πρωτον
μεν ουν μετρητι
tAbout 25 lines lost

Fr. 33.

700 [θα][ι][

]. ηγη .[ ]

]. ξα . . . [ ]

]. ω ουν [ ]

705 ]...α[ ]

Fr. 34. Fr. 35. Fr. 36. Fr. 37. Fr. 38.

707 ]σα[ 711 ]σα[ 715 ]]μ].[ ]]υ [. [ ]]αυτ[ ]]π[ ]

]μ[ ]]θει [ ]]μ [. [ ]]αυ[ ]]π[ ]
6. καί: so MSS.
7. ἑπανωθεῖ: so B, edd.; ἑπάνωθε with superscribed αι T.
8. μεν: so MSS.; τε, the reading of the first hand, is probably due to a reminiscence of l. 2. It is not quite certain that he wrote [θε] rather than [τε] in l. 13.
15. ἵπτομαι: so MSS. except Vat. 1029 (ἵπτομαι). The corrector’s reading ἵπτομαι, which is passive, not middle, and refers to the subject of the infinitives, brings out the antithesis between ἐπικρίμαν and ἑπανωθεῖ more clearly, and is likely to be right.
40. τεῖ γενέει: so BT. Elsewhere (l. 45 and 282) the first hand uses the ξ-form, which the corrector preferred here.
69-71. The fragment containing ἧς, ἑνόθ, and ἐν is not certainly placed here, and the division of lines is doubtful throughout l. 67-73.
89. καὶ χαλάσασα: these words were bracketed by Cobet.
114. [ὑδτέρον]: this word is in the MSS. and can hardly be dispensed with. It may well have been omitted here by the corrector because it was written twice over (cf. ll. 271-2, 436, 593-4, nn.); but the preceding words are corrupt in BT (γαῖτο πότερον instead of θανάτο πότερον) and may have been equally corrupt in 1624, in which case the omission of υπερτερον is possibly part of an extensive alteration.
169. γε ρυμοί: so some edd. since Bekker; but γε ρυμοί (BT, Burnet) can of course be read equally well.
173-4. οὐρί: so T; ἐπιτοί B, like the corrector.
176-7. [καὶ] ἐν | Κριν[τ]ι: ev K. τε MSS. The corrector may have added τε after ev.
180. ἀλλὰ makes the line rather long, but the division ἀλλὰ | τὰ ἐξαρχ. would be unusual.
Cf. l. 280.
223-4. Fr. 45 might be placed here, [ταύτα] ηνε and [νε] θατοι being possible.
271-2. The MSS. have nothing between Συμανίδου and ἀλλἡ. Possibly ἄλλη νυπερβατὸν was written twice by mistake; cf. l. 114, n.
281. εὐανοῦσ: αὐτοῖς BT. Cf. l. 286, n.
283. The letter before ταύ is almost entirely lost, but has clearly been crossed through, and there seems to be a letter above the line, so that it is not satisfactory to suppose that the corrector simply altered the division ἐξαρχ., which is legitimate but rather unusual, to ἐξεντρον. No variant is known here.
288-9. ην ετοι[ι] μηρει: om. ταύ MSS. The article is sometimes inserted, sometimes
omitted, in this phrase by Plato; cf. Gorg. 462 a εν τω μερει ἐρατῶν τε και ἐρατώμενως with 496 b ἀλλ' εν μήρει οἷα εκάστορν και λαμβάνει και ἀπολλάει.

319. διόστειςε τε: διόστει ΒΤ rightly; διόστεν W.

357. ἵσχεναι (B) suits the probable length of the lacuna better than οἰ ἵσχεναι (T, edd.).

360. [ε] [ο]: si t, edd.; iei B; oiei T.

396. γτ: so Stobaeus, Burnet; τε BTW, Schanz. Cf. απὸ μανᾶς γτ και θυμῶν a few lines before l. 394, where Wt Stobaeus have γτ, and BT τε.

397. [αιο μαμάκ]: the ε is fairly certain, and the length of the lacuna does not suit the restoration [αιο μαμάκ] τε, omitting αιο in accordance with Naber's conjecture.

398-400. The division of lines in this fragment is quite uncertain.

431. [αιο]: αιο BTW; αιο a corrector of the Coislinianus, Burnet. The difficulty is caused by the late position of αιο in the sentence.

435. δινων: so W, Vat. 1029; BT agree with the corrector in adding και, but place it after instead of before διον. BT's order seems preferable.

436. [αιο] μοσαιο: probably οιο had been written twice by the first hand; cf. l. 114, n.

436-7. πρωσισαγυονομένοι: so edd.; πρωσισαγυονείομεν BTW. Line 437 is already rather short (11 letters), and the substitution of о for ο, though possible, is not satisfactory. ρο[η]οιομέν αντα πρωσιο[ν]ομέν [me is inadmissible, for, though р could be read instead of ι, the only alternatives to the τ of πρωσιο[ν]ομέν are γ and π.

444-6. The position assigned to this fragment is far from certain.

481. [αιο]: the corrector omitted this word, which is in the MSS., presumably because (διον) αιο had occurred in ll. 479-80; cf. int.

486. [αιο]: this word is in the MSS., but can be dispensed with.

490. [αιο]: the omission of this word is distinctly an improvement, if η (so MSS. and edd.) was meant. This question simply supplies the answer to the preceding one κατα τι δέ κτλ., and does not introduce a fresh alternative of any kind. If η is retained, η seems preferable to η.

535-8. The division of lines in this fragment is uncertain.

582. [αιο]: so MSS.; there would be room for two more letters in the lacuna.

588. ωςανως: the σ above the line does not seem to be due to the ordinary corrector, but it is not quite certainly by the first hand.

589. [αιο]: αι is not in the MSS., but Heindorf's insertion of it has been accepted by practically all editors. The absence of αι can however be defended by supplying αισανωι with ισαι (cf. Ast's note), and it is not at all clear that the first hand was right, even though there is a doubt about the deletion. αι has had dots placed above it, but through these is a horizontal stroke, such as is used in ll. 114 and 272 to indicate the deletion of the letters below. Seeing that in l. 592 the corrector has eliminated double dots marking a change of speaker not by running his pen continuously through them, but by crossing them out separately, we prefer to suppose that the corrector in l. 589 substituted one mode of expressing deletion for another (possibly for the sake of clearness, owing to the presence of a diaeresis by the first hand over the following i of ισαι), rather than that he changed his mind about the omission of αι and meant to cross out the dots indicating deletion and let αι stand, or that this was the meaning of a possible second corrector. The bracketing of the paragraph below ll. 51, 167, 592, and 593 may have been due to a desire on the part of the corrector to avoid confusion between paragraphi and horizontal strokes indicating deletion.

