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PREFACE

All the theological and most of the classical and the non-literary papyri in this volume were discovered in our second excavations at Oxyrhynchus in 1903, described in the Archaeological Report of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902–3, pp. 5–9, and more briefly in the Archiv für Papyrusforschung, III. pp. 139–40. The rest came from the original Oxyrhynchus find of 1897. Owing to the comparatively small space here available for non-literary documents and the discovery in 1903 of a group of papyri, mostly of the early Augustan period, which is rarely represented, we have published all these together with a selection of documents belonging to the next three centuries, instead of limiting the documents to the third century, as foreshadowed in the preface to Part III.

In editing the classical pieces, we have, as usual, availed ourselves largely of the most generous and valuable assistance of Professor Blass, to whom is due much of the reconstruction and interpretation of the new classical fragments and the identification of several of those from extant authors. The help which we have received on particular points from other scholars is acknowledged in connexion with the individual papyri.

In the Appendices we give a list of addenda and corrigenda to the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part II, and Fayûm Towns and their Papyri, a revised text of Part III, no. 405, which has been identified as a fragment of Irenaeus, and a list of all the Oxyrhynchus and Fayûm papyri which have already been distributed among different museums and libraries.

BERNARD P. GRENFEll.
ARTHUR S. HUNT.

Oxford,
April, 1904.
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NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The same general method is followed in the following pages as in preceding volumes. As before, a few of the new literary texts are printed in a dual form, a reconstruction in modern style accompanying a literal transcript. In other cases, and in the fragments of extant authors, the originals are reproduced except for division of words, addition of capital initials to proper names, expansion of abbreviations, and supplements, so far as possible, of lacunae. In 669, however, which is on a rather different level from the other literary pieces, accentuation and punctuation have been introduced as well as in 658, which strictly does not belong to the literary section at all. 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. Non-literary documents are given in modern style only. Abbreviations and symbols are resolved; additions and corrections are usually incorporated in the text and their occurrence is recorded in the critical notes, where also faults of orthography, &c., are corrected wherever any difficulty could arise. Iota adscript is printed when so written, otherwise iota subscript is used. Square brackets [ ] indicate a lacuna, round brackets ( ) the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets ⟨ ⟩ a mistaken omission in the original; double square brackets [[ ]] mean that the letters within them have been deleted in the original, braces { } that the letters so enclosed, though actually written, should be omitted. 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 published in this volume and in Parts I–III; ordinary numerals to lines; small Roman numerals to columns.
The abbreviations used in referring to papyrological publications are practically the same as those adopted by Wilcken in Archiv I. i. pp. 25-28, viz.:—


Archiv = Archiv für Papyruforschung.


P. Cairo = Greek Papyri in the Cairo Museum, Catalogue by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.

P. Catt. = Papyrus Cattaoui (Archiv iii. 55 sqq.).


P. Par. = Les Papyrus Grecs du Musée du Louvre (Notices et Extraits, t. xviii. 2), by W. Brunet de Presle et E. Egger.


I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

654. NEW SAYINGS OF JESUS.

24.4 x 7.8 cm.

By a curious stroke of good fortune our second excavations at Oxyrhynchus were, like the first, signalized by the discovery of a fragment of a collection of Sayings of Jesus. This consists of forty-two incomplete lines on the verso of a survey-list of various pieces of land, thus affording another example of the not uncommon practice of using the back of ephemeral documents for literary texts. The survey-list, which is in a cursive hand of the end of the second or early part of the third century, provides a terminus a quo for the writing on the other side. This, which is an upright informal uncial of medium size, we should assign to the middle or end of the third century; a later date than A.D. 300 is most unlikely. The present text is therefore nearly contemporary with the 'Logia' papyrus discovered in 1897, which also belongs to the third century, though probably to an earlier decade. In its general style and arrangement the present series of Sayings offers great resemblance to its predecessor. Here, as in the earlier 'Logia,' the individual Sayings are introduced by the formula 'Jesus saith,' and there is the same mingling of new and familiar elements; but the second series of Sayings is remarkable for the presence of the introduction to the whole collection (ll. 1-5), and another novelty is the fact that one of the Sayings (ll. 36 sqq.) is an answer to a question, the substance of which is reported (ll. 32-6). It is also noticeable that while in the first series the Sayings had little if any connexion of thought with each other, in the second series the first four at any rate are all concerned with the Kingdom of Heaven. That the present
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text represents the beginning of a collection which later on included the original 'Logia' is very probable; this and the other general questions concerning the papyri are discussed on pp. 10–22.

Excluding the introduction, there are parts of five separate Sayings, marked off from each other by paragraphi. In three cases (ll. 5, 9, and 36) a coronis indicates the end of a sentence, which in the two first cases is also the end of the Saying, but in the third is the end of the question to which the Saying is the answer. In all three instances the words λέγει Ἰησοῦς followed immediately after the coronis. In l. 27, however, there is no coronis at the end of the Saying, but there is one after the succeeding λέγει Ἰησοῦς. The scribe is thus inconsistent in his employment of this sign, and would seem to have misplaced it in l. 27, unless, indeed, his normal practice was to place a coronis both before and after λέγει Ἰησοῦς, and the absence of a coronis after σὺ in l. 27 is a mere omission. It is noteworthy that in l. 27 a blank space is left where the coronis was to be expected. The single column of writing is complete at the top, but broken at the bottom and also vertically, causing the loss of the ends of lines throughout. From ll. 7–8, 15, 25, and 30, which can be restored with certainty from extant parallel passages, it appears that the lacunae at the ends of lines range from twelve to sixteen or at most eighteen letters, so that of each line, as far as l. 33, approximately only half is preserved. The introduction and the first and fourth Sayings admit of an almost complete reconstruction which is nearly or quite conclusive, but in the second, third, and fifth, which are for the most part entirely new, even the general sense is often obscure, and restorations are, except in a few lines, rather hazardous. The difficulties caused by the lacunae are enhanced by the carelessness of the scribe himself. The opening words οἱ τοιοὶ οί λέγοι are intolerable, even in third century Greek, and γνώσθε in l. 20 and ἀποκαλυφθησθαι in l. 29 are forms that require correction; while several instances of the interchange of letters occur, e.g. ει and η in l. 8 βασιλευνη, αι and ζ in l. 23 επερωτησε, and probably in l. 18 γνώσθησαι (cf. note ad loc.), τ and θ in l. 31 θεβαμμενον, and perhaps ν and η in l. 10 (cf. note ad loc.). In two cases (ll. 19 and 25) words which the scribe had at first omitted are added by him over the line. The only contraction which appears is τὴν for Ἰησοῦς; παρῇ in l. 19 and οὖνανθος in ll. 11–2 are written out, as usually happens in the earliest theological papyri.

We proceed now to the text; in the accompanying translation supplements which are not practically certain are enclosed in round brackets.

For valuable assistance in connexion with the reconstruction, interpretation, and illustration of 654, we are indebted to Profs. Blass and Harnack, Dr. Bartlet, and Mr. F. P. Badham, but for the general remarks on pp. 10–22 we are alone responsible.
Introduction.  ll. 1–5.

{o} toioi oi logoi oi [. . . . . . . . . . ods élá-


λςen 'Iη[σou]s d ᾧn kírmos? [. . . . . . . . .


cai Θωμᾶ kai eitp [auτoις] πaς δostis

dn tōn logon tōt[ou]n akoušan thanan

5 ou μη γενέσται.

'These are the (wonderful?) words which Jesus the living (lord) spake to . . . and Thomas, and he said unto (them), Every one that hearkens to these words shall never taste of death.'

The general sense of the introduction is clear, and most of the restorations are fairly certain. In ll. 1 an adjective such as ἑαυμάσιον is necessary after o[. For ἂκοινον with the genitive in the sense of 'hearken to' as distinguished from merely hearing cf. e.g. Luke vi. 47 πας δ ... ἄκοινον μου τῶν λόγων καὶ ποιῶν αὐτῶν. For βαηνάτων oυ μη γενέσται, cf. Matt. xvi. 28, Mark ix. 1, Luke ix. 27, and especially John viii. 52 ἐὰν τίς τῶν λόγων μου τηρήσῃ, οὐ μη γενέσται βαηνάτων εἰς τῶν αἰῶνα. In these passages of the Synoptists βαηνάτων γενέσθαι simply means 'die' in the literal sense; but here no doubt, as in the passage in
St. John, the phrase has the deeper and metaphorical meaning that those who obey Christ's words and attain to the kingdom, reach a state unaffected by the death of the body. The beginning of l. 1 requires some correction, oi tois oi logos oi being extremely ugly. The corruption of o aston into oi tois is not very likely, though cf. Luke xxiv. 44 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοῖς, aston oi logos mou ois elalhseis prois ymas esti en son ymou. But since tois is found in late prose writers for touso, the simplest course is to omit the initial oi. The ε of this oi being in a crack is not clear in the photograph, but is quite certain. The restoration of l. 2 presents the chief difficulty. εὗροι is very doubtful; εὗρι followed by e. g. ἀπηθανόν is equally likely, and several of the possible supplements at the end of the line require a longer word than εὗροι to precede. A dative before καὶ θωμᾶ is necessary, and three alternatives suggest themselves:—(1) a proper name, in which case Φιλίππω or Ματθία (or Ματθαίω) are most likely in the light of the following words καὶ θωμᾶ. Apocryphal Gospels assigned to Thomas, Philip, and Matthias are known, and in Pisitis Sophia 70–1 Philip, Thomas, and Matthias (so Zahn with much probability in place of Matthew found in the text) are associated as the recipients of a special revelation; cf. Harnack, Allchrist. Litteral. I. p. 14; (2) a phrase such as tois te Æolos or tois (') μαθηταί (so Bartlet, cf. l. 32 and John xx. 26 καὶ . . . ἦσαν ὅσα οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ καὶ θωμᾶς μετ' αὐτῶν); (3) 'Ιούδα τῷ καὶ θωμᾶ, suggested by Prof. Lake, who compares the frequent occurrence of the double name Ἰούδας ὦ καὶ θωμᾶς in the Acts of Thomas. The uncertainty attaching to the restoration is the more unfortunate, since much depends on it. If we adopt the first hypothesis, Thomas has only a secondary place; but on either of the other two he occupies the chief position, and this fact would obviously be of great importance in deciding the origin of the Sayings; cf. pp. 18 sqq. On the question whether the introduction implies a post-resurrectional point of view see pp. 13–4.

There is a considerable resemblance between the scheme of ll. 1–3, oi logos . . . oi elalhseis ἵσοις . . . καὶ εἶπεν, and the formulae employed in introducing several of the earliest citations of our Lord's Sayings, especially I Clem. 13 μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου ἵσοι ὁτὲ elalhseis didaskalow . . . ὅσα γὰρ εἶπεν, Acts xx. 35 μνημονεύει τά τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου ἵσοι ὅτι αὐτῶ εἶπεν. Rendel Harris had already (Contemp. Rev. 1897, pp. 346–8) suggested that those formulae were derived from the introduction of a primitive collection of Sayings known to St. Paul, Clement of Rome, and Polycarp, and this theory gains some support from the parallel afforded by the introduction in 654.

First Saying. ll. 5–9.

5 [λέγει Ἰησοῦς.]

μὴ πανυσάθω ὦ ζητῶν . . . . . . . . ἐως ἀν

evphι καὶ διὰν evph ἑαμβηθῆσηται καὶ ἑαμ-

βῃθει̱ βασιλεύσει καὶ βασιλεύσας ἀναπα-

'hēσηται.

'Jesus saith, Let not him who seeks . . . cease until he finds, and when he finds he shall be astonished; astonished he shall reach the kingdom, and having reached the kingdom he shall rest.'

The conclusion of this Saying is quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. ii. 9. 45) ὁ καὶ τῷ καθ' ἑβραίων ἐνσυγγελίω ὁ θαυμάσας
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βασιλεύσει γέγοραται καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἐπαναύσηται. In Strom. v. 14. 96 (a passage to which Zahn first called attention, Gesch. d. NT. Kan. ii. p. 657) he quotes the Saying in a fuller and obviously more accurate form which agrees almost exactly with the papyrus, but without stating his source:—οἱ παίσται ὁ ζητῶν ἐν στίχοις, εὐφοροι δὲ θαυμάζοντες, θαυμάζει δὲ βασιλεύσεις, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναύσηται. The word after ζητῶν in l. 6 is very likely the object of ζητῶν (τὴν ζωήν; τὴν βασιλείαν is too long), but it may be another participle depending on τουσδόθω or an adverb. This part of the saying is parallel to Matt. vii. 7 (=Luke xi. 9) ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε. The supplements in li. 7–8 are already rather long in comparison with the length of lines required in li. 15, 25, and 30, so that it is improbable that ἐπαναύσηται is to be supplied or that ὁ occurred in the papyrus before θαυμάζεις and βασιλεύσας (cf. the first quotation from Clement). ὁ δὲ in place of καὶ is of course possible in l. 7, but since the papyrus has καὶ and not δὲ in l. 8 καὶ is more likely also in l. 7. The occurrence of θαυμάζεις, not θαμάζας, in li. 7–8, confirms Zahn’s acute suggestion (Gesch. d. NT. Kan. ii. p. 657) that θαυμάζεις was the original word; but we should not accept his ingenious explanation of it as a mistranslation of a Hebrew or Aramaic verb which could also mean θαυμάζεις, and his view that σωτηριμμένος (cf. Luke iv. 18) would have been the right term. The attractiveness of this kind of conjecture is, as we have recently had occasion to remark (403 introd.), only equalled by its uncertainty. Now that the Saying is known in its completer form, and if we disregard the particular object (to show that the beginning of philosophy is wonder) to which Clement in the first of his two quotations turns it, this description of the successive stages in the attainment of the kingdom of Heaven seems to us decidedly striking, and by no means so far removed from the 2 Anschauungen des echten Urchristenthums3 as Resch (Agrapha, pp. 378–9) considers. To the probable reference to it in II Clem. v. 5 (cf. the next note) η δὲ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεγάλη καὶ θαυμαστὴ ἐστιν καὶ ἀνάπαυσις τῆς μελλόντης βασιλείας καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίων, quoted by Resch (l. c.), Mr. Badham adds a remarkable one in the Acts of Thomas (ed. Bonnet, p. 243) οἱ δὲ τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντες τῶν ἑκατέρν ἀναπαύονται καὶ ἀναδομοῦνται βασιλεύσοντας4.

As Dr. Bartlet aptly remarks, the idea of the necessity for strenuous effort in order to attain to the kingdom has much in common, not only with the 3rd Saying οὖν ἀποκατάστησιν ἀνθρώποις κ.τ.λ., but with the 5th Logion (‘Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me’); cf. pp. 12–3.

Second Saying. ll. 9–21.

λέγει Ἡ[η]σοδς· τίνες
10 οἱ ἐλκοῦσε ἡμᾶς [εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰ]
ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρα[νῷ] ἐστιν;

tà pēteiνà toû ouρα[νοῦ] kai τῶν θηρίων δ.-

---

1 Since this volume was put into type, Harnack has expressed his views of this Agraphon in Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad. 1904, pp. 175–9. He there shows in opposition to Zahn that astonishment is to be interpreted here as a sign of joy, not of fear, and strongly repels the unfavourable criticisms of Resch upon the Saying, of which Harnack in fact maintains the substantial genuineness. Incidentally, as he also remarks, the close parallelism between the language of the papyrus and Clement is important, for from whatever source this Saying found its way into the present collection, it cannot have come through Clement. There is, therefore, good reason to think that the Gospel according to the Hebrews (or at least a part of it) was known in Egypt in a Greek version at an early period, a view which has been disputed by Zahn.
Jesus saith, (Ye ask? who are those) that draw us (to the kingdom, if) the kingdom is in Heaven? ... the fowls of the air, and all beasts that are under the earth or upon the earth, and the fishes of the sea, (these are they which draw) you, and the kingdom of Heaven is within you; and whoever shall know himself shall find it. (Strive therefore?) to know yourselves, and ye shall be aware that ye are the sons of the ... Father; (and?) ye shall know yourselves ... and ye are ...'

The reconstruction of this, the longest and most important of the Sayings, is extremely difficult. Beyond the supplements in l. 15 which are based on the parallel in Luke xvii. 21 with the substitution of τῶν οὐρανῶν, St. Matthew's phrase, for St. Luke's τοῦ θεοῦ which is too short for the lacuna, and those in ll. 12-3, 16, and 18, the general accuracy of which is guaranteed by the context, it is impossible to proceed without venturing into the region of pure conjecture. There seems to be no direct parallel to or trace of this Saying among the other non-canonical Sayings ascribed to our Lord, and the materials provided by ll. 10-12—οἱ ἐλκοντες, the kingdom of Heaven and the fowls of the air—are at first sight so disparate that the recovery of the connexion between them may seem a hopeless task. But though no restoration of ll. 9-14 can hope to be very convincing, and by adopting different supplements from those which we have suggested, quite another meaning can no doubt be obtained (see below), we think that a fairly good case can be made out in favour of our general interpretation. The basis of it is the close parallelism which we have supposed to exist between l. 15 τῶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν and, on the other hand, l. 10 ὑμῶν ἴμαστε followed in l. 11 by ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρανοῖς, whereby we restore οἱ ἐλκον at the end of l. 14. If this be granted ll. 9-16 divide themselves naturally into two parallel halves at the lacuna in l. 11, ll. 9-10 corresponding to ll. 12-5, and l. 11 to ll. 15-6. How is this correspondence to be explained? The simplest solution is to suppose that ll. 9-11 are a question to which ll. 12-6 form the answer; hence we supply τίνες in l. 9; cf. the 5th Saying, which is an answer to a question. A difficulty then arises that we have ἐλκοντες ἴμαστε in l. 10 but ἐλκοντες ἴμαστε in l. 14-5. This may be a mere accident due to the common confusion of ἴμαστε and ἴμεστε in papyri of this period, and perhaps ἴμαστε should be read in both cases. But ἴμαστε in l. 10 can be defended in two ways, by supposing either that Jesus here lays stress rather on His human than on His divine nature, and associates Himself with the disciples, or that the question is put into the mouth of the disciples, i.e. the word before τίνες was ἐρωτήστε or the like. There remains, however, the greatest crux of all, the meaning of ἐλκοντες. In the two passages in which this word
occurs in the New Testament it has an unfavourable sense; but here a favourable meaning is much more likely, as with ἀλατίον in John vi. 44 εἰς μὴ ὅπως τέλος...ἀλατίον αὐτῶν and xii. 32 πᾶντας καὶ πρὸς ἑκατέραν: Mr. Badham compares Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 6 τοὺς μεν γὰρ (i.e. wild beasts of sinners) προτέρει οἱ Κύμοι τοὺς ὅτι ἐγχειρήσαντι καὶ χείρα ἐφεύρεται καὶ αὐτοί, καὶ ἐκδικεῖν, and *ibid.* v. 12 ἡ ἤχος τοῦ λόγου...πάντα τοῦ καταδεξάμενον καὶ ἐντός ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἔλεη. A phrase such as εἰς τὴν Βασιλείαν is required to explain ἀλατίον, though even with this addition the use of that word in such a context must be admitted to be difficult. The idea in ll. 12–6 seems to be that the divine element in the world begins in the lower stages of animal creation, and rises to a higher stage in man, who has within him the kingdom of Heaven; cf. Clement’s discussion (*Strom.* v. 13) of Xenocrates’ view that even ἀλατίον (οὐκ ἑδώρωσα) possibly had some τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἐννοια, and the curious sanctity of certain animals in the various Apocryphal Acts, e.g. Thecla’s baptized lionness, Thomas’s ass, Philip’s leopard and kid buried at the door of the church. It is possible that there is some connexion between this Saying and the use of Luke xvii. 21 by the Naassenes; cf. p. 18. The transition from the inward character of the kingdom to the necessity for self-knowledge (ll. 16–21) is natural. Since the kingdom is not an external manifestation but an inward principle, men must know themselves in order to attain to its realization. The old Greek proverb γνῶθι σεαυτόν is thus given a fresh significance. Mr. Badham well compares Clem. *Paedag.* iii. 1 ἢ τρόπος ἢ ἔσοχε πάντων μέγιστον μαθημάτων τὸ γνῶναι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ γὰρ τὸς ἐαυτῷ εἰσται. For the restoration of l. 16, cf. l. 18, τοῦτον in l. 17 is the Βασιλείαν. This line may have ended with something like ὅπως οὖν, if we are right in correcting γνῶσθαι to γνῶσθε (cf. the similar confusion in l. 23). For νοια, which is required by the context in l. 18, cf. e.g. Luke xx. 36. τῆς in l. 19 (πρὸς εἰς equally possible) is perhaps the beginning of an adjective, but τοῦ/ν χάριν, e.g., might also be read. How γνῶσθε in l. 20 is to be emended is uncertain; we suggest γνῶσθα (εἰς)θε, but the corruption may go deeper. εἰς is perhaps ἑντός τῆς βασιλείας. ηπτοῖ in l. 21 is very obscure; the letter following τ may be ε, ο or ω; but neither if τη is the article, nor if τητο is one word, does any suitable restoration suggest itself. ηπτοῖ can hardly be a participle, for if λέγει ηπτοῖς occurred, as would be expected, at the end of the line, there is room for only about four more letters in the lacuna. It is tempting to read ἡ πτητροτις, with ἐν τῇ πίθοι τοῦ θεοῦ in l. 20, as Blass suggests, comparing for the omission of ὄστας Mark vi. 20 εἶδος αὐτῶν ἅπαν δίκαιον.

Another and quite different restoration of the early part of this Saying is suggested by Dr. Barlett, who would read λέγει ηπτοῖς· μὴ φοβεῖτωσαι οἱ ἀλατίες ὕψος [ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὑμῶν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ώς ὑμῖν ἄνατα] τὰ σεπτά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πᾶν [ὡς δὲ] τὸ ῥοῦ τῆς γῆς ἐντὸς τὰ τὴν ἐπί γῆς καὶ οἱ Ιθησεῖς τῆς ἑρμήνευσας...; comparing the idea in *Epistle of Barnabas*, vi. 12 and 18 τίς ὁ δυνάμεις νῦν ἄρχειν ἂρχειν ἂρχειν ἡ ἡθος ἡ πετείων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; αἰτεῖναι γὰρ ὑμῖν ἀρέσκειν, ὅτι τὸ ἄρχειν ἐξοντας, ὅτα τὴν προκεῖται κυρία. εἰ οὖν οὐ γίνεται τοῦτο νῦν, ἀρά ἡμῖν εἰρήνην πάντα ὅταν καὶ αὐτοῦ τελειωθήση, κυρίως ἔνας τὰς διαθήκας κυρίως γενέσθαι, and II Clem. v. 4 εἴπεν ὃ ἄνησις τῷ Πετρῷ μὴ φοβεῖτωσαι τὰ ἅρια τοῦ λόγου...καὶ γνῶσθε, ἀθελοῦν, ὅτι ἐπιθήμα η ἐν τῷ κάσῳ τοῦ τῆς σαρκός τοῦτον μικρὰ ἄντι καὶ ὁλοχρόνος, ἢ δὲ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ Χριστοῦ κ.τ.λ. (*a passage resembling the 1st Saying; cf. note, ad loc.*). The parallels from Barnabas and Clement perhaps give this restoration some advantage over ours, but ἀλατίες alone without an explanatory phrase is not a satisfactory word for ‘persecute,’ and the transition from the promise of the kingdom of Heaven to the fowls of the air is very abrupt and almost inconsequent, while it is difficult to find the connexion between the fowls of the air and the second mention of the kingdom of Heaven. This, the chief problem in the 2nd Saying, seems more easily explained by the hypothesis of a repetition of ἀλατίες and the resulting parallelism between the two halves of ll. 9–16 which we have suggested.
Third Saying. II. 21-7.

Jesus saith, A man shall not hesitate ... to ask ... concerning his place (in the kingdom. Ye shall know) that many that are first shall be last and the last first and (they shall have eternal life?).

Line 24 may well have continued τῇς βασιλείας followed by a word meaning 'know' (?είδοσε, or γνόσετε or ἀκούστε, for γνώστευται or ἀκούστευται), but the double -ρων in II. 23 and 24 is very puzzling, and in the absence of a clear parallel we forbear to restore the earlier part of the Saying. Dr. Bartlet suggests a connexion with the Apocalypse of Peter, e.g. § 4 κύριον ἐφη αὐτῷ καὶ ποῦ εἰσὶ πάντες οἱ δίκαιοι ἤ ποιοί ἐστιν ὁ αἰῶν ἐν ὧν ἐστὶν ταῦτα ἡ ἐξουσία τῶν ἀρχῶν (l. ἀρχαίων, Bartlet) ἡμῶν τῶν δίκαιων ἀνθρώπων, taking ἀρχαίων to be equivalent to προσβατόρων in Heb. xi. 2, or to πατέρων; cf. Matt. v. 21, 33 ἐρείπη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις and Luke ix. 8, 19. But the problem was an old one. Lines 25-6 πολλάκις ... πρῶτοι follow Mark x. 31 (=Matt. xix. 30) πολλάκις θ' ἐσωτερικός πρῶτοι ἐχοσταί καὶ οἱ ἐσχατοί πρῶτοι. In the insertion of οἱ before ἐσχατοί the papyrus agrees with BC and many MSS. in Mark x. 31; ND and other MSS. omit οἱ there, and in Matt. xix. 30 οἱ is generally omitted, though found in C and some others. Luke xiii. 30 is rather longer, καὶ οὐδὲ ἐσωτερικός καὶ ἐσχατοί πρῶτοι καὶ ἐσωτερικός καὶ ἐσχατοί πρῶτοι. The sense of this Saying is clear, and the supplements are fairly certain. Lines 29-30

Fourth Saying. II. 27-31.

Jesus saith, Everything that is not before thy face and that which is hidden from thee shall be revealed to thee. For there is nothing hidden which shall not be made manifest, nor buried which shall not be raised.'
are parallel to Matt. x. 26 oidev yap estho kekaleimion o oik apokaluphsetai kal kurpion o ou

yivoshtetai, Luke xii. 2 oidein de syngkekaleimion estin o ouk apokaluphsetai kal kurpion o ou

yivoshtetai: cf. Mark iv. 22 ou yap estin kurpion ein o yu vna fanevtho oide evgeno apokrifiou al

ou ylhe ein fanevno. In general arrangement the papyrus agrees with Matthew and Luke

perhaps more than with Mark; but the language of the first half of the sentence is

much closer to that of Mark (whose expression ein yu vna fanevthi instead of the more

pointed o ou fanevthtetai suggests the hand of an editor), while that of the second half

diverges from all three. tivamwno makes a more forcible contrast to kurpion than

the corresponding word in the Synoptists, which is merely a synonym. Instead of

eyivoshtetai a more general word such as yivoshtetai can be supplied; but this detracts from

the picturesqueness of what is in any case a striking variation of a well-known Saying.

Fifth Saying. ll. 32-42.

[ε]εταξουσιν αυτων oii mpytaia autoy kai
[λε]γουσιν πως νηστευσομεν kai pwo ... 

[....]meba kai pwo [............]

35 [....]kai ti paratdirh[omevn ...]

[....]v; λεγει 'Ηη(σο)ισ'. [............]

[....]etiai μη ποιείτε [............]

[....]eis aλθειας αυτ[....]

[....]v α[π]οκερην [............]

40 [....]μακαριδοσ] estin [............]

[..............]ω esti[............]

[..............]k[............]

'His disciples question him and say, How shall we fast and how shall we (pray?)... and what (commandment) shall we keep... Jesus saith, do not... blessed is he...'

Though this Saying is broken beyond hope of recovery, its general drift may be

cought. It clearly differed from the other Sayings, both in this papyrus and the first

series of Logia, in having a preliminary paragraph giving the occasion, which seems
to be a question put by the disciples; cf. p. 15. For εταξον in reference to them

cf. John xxi. 12 oudeis de etoima tin alogon oxeisth.toi auton' ovo tis e; eidothes oti o kyrios estin.
auto in l. 1 is not very satisfactory, but something more than mpithai is required, and cf. 655. 17-8. pareswos is not likely in the light of what follows. The question clearly consisted of a number of short sentences, each beginning with pws or ti, and so far as can be judged, they were concerned with the outward forms of religion, fasting, prayer (proseuqsmi) and almsgiving. How far, it is probably asked, are existing Jewish ordinances to be kept? The answer of Jesus appears to have been a series of short

commandments insisting on the inner side of religion as the pursuit of virtue and truth, and

very likely concluding in l. 40 with the promise 'Blessed is he who doeth these things.' If

this explanation is on the right lines, there is a general parallelism between this Saying and
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Matt. xix. 16-22 and Luke xviii. 18-22, but the occurrence of ἀλήθεια and ἀπεικονισμόν (ἡ) suggests that the language was more Johannine in character. Line 39, as Prof. Lake remarks, could be restored on the basis of Rev. ii. 17 τὸ μνήμα [τῷ αἰσχρῷ]. The reference to fasting in L. 53 suggests a connexion with the 2nd Logion (‘Except ye fast to the world’), which may well have been an answer to a similar question by the disciples.

We do not propose to enter upon a detailed examination of the numerous and complicated problems involving the Canonical and Apocryphal Gospels and the ‘Logia’ of 1897, which are reopened by the discovery of the new Sayings. But we may be permitted to indicate the broader issues at stake, and in the light of the wide discussion of the Logia of 1897 to point out some effects of the new elements now introduced into the controversy.

We start therefore with a comparison of the two series of Sayings (which we shall henceforth call 1 and 654). Both were found on the same site and the papyri are of approximately the same date, which is not later than about the middle of the third century, so that both collections must go back at least to the second century. The outward appearance of the two papyri is indeed different, 1 being a leaf from a handsomely-written book, which may well have been a valuable trade-copy, while 654 is in roll form and was written on the verso of a comparatively trivial document. The practice of writing important literary texts on such material was, however, extremely common, and the form of 654 lends no support to the hypothesis that the papyrus is a collection of notes made by the writer himself. In the uncial character of the handwriting, the absence of abbreviations and contractions other than those usually found in early theological MSS., and the careful punctuation by the use of the paragraphus and coroni, 654 shares the characteristics of an ordinary literary text such as 1. Since 1 is the 11th page of a book, it must have formed part of a large collection of Sayings, while 654 comes from the beginning of a manuscript and provides no direct evidence of the length of the roll. But the document on the recto is not a letter or contract which would be likely to be short, but an official land-survey list, and these tend to be of very great length, e.g. P. Brit. Mus. 267, P. Tebt. I. 84-5. The recently published Leipzig papyrus of the Psalms (Heinrici, Beitr. s. Gesch. d. NT iv), though incomplete at the beginning and end, contains as many as thirty-six columns written in cursive on the verso. So far therefore as can be judged from externals, 654 like 1 probably belongs to an extensive collection of Sayings which may well have numbered several hundreds.

Turning next to the contents of the two papyri, no one can fail to be struck with their formal resemblance. Postponing for the moment the introduction of 654 (ll. 1-5), which, since it necessarily presupposes the existence of the Sayings introduced and may have been added later, stands on a different footing from the Sayings and requires separate treatment, the five Sayings partly recorded in 654 begin like those in 1 with the simple formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς; and both fragments contain Sayings which to a greater or less degree have parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels side by side with Sayings which are new. In 1 the style was simple and direct, and the setting, with the constant balancing of the words and sentences and the absence of connecting particles, highly archaic; the same features, though obscured unfortunately by the incompleteness of the papyrus, are also distinctly traceable in 654. There is, however, one difference in the two papyri in point of form. To the 5th Saying in 654 (ll. 36 sqq.) is prefixed (ll. 32-6) a brief account of the question to which it was the answer. This may prove to be of great importance in deciding the origin of these Sayings, but for our present purpose it is sufficient to point out that even in 654 the occurrence of the context is the exception, not the rule, and the fact that the Sayings in 1 agree with the
first four Sayings in 654 in omitting the context rather than with the 5th obviously produces no serious conflict between the two documents.

We proceed to a closer examination of the two series. In 1 the 7th Logion ('A city built on a hill') is connected with St. Matthew's Gospel alone; the 6th ('A prophet is not acceptable') has a noticeable point of contact with St. Luke in the use of the word ἔκτρος, and the 1st also agrees with St. Luke. The 5th ('Wherever there are') starts with a parallel to St. Matthew, but extends into a region far beyond. Nowhere in 1 can the influence of St. Mark be traced, nor was there any direct parallel with St. John's Gospel; but the new Sayings, both in thought and expression, tended to have a mystical and Johannine character. In 654 we have one Saying (the 2nd) of which the central idea is parallel to a passage found in St. Luke alone, but of which the developments are new; the conclusion of the 3rd Saying connects with St. Matthew and St. Mark rather than with St. Luke, while the 4th is a different version of a Saying found in all three Synoptists, and is on the whole nearer to St. Mark than to the other two Evangelists. The 1st Saying and, so far as we can judge, the 5th have little, if any, point of contact with the Canonical Gospels. As in 1, so in 654 the new elements tend to have a Johannine colouring, especially in the 2nd Saying; but some caution must be observed in tracing connexion with St. John's theology. The 1st Saying, if the papyrus had been the sole authority for it, might well have seemed nearer in style to St. John than to the Synoptists; yet as a matter of fact it occurred in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, a very early work which is generally admitted to have been originally written in Hebrew and to have been independent of the Canonical Gospels, most of all St. John's. On the other hand, while the Sayings in 654 contain nothing so markedly Johannine in style as e.g. 'I stood in the midst of the world...' in 1.11 sqq., the introduction contains a clear parallel to John vii.52. This at first sight may perhaps seem to imply a knowledge of St. John's Gospel on the part of the author of the introduction, but it must be remembered (1) that St. John may well not have been the sole authority for the attribution of that Saying to our Lord, and if so, that the author of the introduction may have obtained it from another source, (2) that a knowledge of St. John's Gospel on the part of the author of the introduction does not necessarily imply a corresponding debt to that Gospel in the following Sayings, which, as we have said, stand on a somewhat different footing from the introduction.

In our original edition of 1 we maintained (a) that the Sayings had no traceable thread of connexion with each other beyond the fact of their being ascribed to the same speaker, (b) that none of them implied a post-resurrectional point of view, (c) that they were not in themselves heretical, and that though the asceticism of Log. 2 and the mystic character of Log. 5 were obviously capable of development in Encratite and Gnostic directions, the Sayings as a whole were much nearer in style to the New Testament than to the apocryphal literature of the middle and end of the second century. If these positions have been vigorously assailed, they have also been stoutly defended, and about the second and third no general agreement has been reached; with regard to the first the balance of opinion has been in favour of our view, and the various attempts to trace a connexion of ideas running through the Sayings have met with little acceptance. What answer is to be returned to the corresponding problems in 654?