590. [αιο]: nothing seems to be gained by the omission of this word, which is in the MSS., but is not essential. Since the following word began μει, the intrusion or omission of μει would be easy.

592. ομικροτεραι: so MSS. except Vat. 1029, which has ολάττου και σμικρα, a conflation
of the alternative readings found here. The corrector’s reading ἐλαττος is in accordance with μείως ... ἐλαττος in ll. 584-5.

593-4. The MSS. have ἐι οὖν ἐν τοῦτω ἦμων ἤπειρος τοι ἐκλ., except Venetus 184, which places οὖν after τοὐτῷ. ἦμων can be dispensed with, but hardly ἤπειρος. τοῦ[τοι], μείως ν. may have been the reading of the first restoration, but this first restoration, even if ἤπειρος had dots placed above it by the corrector, fails to account satisfactorily for the position of the insertion. ημων ν., and τοῦ[τοι] γε is less probable than a mistaken repetition of the syllable τοῦ: cf. ll. 114, 436, nn., and for the omission of ἤπειρος ἐν τοῦτοι l. 637, n.

596-7. The lacuna after μηκη is not very adequately filled by a wedge-shaped sign. If μηκη [καί] be read, in the absence of any known variant for μηκη και πράττειν the simplest course would be to suppose a mistaken repetition of καί: cf. the preceding n.

627-8. Βδον αρα αν ό μολογου: or possibly Βδον αρα αν ό μου.
629. ανδρωποι: so BT (and.); οι ανδρ. W, Vat. 1029, Burnet. ανδρωποι may have been meant if the first hand omitted οι, which, though probable, is not quite certain. The o of ανδρωποι apparently projected slightly to the left of the μ of ο μολογου in l. 628 and a of ημως in l. 630.

632. οὖν: so BT; om. Vat. 1029 like the first hand. οὖν is necessary in view of ἔσωσεν ἤπειρος οὖν (l. 627) and ἐσώζειν οὖν (lost in l. 646).
637. ημως: so BT. ἤπειρος is indispensable; cf. ll. 593-4, n.
649. καί: so BT. The corrector’s reading ημως i. c. ημως seems to suit the argument better.

663-5. Μετα τοι: τοι BT; ποι T. Vat. 1029 omits en in l. 664, and possibly the first hand or the corrector differed there from the ordinary reading en ὤρθη (e. g. by having την ὤρθη or en την ὤρθη). The mere omission of την in l. 665 is however more probable. The article can easily be dispensed with.

666. ημως: so MSS. The corrector’s reading ημως gains some support from the proximity of εἰς, δω ἀνθρωποι (l. 662), which introduces the summing-up of the argument, and the constant use of the second person plural throughout the dialogue with imaginary objectors in pp. 352 sqq. ἡμις, however, not ημις, is used in the previous steps of the argument (e. g. in ll. 594, 637), and the theory that good and evil ultimately meant pleasure and pain is not the starting-point of the opponents of Socrates in this part of the Protagoras, but on the contrary is forced upon them by him, so that there was no need for Socrates to dissociate himself from his opponents just at this point.

671-3. πορροτέρως καί ἐγγυτέρως: so T, and with the omission of the final iota B and modern edd.; πορροτέρως καί ἐγγυτέρω Ald. (1513); πορροτέρων καί ἐγγυτέρω Basileensis 1 (1534), agreeing with the corrector. Stephanus objected to the coupling of the adverbs without an article to the preceding adjectives, but his criticism has been answered (e. g. by Stallbaum and Ast) by citing (1) numerous parallels in Plato for the omission of the article in enumerations after the first noun, (2) instances of the coupling of adverbs with adjectives in e. g. Protag. 356 δ ταῦτα δ᾽ ἐστι μείος τε καὶ συμφόρτερα γεγυμνημα διὰ λήπως καὶ πλείο καὶ ἐλάττω καὶ μᾶλλον καὶ ἤπειρος, Philcb. 41 ε τις ... μείος καὶ τις ἐλάττων καὶ τις μᾶλλον καὶ τις σφιδροτέρα λέπτην. The objection to πορροτέρων and ἐγγυτέρω here is that these adjectival forms are in general post-classical. Thucydides, however (viii. 96), has δ᾽ ἐγγυτέρων ἐθαυμάζει, while Xenophon frequently uses ἐγγυτέρων adverbially, and there is an obvious advantage in substituting adjectives for adverbs at this point, so that the corrector’s reading is not lightly to be rejected on philological grounds alone.

700-6. It is not quite certain that this fragment belongs to the Protagoras.
740-1. Cf. ll. 223-4, n.
Aeschines, in Ctesiphontem.

32.5 x 25 cm.

Second century.

This fragment of a roll consists of three incomplete columns and a few letters from a fourth, covering §§ 14–27 of Aeschines' oration against Ctesiphon, written in a clear cursive hand of the second century, probably not later than the reign of Hadrian or Antoninus, to which a document found with 1625 belongs. There were 51 or 52 lines in a column, and 24–30 letters in a line. Iota adscript was regularly written, and elision generally avoided. Punctuation was effected by paragraphe and high stops. Diaereses are sometimes placed over initial i and u; accents, breathings, and marks of quantity are rare (ll. 53, 63, 111). That the syllable inserted above the line in l. 53 is in a different hand is not quite certain, and a still greater doubt attaches to the supposed distinction of hands in l. 21. Seven other fragments of Aeschines from Egypt are known, of which three (457, 703, and Hartel, Vortrag über die Griech. Pap. Erz. Rainer, 45 sqq.) belong to different parts of this oration, two (458 and 440; cf. Blass, Archiv, iii. 293) to the De falsa leg., and two (Nicole, Textes grecs inéd. de Genève, pp. 5–12 and P. Halle 6) to the Contra Timarchum.