We will take the third question first. Is there anything in 654 to show that the Sayings originated in or circulated among a particular sect? We should answer this in the negative. There is nothing heretical in the introduction, the 1st, 3rd, and 4th Sayings, or, so far as can be judged, the 5th. The Encratite leanings which have been ascribed to the 2nd Logion are conspicuously absent in 654; the remains of the 5th Saying in fact rather suggest an anti-Jewish point of view, from which however the 2nd Logion itself
was not widely distant, if, as we strongly hold, ἀποστάσεις and σαββατικής are to be taken metaphorically. The absence of any Jewish-Christian element in 654 is the more remarkable seeing that the 1st Saying also occurs in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The only Saying that is at all suspicious is the 2nd, which like Log. 5 is sure to be called in some quarters ‘Gnostic.’ That the profoundly mystical but, as it seems to us, obviously genuine Saying of our Lord recorded in Luke xvii. 21 ‘The kingdom of God is within you’ should have given rise to much speculation was to be expected, and from Hippolytus Refut. v. 7 it is known that this Saying occupied an important place in the doctrines of the Naassenes, one of the most pronounced Gnostic sects of the second or early third century. That there is a connexion between the Sayings and the Naassenes through the Gospel of Thomas is quite possible and this point will be discussed later (pp. 18–9); but to import Naassene tenets into the 2nd Saying in 654 is not only gratuitous but a θυτερον πρότερον. Moreover, though the other ideas in the Saying connected with the parallel from St. Luke, the development of the kingdom of Heaven through brute creation up to man (if that be the meaning of ll. 9–16), and the Christian turn given to the proverbial γραμματέων (ll. 16–21), may point to a later stage of thought than that found in the Canonical Gospels, the 2nd Saying as a whole, if ‘Gnostic,’ presents a very primitive kind of Gnosticism, and is widely separated from the fully-developed theosophy of e.g. the Pistis Sophia. In any case the ‘Gnosticism’ of 654 is on much the same level as that of 1.

Do any of the Sayings (apart from the introduction) imply a post-resurrectional point of view? This too we should answer in the negative. There is not only nothing in them to indicate that they were spoken after the resurrection, but substantial evidence for the opposite view. The familiar Sayings in the Canonical Gospels which are parallel to those found in 654 are there assigned to our Lord’s lifetime, including even John viii. 52. The Gospel according to the Hebrews with which the 1st Saying is connected covered the same ground as the Synoptists, and there is no reason to suppose that this Saying occurred there as a post-resurrectional utterance. But the best argument is provided by the 5th Saying, especially its context which is fortunately given. The questions there addressed to Jesus clearly belong to a class of problems which are known to have been raised by our Lord’s disciples and others in his lifetime, and, if ἐκαίνιας is in any case a somewhat stronger term than would be expected, seeing that the disciples seem to be the subject (though cf. John xxi. 12), it is most unlikely that this word would have been used with reference to the risen Christ. In fact none of the five Sayings in 654 suggests a post-resurrectional point of view so much as the 3rd Logion (‘I stood in the midst of the world’); cf. pp. 13–4.

Can a definite principle or train of ideas be traced through the Sayings? The first four are certainly linked together by the connecting idea of the kingdom of Heaven, which is the subject to a greater or less degree of all of them. But between the 4th and 5th Sayings the chain is certainly much weaker and threatens to snap altogether. It is very difficult to believe that if 654 was part of a large collection of similar Sayings a connexion of thought could have been maintained throughout, and the Sayings in the later columns of 654 may well have been as disconnected as those in 1. Even in the five which are partly preserved in 654 there is a constant change in the persons addressed, the 1st and 3rd being couched in the third singular, the 2nd and almost certainly the 4th in the second plural, and the 4th in the second singular. Moreover the real link is, we think, supplied by the introduction, the consideration of which can no longer be delayed. Only before proceeding further we would state our conviction that in all essential points, the date of the papyrus, the form of the Sayings, their relation to the Canonical Gospels, and the general character of the new elements in them, to say nothing of the parallelism of thought between the 1st and
3rd Sayings and the 5th Logion (cf. p. 5), the resemblances between 654 and 1 so far outweigh the differences that for practical purposes they may be treated as parts of the same collection. Even if it ever should be proved that the first page of 1 did not coincide with 654, the two fragments so clearly reflect the same surroundings and mental conditions that we cannot regard as satisfactory any explanation of the one which is incompatible with the other.

'These are the . . . words which Jesus the living . . . spake to . . . and Thomas, and he said unto them: "Every one that hearkens to these words shall never taste of death."' Such is the remarkable opening prefixed to the collection of Sayings in 654 by its unknown editor. The first point to be noticed is that the name given to the collection is, as was acutely divined by Dr. Lock (Two Lectures on the Sayings of Jesus, p. 16), λόγια not λόγια, and all questions concerning the meaning of the latter term may therefore be left out of account in dealing with the present series of Sayings. The converse of this, however, in our opinion by no means holds good, and as we have pointed out (p. 4), the analogy of the present document has a considerable bearing upon the problems concerning an early collection of λόγια.

Secondly, the collection is represented as being spoken either to St. Thomas alone or to St. Thomas and another disciple or, less probably, other disciples. Does the compiler mean that the Sayings were the subject of a special revelation to St. Thomas and perhaps another disciple, from which the rest were excluded? In other words is this introduction parallel to that passage in the Pistis Sophia 70–1 in which mention is made of a special revelation to SS. Philip, Thomas, and Matthias (or Matthew; cf. p. 4)? The case in favour of an affirmative answer to this query would be greatly strengthened if the introduction provided any indication that the editor assigned his collection of Sayings to the period after the Resurrection. But no such evidence is forthcoming. We do not wish to lay stress on δ᾿ ζωή in l. 2 owing to the uncertainty attaching to the word that follows; but the phrase δ᾿ ζωή certainly does not point to the post-resurrection period. In the Canonical Gospels St. Thomas is made prominent only in connexion with that period (John xx, 24 sq.), but this circumstance, which is probably the strongest argument in favour of a post-resurrectional point of view, is discounted by the fact that the Gospel of Thomas, so far as can be judged, was not of the nature of a post-resurrectional Gospel but rather a Gospel of the childhood (cf. pp. 18–9), and, secondly, seems to be outweighed by the indications in the Sayings themselves (cf. p. 12) that some of them at any rate were assigned to Jesus’ lifetime. The force of the second argument can indeed be turned by supposing, as Dr. Bartlet suggests, that the standpoint of the collection, both in 1 and 654, is that of a post-resurrection interview in which the old teaching of Christ’s lifetime is declared again in relation to the larger needs of Christian experience. But such a view necessarily implies that l. 1–3 define a particular occasion (e.g. that contemplated in John xx. 26) on which the Sayings were spoken in their present order, and to this hypothesis there are grave objections. The use of the aorists ἀληθέν and εἶπεν in 654. 2–3 does not prove that one occasion only was meant. The repetition of λέγει ἵνα ἦσθι before each of the Sayings seems very unnecessary if they are part of a continuous discourse. The difficulty of tracing a connexion of ideas throughout 654, and still more throughout 1, and the frequent changes in the persons addressed provide fresh obstacles to such an interpretation; and the inappropriateness of the word ἐξερεύναμεν in connexion with the risen Christ has already been alluded to (p. 12). To suppose that 654. 3–31 is a speech in itself, that l. 32–6 revert to the original narrative broken off at l. 3 and that 1 is part of a later discourse appears to us a very strained interpretation.

We are not therefore disposed to consider that the introduction to the Sayings, any more than the Sayings by themselves, implies a post-resurrectional point of view on the part
of the compiler, still less that the background of the Sayings is at all the same as that contemplated in the *Pistis Sophia*, which belongs to a later stage of thought than the Sayings. Hence we are not prepared to accept an analogy derived from that or any other similar treatise as an argument for thinking that the editor by his introduction meant to imply that St. Thomas or St. Thomas and some one else were the sole hearers of the Sayings. What we think he did mean to imply was that the ultimate authority for the record of these Sayings was in his opinion St. Thomas or St. Thomas and another disciple. This hypothesis provides a satisfactory, in fact we think the only satisfactory, explanation of the frequent changes of persons and abrupt transitions of subject which characterize the Sayings as a whole.

Thirdly, the editor enforces the momentous claim which he has made for the authoritative character of the Sayings by quoting a sentence which, with several variations of language, but not of thought, occurs in John viii. 52, and which in the present context forms a highly appropriate prelude. Does this imply that the editor adapted the verse in St. John to his own purposes? On this point, since we are not prepared to maintain that that passage in St. John is essentially unhistorical, we cannot give a decided opinion; and in any case the probable relation of 654 to St. John's Gospel must be considered from the point of view of the collection of Sayings as a whole and of the conclusions adopted as to the editor's claim, rather than made a starting-point for an investigation of that claim and the source of the Sayings. For as we have said (p. 10), the introduction necessarily stands on a somewhat different footing from the Sayings, and even if knowledge and use of the Canonical Gospels by the author of the introduction was certain, this would not prove a corresponding dependence of the Sayings themselves upon the Canonical Gospels. All that can at present safely be inferred from the parallelism between the introduction and St. John is that the editor of the collection lived in an atmosphere of thought influenced by those speculative ideas in early Christianity which found their highest expression in the Fourth Gospel.

What value, if any, is to be attached to this far-reaching claim—that the collection of Sayings derives its authority, not from the traditional sources of any of the four Canonical Gospels, but from St. Thomas and perhaps another disciple? The custom of invoking the authority of a great and familiar name for an anonymous and later work is so common in early Christian, as in other, writings, that the mere statement of the editor carries no weight by itself, and is not worth considering unless the internal evidence of the Sayings themselves can be shown to point in the same direction or at any rate to be not inconsistent with his claim. We pass therefore to the problem of the general nature and origin of the Sayings in 654 and 1, and as a convenient method of inquiry start from an examination of the various theories already put forward in explanation of 1. Not that we wish to hold any of our critics to their previous opinions on the subject. The discovery of 654, with the introduction containing the mention of Thomas and a close parallel to St. John's Gospel, with one Saying coinciding with a citation from the Gospel to the Hebrews and another having the context prefixed to it, introduces several novel and highly important factors into the controversy; and, being convinced of the close connexion between 1 and 654, we consider that all questions concerning 1 must be studied de novo. But since most of the chief New Testament scholars have expressed their views on 1, and an immense variety of opinion is represented, it is not likely that we shall require to go far outside the range of solutions which have already been suggested. A convenient bibliography and summary of the controversy will be found in Profs. Lock and Sanday's *Two Lectures on the Sayings of Jesus*.

In our original edition of 1 we proposed A.D. 140 as the latest date to which the composition of the Sayings could be referred. This *terminus ad quem* has generally been
accepted, even by Dr. Sanday, who is amongst the most conservative of our critics; and the only notable exception is, so far as we know, Zahn, who would make the Sayings as late as 160–70. But his explanation of 1 has met with little favour, and, as we shall show, is now rendered still less probable. Accordingly, we should propose A.D. 140 for the terminus ad quem in reference to 654 with greater confidence than we felt about 1 in 1897.

The chief dividing line in the controversy lies between those who agreed with our suggestion that 1 belonged to a collection of Sayings as such, and those who considered 1 to be a series of extracts from one or more of the numerous extra-canonical gospels which are known to have circulated in Egypt in the second century. Does 654 help to decide the question in either direction? One argument which has been widely used in support of the view that 1 was really a series of extracts, viz. that the Sayings had no contexts, is somewhat damaged by the appearance of a Saying which has a context. But we are not disposed to lay stress on this contradictory instance, which is clearly exceptional, though we may be pardoned for deprecating beforehand the use of the converse argument that the occurrence of a context proves the Sayings to be extracts. This argument may seem to gain some support from the use of αὐτῶν (and probably αὑτῶν) in 654. 32; and it will very likely be pointed out that such a passage as 655. 17–23 would by the insertion of Ἰησοῦς after λέγει make a context and Saying in form exactly resembling 654. 32 sqq. But the use of αὐτῶν causes no ambiguity where it is found in one of a series of Sayings each beginning λέγει Ἰησοῦς, a formula which itself recurs later on in the same context; and the argument from the analogy of 655. 17–23 is open to the obvious retort that such a passage may equally well have been transferred from a collection of Sayings with occasional contexts, like 654. The fact is that the formal presence or absence of contexts in a series of Sayings can be employed with equal plausibility to prove or disprove the view that the series consisted of extracts, and would therefore seem a very unsound argument to introduce into the discussion. The matter of the context of the 5th Saying, however, has perhaps a more important bearing than the form upon the question of extracts. The phrase λέγει Ἰησοῦς there follows two historic presents, ἔχετοκουσιν and λέγοντας, and is therefore presumably itself a historic present; and if λέγει Ἰησοῦς is a historic present in one case, it should be so throughout 654 and 1. This context therefore confirms the explanation of λέγει Ἰησοῦς in 1 suggested by Zahn. Are we to follow him in his next inference that the formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς has been taken over without alteration by the editor from his source, which was therefore presumably a Gospel narrative? To this we should answer by a decided negative. As Dr. Lock remarks (Two Lectures, p. 18), 'it is not likely that λέγει should have occurred uniformly in a narrative,' a criticism which is strengthened by the recurrence in 654 of at least three more instances of λέγει Ἰησοῦς (ll. 9, 27, and 36), and by the comparison of 654. 32 sqq. and 655. 17–23, which suggests that if the former had been taken directly from a Gospel like that to which the latter belonged, Ἰησοῦς would have been omitted. It is, we think, much more probable that the formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς is due to the editor of the collection than to his sources, whatever they were. And though there is now no longer any particular reason for interpreting the tense of λέγει as more than a historic present, a secondary meaning is not excluded, and may be present in 1. 36 just as much as in the other instances where there is no context. We should be inclined to paraphrase λέγει Ἰησοῦς as 'This is one of those λέγει of Jesus to which I referred in the introduction,' and to explain the uniform repetition of it as marking off the several λέγοι from each other, and giving greater impressiveness to the whole. The fact that the editor used the aorist and not the historic present in his introduction suggests that by his employment of the present tense λέγει throughout the Sayings he intended to produce a slightly different effect from that which would have been caused by λέγειν or εἴπειν.
this new light shed upon the formula λέγετε ἵστροῖς does not bring with it any new reason for regarding the Sayings as extracts from a narrative Gospel.

A much more important factor in deciding whether the Sayings are extracts or not is the introduction, which though it may be a later addition, and though the reference to St. Thomas may be merely a bold invention of the editor, is there, and its presence has to be accounted for. So far from stating that the Sayings are extracts from any work, the editor asserts that they are a collection of λόγου, a circumstance which seems to provide an adequate explanation not only of the disconnected character of the Sayings in part of the collection, but of the repetition of the formula λέγετε ἵστροῖς before each one. It is now clear that 654 was meant by the editor to be regarded as an independent literary work, complete in itself; and though it is not necessary to accept it as such, those who wish to maintain that the collection is something quite different from what it purports to be must be prepared to explain how the introduction comes to be there. Hence we think that no theory of the origin of the Sayings as a whole is to be considered satisfactory unless it at the same time provides a reasonable explanation of the fact that some one not later than the middle of the second century published the Sayings as specially connected with St. Thomas (and perhaps another disciple), and that the collection attained sufficient importance for it to be read, and presumably accepted as genuine, in the chief towns of Upper Egypt in the century following. This contention, if it be generally acknowledged, will be an important criterion in discussing the merits of the different theories.