The MSS. of Aeschines number about 27, and fall into three main families, called by Blass A, B, and C. In this oration A consists of ekλ, B of agmn Vat. Laur. Flor., C of διq Barb. h generally supports A rather than C, p usually agrees with B. d (10th century) is the only MS. older than the thirteenth century, but C, the family to which it belongs, has generally been regarded as inferior to the other two, of which A is now usually considered superior to B. The untrustworthy character in general of the MSS. has been clearly shown by the papyri, most of which present a number of new and better readings, not infrequently establishing conjectures. 1625, which is much longer than 457 and 703 and much older than Hartel's vellum fragments, is a carefully written papyrus, and naturally does not fail to make several improvements upon the ordinary text. The chief of these is in § 20, where two of the three families have an omission and the third, A, is corrupt. Here the papyrus confirms the simpler emendations of Lambinus, another early scholar (probably Scaliger), and Wolf against the more elaborate changes proposed by later editors (ll. 81–2). A gloss which had found its way into the text of all the MSS. in § 15 can now be detected and explained with the help of the scholia (l. 19), and a gloss found in B and C, but not in A, in § 24 was absent from 1625 (l. 154, n.). Hamaker's conjecture ἔρα for γέρα in § 18 is confirmed (l. 61), and Cobet's objection to the repetition λέγει . . . φησί in § 21 is justified, though by the omission of φησί, not P.
λέγει, as he proposed (ll. 94–5). A passage in § 19, in which the variation between present and past participles had caused difficulties, is probably set right (ll. 69–70). The other new readings mainly concern the order of words (ll. 3–4, 58–60, 97–8, 144–5), a lacuna having obscured a variant of some magnitude in ll. 135–6. In numerous instances evidence is provided for words which recent editors have wished to delete, generally in order to avoid hiatus, about which 1625 (and probably Aeschines) was not more particular than the MSS. The general relation of 1625 to them is very similar to that of most other Aeschines papyri. A is on the whole supported more frequently than B and much more frequently than C, especially in important points of divergence, there being at least 6 agreements with A (or 2 of the 3 MSS. composing it) against BC (ll. 24, 77, 81–2, 93, 116, 154 sqq.), 1 or 2 with AB against C (ll. 78, 134?), and 3 or 4 with AC against B (ll. 25, 70, 117; cf. ll. 92–3, where most of the B group and one member of A are on the wrong side). On the other hand 1625 agrees with B against AC in l. 73, with isolated members of B against all the other MSS. in ll. 62 and 131, and with BC against A at least 5 times (ll. 22 twice, 52, 53, 120, 1877). C thus comes off the worst of the three families in relation to 1625, since it gains no support for any of its peculiar readings; but when C is in combination with A or B its relationship to 1625 is much the same as that of B in combination with A or C, 1625 agreeing with the majority in about half the instances in either case, whereas A in combination with B or C is confirmed in 6 out of 7, or (if ll. 62 and 131 are included) 9, instances.

Col. i.

[ταὶ τὰς χειραπὸς φησίν] αρχαῖ 14
[απασάς εἰς περι[λαβὸν ονο]ματι
[o νομοθής καὶ] προ[σειᾶν απ]ασάς
[αρχαῖ εἰνα] αίς οι δήμοι χειροτονεῖν
5 [καὶ τοὺς εἰπότας φησί· των δήμοις
[ον εργον εο]τίν δε θ [Δημοσθ.]ης
[τειχοποιοι εἰπότας τίς του μεγά]τον
[του εργον καὶ] παρθεῖν] τοῖς οσυ διάχειρε
[ζουσι τοι των της] πολείως πλεον η τρι

Col. ii.

καὶ κοινῆ τα γενη Ευμολπίδας και
65 Κηρυκα καὶ τους αλλους απαντᾷ[·]πα 19
λιν τους τριπαρχους υπενθύνους ει
ναὶ κελευει νομὸς]·] ο[ν] τα κοινα δια
χειρισταντας υπὸ απο τοιον υμετέρουν
προσοδον πολλα μεν υφηρημενους
70 βραχεα δε καταθεντας επιδιόναι
[δε] φασκοντας αποδιόντας δε ιό
[μι]ν [τα] [υμε]τερα·] αλλα ομολογουμε
[νος τας πα]ρειας ουσιας εις την πρι]ος
[ο[μι]ς ανηλωκοτ]ας φιλοτιμιαν·] ου τοι
75 [μον] μονον οι τριπαρχοι αλλα και τα με
[γιστα των εν τη]ς [πολει συνε]δριων
Aeschines, In Ctesiphontem

[tous kellevei] poiein' ou diakonein 15
 [all arxhein do]ximassentas en [t]oi
[diakasthrioi ei]steidh kai ai klhri[ati]ai
[archai ouk ad]ximass[to]i ala doximass
[theiai arxhoui k]ai loygon kai euvn
[nas eugraphein pros tois [i.] logios
20 [tas kathaper k]ai tas allas arxhas
[kellevei oti di]al[th eis ?]] legew tous no
[mous autous v]myn anagnwsetai:
[vnomoi]
[stai toin ome avndres] Athnainoi 16
25 [a's o nomothen h]arxhas] onomazei
26 lines lost

Col. ii.

[phi]ereonta' en gar ta[v]nti [t]i[pi ol]ei ou 17
ai [tou] arxai outhi kai thlikaut[hi]i t]i me
gedos oudeis estin antip[euthnos
55 ton kai opousel pros ta koiva pros
eleuthovnoi. didazov 8 v[m]as protan 18
epi ton paran宝藏ion oioi ton iereis
kai tas iereias up[et]hunous einai o no
mos kellei kai suyllambhon panta'
60 kai xoris ekastous kata syma kai tois
tha[pera] monon lambazontas kai tas
ewxas uper [h]mwn pros tous theous
euxomenous kai ou monon idiai alla

Col. iii.

oude alla [pollla' eni de logoi ene
churaxi i o]nomothen a's outhia ton
105 uptheunov eous [an logoi apodoxoin
thi polei] vai a'allo esti tis anbropos os 22
outhei[fei]n oudein toni dhmosion

[upo toni twn dik]a]stov [ep]ychetai pe
[pho protan men] gar ton [bou]lnh ton 20
[en Apeloi pai[goi] e[ylgra]f[ei]n pros tous
80 logistos o nomos] kel[enei] logon
[ka]i euvnias didonai kai ton ek[i] skuvrho
[pon kai ton] megistovn [kuriou] aigei
[upo toni metapera]n psyfo [ou]i]k[rei sta stel[a]
[novetai he boulihe he epe Apeloi] pai[go]
85 oude gar patroin autous estin ouk a
[ra filologonutai pani ge all ouk aga]
xpwoi ean tis par autous mi adikei]
[all ean tis e]xamartanhe kholagou
[son ou de metepoi rho]ri[phi]
90 [si polin twn boulhe toni pen]ta
[koinoi upethunov pethi]kev o no
[motheon] kai ou[thi eurhrois] apio 21
[tei tis u]pethunoi oswte euv[th a]
[cho]menos] ton nomon legeo arx[he]
95 [upethunov mou apol[th]i m] He[akleis
[upeleboi an tis oti epe]nei
[mena ina ge me pr]ola[boi ton]
[chrh]e[rhoi polin upethunov ouk]
e [ai toubi outhei[fei]n oude ana]b[he
[ma anaideinai oude ekpoit]n
[ves[ va oude diadethai ta eau]

100

profallou[ta i] me[rrh deurop eirhatho
mou] o[i de outhi]n upetheunov o Aphe
145 epi toie theoiou a[s]mon de tnu
ουτε αναλωσει προσηλθε δε προσ
τι των κοινων και τουτων αποφειν
κελευει λογιουν προς τους λογιστας
και ποιος σε γε μηθεν λάβων μηθε ανα
λωσας αποσει(ει λογου) της πιολει αυτουs 150
υποβαλει και διδασκει ο νομος α χρη
γραφειν κελευει γαρ αυτο τουτο εγυγρα
φειν οτι ουτε ειδοποιον ουθεν των της
πολεως ουτε αναλωσα ανηπτυχυ
νυν δια και αιζητητων και ανεξετασ
τονου ουθεν εστιν των εν τη πιολει ο
τι δε αληθη λεγω αυτων ακουσατε

των νομων ουτε
οταν τουνο μελισσων θησσευται 23185
Δημοσθενες λεγων ως δια την επιθο
σιν ουκ εστιν υπευθυνον εγενον αν
τωι υπερβαλλετε ουκ ουκ εχον σε
ω Δημοσθενες εασαι τουν της αν
υπολογια των κηρυκην κηρυξα το πιατριον και
εννομον κηρυγμα τιτουτο της βουλη
ται κατηγορειν εασαι αμφισβητησαι
οι του βουλημενον των της υλιτων
οι ουκ επιδεικνυκες αλλα απο τοι
λοι ουν εχεις εις την των τειχους
οικοδομους μικρα καταθηκας δεκα τα
λαρνα εις ταυτα εκ της πολεως ειλη

φως μη [αρπαζη την φιλοτιμιαν .....
λου μη θε έξαιρον των δικαστων τος ψη
φους εκ των χειρων μηθε εμπροσθεν
των νομων αλλα υπερος πολιτευου
ταυτα γαρ ορθον την δημοκρατιαν προς 24

μεν ουν τις κενας; προφασεις ας ουτοι

3. ο νομοθετης, which must have stood in the lacuna, was bracketed by Weidner
and Blass. Whether 1625 had προσφέρειν with most MSS. and edd., or προσείπων with ḏ̱ν, is uncertain. Cf. § 17, where BC have προσφέρειν, A rightly προσείπων.

3–4. ἀποστασι[ας] [ὁρχας: ἀρχαὶ ἀπάσως MSS. Probably 1625 is right, and the reading of the MSS. is due to the influence of ἀρχαὶ ἀπάσως in ll. 1–2.

6–7. [Δημοσθ.]νοσ. was bracketed by Schanz and Blass, while after τειχοστῆς Halm inserted ὑδ., for which there is not room here.

8. παύτιορ[σ] : so most MSS. and edd.; but παύτιορ[σ] could be read with e.

18. καὶ εὐθὸς was bracketed by Dobree and Blass.

19. πρὸς τοὺς [τοὺς] λογοστα[ῖς] πρὸς τὸν γραμματέα καὶ τοὺς λογοστάς MSS.; cf. Schol. B (on the margin of a printed book; source unknown) γραμματεία λέγει τὸν εἰσδότα ἐν τῷ κανόν τὰ τῶν δύο γράμματα ἀναγνώσκειν, and Schol. gm Vat. Laur. λογοστής ἐκάστης φυλής eis. γραμματεία δὲ ἐκαστοί εἰςον, λέγει οὖν τὸν τῶν λογοστῶν. ἀλλαξτε ἀρχομετέ ἦσαν δέκα ἑρμηνεύοντο καλομένου λογοστατ. . . . The omission of τὸν γραμματεία καὶ in 1625 brings this passage into line with ll. 79–80 [γραφ. εἰς πρὸς τοὺς λογοστα[ῖς] and 109–10 αποφειτ][ε]ν] κελευ[ν] λο[γιον πρὸς τοὺς λογοστα[ῖς], where the MSS. equally ignore the γραμματεῖς. The scholia do not really support the longer reading. The logistae no doubt had γραμματεῖς, but the order of the words and the use of the singular γραμματεία show that these are not meant here, while the explanation of Schol. B is not at all convincing, for the γραμματεῖς who read the laws, &c., in the assembly was quite a different kind of official from the λογοσταῖ, and not likely to have been specially concerned with εὐθὸς. A comparison of l. 22 ἀναγρώσεται (sc. ὁ γραμματεία) with § 124, where most MSS. have ἀναγρώσεται ὕμω ὁ γραμματεία (ἀναγρώθη Blass with e), indicates that Schol. B has been misplaced, and really refers to l. 22, while τὸν γραμματεία καὶ in the MSS. at l. 19 is a corruption arising out of this very scholium or one like it owing to a mistaken idea that τὸν γραμματεία occurred in the text about this point, the accusative case suggesting l. 19 as a suitable point for the insertion of the words with καὶ to restore the construction. With regard to the deletion before λογοστα[ῖς] there were, as the scholium states, 10 of these officials; but it is unlikely that a second-century scribe would place a diaeresis instead of a stroke above ι (which is fairly certain), if it meant ιο, and he seems to have written or begun to write another letter after ι, though it is not clear how much ink belongs to a stroke of deletion.

21. κελευ[ν]τε, which must have stood here, is deleted by several editors, but not by Blass.

αληθῆ: of the supposed η above the line only a vertical stroke remains, and the correction may be due to the first hand: the nature of the original reading is still more doubtful.

22. αυτοῦ νῦν: so BC; ὕμων αὐτοῦς A, Blass. ἀναγρωσσετα: so BC, Blass; ἀναγρωσσετα A. Cf. l. 19, n.

23. νομοὺ: so most MSS. and edd.; νόμος a; om. επ Vat.1

24. ἀνδρέ: so A, Blass; om. BC.

25. ὡς ὁ κομβότης ἀρχαί ὄνομᾷ την [αυτοῦ: so AC, Blass; ὡς μὲν νομοθ. ἄρχας ὄνομαζῃ ὅτα ἐν B, Schultz.

52. εν: εἰ κλ.

53. ἀρχαίατο: so MSS.; ἁρχαία (r) Blass, to avoid hiatus. τῆς καταντη[θ] so BC, Blass; τοσικατη A.


57. νομο: ὅν p. ἱπεις: so MSS.; ἱπεις edd.

58. νομος κελευ: κελ. ὁ νομ. MSS. Cf. ll. 66–7, n.

59. παντας: ἀπαντας MSS.

60. καὶ τοὺς: om. καὶ MSS.

61. ἵπα: so Hamaker; ἵπα MSS., Blass. The top of the ι is lost, but one of the two dots is visible. ἵπα is no doubt right, the point being that priests got no public money.
The confusion was easy; cf. the spellings ίμη and γεμη for the same Oxyrhynchite village (1885. 98 and 1444. 34) and στηρων for στερων in P. Weil vi. 6.