We begin therefore with a brief enumeration of the different Gospels to which 1 has been referred, premising that all theories in favour of extracts have now to face at the outset a difficult, and to some of them, we think, an insurmountable obstacle in the shape of the introduction in 654. Of these the most generally accepted is probably that maintained with all his usual brilliant powers of analysis by Harnack (Die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu), that 1 consisted of extracts from the Gospel according to the Egyptians. The question was, however, complicated by the extremely divergent views held concerning that Gospel, to which only one passage of any length can be assigned with certainty. At one extreme stands Harnack's view that this with the Gospel according to the Hebrews was the Gospel first used in Egypt, that it was not really heretical, and that it is the source of the non-canonical Sayings found in the Second Epistle of Clement. At the other extreme is the view of Resch (Agrapha, pp. 316–9), that the Gospel according to the Egyptians was not used by the author of the Second Epistle of Clement, and that it was thoroughly Gnostic and Encratite, as Origen and Epiphanius declared; the view of Zahn (Gesch. d. NT. Kan. ii. pp. 628 sq.), which seems to us the most reasonable, stands midway between, assigning to this Gospel neither the importance given to it by Harnack nor the heretical character ascribed to it by Resch, with whom, however, Zahn is in accord in considering that it was not used by the author of II Clem. Disagreeing as we do with Harnack's view of the Gospel according to the Egyptians, we have never been able to regard his explanation of 1 as satisfactory, and the insecurity of his hypothesis is illustrated by the attempt of Mr. Badham (Athenaeum, Aug. 7, 1897), from a point of view not far from that of Resch, to reach the same conclusion. The evidence of 654 provides fresh objections to the theory. There is no direct point of contact between 654 and the Gospel according to the Egyptians, and where one of the uncanonical Sayings happens to be known, it occurs not in this Gospel but in that according to the Hebrews. There is, indeed, more to be said for regarding 654 as extracts from the latter Gospel, as was suggested in the case of 1 by Batiffol (Revue Bibliq., 1897, p. 515) and Davidson (Internat. Journ. of Ethics, Oct. 1897), than from the Gospel according to the Egyptians. In their divergence from the Canonical Gospels, the striking character of much of the
new matter, the Hebraic parallelisms of expression, the Sayings are quite in keeping with the style of the most venerable and important of all the uncanonical Gospels, which is known to have been written originally in Hebrew, and which is now generally regarded as independent of the four Canonical Gospels. To these points of connexion has now to be added the far more solid piece of evidence afforded by the 1st Saying in 654. There remain indeed the objections (cf. Sayings of our Lord, p. 17) that the Gospel according to the Hebrews would be expected to show greater resemblance to St. Matthew than we find in 1 and 654, which is even further away from St. Matthew's Gospel than 1, and secondly that the Johannine colouring traceable in the new Sayings is foreign to the extant fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which seems to have been quite parallel to the Synoptists. But on the other hand, if Harnack is right (Gesch. d. Alchrist. Lit. ii. pp. 646–8) in supposing that the resemblance of this Gospel to St. Luke's was not much less marked than its resemblance to St. Matthew's, the points of contact between the Sayings and St. Luke, which are at least as strong as these with St. Matthew, constitute no great difficulty. And it is quite possible that the Gospel according to the Hebrews had a mystical side which is revealed to us occasionally (as e.g. in the curious passage in which Jesus speaks of his 'mother, the Holy Ghost,' and in the Saying found also in 654), but which owing to the paucity of references has hitherto been underestimated. A far graver and in fact almost fatal objection, however, to regarding the Sayings as extracts culled from either the Gospel according to the Hebrews or the Gospel according to the Egyptians is the irreconcilability of such a view with the introduction of 654. It is very difficult to believe that an editor would have had the boldness to issue extracts from such widely known works as an independent collection of Sayings claiming the authority of Thomas and perhaps another disciple. Even if we supply Matthew at the end of 654. 2 and suppose that the mention of Thomas is of quite secondary importance, it is very hard to supply a reasonable motive for issuing a series of extracts from the Gospel according to the Hebrews with such a preface as we find in 654, and to account for the popularity of these supposed extracts in the century following their publication. We are therefore on the whole opposed to the view, attractive though it undoubtedly is, that the Sayings are all directly derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. But that there is a connexion between them is certain, and it is significant that the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria, in which work Mayor (op. Rendel Harris, Contemp. Rev. 1897, pp. 344–5) has with much probability detected references to the 2nd Logion (cf. the parallels adduced on p. 7), are also the source of the quotation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews which is closely parallel to the 1st Saying. It is not at all unlikely that the 2nd Logion ('Except ye fast') also presented a strong similarity to a passage in the same Gospel.

The obstacle which prevents us from accepting the Gospel according to the Hebrews as the source of all the Sayings, in spite of the evidence in favour of such a view, applies with equal force to Zahn's hypothesis that they were derived from the Gospel of the Ebionites or Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, which is open to grave objections on other grounds. The instances adduced by Zahn to show the use of collections of extracts in the second century, (1) a series of ἔκλογαι from the Old Testament composed by Melito of Sardis, and (2) a list of heretical passages from the Gospel of Peter appended to a letter by Serapion, were singularly inapt even as regards 1 (cf. Sanday, Two Lectures, p. 45, note), and still less bear any relation to 654. Even admitting for the sake of argument Zahn's theory of the relation of the Gospel of the Ebionites to the Gospel according to the Hebrews (on which Harnack throws doubts, op. cit. ii. p. 626), and his proposed date for 1, about A.D. 170 (which has generally been regarded as too late), and for the Gospel
of the Ebionites (which if we follow Harnack, op. cit. ii. p. 631, is too early), the character of the extant fragments of this thoroughly Gnostic Jewish-Christian Gospel is very different from that of 1 and 654, to say nothing of the other arguments against Zahn's theory brought by Dr. Sanday in Two Lectures, p. 46.

The views which we have discussed so far have, whether satisfactory or not on other grounds, all been confronted by the initial difficulty of the introduction. Let us now examine those Gospels ascribed to disciples whose names either occur or may with reasonable probability be supposed to have occurred in ll. 2–3. It is obvious that the introduction would suit a series of extracts from e.g. the Gospel of Thomas much better than one from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The Gospel of Thomas is known to have existed in more than one form, namely as an account of Jesus' childhood which is extant in several late recensions of varying length, and as an earlier Gospel condemned by Hippolytus in the following passage (Reful. v. 7) οὐ μόνον δ' αὐτῶν ἑπιμαρτυρεῖν φασί (sc. the Naassenes) τῷ λόγῳ τὰ ἀσερίων μυστηρία ἀλλὰ καὶ Φυσίγνωμεν περὶ τῆς τῶν γεγονότων καὶ γεγομένων καὶ ἔσομέν ἐτι μαραθνίων κρυμβοηθήν ὁμοῦ καὶ μανερομένην φύσιν ὑπερφη σφας τὴν ἐντὸς αὐθρόπου βασιλείαν οἰρανών ξτομομένην, περὶ ἦι διαφθόνην ἐν τῷ κατὰ Θεωράν ἐπιγραφομένῳ εἰσαγωγῇ παραθεδόσας λίγαντες οὕτως εἶπε δ ἐξήν εἰρήνη ἐν παίδιον ἀπὸ ἐτῶν ἐτέρα: εἴτε γὰρ ἐν τῷ τεσσαρακοντεκάτῳ αἰῶνι κρυβόμενος φανερόμενος. Here we have two remarkable points of contact with 654, the mention of Thomas coupled with the ἐντὸς αὐθρόπου βασιλεία (cf. the 2nd Saying).

The parallels between 1 and one of the later forms of the Thomas Gospel have been worked out with great ingenuity and elaboration by Dr. Taylor on pp. 90–8 of The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels. There is much to be said for his view that the extant Gospel of Thomas contains some traces of 1, and the probability would be increased if 1, which Dr. Taylor was inclined to regard as extracts from the Gospel according to the Egyptians, be supposed to be derived from the earlier Gospel of Thomas. 654 does not seem to contain any clear points of connexion with the later Gospel of Thomas, but this is compensated for by the remarkable parallel from Hippolytus quoted above. It is moreover noteworthy, as Mr. Badham remarks, that the Acts of Thomas, which may well have been partly built upon the Gospel, exhibit a knowledge of that Saying which occurs both in the Gospel according to the Hebrews and in 654, and that, as Prof. Lake informs us, an Athos MS. (Studia Biblica, v. 2, p. 173) asserts that the περικοπή of Christ and the woman taken in adultery (which has found its way from the Gospel according to the Hebrews into St. John's Gospel) occurred in the Gospel of Thomas. But there are serious objections to regarding 1 and 654 as extracts from that Gospel. In the first place though it is possible that Thomas is the only disciple mentioned in the introduction, it is equally possible that he stood second, and in that case the Gospel from which the Sayings may have been extracted is more likely to have been one which went under the name of the person who stood first; though indeed, if there were two disciples mentioned in the introduction, it is not very satisfactory to derive the Sayings from any Gospel which went under the name of only one. A much greater difficulty arises from the divergence of the Sayings from what little is known about the earlier Gospel of Thomas. The saying quoted by Hippolytus is widely removed in character from those in 1 and 654, and it is significant that, though the doctrine of aeons seems to be known to the author of the Gospel of Thomas, 654 employs in l. 24 the neutral word τότοπος in a passage in which οἶκος, as is shown by the parallel from the Apocalypse of Peter, would have been highly appropriate, if the composer of the Sayings had known of or been influenced by that doctrine. The Gospel of Thomas, which Harnack thinks was known to Irenaeus, is indeed placed before a.d. 180, but from
the quotation in Hippolytus, coupled with the form of the Gospel in later times and the scanty evidence from other sources, it has been considered to have been mainly at any rate a Gospel of the childhood and of an advanced Gnostic character. If the Sayings are to be derived from it, the current view of the Gospel of Thomas must be entirely changed; and it is very doubtful whether this can be done except by postulating the existence of an original Thomas Gospel behind that condemned by Hippolytus. This would lead us into a region of pure conjecture into which we are unwilling to enter, at any rate until other less hazardous roads to a solution are closed. That there is a connexion between the earlier Gospel of Thomas and the Sayings is extremely likely, but this can be better explained by supposing that the Sayings influenced the Gospel than by the hypothesis that the Gospel is the source of the Sayings.

The Gospel of Philip, which is assigned by Zahn to the beginning of the second century, by Harnack to the second century or first half of the third, would, even if it were certain that Φλλετη occurred in Θεολογον (2), be an unsuitable source for the Sayings. The extract quoted from it by Epiphanius shows much more highly developed ascetic and Gnostic tendencies than can be found in 1 and Θεολογον.

The only other Apocryphal Gospels which seem to be worth consideration are the works connected with Matthias, of which there are three; (1) the παραδοσεις of Matthias, a few extracts from which are cited by Clement of Alexandria, (2) a Gospel according to Matthias mentioned by Origen, and (3) certain λόγοι ἀπόκρυφοι in use among the Basilidians which are thus described by Hippolytus (Refut. viii. 20) Βασιλείδως τοιούτως καὶ ἱστώρες... φασὶν εἰρηκτικα Ματθαίων αὐτοίς λόγους ἀπόκρυφους, αὐτοὶ χρὴ παρὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἄλλοι αὐτοῖς. The nature of these three works and their relation to each other are very uncertain. Zahn considers all three to be identical: Harnack, who at first (op. cit. 1. p. 18) was disposed to accept the identity of (1) and (2), subsequently (op. cit. ii. p. 597) reverts to the view that these two at any rate were distinct. The suggestion that the παραδοσεις of Matthias might be the source of 1 was thrown out by Dr. James (Contemp. Rev. Aug. 1897), only to be immediately rejected on the ground of the dissimilarity of form between 1 and the extant fragments of the παραδοσεις, which seem to have been a work of a mainly homiletic character. The παραδοσεις are now altogether excluded from the likely sources of the Sayings owing to the fact that Clement quotes an extract from them, θεωρηματικόν το παράδοση, side by side with the very citation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews which is parallel to the 1st Saying. Of the Gospel according to Matthias practically nothing is known except its name; the hypothesis that it is the source of the Sayings is therefore incapable of proof or disproof, but being based on pure conjecture has nothing to oppose to the antecedent improbability (cf. p. 16) that the Sayings are something quite different from what they profess to be. There remain the λόγοι ἀπόκρυφοι mentioned by Hippolytus. The occurrence of the word λόγοι suggests a connexion with the Sayings, but this cannot easily be carried much further. The λόγοι ἀπόκρυφοι were, according to Hippolytus, revealed to Matthias καὶ ἄλλοι, whereas if Matthias occurred at all in the introduction, it was in conjunction with Thomas. The particular Gnostic ontological speculations which according to Hippolytus were found in these λόγοι ἀπόκρυφοι belong to another plane of thought from that found in the Sayings; but the question is complicated by the confused and untrustworthy character of Hippolytus' discussion of the Basilidians, vii. 20 being among the most suspicious passages. And even if there were a connexion between these λόγοι ἀπόκρυφοι of Matthias and the Sayings, this would bring us no nearer to a proof that the Sayings were extracts from a narrative Gospel rather than a collection of Sayings as such. There is moreover another objection to connecting the Sayings with any work professedly under the name of Matthias, because
such a view would necessarily entail the supposition that the Sayings are post-resurrectional; and this for the reasons given on pp. 12–3 we do not think justifiable.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that no one of the known uncanonical Gospels is a suitable source for the Sayings as a whole. Shall we regard them as a series of extracts from several of these Gospels, as was suggested with respect to 1 by Dr. James? So long as the discussion was confined to 1, such an explanation from its vagueness was almost beyond the reach of criticism. The recovery of 654 alters the situation. On the one hand the occurrence of a Saying, which is known to have been also found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, side by side with other Sayings which it is difficult to ascribe to the same source, rather favours the theory of an eclectic series derived from different Gospels. But the introduction connecting the Sayings with particular disciples is not very suitable for such a collection which *ex hypothesis* is of an altogether miscellaneous character; and it would be difficult for any one to maintain that the Sayings are derived from several Apocryphal Gospels and at the same time in face of the mention of Thomas to deny that one of the chief elements was the Gospel of Thomas. But the inclusion of the Gospel of Thomas among the sources of the Sayings to a large extent involves the hypothesis of extracts from several Gospels in the difficulties which are discussed on pp. 18–9.

The result of an examination in the light of 654 of the various theories that the immediate source of 1 was one or more of the known non-canonical Gospels confirms us in the view that the solution does not lie in that direction, and that the Sayings are much more likely to be a source utilized in one or more of the uncanonical Gospels, than vice versa. The probability of the general explanation of 1 which we suggested in 1897 and which has been supported, amongst others, by Drs. Swete, Rendel Harris, Sanday, Lock, and Heinrici, that it was part of a collection of Sayings as such, is largely increased by the discovery of 654, with its introduction to the whole collection stating that it was a collection of λόγους, which was obviously intended to stand as an independent literary work. In fact we doubt if theories of extracts are any longer justifiable; and in any case such explanations will henceforth be placed at the initial disadvantage of starting with an assumption which is distinctly contradicted by the introduction of 654. It is of course possible to explain away this introduction, but unless very strong reasons can be adduced for doing so, the simpler and safer course is to accept the editor’s statement that 654, to which, as we have said, 1 is closely allied, is a collection of λόγους ἑγγενῶν.

The opinions of those critics who agreed with our general explanation of 1 as against the various theories of extracts may be divided into two classes: (1) those who regarded 1 as a collection of Sayings independent of the Gospels and belonging to the first century, and who therefore were disposed to admit to a greater or less extent and with much varying degrees of confidence the presence of genuine elements in the new matter (Drs. Swete, Rendel Harris, Lock, and Heinrici); (2) those who, like Dr. Sanday, regarded the new Sayings in 1 as the product of the early second century, not directly dependent on the Canonical Gospels, but having ‘their origin under conditions of thought which these Gospels had created’ (Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 41), a view which necessarily carries with it the rejection of the new matter. It remains to ask how far 654 helps to decide the points at issue in favour of either side.

With regard to the relation of 654 to the Canonical Gospels, the proportion of new and old matter is about the same as in 1, and the parallels to the Canonical Gospels in 654 exhibit the same freedom of treatment, which can be explained either as implying independence of the Canonical Gospels, or as the liberties taken by an early redactor. The introduction in 654 contains a clearer parallel to St. John’s Gospel than anything
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to be found in 1; but even if it be conceded (and there is good reason for not conceding it; cf. p. 11) that the introduction implied a knowledge of St. John's Gospel, and was therefore probably composed in the second century, the Sayings themselves can (and, as we shall show, do) contain at any rate some elements which are not derived from the Canonical Gospels, and go back to the first century. So far as the evidence of 654 goes, there is nothing to cause any one to renounce opinions which he may have formed concerning the relation of 1 to the Canonical Gospels. No one who feels certain on this point with regard to the one, is likely to be convinced of the incorrectness of his view by the other.

Secondly, with regard to the new matter in 654, the uncertainties attaching to the restoration and meaning of most of the 2nd, the earlier part of the 3rd, and all the 5th Saying, unfortunately prevent them from being of much use for purposes of critical analysis. Unless by the aid of new parallels the satisfactory restoration of these three Sayings can be carried beyond the point which we have been able to reach, their remains hardly provide a firm basis for estimating their individual value, still less that of the collection as a whole, each Saying of which has a right to consideration on its own merits. Only with regard to the 1st Saying are we on sure ground. Concerning this striking Agraphon the most diverse opinions have been held. Resch, a usually indulgent critic of the uncanonical Sayings ascribed to our Lord, rejects it as spurious; Ropes on the other hand, though far more exacting, is inclined to accept it as genuine, but on account of the absence of widely attested authority for it does not put it in his highest class of genuine Sayings which includes 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.' The judgement of Ropes upon Agrapha has generally been regarded as far sounder than that of Resch; and much of Resch's unfavourable criticism of this Saying is beside the mark (Harnack now regards it as primary; cf. p. 5), while the occurrence of the Saying in 654 is a new argument for its authority. But whatever view be taken of its authenticity, and however the connexion between 654 and the Gospel according to the Hebrews is to be explained, the 1st Saying in 654 establishes one important fact. Dr. Sanday may be right in regarding A.D. 100 as the terminus a quo for the composition of 1, and the same terminus a quo can of course be assigned to 654 in the sense that the Sayings were not put together and the introduction not written before that date. But, if we may accept the agreement of the leading theologians that the Gospel of the Hebrews was written in the first century, it is impossible any longer to deny that 654 and therefore, as we maintain, 1, contain some non-canonical elements which directly or indirectly go back to the first century; and the existence of first century elements in one case certainly increases the probability of their presence in others. In this respect, therefore, 654 provides a remarkable confirmation of the views of those critics who were prepared to allow a first century date for 1.