62. τα: om. MSS. ημω: so a; ημων the rest, Blass.
64. τα: so most MSS., Blass; κατα hm γρ.
65. 6. παλιν: κα παλιν q.
67-8. διαχειριστας: the last a is corr. from ε. διαχειριστας some edd., but cf. ll. 69-70. n.
69. προσανατολισθη: bracketed by Bake and Blass.
69-70. υφηγημενοι ... καταδεικνυτας: υφαιμενους ... καταδεικτας AC; υφαιμενους ... καταθετας B. Blass. Probably 1625 is right, and the reading of B is an emendation of that of AC, which is a corruption of the papyrus text.
76-1. επιθυμον [δ]: so MSS.; εδδ. επιθυμον μεν Blass.
73. τα παρευρων: so B, Blass; for τοις τας παρ. (AC, except d) there is not room.
77. δικαιον: so kl; δικαιον προ το τον the rest, Blass.
78. την: so AB. Blass; om. C.
81. εδοθαι, which must have stood here, was deleted by Cobet, but not by Blass.
81-2. κα τον εκ [ει] [ακτουριον και των] μεγαστων [κυριον] σημειον: so Orelli, Baiter and Sauppe, Simcox (των . . . ακτουριων Lambinus and marg. Bern.; dγει Wolf); κ. των εκει ακτουριων κ. τ. μεγ. κυριων dγειν B; om. AC; κ. την εκ. ακτουριων . . . κυριαν δγει Wolf, Reiske, Bekker, and, with dγει instead of δγει to avoid hiatus, Blass; cf. int. There is not room for [κυριαν] in l. 82, even if τον in l. 81 did not require [κυριαι].
84. η βουλη της Αρειου παγου was bracketed by Blass to avoid hiatus.
92-3. απαιτει τοις απευθυνων: so Cahkl Vat. γρ., edd. απαιτει τοις απευθυνων έγμπρ Λαυρ. Vat.
93. ευνυ: so A, Blass; ενδεικνυ BC.
94. λεγει: this was deleted by Cobet, the MSS. having after ἵππηθον in l. 95 φησι, which was clearly omitted in 1625 and is not necessary.
95. αρχην: this was deleted by Hamaker, while Dobree preferred ἀρχης.
97-8. The MSS. have προλαβον προματα της πολεος ἢ προμετησις, from which 1625 clearly varied in regard to the position of της πολεος and προματα, and possibly by the insertion of τα after προλαβον.
103-4. εκ [χειρας]: so B; ενεχειραι A; ενεχειραι or -πις C.
104. ο νομοθεσις τας ουσιας των: so A; τας ουσιας ν. νομοθεσις τας των BC, Blass; om. ν. νομοθεσις Cobet. τας ουσιας can be read in place of ν. νομοθεσις, but the insertion of τα before των would make the line too long, while the omission of ν. νομοθεσις would leave it too short, so that A's reading is the most probable, especially since 1625 shows no tendency to avoid hiatus.
105. The supplement is rather short, and perhaps 1625 had ἀποδιδωσιν with c; ἀποδωσις most MSS., Blass; ἀποδοθαι hq Bern., ἀποδωσον Vat. Laur.
113-14. ο νομος α χρησεθηνει was bracketed by Hamaker and Blass.
116. απειδοθαι: so Δ; και ειδου βιου BC, Blass.
117. αξιωται και απειδοθαι των: so AC, Blass; άνεξ. καλ άξιωται B.
120. των νομων: so BC, Blass; των εν τη πολει Α.
121. νομος: so most MSS.; νομος 1; om. agg Vat.
124-5. αυτω: so most MSS.; αυτω glm; om. Blass on account of hiatus.
127. κηρυκα: κυριων g.
131. επεδοκασα: so g; ἐπεδοκασα q; ἐπεδοκασα the rest, Blass. απο, which must have stood in the lacuna, is omitted by εκ.
132. ειχε[ς]: so MSS., Blass; ειχε (Bake) is inadmissible.
134. εις ταύτα εκ της πολεως is restored from most MSS., but C omits εις and el have πολιτιειας for πολεως, while Blass omits εκ, and Bekker reads εκ των της. The length of the lacuna favours the presence of both εις and εκ, but not των as well.
135-6. . . . . . .καιν: α and μ are the only alternatives to λ, and the lacuna may be 2 or 3 letters shorter than as printed, but hardly any longer. The MSS. have nothing between φιλοτιμοιαν and μηδε. An imperative either preceded by μη or governing ἀρπάζειν (instead of ἀρπάζε) seems most likely, but ελθειν is not satisfactory.
140. Whether 1625 had κοινος with the MSS. or κενας, the generally accepted correction of Stephanus, is uncertain.
144-5. την αρχην την? | επι τω[ι θεωρικοι: την επι τωθ. αρχην (MSS., except h επι των θεωρικων) does not suit. την before αρχην can be omitted from the restoration, but cf. l. 154. Blass proposed επι τω θεωρικοι in both places, comparing § 25 and avoiding hiatus in l. 145; most MSS. in l. 154 have των θεωρικων (which may of course have been the reading of 1625 in both places), but cdq have τω θεωρικοι.
153. The restoration is rather short, containing only 16 letters compared with 21 in the two lines above (l. 154 may be short for special reasons; cf. n.); and ο may be inserted before Δημοκρίτησ. The loss of it would be easy owing to the hiatus.
154. After των θεωρικοι (οτ των θεωρικων; cf. ll. 144-5, n.) BC proceed στι μεσούντα την αρχην ἔγραψεν αυτῶν στεφανούν ἀναγινώσκει (ἀναγινώσκει some MSS.) διαλογισμὸς τῶν ἡμερῶν. (ὅπισ. ε. om. B), while of the A group ε has only ψῆφισμα (so Blass) and kl omit the title as well as the preceding sentence. στι . . . ἀναγινώσκει was deleted by Bekker and subsequent editors as a gloss, but some retain διαλογισμὸς τῶν ἡμερῶν as the title. Allowing for a title at the top of Col. iv corresponding to l. 121, there is certainly not room for more than 27 lines of continuous text, and there may have been only 26, so that it is practically certain that the gloss was omitted by 1625, as in A.
187. The papyrus may have had καθετερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι with C, but is unlikely to have omitted ἄλλοι with A.
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'Αδέλ 1600. 22.
άγγελος 1603. 12.
άγειν 1600. 57.
άγος [1601. 4.]
άδραλφος 1600. 22?; 1602. 29.
άδράπεπτος 1603. 21.
αἰδώσθαι 1603. 17.
άιμα 1600. 38.
άιόνιος 1602. 29.
άκοινον 1602. 1.
άκλα 1600. 16.
άκλος [1600. 31.]
άλλοφθείον 1602. 9, 15.
άν 1602. 31.
άμφιθαίμον 1601. [2], 8.
άμφιθής 1603. 15.
άμφιρεύ 1602. 24–5.
άμφιριζμος 1601. 11.
άμφιριζώντας 1603. 4.
αίνε 1601. 9.
αίνθρ 1601. 24.
αίνωμα 1602. 27.
αίνωμον 1603. 2; 7.
αίνωστέρον 1602. 8.
αίτι 1601. 34.
αίτικος 1601. 13.
ανδρός 1602. 17.
άπο 1602. 5.
άποθέλεσθαι 1600. 17; 21, 33.
αποστάλλειν 1601. 19.
αποστέμνειν 1603. 11.
απώλεια [1601. 5.]
'Αράθ (αδώρ Π) 1602. 9.
αρθιβός 9.
αρθρίον 1600. 56.
ατιμάζειν 1603. 14?
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ἀφαίρεται 1602. 5, 25.

Βασιλεύς 1602. 8.
βουλεύειν 1600. 19.
γὰρ 1600. 12, [41]; 1601. 4, 11; 1602. 6; 1603. 15.
γὰρ 1601. 3; 1602. 13, 37.
γυνάκειν 1600. 21.
γράφειν 1601. 32.
γραβῆ [1600. 39.]
γυνὴ 1601. 29; 1603. 1, et sæp.

Δαυίδ [1600. 48.]
δὲ 1600. 6; 1601. [12], 20, 27; 1603. 11, 19.
δεσμεύειν 1603. 9.
δῆ 1600. 4.
δηλοῦν 1600. 7?; 1601. 21.
διὰ 1600. 6, 18, 22?, 39; 1603. 2, et sæp.
διάδοχος 1601. 14.
διάδοσιν 1602. 11.
δίκαιον 1601. 26.
δικαστὴς 1603. 20.
διώκειν 1603. 3.
δοκεῖ 1600. 19?

δύναμις 1602. 39.

ἐὰν 1600. 16; 1601. 32; 1603. 19.
ἐαυτὸν 1602. 36.
ἐγὼ 1601. 23, 30, ἡμεῖς
[1600. 8; 1601. 7]; 1602. 20, 36.
ἐδαφίζειν 1603. 6.
ἐθνικὸς 1601. 34.

ἐθνος 1601. [2], 6, [12], 33; 1600. 19.
ἐὰν [1600. 12; 1601. 7]; 1602. 7, 37.
ἐἰς 1600. 17, 22–34, [47], 56.
ἐκ, ἐκ 1600. 3, 5; 1601. 33; 1602. 2, 6, 12.
ἐκκλησία 1601. 33.
ἐκπέμπτειν 1602. 19.
ἐκπεθανεῖν 1600. 29.
ἐκπροσθεν 1600. 44.
ἐφ 1600. [8], 34; 1601. 21, 26; 1602. 16; 1603. 9.
ἐξουσία 1601. 6.
ἐπαγγέλλειν 1602. 13.
ἐπί 1602. 10.
ἐπὶ 1601. 3, 24–5, 30; 1602. 18, 39.
ἐπιθυμ[ ] 1601. 33.
ἐρείν [1603. 11.]
ἐρμος 1602. 16.
ἐσχάτος 1602. 39.
ἐτί 1602. 11.
ἐνδοκία 1602. 34.
ἐχθεῖ 1603. 19.
ἐως 1602. 31.

ἐώς 1602. 26.
ἐτεῖν 1601. 15.
ζωή 1600. [43], 48.

'Ηλεί 1603. 6.
ἡμέρα 1600. 46.
'Ησαΐας [1600. 34.]

θεός 1600. 18; 1601. 27; 1602. 3, 10.
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μΎ 1601. 30, 34.
μαστύριαν 1600. 13, 20, 40.
Μαυσολέως 1600. 28, 42; 1601. 32.

νηστείαν 1601. 28.
νικηθής 1602. 30.
νόμιζεν 1600. 11.
νόμος 1601. 2.
νῦν 1602. 29.
νῦς 1600. 46.

εὐνυχίαν 1603. 5.

οὖν 1601. 13.
ομοίος 1600. 24-32.
όπλον 1602. 34.
όφων 1600. 18, 43.
όσος 1601. 10, 25; 1602. 4.
όσος 1602. 16.
όσπερ 1601. 21.
όστις 1602. 21.
οὐ 1594. 15; 1600. 1;
οὐ 1601. [2, 13], 28, [30],
ο簏ις 1602. 39.
οὐ, οὐκ 1600. 47; 1602. 5;
1603. 16, 17. οὐ μη 1601.
οὐκ οὖν οὐκ 1594. 15.
οὐδείς 1603. 15.
οὐδέρος 1603. 7.
Οἴρος 1603. 1?
οὖς 1601. 6, 11-12, 22, 34;
1602. 18.
οὖς(ε) 1600. 4; 1602. 37.
οὐδῆμος 1600. 45.

πᾶσα 1600. 5.
παλαιός 1600. 10, 12, 14.
πάλη 1601. 8.
παντοποθέτησις 1603. 3.
παράδοται 1603. 3.
παράγει 1603. 3.
παραλαμβάνειν 1602. 38.
παρέχει 1602. 18.
πᾶς 1603. 13-14, 17-18.
πάχυς 1600. 32.
πιάταις 1600. 36.
περί 1600. 38.
περιστάτων [1601. 14.]

περιστάτων 1601. 20.
πεπτωκέων 1600. 27.
πιστεύει 1600. 47.
πίστις 1604. 2.
πλοῦτος 1603. 19.
πνεύμα 1602. 23, 26, 39.
πνευματικὸς 1601. 7.
πολὺς [1600. 37.]
πονηρία 1603. 19.
πονηρός 1603. 18.
πορεύεται 1601. 29, 30.
ποσάκιος 1602. 11.
πρόβατον 1600. 35.
πρὸς 1600. 37; 1601. 23;
1602. 4, 10, 33; 1603. 3.
προσέλευσε 1602. 32.
προσφετεῖες 1600. 42.
προφήτης 1602. 19; 1603.
17.
προφητικός 1600. 39.
πρῶτος 1601. 31.

ῥέπτειν 1601. 18.
ῥήσειν 1602. 3.

σάκκος 1601. 24.
Σαιμψών [1603. 4.]
σήμερον 1600. 7.
Σολομόν 1603. 3.
σοφότατος [1603. 2.]
στρατιώτης 1602. 1.
σῦ, ὑμεῖς 1600. 43, 45, 48;
1601. 14; [1603. 11.]
στυγάτος 1602. 33.
συνεργῶν 1603. 20.
σαφὴν [1600. 56.]
σφίξεως 1600. 35.
σφάλλειν 1602. 27.
σώζων 1600. 37; 1602. 6.