Are we then, adapting to 654 Dr. Sanday's view of 1 with the fewest possible modifications, to regard the whole collection as a free compilation in the early part of the second century, by an Alexandrian Jewish-Christian, of Sayings ultimately derived from the Canonical Gospels, and very likely the Gospels according to the Hebrews and Thomas, and perhaps others as well; and shall we dismiss the new elements, except the 1st Saying in 654, as the spurious accretions of an age of philosophic speculation, and surroundings of dubious orthodoxy? Even so the two papyri are of great interest as revealing a hitherto unknown development of primitive belief upon the nature of Christ's teaching, and supplying new and valuable evidence for determining the relationship of the uncanonical Gospels to the main current of orthodox Christianity. Or are we rather to consider 1 and 654 to be fragments of an early collection of our Lord's Sayings in a form which has
been influenced to some extent by the thought and literature of the apostolic and post-
apostolic age, and which may well itself have influenced the Gospel of Thomas and perhaps
others of the heretical Gospels, but which is ultimately connected in a large measure with
a first-hand source other than that of any of the Canonical Gospels? Some such view has
been maintained by scholars of eminence, e.g. Heinrici and Rendel Harris, with regard to 1;
and if the claim made by the editor of the collection in his introduction, that his source was
St. Thomas and perhaps another disciple, amounts to but little more, the internal evidence of
654 provides no obvious reason why we should concede him much less; while the occurrence
of one uncanonical Saying, which is already known to be of extreme antiquity and
has been accepted as substantially genuine by several critics, lends considerable support to
the others which rest on the evidence of 654 and 1 alone.

That is as far as we are prepared to go; for a really weighty and perfectly unbiassed
estimate of the ultimate value of any new discovery, resort must be made to some other
quarter than the discoverers. We conclude by pointing out that, if the view with regard
to 1 and 654 which we have just indicated is on the right lines, the analogy of this
collection has an obvious bearing on the question of the sources of the Synoptic Gospels,
and that the mystical and speculative element in the early records of Christ’s Sayings which
found its highest and most widely accepted expression in St. John’s Gospel, may well have
been much more general and less peculiarly Johannine than has hitherto been taken
for granted.

655. Fragment of a Lost Gospel.

Fr. (b) 8·2 × 8·3 cm.  
Plate II.

Eight fragments of a papyrus in roll form containing an uncanonical Gospel, the largest (b)
comprising parts of the middles of two narrow columns. None of the other fragments actually joins (b), but it is practically certain that the
relation to it of Frs. (a) and (c), which come from the tops of columns, is as
indicated in the Plate. Frs. (d) and (e), both of which have a margin below the
writing, probably belong to the bottom of the same two columns which are
partly preserved in (b); but how much is lost in the interval is uncertain. Since
the upper portion of Col. i admits of a sure restoration of the majority of the
lacunae, the first 23 lines are nearly complete; but the remains of the second
column are for the most part too slight for the sense to be recovered. The
handwriting is a small uncial of the common sloping oval type, which in most
cases belongs to the third century, among securely dated examples being 23
(P. Oxy. I. Plate vi), 223 (P. Oxy. II. Plate i), 420 (P. Oxy. III. Plate vi),
P. Amh. II. 12 (Plate iii). But this kind of hand is found in the second century,
e.g. 26 (P. Oxy. I. Plate vii), 447 (P. Oxy. III. Plate vi), and continued in the
fourth; for late third or fourth century examples see P. Amh. I. 3 (b) (Part II.
Plate xxv) and 404 (P. Oxy. III. Plate iv). 655 is a well-written specimen,
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suggesting, on the whole, the earlier rather than the later period during which this hand was in vogue, and though we should not assign it to the second century, it is not likely to have been written later than A.D. 250. Lines 1–16 ἦμῶν give the conclusion of a speech of Jesus which is parallel to several sentences in the Sermon on the Mount. Then follows (ll. 17–23) an account of a question put to Him by the disciples and of the answer. This, the most important part of the papyrus, is new, but bears an interesting resemblance to a known quotation from the Gospel according to the Egyptians; cf. note ad loc. A passage in Col. ii seems to be parallel to Luke xi. 52. On the general questions concerning the nature and origin of the Gospel to which the fragment belonged see pp. 27–8. In ll. 7–11 of the text the division between Frs. (a) and (b) is indicated by double vertical lines ||. No stops, breathings, or accents are used, but a wedge-shaped sign for filling up short lines occurs in l. 27 and a correction in a cursive hand in l. 25. An interchange of η and η causes the form εἰλικρίνεια in l. 14, and l. 13 requires some correction.

The key to the general restoration of ll. 1–3 was supplied by Mr. Badham, that to ll. 41–6 by Dr. Bartlet.

Col. i.

(a) [. . .]ΠΟ ΠΡΩΙ Ε[. . . .]
   [. . .]Ε ΑΦ ΕΠ[. . . .]
   [. . .]ΡΩΙ ΜΗΤΕ [. . .]
   [. . .]ΜΩΝ ΤΙ ΦΑ[
5 [. . . . . .] ΤΗ ΚΤ[::-
   [. . . . . .] ΤΙ ΕΝΑΥ[.
(b) [. . .]ΧΩ[. . . .][. . .]ΛΩ ΚΡΕ[. . .]
   [. . .]ΣΟ [. . . . ] ΤΩΝ [. .
   ΝΩΝ ΑΤΙ[. . . . ]ΥΕ[
10 ΝΕΙ ΟΥΔΕ Ν[. . . ]ΕΙ [. .
   ΕΝ ΕΧΟΝΤ[. . . . ]ΝΩ[.
   ΜΑ Τ[ ΕΝ [. . ] ΚΑΙ
   ΥΜΕΙC ΤΙC ΑΝ ΠΡΟΣΩΗ
   ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΕΙΛΙΚΡΙΑ[
15 ΥΜΩΝ ΑΥΤΟ[. ]ΝΩΣΕΙ
   ΥΜΕΙΝ ΤΟ ΕΝΔΥΜΑ Υ]
   ΜΩΝ ΛΕΓΟΥ<ΙΝ ΑΥ]
   ΤΩ ΟΙ ΜΑΟΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ
   ΠΟΤΕ ΗΜΕΙΝ ΕΜΦΑ[
20 ΝΗC ΕΕΙ KAI ΠΟΤΕ
   CE ΟΥΟΜΕΓΑ ΛΕΓΕΙ

Col. ii.

(c) Θ
   30 ΑΕ[.
   O[.
   ΤΑ[.
   ΓΥ[.
   ΚΑ[.
   35 N . [
   ΚΑ[.
   ΗΜ[.
   Κ[.
   C[.
   ]
40 [.
(b) ΕΛ[.
   ΤΗC [.
   ΚΡΥΨ[.
   ΕΙΧΑ[.
   45 ΕΙΣΕΡ[.
   ΚΑΝ[.
   ΔΕ ΡΕΙ[.
   ΜΟΙΩ[.
   ΚΕΡΑΙ[.
1-23. 'Take no thought' from morning until even nor from evening until morning, either for your food what ye shall eat or for your raiment what ye shall put on. Ye are far better than the lilies which grow but spin not. Having one garment, what do ye (lack?)... Who could add to your stature? He himself will give you your garment. His disciples say unto him, When wilt thou be manifest to us, and when shall we see thee? He saith, When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed...' 41-6. '... He said, The key of knowledge ye hid; ye entered not in yourselves and to them that were entering in ye opened not.'

1-7. Cf. Matt. vi. 25 μὴ μεριμνάτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ένδύσησθε. οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλείον ἐστὶ τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος; Luke xii. 22-3 μὴ μεριμνάτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ένδύσησθε, ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πλείον ἐστὶν τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος. The papyrus probably had μὴ μεριμνάτε at the beginning of the sentence but differs (1) by the addition of ἀπὸ πρῶτον... τῶν πρῶτον (2) by the use of a different word for σῶμα and probably for ψυχή, though it is possible that τῷ σώματι or τῇ ψυχῇ preceded ἀπὸ πρῶτον in l. 1, (3) by the omission of the second half of the Saying as recorded in the Gospels. In ll. 1-2 there is not room for ἐστὶν ὁμήρει, στολὴν in ll. 5-6 is not quite the word that would be expected, being used in the New Testament for grand 'robes' rather than a plain garment, but if the division τῇ στολῇ is correct στολή cannot be avoided, and with the reading τῆς it is difficult to find any suitable word; cf. also e.g. 839 ἠλθέ μοι γυμνὸς... ἡγόμενα αὐτῶν σταλῆν.

7-13. Cf. Matt. vi. 28 καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματος μὴ μεριμνάτε; καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα τοῦ άγροῦ πῶς αὐξάνονται: οὐ κοπιώσατε οὐδὲ νήσουσαν λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδὲ Σολομὼν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἐν τούτῳ, Luke xii. 27 καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα πῶς αὐξάνοντες οὐ κοπιώσατε οὐδὲ νήσουσαν λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν οὐδὲ κ.τ.λ. and Matt. vi. 26 οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν πετεινῶν); Luke xii. 24 πάσῃ μάλλον ὑμεῖς διαφέρετε τῶν πετεινῶν. The corresponding passage in the papyrus is not only much shorter, but varies considerably, though to what extent is not quite clear owing to the uncertainty attaching to the restoration of ll. 10-2. Our reasons for placing Fr. (a) in the particular relation to Fr. (b) indicated on Plate II are the facts (1) that Fr. (a) is from the top of a column which is presumably, judging by the general appearance and lacunae in Fr. (a), Col. i of Fr. (b); (2) that though there is nothing in the external appearance of Fr. (a) to show that it contains any actual ends of lines, the connexion of ll. 8-9 and 9-10 which results from our proposed combination of the two fragments, τῶν κρίνων and αὐξάνων, is so suitable to the context that it is unlikely to be fortuitous. The connexion of ll. 10-1 and 11-2 is, however, more difficult. With the readings and punctuation which we have adopted εὐ in l. 13 suggests nothing but εἰς[ἐν]τρόπον, which does not suit τὶ, and there are many points of uncertainty. At the end of l. 10 the letter before ε is more like Γ, C, or Τ than Ε, so that ovd...[ intends (cf. Luke xii. 27) is not very satisfactory. MATION can be read in l. 12, and would in the context be expected to be the termination of a word meaning 'garment'; but with the reading ἐνιαυτῶν it is hard to explain the vestiges of the two letters on l. 11 of Fr. (a), which suit respectively a straight letter such as Λ, Μ, or Ν and Δ or, less probably, A or Λ. ἐνιαυτῶν, a rare word not found in the N. T., but not inappropriate here, is possible; but τὸ ἔχοντι ἐν ἐνιαυτῶν [ἐπε] is unlikely. It is also possible to connect καὶ ὑμεῖς with τὶς instead of with the preceding words, but this does not help towards making the restoration of ll. 10-2 easier. These difficulties could be avoided by supposing that Fr. (a) is to be placed much higher up in relation to Fr. (b), but this involves the sacrifice of any direct connexion between Frs. (a) and (b), and ll. 8-9 and 9-10 afford very strong grounds for our proposed combination of the two fragments.

13-5. Cf. Matt. vi. 27 τίς δὲ εἶ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύνασθαι προσθέτω καὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν
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, and Luke xii. 25 'εί • αυτού προσθείναι πέλην; The papyrus version is somewhat shorter, omitting 'ομηρίων and πέλην. The position in which this Saying is found in the papyrus is also slightly different from that in the Gospels, where it immediately precedes instead of following the verse about the krína. In l. 13 prose-θεί(α) could be read in place of προσθέθεσθαι: there does not seem to be room for προσθέθει[α]. 15—6. Cf. Matt. vi. 31—3 μή γὰρ 'ομηρίων λέγοντες τί φάγωμεν ἢ τί πίομεν ἢ τί περιβαλόμεθα... οὕτω γάρ ὁ πατὴρ ὦμοιν ὁ οὖραίον διὸ χρῆσετε τούτων ἀπάντων. ζητείτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν δικαιασθήναι αὐτοῦ καὶ τάτα πάντα προστεθήσατε ὑμῖν, and Luke xii. 29—31, which is nearly identical and proceeds, μὴ φοβοῦ τὸ μικρὸν ποιμέν ὃ διεδόθην ὁ πατὴρ ὦμοιν δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν. The papyrus has the corresponding idea but expressed with extreme conciseness. αὐτὸς δὲ θάνατος, unless δόθηται is an error for δόθηται, for we should expect ὁ πατήρ ορ ὁ θεός. Apparently αὐτός refers back to πατήρ ορ θεός in the column preceding, or the author of the Gospel may have here incorporated from some source a Saying without its context which would have explained αὐτός (cf. 654. 32).

17—23. For the question cf. John xiv. 19 sqq. ἐτί μικρὸν καὶ ὁ κόσμος με οὐκέτι θεωρεῖ ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτε με." ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσετε. ... λέγει αὐτῷ λοίδας. ... καὶ, τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλει ἐμβασιλεύειν; ἑαυτάν καὶ οὐκ ὁ κόσμος; ἀπεκρίθη. ... ἐὰν τῆς ἀγάπης με τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτὸν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ελευθερώσει. The answer ascribed in the papyrus to Jesus bears a striking resemblance to the answer made to a similar question in a passage of the Gospel according to the Egyptians which is referred to several times by Clement of Alexandria, and which is reconstructed by Harnack (Chronol. i. p. 13) thus:—τῇ Ἁλομή πνευματικῇ μέχρι πότε θάνατον εἰσίν ὁ κύριος· μέχρις ἢ ὑμεῖς αἱ γυναῖκες τύπεσετε. ἢλθον γὰρ καταλύει τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς βασιλείας. καὶ Ἁλομὴ ἔφη αὐτῷ καλῶς ὁνύ ἐπέστη μὴ τεκύσας; ὃ δὲ κύριος ἢμαίνοντος λέγων τῶν φάγων βοσάνυν, τὴν δὲ πικρών ἔξωσαν μὴ φάγης. πνευματικῶς ἐφ' ἑκείνης τῆς Ἁλομῆς πότε γνωρίζονται τὰ περὶ ὅν ἦρετ ἐφ' ὁ κύριος' ὅταν οὖν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ένδικα παράστησε καὶ δὲν γένηται τὰ δύο ἐν, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς βασιλείας οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θεῖο. Cf. II Clem. 2. ἐπερωτήθης γάρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπὸ τίνος πότε οὔτε ἔθει αὐτῷ ἡ βασιλεία εἰσέλθ' ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἐν, καὶ τὸ ἤξω ὥς τὸ ἔσον, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς βασιλείας οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θεῖο. Βοθὸν ὃν ἐκδύσανθε καὶ μη ἀναχυθήσθη καὶ τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ένδικα παράστησε express the same idea, a mystical reference to Gen. iii. 7, 'And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and they were not ashamed,' the meaning in either case being that Christ's kingdom on earth would not be manifested until man had returned to the state of innocence which existed before the Fall, and in which sexual ideas and relations had no place. The chief differences between the two passages are (1) the setting, the questioner being in the Gospel according to the Egyptians Salome, and in the papyrus the disciples, (2) the simpler language of the papyrus as contrasted with the more literary and elaborated phrase τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ένδικα πατήσῃ, (3) the absence in the papyrus of the Encratite tendency found in the earlier part of the quotation from the Gospel according to the Egyptians. On the relation between the two see p. 27. Whether the papyrus continued after αἰσχυνθήσθη with something like καὶ τὸν γένηται τὰ δύο ἐν, κ.τ.λ., is of course uncertain, but Fr. (d), which probably belongs to the bottom of this column, is concerned with something different.

35. φροντινός: the corrector's spelling φροντινός is commoner than φροντινός. Perhaps this passage was parallel to Matt. vii. 22—3 (Sermon on the Mount) ἐὰν ἢ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπόλου, ὅλον τὸ σῶμα σου φροντίσαι, κ.τ.λ.; cf. Luke xi. 34—6. But the papyrus must in any case have differed largely in its language, and κλώσῃ ('?) in l. 26 suggests a Johannine colouring.

36. The Λ of ΛΕ[ projects somewhat, but since the whole column trends to the left, probably no importance is to be attached to the circumstance; cf. the initial δ in l. 47. 42—6. With the remains of these lines Bartlett well compares Luke xi. 52 oμα
655 seems to belong to a Gospel which was closely similar in point of form to the Synoptists. The narrator speaks in the third person, not in the first, and the portion preserved consists mainly of discourses which are to a large extent parallel to passages in Matthew and Luke, especially the latter Gospel, which alone seems to be connected with II. 41 sqq. The papyrus version is, as a rule, shorter than the corresponding passages in the Gospels; where it is longer (ll. 1-3) the expansion does not alter the meaning in any way. The chief interest lies in the question of the disciples and its answer, both of which so closely correspond to a passage in the Gospel according to the Egyptians and the uncanonical Gospel or collection of Sayings used by the author of the Second Epistle of Clement, that the Gospel of which 655 is a fragment clearly belongs to the same sphere of thought. Does it actually belong to either of those works, which, though Harnack regards them as one and the same, are, we think, more probably to be considered distinct? In the Gospel according to the Egyptians Salome was the questioner who occasioned the remarkable Saying beginning ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἐνυμα πατήσῃ, and it is much more likely that 655 presents a different version of the same incident in another Gospel, than a repetition of the Salome question in a slightly different form in another part of the Gospel according to the Egyptians. Nor is 655 likely to be the actual Gospel which the author of II Clem. was quoting. It is unfortunate that owing to the papyrus breaking off at αἰσχυνθῆτε there is no security that ὅταν γίνηται τὸ δίο ἐν, or at any rate something very similar, did not follow, and the omission in the Clement passage of a phrase corresponding to ll. 22-3 may be a mere accident. But the fact that the question in II Clem. is worded somewhat differently (πότε ἐξεί ἡ βασιλεία), and is put into the mouth of τοῦ instead of the disciples, as in 655, is a good reason for rejecting the hypothesis that the two works were identical.

The evidence of 655 as to its origin being thus largely of a negative character, we do not propose to discuss in detail whether it is likely to belong to any of the other known Apocryphal Gospels. There are several to which it might be assigned, but direct evidence is wanting. If the Gospel according to the Hebrews were thought of, it would be necessary to suppose that the resemblances in 655 to Matthew and Luke did not imply dependence upon them. In its relation to the Canonical Gospels 655 somewhat resembles 654, and the view that 655 was, though no doubt at least secondary, dependent not on Matthew and Luke, but upon some other document, whether behind the Synoptists or merely parallel to them, is tenable, but is less likely to commend itself to the majority of critics than the opposite hypothesis that 655. 1-16 is ultimately an abridgement of Matthew and Luke with considerable alterations. In either case the freedom with which the author of this Gospel handles the material grouped by St. Matthew and St. Luke under the Sermon
on the Mount is remarkable. The Gospel from which 655 comes is likely to have been composed in Egypt before A.D. 150, and to have stood in intimate relation to the Gospel according to the Egyptians and the uncanonical source used by the author of II Clem. Whether it was earlier or later than these is not clear. The answer to the question put by the disciples in 655 is couched in much simpler and clearer language than that of the corresponding sentence in the answer to Salome recorded in the Gospel according to the Egyptians, the point of which is liable to be missed, while the meaning of 655. 22-3 is unmistakable. But the greater directness of the allusion to Gen. iii. 7 in 655 can be explained either by supposing that the version in the Gospel according to the Egyptians is an Encratite amplification of that in 655, or, almost but not quite as well, in our opinion, by the view that the expression in 655 is a toning down of the more striking phrase ἐπαν τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἔνδυμα παράσηπτα. As for the priority of 655 to the source of the uncanonical quotations in II Clem., the evidence is not sufficient to form any conclusion.

There remains the question of the likelihood of a genuine element in the story of which we now have three versions, though how far these are independent of each other is uncertain. As is usual with Agrapha (cf. p. 21), the most diverse opinions have been held about the two previously known passages. Zahn (Gesch. d. NT. Kan. ii. p. 635) defends the version in the Gospel according to the Egyptians from the charge of Encratism, and is inclined to admit its genuineness. Resch on the other hand (Agrapha, p. 386), while accepting the version of Clement, vehemently attacks the other. Ropes again takes a different view, and though he thinks (Die Sprüche Jesu, p. 131) that ἐπαν ... παράσηπτα is too ascetic for Jesus, is disposed to believe in a kernel of genuineness in the story. The criticisms of both Zahn and Ropes, however, are now somewhat discounted by the circumstance that they took the phrase corresponding to 655. 22-3 to mean 'when you put off the body,' i.e. 'die,' whereas the evidence of the parallel in the papyrus gives the words a slightly different turn, and brings them more nearly into line with the following sentences ἐπαν γίνεται τὸ δίδο ἐν, κ.κ.λ. But Zahn would, nevertheless, seem in the light of the new parallel to be right in maintaining that the passage in the Gospel according to the Egyptians does not go much further in an Encratite direction than, e.g. Matt. xxii. 30 and Luke xx. 34-6. The occurrence of another version of the story is an important additional piece of evidence in defence of the view that it contains at least some elements of genuineness, and a special interest attaches both to the form of the Saying in 655. 22-3 on account of the clearness of its language, and to its context, in which other matter closely related to the Canonical Gospels is found in immediate proximity. All this lends fresh value to what is, on account of the far-reaching problems connected with it, one of the most important and remarkable, and, since the discovery of 655, one of the better attested, of the early Agrapha.

656. Genesis.

Height 24.4 cm. Plate II (c verso).

Parts of four leaves from a papyrus codex of the book of Genesis in the Septuagint version. The MS. was carefully written in round upright uncialis of good size and decidedly early appearance, having in some respects more
affinity with types of the second century than of the third. To the latter, however, the hand is in all probability to be assigned, though we should be inclined to place it in the earlier rather than the later part of the century; in any case this may rank with the original Oxyrhynchus Logia (1) and the fragments of St. Matthew's and St. John's Gospels (2, 208) as one of the most ancient Greek theological books so far known, and it has some claim to be considered the oldest of the group. Another mark of age is perhaps to be recognized in the absence of the usual contractions for \( \theta \varepsilon \omicron \varsigma \), \( \kappa \upsilon \rho \omicron \omega \varsigma \), &c., but this may of course be no more than an individual peculiarity. The only abbreviation that occurs is the horizontal stroke instead of \( \nu \), employed to save space at the end of a long line. Both high and middle (l. 13, 19) stops are found, but are sparingly used: more often a pause is marked by a slight blank space. A few alterations and additions have been made by a second hand, which seems also to be responsible for the numeration in the centre of the upper margin of each page.

The evidence of so early a text is of particular value for the book of Genesis, where the uncial MSS. are most weakly represented. The only first-class MS. available for comparison practically throughout the parts covered by the papyrus, namely, xiv. 21–3, xv. 5–9, xix. 32–xx. 11, xxiv. 28–47, xxvii. 32–3, 40–1, is the Codex Alexandrinus (A). The Vatican and Ambrosian codices do not begin till later in the book, the Sinaiticus (N) is defective except for occasional verses in the twenty-fourth chapter, the readings of D, the Cottonian MS., which for the most part survives only in a collation (=D), are unascertainable in xx. 4–11 and xxiv. 28–30, and the Bodleian Genesis (E) fails us in xxiv. The result of a collation, where possible, with these MSS., is to show that the papyrus, while seldom supporting E, does not side continuously with either N, A, or D, though, of course, too little of N remains for a satisfactory comparison. As a general rule the readings favoured by the new witness are the shorter ones; cf. e.g. notes on l. 16, 27, 47–8, 53, 62, 67, 74, 129, 138–9, 154, 183, 185, 188, as against l. 42, 81, 144, 163. Not infrequently variants occur otherwise attested only by cursive MSS., though here too no consistent agreement can be traced, and the mixed character of the cursive texts is further emphasized. The papyrus is certainly pre-Lucianic, but it has two readings characteristic of Lagarde's Lucianic group (= Holmes 19, 108, 118), \( \gamma \varepsilon \nu \omicron \varsigma \) for \( \tau \omicron \delta \gamma \varepsilon \upsilon \nu \omicron \varsigma \) in xix. 38 and the omission of \( \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \epsilon \iota \delta \varepsilon \nu \) (with the Hebrew) in xxiv. 38. Readings common to this group and other cursives are \( \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu \gamma \) for \( \tau \upsilon \gamma \upsilon \nu \gamma \) in xix. 33, and \( \delta \nu \dot{\nu} \varsigma \varepsilon \) for \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\delta} \rho \omicron \sigma \iota \upsilon \) in xx. 8. On the other hand, the papyrus opposes the Lucianic group in the addition of \( \tau \nu \upsilon \nu \nu \tau \alpha \upsilon \nu \gamma \nu \) in xix. 35, and the omission of \( \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \omicron \delta \beta \rho \omicron \upsilon \nu \ldots \alpha \upsilon \nu \) in xx. 2, in the one case against, in the other with, the Hebrew. The number of
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variants which are altogether new, considering the scope of the fragments, is considerable; see ll. 48, 55, 56, 81, 114, 154, 155, 160, 163, 181. A peculiar feature is the tendency to omit the word κύριος when applied to the Deity; this occurs in no fewer than four passages (ll. 17, 122, 155, 166), in three of which (ll. 17, 122, 166) the omission has been made good by the second hand. A blank space was originally left where the word occurred in l. 17. In the version of Aquila the Tetragrammaton was written in Hebrew letters, and this peculiarity reappears in a few Hexaplaric MSS. of the Septuagint. The papyrus offers the first example of a similar tendency to avoid the sacred name in a text otherwise independent of the Aquila tradition.

The collation with the chief uncial codices given below is based on the edition of Swete, while the occasional references to the cursives are derived from Holmes; for some additional information we are indebted to Mr. N. McLean.

(a) Verso xiv. 21–3.

[Αβραμ δοσ] μοι τοὺς ανδρα[ς] [την δε ἱππον] λαβῇ σεαυτῷ [εἰπὲν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ πρὸς βασιλεᾶς] [Σοδομῶν εὐ]τε[ἰ]ρῳ τὴν χε[ὶ]

(b) Verso xix. 32–xx. 2.

μετ αὐτὸν καὶ εξαναστησω μεν εκ του τοι[πατρος] ημιων σπερ [μα εποτισα[ν] δε τον πατερα

Recto xv. 5–9.

10 [σπ]ερμα σ[α]υ [και επιστευσεν] [Αβραμ τω θεω και ελογισθη] αυτω εις δικαιοσκυνην ειπεν δε προς αυτον εγιω ο θεος ο εξα γαγων σε εκ χωριας Χαλδαιων ωσ
15 τε δουναι σοι την γην ταυτην [κληρονομεσαι] ειπεν δε δεσπο τα κυρια κατα τη γνωσμαι οτι [κληρονομεσω αυτην ειπεν δε αυτω] λαβε μοι δαμαλιω τριε
20 [τι]ξουσαν και αιγα [τριετιξουσαν

Recto xx. 2–11.

[δε Αμειβελεχ β]ασιλεὺς Γερα [υ]
ra ekoumeny [meta tou patros
tn vuktta ekxevn kai ouk ei
dh en to koimh[thetai authn kai
30 aivasqenai ev[eleneto de th epav
[p]on kai eisun [h p[resventera
th nevtera id[on ekoumen
exhes meta to patr[os hmun] pi[oni
swmen auton o[ion kai t[yn
35 kata [th]v[enti kai ei[selhousa] koi
muqen met afiton kai eixev
sthesomen ek [ton patros hmun
[smera evostisan de kai en t
vukti ekewn [ton patera] axi
40 ton oinon kai ei[selhousa] [h [ne
vukti ekoumeny[thetai meta tou pa
tros auths th[n vuktta ek]xevn
kai ouk eixev [en th koimh
[thetai] kai an[iasthynai kai syn
45 [ele]bouen ai [d[no bygateres Ast
ek [thetai patros a[iuton kai etekan
h [p]resventera [inon kai eka
le [se] onomo auton Mowab ek [ton
pat[ro]s mou outhos patrh Mowabi
50 ton eos ths s[imeron metas
etekan de kai th nevtera vunon
kai [ekalos[en [to onoma auton
A[m]van vious [e]vunos mou ou
ton patr[ha Am[man ton eos
55 ths metas tauths
[ekw]sen de ekeidh [A]beta[am
[eis] gyn prros liva [kai] xek[se]n
[a]nava meson Kado[n] kai[ai] ame
[so]v Zour kai par[as]e[en ev Ge
60 [paroi]s eipen de [A]beta[am] peri
[pi th y
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70 [th de eAIT[ th
[Ambelex de] oux h[psato auths
[kai eipen kuri:e] ethos a[vroun
kai d[i][kaiou a]oleis ouk autos
] mo e[i]pen a[de]f[hy] mou estin
75 aut[th moi eipton a[de]lfoi mou
est[en en kathar[a kardeia kai e[i]
dikai
[os[i]hi kheiron ei]poiesa touto
[eipen de autou] o [theta kath
y[no]
[kaqou eignon o]i en kathara ka[ro
80 [d]ia [eipoi[ena t]outo kai efisa
[on
[m][h]n k[agw sou to]nu mi amartei
[ei]s eipe enekun toutou ouk
[theta] se [a[v]sathai aut]h th
vun de apo
[do]s [thn gnvaka t]ho anvropo
85 [ti] [pre]ph[etai est[en kai [pre]
osev[de]
tai peri sou kai [etai ei de mi
[sp[s]ois [g]nvoi o]i apothe
[on kai pa[ntha se [a]i kai
[epaide[en
[Ambelex to] prou kal[i] eka[le]
80 [pantas ton] [a]pinas auton v
[ele]ren [panta] ta [n
[tai eis th ota auton ev
[sa]n de [pantas] a[ntaiou
[Ambelex ton
95 [A]beta[m] kai eipen autov ti th
[ti] eipoi[s]a [eta]i mi ti
[theo]
[to] mei eis se oti [epi]gyge[s] e[i]
me kai eti thn ba[sileian mou a]
[thian megalh etho o oudeis t[i]
100 [se]i pei[noekei moi eipen de
[A]mei[belex to [beta
[evi]
(c) Recto xxiv. 28–37.

δραμοῦσα η οισι απηγγειλε[ν] εις τον οικον της μητρος αυτης τα κατα ρηματα ταυτα τη δε Ρεβεκ
110 και [α]δελφοι[ν] ην ω ονομα Λαβαν και εδραμεν Λαβαν προς τον αν
θρωπον εξω επι της πηγης και εγενετο[ν] η[υ]ικα ειδεν τα ενωτια και τα σελια περι τας χειρα της
120 οεκοτου αυτου επι των καμη
125 λων επι της πηγης και ειπε[ν] αν τω [δε]υρο εισελθε ευλογητος κυριος
ινα τι εστηκας εξω εγω δε η[πι]οι μακα την οικιαν και τοπου ταυς
130 [ποιει] τον αν[θρωπον] τω νε 

Verso xxiv. 38–47.

[επ]οιησας τοντο ειπεν δε Αβρααμ
[ει]να γαρ [α]ρα ουκ εστιν θεος[εβια]
[ε]ν το τοπω τουτω εμε της απο
γενεσι
150 [κτεινουσιν ενεκεν της γ]υναι
155 και ειπεν μοι ο θεος ω ευρεσθη
σα εναπτον αυτου αυτος απο
στελει τον αγγελον αυτου με
τ[α] σου και [ε]υδοσει την оδον
σ[ο]ν και [λη][μυη] γυνα[ι]κα τω νυω
160 μ[ο]ν εκ της φυλης μου η εκ του
οικου του πατρος μου τοτε αθω
οι εση απο της αρα μοι [νικα]
γα[ρ] εαυ εισελθης εις την εμην
φυλη[ν] και μη σοι δωσιν και εση αθω
165 [ο[σ] απο του ορκου μου και ελ[θ]αν]
[ση]μερον επι την πηγην ει[πα κν]
[πι της] θεος του κυριου μου Αβ[ρααμ] ει συ
[ευωδο]κεσ την οδον μοι η νυν[ε] γ[ε]
170 [στη]κα επι της [πε]γης του [υδατος]
[αι δε] θυγατρεσ των ανθρωπων
[τη]ς πολεως εξελευσονται αι αντλη
[σαι] υδωρ και εσται η παρθενος η
εγω
[εα]ν ειπον ποτισον με [εικρον ν]
[μοι πιε συ και τας καμηλοις σου ν]
135 [παν Αβρααμ] εγώ εἰμι . . . . .
136 [. . . . . . του] κυρίου [μου σφόδρα
και υψωθή [καὶ] εἰδὼκεν αυτώ
2 lines lost
140 [καὶ] οὐν[ους και ετεκέ
[Σαρ'ρα] [η γυνη του κυρίου μου ιουν
[ενα τω κυριῳ μου μ]ε[τα το [γηρα
[σαι αυτων και εωκε]ν αυτω παν
145 [κυριος μου λεγων ου] λημψη [γυ
[ναικα τω υιω μου απο τον] θυγα[τε
[ρων των Χαναναιων εν] οἰς [ε

180 [δρευσομαι αυτη] [η γυνη ην ητοι
[μασεν κυριος τ]ω θεραποντι αυτου
[Ισαακ και] εν τουτο ο γνωσομαι ο

145 [κυριος μου λεγων ου] λημψη [γυ
[ναικα τω υιω μου απο τον] θυγα[τε
[ρων των Χαναναιων εν] οἰς [ε

190 [σο]υ ποτιω και επιου και τας καμηλους
[λου]ς μου [εποτισεν και ηρωτησα
[αυτη]ν] καὶ

(d) Recto xxvii. 32-3.

Verso xxvii. 40-1.

1. [Αβρααμ δος] is somewhat short for the lacuna, but to add προς would make the supplement rather long.
4. The deletion of ε may be due to either the first or second hand; εκενω Α.Δ.
13. προς αυτω: so most cursives; αυτω Α.Δ. The ε of εγω seems to have been altered from some other letter.
16. [κλπρονωμησα] so A; κλ. αυτη D.
17. A blank space, sufficient for four letters, was left by the original scribe between τα
and κατα, and in this κυριος was inserted by the second hand; cf. ll. 122, 155, and 166.
25. εκειη: so a number of cursives, including the ‘Lucianic’ group; ταυτ D.ΑΕ. 
27. αυτη which is read after παρος by DΕ seems to have been omitted by the
papyrus, the line being quite long enough without it. On the other hand τὴν νυκτα ἐκενων is omitted in D.

28. ἐιδὴ: the same spelling for ἦδει recurs in l. 43; εὗρω D in both places.

32. τῷ νεώτερα: so the Codex Caesareus and several cursive; πρὸς τὴν νεώτεραν ADE. ἐκθέν has been added at the end of the line by the second hand.