τάξις 1602. 21.
tapetouhsfroinov 1599. 42.
teleiōν 1600. 8?
tέχνη 1601. 10.
tηρεῖν 1602. 4, 11.
timain 1603. 16.
tίς 1603. 11.
tίνως 1600. 19.
tηγχάνειν 1600. 8; 1601. 9.
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νῦν 1600. 6, 17.
τυφλαίν 1603. 5.

νῦν 1601. 5; 1603. 6.
ὑπὲρ 1602. 36.
ἐπὶ 1602. 24.
ὑπομένειν 1602. 31.
ὑπότασεῖν 1602. 14.
φάνει 1601. 4.

Φαρὰώ 1602. 6.
φείδεσθαι 1603. 15.
φονεύειν 1600. 23; 1603. 14.
φέας 1602. 36.
φιλάκη 1603. 9.

Χαναάιαί 1602. 14.
χάρα 1600. 1, 16.
χείρ 1602. 2, 6.
Χριστοῦ 1602. 1, 21, 23, 35.

ψυχῇ 1601. 4, 5.

"Αχαία 1. 9.
"Αγίνειν [II. 28?]
"Αγία II. 23.
"Αγνοεῖν I. 6; sch.
"Αγρότερος II. 21?
"Αδεία I. 14.
"Αίτία II. 17.
"Αθάνατος II. 10.
"Ακαμπτεί III. 12.
"Ακόνειν II. 29.
"Αλαλά II. 13.
"Αλκάεις II. 17.
"Αλμα I. 16.
"Αμπραί II. 15.
"Ανάκι I. 3.
"Ανάθρομος [I. 3], 30.
"Αναστάναι 1600. 25.
"Ανατράφη I. 20 sch.
"Αναθάνα II. 14; [II. 1]; III. 17.
"Από I. 1; [II. 3].
"Απο γεγονός I. 20 sch.
"Αρά I. 6.
"Αργος I. 7.
"Αρμονία II. 27.
"Αρτέμις II. 19.
"Αστασίως I. 31?
"Ατός I. 6 sch.
"Αχριν III. 14.

Βάρκος II. 21.

Βαδάκειν I. 19.
Βρασάματος II. 26.
Βρομίς I. 11.
Βρόμος II. 6, [21].

Βρατός I. 15.

Γαμετά II. 27.
Γάρ I. 15.
Γείτων III. 10.
Γενᾶ [II. 30].
Γοργόνες I. 5.

Δαναὶ I. 1.

Δᾶς II. 11.

Δέ I. 6 and sch., 15; II. [4], 10, 12, 15, 19, 22–3, 29.

Δί III. 9?

Διαπετανώνθαυ II. 4.
Διαφράμβος II. 2.
Διανυσικόν I. 10 sch.
Διήνυσος II. 31.

Δίο( ) I. 6 sch.
Δόμος I. 8.
Δράκων II. 18.

Δέ I. 6 and sch.

Δέχον II. 17.

Δέγα II. 23.

Δείδαν II. 5.

Δεινοὶ I. 6 sch.

Δεῖ I. 6 sch.

"Ελλάς II. 25.

"Εν I. 7; II. 8, 10, 12, 15, 20.

"Ενθα II. 27.

"Ενώπιον II. 16.

Εἶδος I. 20 and sch., 34.

Εἶ I. 20 sch.

Εἰσιρένος II. 23.

Εἰρ I. 23 sch.

Εἴποντες III. 13 sch.

Εἶπαχαος I. 23 sch.

Εἴπος II. 24.

Εἴρας I. 9.

Εἴργοδονος II. 12.

Ερκος I. 16.

Ερπεῖν Π. 1.

Εἴρχασθα II. 9, 25?

Εἴτε I. 14.

Εἴδαμνῆς I. 13.

Εἴδαμνος I. 11.

Εἴδοξος Π. 30.

Εἴχασθα Π. 15; II. 26.

Εὐγήθα I. 8; II. 20.

Ζεῦς II. 7, 29.

Η II title.

Ηρακλῆς II title.

Ηρωὸς III. 19?

Θιλος I. 14.

Θάνατος I. 36.
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(b) OTHER CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS.

(1600 is to be supplied before the figures in thick type. The extant portion of 1808 is not indexed, except the proper names.)

(1600 is to be supplied before the figures in thick type. The extant portion of 1808 is not indexed, except the proper names.)
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7. Απολλόδορος 8, 34.
2. Απολλώνια 6, 83.
3. Απολογισμός 8, 36.
4. Απολογία 8, 28.
5. Απολύτρα 11, 54.
7. Αποστολακτίσθη 6, 317.
8. Αποστολεύμα 6, 117, 162, 253, 364, 949.
9. Αποφέρεσθαι 8, 12?
10. Αποφοβιζόμεθα 6, 221.
11. Άπρατος 6, 41.
12. Άπρεπής 7, 180.
13. Άργες 11, 52.
14. Άργυρον 6, 264, 283, 296, 414, 345.
15. Άριστα 6, 210; 11, 231?
16. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
17. Άριστοπάνης 11, 174.
18. Άριστηρ 13, 1.
19. Άριστος 11, 148?
20. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
21. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
22. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
23. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
24. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
25. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
26. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
27. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
28. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
29. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
30. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
31. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
32. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
33. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
34. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
35. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
36. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
37. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
38. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
39. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.
40. Άριστος ή άριστος 11, 123.

βασιλεύς 10, 51, 87, 132; 11, 50, 69.
βεβαιος (βεβαίος) 6, 493, 602.
βελτιών 6, 132, 141, 148, 204.
βία 6, 227.
βίος 6, 353.
βίος 11, 123, 126.
βολικέσθαι 6, 138, 441; 10, 33, 125?; 12, 10, 22.
βολικέσθαι 6, 498?
βούς 6, 336.
βραχύς 10, 135.
βράχιονον 10, 41.

γάρ 6, 17, 113?, 122, 152, 157, 183, 242, 329, 538, 553, 595; 7, 19, 42, 63, 73, 98, 187, 224, 228; 8, 21, 40, 151; 9, 10; [10, 50?]; 11, 46, [51], 55, 58, 84, 166, 239, 389; 12, 12, 28, 35.

γε 7, 59, 162; 8, 42, 400?; 11, 190.

γεύμα 10, 35 marg.

γεύμα 10, 11?

για 6, 43; 11, 81.

γλυκασθαι 6, [156], 205, 262, 359, 378; 7, 25, 63; 8, 27, 10; 11, 30, 96; 11, 69, 90.

γευσθείων 6, 535; 8, 82.

γονέω 8, 2, 5, 45, 50.

γονή 11, 45.

δοματήσσομεν 11, 164.

δακτιλευθή 6, 320, 327, 444.