36. µ of μετ has been altered from α.

37-8. εκ...[σ]ερμα: so AD; σπ. εκ τον π. ημων E.

39-43. The position of the small fragment at the ends of these lines is made practically certain by the recto (cf. note on l. 81); but the scanty vestiges in l. 42 do not suit particularly well and the reading adopted is very problematical. Moreover above the line between the supposed α and η is a curved mark which does not suggest any likely letter and remains unexplained. One cursive (ι08) has καὶ η νεώτερα, but there is no ground for attributing this to the papyrus.

42. τὴν νυκτα ἑκθέν: om. ADE. The papyrus reading is found in the cursive

56 (margin), 74, 106, 130, 134, 135.

43. ἐιδὴ: cf. l. 28, note.

47. There would be room for two or three more letters in this line.

47-8. εκάλεσεν ὁ οὐμα: εκάλεσεν το ὁμωμα ADE. There is not sufficient room in the lacuna for the usual το ἕφελκουσιν, still less for το.

48. λέγουσα which is read after Μωνῆ by ADE was certainly omitted by the papyrus (so Jerome), the passage being quite parallel with the explanation of the name Λμμαν in the following verse.

53. υιὸς Χενος: so the 'Lucianic' cursive; ο υιὸς του γενους A, υιος του γ, D, νιον του γ, E.

55. τῆς ημερας ταυτης: τῆς σημερον ημερας ADE. The rest of the line was left blank, a new chapter commencing at l. 56.

56. [εκύπτεσαν δὲ: καὶ εκύπτεσαν ADE.

57. πρὸς λῆμα: so AD; εως λῆμα E.

62. A has οτι before αὐθανη, but οτι is omitted, as in the papyrus, by D and E. After εστὶν the papyrus omits the second half of the verse εσομαι γαρ εστὶν (οτι) γυνὴ μον εστὶν μη ποτε αποκτενων αυτον οι ανδρες της πολεως δε αυτη (ADE), as do the cursive 15 (first hand), 82, 106, 107, 135.

64. Αμβελεξ or Αμβελεξ is the regular spelling of the name in this text. Αμβελεξ ADE.

67. There is evidently not room in the lacuna for A's reading ειτεν αυτο ειδον αν αποθνησκεις, and the omission of αυτω is more probable (so DE and many cursive) than that of συ (om. E).

74. E inserts οτι before αὐθανη here and αὐθανος in l. 75.

79. καθαρα καρδια: so A; καρδια καθαρα E.

80. εφημαυ: εφημαυν A, εφημαυν E.

81. Κεγυω (κεγυ AE) may have been merely repeated here from l. 79, but, as Mr. McLean points out, it is supported by the Hebrew and may well be a genuine reading. The other letters on this fragment (ll. 80-5) suit so exactly that there can be no reasonable doubt that it is rightly placed here, although there is also a slight difficulty with regard to the verso.

αμαρτειν, the reading of the first hand, is that of AE.

86. ἐγνητη: so A; ξνητη E.

93. ανδρες: so a number of cursive; ανδρωποι AE.

104. τη: so A; δε E.
The reading of the interlinear insertion is very uncertain, but the alteration apparently concerns the termination of the verb, and it seems more probable that ἀποκτεῖνον was corrected to ἀποκτείνων than vice versa. ἀποκτεῖνον ΑΕ; ἀποκτείνων occurs in the cursive 72; cf. l. 165, note.

The reading of A here is exactly parallel to that of the papyrus, ἡ after κατά having been originally omitted and supplied by an early corrector. NDE are deficient.

112. τὴν πηγὴν: τὴν πηγὴν Α. The genitive seems to have come in from the next verse.

113. εἰπέν: ἤδει Α.
114. περί: εἰπέν Α, ἐν τῷ δὲ χερσί a number of the cursive.
115. κύριος has been added at the end of the line by the second hand: κύριος ΑΝΔ.
116. ἔτοιμα: κύριος ΑΝΔ; ητοιμασα Α.
117. ἐπεσαζαν: κύριος ΑΝΔ; ἐπεσαζαν Α.
118. The papyrus agrees with A in omitting μὴσαθήν which ΝΔ add after υῶρ.
119. The reading of the papyrus here cannot be determined; ΝΑ have κύριος ἐκλάγησαν, D ἐκλάγησαν. κύριος ἐκλάγησαν οὐ καὶ εὐδόκησαν τὸν makes the end of l. 135 a little long, but a blank space may have been originally left for κύριος as in ll. 122 and 126 or δὲ may have been omitted.
120. The papyrus here omits several words and its exact reading is not quite clear. A has πρὸ δια καὶ μονοχος καὶ ἀργυρον καὶ χρυσον παιδι καὶ παιδικας καμήλους καὶ ὦνους, D leaves out the καὶ after μονοχος, transposes ἀργυρον and χρυσον and inserts καὶ before παιδι. It is just possible that the papyrus agreed with D in reading μονοχος χρυσον καὶ, but παιδι καὶ παιδικας καὶ can evidently not be got into l. 139, and more probably both χρυσον καὶ παιδι were omitted and καὶ was written with each substantive. The words originally missing were probably supplied by the second hand at the bottom of the page, for opposite l. 139 is the semicircular sign commonly used to mark an omission; cf. e.g. 16. iii. 3.
121. It is quite possible that the lines were divided υῶρ and that εἰπέν was omitted, as in D.
122. αὐτον: οὐ αὐτὴν (D).
123. The length of the lacuna indicates that the text agreed with D and the second corrector of Ν in adding παιδα before the simple οὐ of ΝΑ.
124. After μον ΝΑΔ add εἰκάθεν. The papyrus here supports the 'Lucanian' cursive 19 and 108.
125. πορευθήσεται: so a number of cursive; πορευθη Α, πορεύσεται ΝΔ.
126. η γυνη ΑΝΔ.
127. ο θεος: κύριος ο θεος Α, om. ο θεος ΝΔ.
128. εισαντων: so ΑΔ and the second corrector of Ν; εἰσανθων Ν. 
129. ἐποστελευ: so ΝΔ; εξεποστελει Α.
130. η και MSS.
131. απο: so ΝΔ; Α.
132. εικαθε: εἰκάθης ΑΔ.
133. την εμον φιλην: so Ν; την φιλην μον Α.
134. σου δουσ: this is the order in many of the cursive; δουσ σου ΑΔ. και before εἰς is omitted by D.
135. ορκου: so the cursive 72 (cf. note on l. 105); ορκειμον ΝΑΔ.
136. κυριε (so ΝΑΔ) is again due to the second hand; cf. l. 17, note.
137. η νην: there is not room in the lacuna for more than two letters, so η νην (ΝΑΔ) is inadmissible. η is found also in the cursive 75 and 106.
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169. \(\epsilon\phi\epsilon\iota\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\kappa\alpha\) : \(\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\ \mathbb{N}\mathcal{D}D\); there is an erasure before \(\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\) in A, and apparently \(\epsilon\phi\epsilon\iota\varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\) (which also occurs in several cursives) was the original reading.

170. \(\tau\iota\varsigma\: \pi\gamma\gamma\nu\) : so \(\mathbb{N}\mathcal{D}D\); \(\tau\iota\nu\ \pi\gamma\gamma\nu\ \Lambda\).

171. [\(\alpha\) \(\delta\)\(\iota\)\(\varepsilon\) : so \(\mathcal{D}\); \(\kappa\alpha\ \alpha\) \(\mathbf{N}\).]

172. \(\epsilon\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\nu\sigma\nu\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\iota\) : so \(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{D}D\); \(\epsilon\kappa\pi\rho\iota\rho\varepsilon\nu\sigma\nu\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\iota\) \(\mathbb{N}\). The papyrus seems to have had \(\alpha\nu\lambda\lambda\sigma\varsigma\alpha\iota\), which is found in some of the cursives; \(\upsilon\delta\rho\nu\varepsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma\theta\iota\alpha\iota\), the better supported reading, is too long.

174. [\(\epsilon\gamma\omega\) : the papyrus follows the vulgar spelling. \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\) was originally omitted, and was added by the second hand.]

\(\mu\varepsilon\kappa\rho\omicron\nu\) is also the spelling of \(\mathbb{N}\).

175-6. The reading printed is that of \(\mathbb{A}\), which on the whole seems to suit the space best; but \(\mu\iota\varsigma\) may have been written at the end of l. 175, and the variant of \(\mathbb{N}\ \pi\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\ \sigma\nu\) or of \(\mathcal{D}\ \kappa\alpha\ \sigma\nu\) is quite possible.

178. \(\theta\varepsilon\rho\alpha\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \alpha\nu\tau\omicron\ (\mathbb{N})\) seems more likely than \(\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \theta\varepsilon\rho\alpha\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\ (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{D}\), for though the supposed \(\theta\) may equally well be \(\epsilon\) the line is already rather long and the lacuna in l. 179 is sufficiently filled with [\(\iota\sigma\alpha\alpha\kappa\ \kappa\alpha\)].

181. \(\epsilon\nu\ \tau\iota\) : \(\pi\rho\ o\tun\ \mathbb{N}\mathcal{A}\), \(\pi\mu\nu\ \eta\ \mathcal{D}\).

183. [\(\delta\iota\alpha\upsilon\alpha\omicron\) : so \(\mathbb{N}\); \(\delta\iota\alpha\upsilon\alpha\\mu\nu\ \mathcal{A}\mathcal{D}\).

\(\epsilon\upsilon\\delta\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\) : so \(\mathbb{N}\mathcal{A}\) : \(\kappa\alpha\ \iota\delta\omicron\ \mathcal{D}\).

185. Though the \(\kappa\) of \(\kappa\alpha\) is not quite certain and still less the \(\alpha\) of \(\kappa\iota\tau\omicron\beta\omicron\), the papyrus clearly agreed with \(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{D}\) in omitting \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\) which is read after \(\omega\mu\sigma\nu\) by \(\mathbb{N}\).

188. A here has \(\tau\iota\nu\ \upsilon\delta\rho\nu\ \epsilon\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \beta\rho\alpha\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \alpha\phi\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\ \epsilon\iota\tau\nu\), while \(\mathbb{N}\mathcal{D}\) omit \(\epsilon\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \beta\rho\alpha\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\). The papyrus reading was still shorter, since not more than about 15 letters should stand in the lacuna, and there can be little doubt that \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\) was left out, as in some of the cursives.

189. \(\pi\epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\) : l. \(\pi\iota\epsilon\).

192. This line may have been the last of the column, but the recto has one line more.

657. Epistle to the Hebrews.

Height 26.3 cm.

This considerable fragment of the Epistle to the Hebrews is written on the back of the papyrus containing the new epitome of Livy (668). The text is in broad columns, of which eleven are represented, corresponding to Ch. ii. 14-v. 5, x. 8-xi. 13, and xi. 28-xii. 17, or about one-third of the whole. The columns are numbered at the top, those preserved being according to this numeration 47-50, 63-5, 67-9; it is thus evident that the Epistle to the Hebrews was preceded in this MS. by something else, probably some other part of the New Testament. The hand is a sloping uncial of the oval type, but somewhat coarse and irregular, and apparently in the transitional stage between the Roman and Byzantine variety. It is very similar in appearance to the hand of 404, a fragment of the Shepherd of Hermes, of which a facsimile is given in
P. Oxy. III, Plate iv; and we should attribute it to the first half of the fourth century, while it may well go back to the first quarter. As stated in the introd. to 668, the papyri with which this was found were predominantly of the third century, and it is not likely to have been separated from them by any wide interval. The fact that the strips of cursive documents which were used to patch and strengthen the papyrus before the verso was used are of the third and not the fourth century points to the same conclusion. There is no sign anywhere of a second hand, and such corrections as occur are due to the original scribe, who is responsible for occasional lection signs and the punctuation by means of a double point inserted somewhat freely and not always accurately (cf. e. g. l. 19); a single point is occasionally substituted. This system of punctuation is remarkable, for it seems to correspond to an earlier division into στιχοι longer than those in extant MSS. and frequently coinciding with the arrangement in the edition of Blass (Halle, 1903). The contractions usual in theological MSS. are found, IC being written for ἰησοῦς. Orthography is not a strong point, instances of the confusion common at this period between ι and ε, ε and α, ι and ο, being especially frequent; but apart from minor inaccuracies the text is a good and interesting one. Its chief characteristic is a tendency in Chs. ii–v to agree with B, the Codex Vaticanus, in the omission of unessential words or phrases; cf. notes on ll. 15, 24, and 60. This gives the papyrus a peculiar value in the later chapters, where B is deficient; for here too similar omissions are not infrequent (cf. notes on ll. 118, 125, 151, 152, 161, 224), and it is highly probable that they were also found in B, particularly when, as is sometimes the case, D (the Claromontanus, of the sixth century) is on the same side. Of the other MSS. the papyrus is nearest to D (cf. notes on ll. 60, 125, 145, 152, 154, 178, 222, 224–6), but the two sometimes part company (cf. notes on ll. 139, 163, 180); only in one doubtful case (note on l. 168) does it support Ν against the consensus of the other MSS. Variants peculiar to the papyrus, apart from the omissions already referred to, are noted at ll. 32, 37, 106, 115, 156, 162, 227, 229. We give a collation with the Textus Receptus and the text of Westcott and Hort, adding particulars concerning the readings of the principal authorities.

Col. i.

\[\mu\xi\]

[kαταργησιν του] το κρατος εχοντα του θανατου
[tουτεστιν των διαβολων : και απαλαξη του]
[tους οσου φοβω θανατου δια παν\{τον\}τος του χην]
5 [ενοχοι ησαν δουλειας : ου γαρ δηπου αγγελων]

ii. 14
[επιλαμβανεται] αλλὰ σπερματος Ἀβρααμ επι
[λαμβανεται οὖ]εν αφίλεν κατα παντα τοις α
[δελφοις ομοιωθηναι] : ἕνα ελεπημον γενηται
[και πιστος αρχιερεως τα προς τον δυ εις το ειλασ
[κεσθαι τας αμαρτιας του λαου : εν ὡ γαρ πεπον
[θεν αυτος πιρασθεις] : δυναται τοις πιρασομε
[νους βοηθησαι ο]βεν αδελφοι αγιοι κλησεως ε
[πουρανιου μετοχι]οι : κατανοησατε τον αποστολο
[και αρχιερεια της ομολογιας ημων Ιν πιστον ουτα
[το ποιησαντι] αυτον : ὤς κε Μωυσης εν τω οικο
[αυτου πλειονος γαρ δοξης ουτος παρα Μωυσην
[κατασκευαζας αυτον] : πας γαρ οικος κατασκευ
[αζεται υπο] τινος : ο δε παντα κατασκευασας : δυ
[και Μωυσης] μεν πιστος εν ολω τω οικω αυτον
[ως θερασων εις μαρτυριον : των λαληθησομε
[νους Χε δε] ως υιος επι τον οικον αυτον ου οικο
[εσμεν ημεις] : εαν την παρρησιαν και το καυχη
[μα της ελπι]δος κατασχωμεν : διο καθως λεγει
[το πνα το α]γιον σημερον εαν της φωνης αυτον
[ακουσητε] μη σκληρυνητε τας καρδιας υμων
[ως εν τω πα]ραπικρασμω κατα την ημεραν του
[πιρασμου] εν τη ερημω ου επηρ(α)σαν οι πατερες υμω

Col. ii.

Μη

30 εν δοκιμαια και ειδον τα εργα μου τεσσερακονιτα
ετη [δι]ο προσωπθεια τη γενεα ταυτη και ειπ[ον
αει [πλανω]υται εν τη καρδια αυτων διο ουκ εγνω[σαν
τα[ις οδοης ιου]ως ωμωσα εν τη οργη μου ει ει[σ]ε
λευ[ονται] ει[ις] την καταπαυσιν μου : βλεπεται α[δει
35 φο[ι μη] ποτε εστε εν τωι υμων καρδια πονηρ[α
[λα] πα[ρα]καλεσατε εαυτους καθ εκαστην ημ[ε]
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40 χοι] γα[ρ του Υ]ν γεγοναμεν : εανπερ την α[ρξην
[τ]ης υποστασεως μεχρι τελους βεβαιαν [κατα
[σ]χωμεν εν τω λεγεσθαι σημερον εαν της φ[ω
νης αυτου ακουσητε : μη σκληρυνητε τας καρ
deιας υμων ος εν τω παραπικρασμω : τι[νε]
45 γαρ ακουσαντες παρεπικραναι αλλ ου πα[ντες
οι εξελθο[ντες ε]ξ] Διογνποι δια Μωσηως της[ιν
δε προσωθεις] τεσσερακοντα ετη ουχι τ[οις
αμαρτησασιν ον τα κωλα επεσεν εν τη ε[ρη
μω : τισ[ι]ν δε αμοσεν μη εισελευσασθαι εις
50 τ[η]ν καταπαυσιν αυτου ει μη τους απιθσασει[ν
κα[ι] βλεπομεν στι [ο]υκ ηδυνασθησαν εισε[λ
θεν δε [α[πιστε]ιαν : φοβησωμεν ουν μη πι[ο
τε κατα[λη]πομενης επαγγελιας εισελθειν
[ε]ς την καταπαυσιν αυτου δοκη της εξ υμ[ων
55 υστερ[η]κεναι : και γαρ εσμεν ευγγελισμενοι

Col. iii.