δε 6, [7], 15, 41, 47, 85, 116, 143, 155, [163], 175, 181, 186, 189, [216], 224, 246, 251-2, 255, 257, 261, 266, 295, 319, 324-5, 336, 494, 595, 588; 7, [72], 80, 84, 186, 268, 455; 8, 7, 34, 37, 49, 57; 9, 9, 14, 31-2, [34], 37; 10, 8, [12], 16, [32], 38, 70, 74, 106, 125, [237], 249?; 11, 34-5, 56, 75, 86, 92, 107, 109, 111, 127-8, 137, 151, [175], 213, 215, 223, 229, 232, 247, 276, 280; 12, 1, 11, 18, 30.

δεδώσω 10, 126?

δείν 6, 249, 361; [7, 100]; 9, 14; 12, 17.

dείν 6, 113?; 422?

dεούσαι 6, 143, 219, 318, 335.

dεκάλεω 6, 186.

δέσποινα 7, 102.

dευτερος 11, 39, (figure) 329.

δή 6, 417; 7, 102; 8, 48; 10, 101.
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δόλος 6. 152, 193, 803; 11. 32.
δρόμον 7. 24.
Δμήτηρ 12. 25.
Δμύκτατον 7. 16.
δήμος [6. 217.]
διὰ 6. 56; 203, 239; 8. 28; 10. [16?]; 21, 108; 11. 86, 88, 96.
διαδίδολος 8. 51?
διαβλάστης 7. 211.
διαγωνιστέων 6. 84.
δάγκασθαι 6. 559.
διακεφαλικαί 7. 82.
διακόσιον 5. 32; 10. 66.
διαλέγεσθαι 7. 97.
διάλειον 6. 333, 560; 11. 128.
διαπορεῖν 11. 166.
διασπαρτέονθαι 8. 25.
διαρρήκτη 7. 128.
διατείχον 10. 93.
διατήθειν 6. 422?
διαφέρεσθαι 7. 23, 62, 100.
διαφθορά 7. 194; 10. 73.
διαφορά 6. 262; 8. 42.
δίδωμος 11. 92.
δικαίων 6. 17, 254, 871; 7. 159.
δικαιο 6. 410, 495.
δικαστήριον 11. 226.
δικαστής 6. 77, 114, 221, 369, 378, 384, 859; 7. 222.
δίκη 6. 103?; 184, 248.
διόνυσι 6. 330.
διορίστεταν 7. 14, 23, 30, 40, 92.
διώχθεται 7. 285.
διολίζον 10. 134?
δίοξη 12. 31.
δόμενα 11. 41, 45, 48, 84.
δίου 6. 250, 355.
δύναμες 6. 348.
δύνασθαι 6. 16, 34, 538; 11. 51, 85.
δυστυχέστερος 6. 226.
δυστυχία 6. 158.
δωρεί 6. 172.

εἰν 6. 47?; 7. 161; 11. 94; 12. 32.
εἰσπόρτοι (αιτούν) 6. 16, 80, 168, 177, 345, 358; 8. 5, 45.
εἴδομέναι 6. 30.
εἴδομεν (figure) 11. 232.
ἐγγονος 11. 146.
εἴδεναι 6. 552; 12. 28.
ἐθνος οἱ Ἰππόποντες 11. 213.
εἰδοντα 7. 46.
ἐκές 6. 252, 322, 344.
ἐκπερ 10. 33.
ἐλιον 5. 31; 6. 93?; 165, [234], 260, [330], 346, 354, 489; 7. 284; 8. 42; 9. 13; 10. 6; 11. 224, 226.
ἐλιον 7. 191; [10. 238.]
ἐστίναι 6. 234.
ἐστία 6. 201?
ἐσόδα 7. 95.
ἐκ, ἐξ 6. 186, 285; 7. 194; 10. 41, 58; 11. 59, 60; 12. 12.
ἐκκατον 10. 74.
ἐκγονος (ἐγγονος II) 11. 146.
ἐκδοντα 10. 34?
ἐκτι 9. 9; 10. 103.
ἐκεῖον 12. 27.
ἐκπληθει 5. 47?; 10. 40.
ἐκπληθεσθαι 11. 148.
ἐκτίσεως 6. 249, 300.
ἐκτισει 6. 490.
ἐκφεύγει 6. 7.
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εὐρεγεία 6. 178, 217.
εὐτερπέμενε 10. 255.
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eὔδοσιος 10. 96.
eὔφορον 11. 78.
εὔχεμεν 6. 41, 198, 232, 297, 504, 553; 7. 44, 59, 177, 221; 8. 79, [83]; 9. 31?, [37]; 10. 44; 11. 63; 12. 5.
εὔθρα 7. 71; 8. 43.
eὔθρος 6. [190], 258, 320, 349, 359.
ες ως 6. [10], 152.

εὐκλεία 6. 5. 33; 7. 108, 216; 11. 76, [163].
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κόγχη 9. 30.
κουκονός 6. 379.
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πολέματις 7. 11.
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πόλες 6. 142, 189; 7. 287; 8. 58; 10. 19, 21, [57].
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Ποσειδών 11. 57, 61.
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προαρέσει 7. 405?
προήκειν 6. 354.
προδομεία 10. 145.
προδομιός 7. 22.
προκείμενο 11. 96.
πρό 6. 86, 237, [241], 338, [389], 457, 460, 563; 7. 15, (19), 25, 61, 69, [98], [209], 394; 8. 45, [83]; 10. 31, 59, 67, 98, 129; 11. 51?
προσευχήθη 5. 38.
προσηκοντα 6. 148?
προσήμεις 11. 173.
προσφέρεθαι 7. 103.
πρότερον 7. 19; 8. 10, 14.
προτίθεσθαι 7. 79?
πρόχερος 7. 71.
πρώτος 12. 15. πρώτος 6. 121; 11. 265.
Προλόγιοι 11. 370?
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πύρας 10. 116?
πυλία 6. 19, 123.
πύντος 6. 175.
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πόμα 5. 42.
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πάρευρος 11. 66.
περνή 10. 88.
πεστρέφων 11. 44, 48.
περιπέτευμ 6. 384.
Πεστρές 10. 46.
παπαρτός 10. 27?
πετάλεσιν 7. 238?
παπύρα μένων 10. 15.
Πετραίορος 11. 106, 112, 117.
πετρακούν 7. 286.
Πετραχώρος 11. 169.
πετσός 10. 64.
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χάρπετος 7. 283.
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Alcibiades 88-90.
Alcmeneon, archon 154.
Alexandria 151.
Alexandrian librarians 130-1.
Alexion 132.
amnesty in 493 B.C. 50.
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Bithynia 150-1.
Boges 120.
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Boreas 145.

Bucolic poets 169.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callistratus</td>
<td>132</td>
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<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitarchus</td>
<td>105, 118</td>
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<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cratinus, Πλατήν 127, 141</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocrates</td>
<td>97</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycia</td>
<td>129</td>
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