μθ

[καθαπερ κ]ακεινοι αλλ ουκ ωφελησεν ο λογος
[της ακοης] εκεινοις μη συνκεκερασμενος
[τη πιετε το]ις ακουσασιν : εισερχομεθα γαρ εις
60 [καταπαυσιν οι πιστευσαντες : καθως ειρηκεν
[ως ομο]σα εν τη οργη μου ει ελευσοντε εις την κα
[ταπαυσιν μου : καιτοι τω]ν εργων απο καταβο
[λης κοσ]μου γενηθεντων ειρηκεν που περι της
[εβδομης ουτως : και κα[τε]παυσες ο θς εν τη ημε
65 [ρα τη εβδομη απο παντ[ι]ων των εργων αυτου : και
[εν τουτω] πα[λ]ιν εισελευσομεναι εις την καταπαυσι
[μου επι] ουν απολιπετε τινας εισελθειν εις αυτη
[και οι πρ]ωτος ευαγγελισθεντες ουκ ειση[θ]ο
[δι απιθ]ιαν παλιν τινα οριζει ημεραν σημερο
περ πασάν μαχαίραν διστομών καὶ δικνουμέν
νοσ αχρείας μερισμῶν Ψυχῆς καὶ πυς αρμον τε
καὶ μυελῶν καὶ κριτικος ευθυμησεων καὶ εν
νυσαν καρδείας [καὶ οὐκ εστὶν κτισις αράνης
eνοσιον αυτον [παντα δε γυμνα καὶ τετραχη
λιψοντα τοις ωφθαλμοις αυτον προσ ον ημιν
ο λογος: εχοντες ουν αρχιερεα μεγαν διε
ληθυστα τους ουρανους Ιην τον ιον του δυ
κρατομεν της [ομολογιας ου γαρ εχομεν αρχη
ρεα μη δυναμενον συνασθησα ταις ασθε
νειας ημων [πεπρασμενον δε κατα παντα
καθ ομοιοτητα [χορίς αμαρτίας προσερχομε
θα ουν μετα [παρρησιας τω θρονω της χαριτο
[ην]α λαβομεν ελεος και χαιριν ευρομεν εις ευ
[καιρον βοηθειαν πας γαρ αρχιερευς εξ ανδρω
πον λαμβανομενος υπερ ανθρωπων κα
[θη]σταται τα προσ τον δυ ει α προσφερη δωρα
και θυσια υπερ αμαρτιων μετασπαθειν δυ
ναμενοι τοις αγορουσι και πλαισμενοι επει
καὶ αὐτὸς περὶ ἱκεταῖαι ασθενείαν καὶ δὲ αὐτήν
οφίλη καθὼς περί τοῦ λαοῦ οὕτως καὶ περὶ εαυ
τοῦ προσφερεῖν περὶ αμαρτίων καὶ οὐχ ἐ
105 αὐτῷ τις λαμβανεῖ τὴν τιμὴν ἀλλὰ καλοῦμε
νός ὑπὸ τοῦ ἧν οὗτος καὶ ὁ Ἱεροσολύμων οὗτος εἰνῷ διὸ
ξάσει γενήθησαι αἰχμαλωσθεὶς ἀλλὰ οἱ λαλήσας

12 columns lost.

Col. v.

[προσφέρονται το]τε εἰρή[κεν ἑ]δον η[κο τοῦ ποιήσαι το]

x. 8

[θελήμα σου] : ἀναμείρε τὸ [πρῶτον ἱνα [τὸ δευτέρον στῇ
[σὴν ὕρ θελήματι ηγιασμε[ν]ο] εσθι[εν διὰ τῆς πρὸ-
[φορὰς τοῦ σω]ματος Ἰν Ἰκ]ν εφάπαξ : [καὶ πας μεν ἰε
[ρεὐς εστὶ]κεν καὶ ημεραν λιτούργοι καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς
[πολλὰκις] προσφέρω[ν] θυσίας αἰτινες οὐ[δεποτε]

[δυνάνται] περιελεῖν αμαρτίαν : οὗτος δὲ [μιαν ν
[περ αμαρτίων] προσενεχκας θυσίαν εἰς τὸ διήνεκες
[εκαθίσαν εν δέξια] τοῦ δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν εκδέχομεν
[εως τεθωσι] οἱ εὐθύρῳ ὑποποδίων τῶν ποδ[ε]ν ἅπαντί
[μια γαρ πρὸσφορά τετελείσθεν εἰς τὸ διήνεκες τοὺς

120 [αγιαζομένους] μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ημεῖς καὶ τὸ πνά
[τὸ αἰγὸν μετὰ γαρ τὸ εἰρήκειν αὐτή δὲ η 
[ν διαθήσομαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ τὰς ημερ[ας εκι
[νὰς λεγεῖ κ']δὲ διὸς νομοὶ μου επὶ καρδίας αὐτὸ
[καὶ εἰπὶ τῇ]ν διανοιαν αὐτῶν [[α]] εἰπεργασθὼς αὐτοὺς

125 [καὶ τῶν αμαρτίων καὶ τ]ῶν αὐ[μοι αὐτῶν οὐ μ]
[μηνοθεσο]μαι εἰτ : ὅποι δὲ αφεσὶς τούτων οὐκ
[εἰτ] προσφόρα περὶ αμαρτίας : ἑχοντες οὖν αὐδὴ
[ὅι] παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἰσοδὸν τῶν αἰγιὼν εν τῷ
[αἰματὶ Ἰ]γνη ημεσιμουνην οὐδον πρὸσφερον

130 [φατο]ν καὶ ἔωςαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετασμάτος
[τοὺτ] εὐτῖν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ : καὶ ἱερεὰ μεγαν
[επὶ] τον οἴκον τοῦ δὲ προσερχαμέθαι μετα
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Col. vi

πῶσο δοκεῖτε χειρονος αξιωθησαί τιμωρίας ο τον ύιον] τι[ον [θυ καταπαθησας και το αιμα της διαθηκης x. 29

κωμου [ηγισσομενος εν ω ηγιασθη και το πνα της χα
ριτων ευβρισας οιδαμεν γαρ τον ειποντα εμοι εκ
dικησις εγ\(ω\) ανταποδωσω και παλιν κρινει κς του

λαον αυτοιν φοβερον το εμπεσεν εις χειρας θυ
ζωτος : [αναμιμηνασθε δε τας προτερουν ημε

ρας εν αισ φωτισθεντες πολλην αθλησιν υπεμεινατε
παθηματων τουτο μεν ονειδισμως τε και θλησειν

Col. vii.

ξδ

[θεα]τριζομενοι : τουτο δε κωμων[ο]ι των ουτως x. 33
[ανα]τρεφομενων γενηθεντες : και γαρ τοις δεσ

κωμων] ου[ν μετα χαρας προσεδεξασθε : γινωσ
cο[ντες εχιν εαυτους κρισιωνα υπαρξων και μεν[ο]υ

ο\[ιν\] : μη αποβαλθετε ουν την παρησιαν υ\[ιων\]
[ητ]ισ εχει μεγαλην μισθαποδοσιαν υπομονης

γαρ εξεται χρειαν ινα το θελημα του [θυ] ποιησαντες

κο[μισθησε] την επαγγελιαν : ετι[ι] μικρον ουσιν :

ο[σο]ν ο ερχομενος ηξει και ου χρονισει ο δε δικαιος

πιστεος ζησεται : και εαυτων υποστηληται : [ο\[υη] εν

dox[ει] μου η ψυχη εν αυτω : ημες δε ουκ εσμεν [υ\[πο\]

αιρ\[ει\] εις απολειαν : αλλα πιστεος εις περιτοι[η\[ου\]

πι[χαι] : εστι δε πιστας επιζομενων πραγματ[αι]

αποθε\[ση\] εις \{λ\} εγερον ου βλεπομενον : εν αυτη γαρ εμαρτηρη

[θη]ναι οι προσβυτεροι : πιστα νοουμεν καθητεισθαι

[τους] αιωνας ρηματι δυ εις το μη εκ φα[[ε]]ινομενων το

[βλ][επομενον γεγονε\[ναι] : πειστει πλειονα θυσιαν Αβε[λ]
παρα Καειν προσηνικ'κεν δη ης εμαρτυρηθη ειναι δι [κ]'αιος μαρτυρουντος επι τους δωροις αυτω του θυ και δι αυ της αποθανων ετι λαλει : πιστει Ενωχ' μετετεθη[η] του [μη] ιδειν θανατον και ουχ ευρισκετο διοτι μετεθηκεν αυτων
165 ο δε : προ γαρ της μεταθεσεως μεμαρτυρηται ευρετησηκε

Col. viii.

[ξε
ναι τω θω [χορις δε πιστως αδυνατον ευαρεσθησαι πιστευναι γαρ δει τον προσερχομενον θω στι εστιν και τοις ξητουσιν αυτων μισθαποδοτης γινεται πιστει
170 χρηματισθεις Νωε περι των μηδεπω βλεπομενων ευλαβηθεις κατεσκευασεν κιβωτων εις σωτηριαν του οικου αυτων [δη ης κατεκρινεν τον κοσμον και της κατα πιστιν δικαιοσυνης εγενετο κληρονομος πιστει καλου μενος Αβρααμ μυπηκουσεν εξελθεν εις τοπον ον ημελ
175 λεν λαμβανειν εις κληρονομιαν και εξηλθεν μη επι σταμενος π'ου ερχεται πιστει παρωκησει εις γην της επαγγελιας [ως αλλοτριαν εν σκηναις κατοικησας μετα Ισακ' και Ιακωβ των συγκληρονων της επαγγελιας της αυτης : εξεδεχετο γαρ την τους θεμελιους εχουσαν το
180 λιν : ης τεχνιτης και δημιουργος ο δε πιστει και αυτης αρρα δυναμιν εις καταβολην σπερματος ελαβει και πα ρα καιρον ηλικιας επει πιστων ηγησατο τον επαγγειλαμε νονν διο και [αφ ενος εγεννηθησαν και ταυτα νενεκρω μενον : καθως τα αστρα του ουρανου το πληθει και
185 ως η αμμος η [παρα το χειλος της θαλασσης η αναριθμητος κατα πιστιν απεθανον ουτοι παντες μη κομισαμενοι τας [ε]παγγελειαις αλλα πορρωθεν αυτας ιδοτες και ας [π]ασαμενοι και αι ομολογησαντες στη ξενοι και παρεπιδημοι [ε]ισιν επι της [γης

1 column lost.
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Col. ix.

190  
ζζ
[πρωτότοκα θιγή αρτων : πιστει διεβησαν την Ερυθραν  
θαλασσαν ως δια ξηρ]ας γης : η[ς] πειραν λαβοντες οι Αιγιν
[πτοι κατεποθησαν] πιστει τα τιχη Ιεριχω επεσαν κυκλω
[θευτα επι επτα ημερας : πιστει Πααβ η πορνη ου συναισω
195 [λετο τους απιθησαυν] δεξαμεν τους κατασκοπους μετ'
[ειρηνης και τι ετι λεγω επιλυτε γαρ με διηγουμενον ο χρο
[νος περι Γεθεων Βαρακ' Σαμψο Φεθβαε Δαυειδ' τε και Σαμουηλ
[και των προφητων] οι δια πιστεως κατηγωνισαντο βασιλειας
[ηργασαντο δικαιοσυνην : επετυχον επαγγελιον [:] εφρα
200 [ξαν στοματα λεοντων : εσβεσαν δυναμιν πυρος [:] εφυ
[γον στοματα μαχαιρις : εδυναμωθησαν απο ασθηνει
[ας εγενθησαν ια]χυροι εμ πολεμω παρεμβολας εκλει
[μεν αλλοτριων ελαβον γυνεκα\. ] εξ αναστασεως τους
[νεκρους αυτων α]ιλοι δε ετοιμαπαυςθησαν ου προσδεξα
205 [μενοι την απολυτρωσει ρωσιν ινα κρειττονος αναστασεως
[τυχων ετεροι δε] εμπεγμων και μαστεγους πειραν
[ελαβον ετι δε δεσμων και φυλακης : ελιθασθησαν
[επιριθησαν επι ιαρα]σθησαν : εν φοιο μαχαιρας α
[πεθανον περι]λη[λον εν μηλοταισ εν εγιοι δεμα
210 [σιν νυστρομενοι] θλειβομενοι : κακουχουμενοι
[ων ουκ ην αξιοις] ο [κο]σμος : επι ερημειαις πλανωμε
[νοι και ορεσι και σρη]πες και τας οπας της γης : και
[ουτοι παντες μαρτυρηθευςτες δια της πιστεως ουκ εκομι
[σαντο την επι]γγει[λην του δυ περι ημων κριτουν
215 [τι προβλεψα]μενοι ινα μη χωρις ημων τελειωθωσει[τι]
[τοιγαρου και] ημεις τοσοτουν εχοντες περικμενον

Col. x.

τη[ν ευπεριστατον αμαρτειαν δι] ιπομονης τρεχομεν το
xii. 1
637. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

220 προκειμένου ημείς αγώνα αφοροῦντες εἰς τὸν τὴς πιστεύω
αρχὴν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰν οὐ αντί τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῶν χα
ρας ύπεμεινεν τὸν σταυρὸν αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας εἰν
δέξια τε [τ]οῦ θρόνου τοῦ ὅν κεκαθίκεν : ἀναλογισασθαί γαρ
τοινυν ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν αμαρτωλῶν. εἰς αὐ

225 τοὺς αντιλογιαν ἧνα μὴ καμήτε ταῖς ψυχαῖς εκλειπούν
νοὶ : οὐπώ μεχρί αιματος αντικατεστήτε πρὸς τὴν α
μαρτίαν ἀγωνίζομεν καὶ εκλείπομεν τῆς παρακλήσεως
ητῷ ύμειν οὐ ύμεις διαλεγοῖται υἱε μοῦ μὴ ὁλίγωρει παιδεί
ας καὶ μὴ εγγυνοῦ ὑπὸ αὐτὸν ἐλεγχόμενος : οὐ γὰρ α

230 γαπα κἂν πεδεύει μαστειγοῦσα δὲ παντὰ ύμιν ὑπὸ παραδεχεῖσθαι
εἰς παιδεῖαν υπομενεται ὡς ο[ι]ς ύμειν προσφέρεται
ο ὅς τὸς γὰρ ύμον ὑμὲν οὐν ὑμῖν πεδεύει πατήρ εἰ δὲ χορὶς [ἐστίν]
παιδείας ης μετοχοι γεγονοῦσα παντες : ἄρα νο[θοι καὶ] οὐκ
ὑμοὶ εἰστε : εἰτα τοὺς μεν τῆς σαρκὸς ημον πτ[ατ]ερα[ς] εἰ]χο

235 μεν παιδευτας καὶ ενετερπομεθα : ου πολυ δε μαλ
λον υποταινησομεθα τω πατρι των πνευματων και ζη
σομεν : οι μεν γαρ προς ολίγας ημερας κατα το δοκοῦ
αυτοις επαιδευον : ο δε ετπ το συμφερον εἰς το μετα
λαβειν της αγιωτητης αυτου : πασα δε παιδεια προ(ς) μεν το

240 παρον ου δοκει χαρας ειναι αλλα λυπης υστερον δε καρ
πον ειρηνικον τοις δι αυτης γεγυμνασμενοι αποδιδοσι

Col. xi.

[ζθ]

δικαιοσύνης διο τας παρειμένας χειρας καὶ τα παραλειμά

να [γονατά ανορθώσατε και τροχίας ορθάς ποιετε τοις

245 ποσιν υμῶν ἐνα μὴ το χωλόν εκτραπῆς ιαθῇ δε μαλλον
eιρήνην δικαστε μετα παντων καὶ τον αγιασμον ου χωρίς
οὐδεις ουσετα τον κυ πισκοπούντες μη τις υστερον απο της
χαριτος τον ὅθεν μὴ τις ρίζα πικριας ανω φυσουσα ενοχλη
καὶ δι αυτης μιανθωνι οι πολλοί μη τις πορνος η βεβηλος

250 ως [Ησαυ ος αντι βροσεως μιας απεδοτο τα πρωτοτοκία αυτον ἰσ
14. ι(ησου)ν: so NABCD, &c., W-H.; Χριστον Ιησουν EKL, &c., T-R.
15. εν τω οικω: so B; εν ολω τω οικω NACDE, &c., T-R., W-H. ολω may have come in from verse 5.
16. δοξην ουτος: so KLM, &c., T-R.; ουτος δοξης NABCD, &c., W-H.
17. παντα: so NABCDKM, &c., W-H.; τα π. EL, &c., T-R.
18. εαυτον: so NBDE, &c., W-H.; εαυτερ AC, &c., T-R. κ of καυχημα has been altered apparently from χ.
19. απ’δος καταχωμεν: so B; αλπ. μεχρι τελουν βεβαιουν κατασχ. NACDE, &c., T-R., W-H. The phrase μεχρι τελουν βεβαιουν κατασχωμεν recurs in verse 14 and may have come in here from that passage.
31. προσωκειται: I. προσωποθυσα; the θ has been altered from τ.
32. εν τη καρδια αυτων διο: τη καρδια αυτοι δε MSS.
36-40. The position of the narrow strip placed near the beginning of these lines is uncertain, but it suits very well here. The recto being blank does not help to decide the question.
37. παρακαλεσαι is another otherwise unattested reading: παρακαλει MSS.
38. α’χ’με: so M; σχρυ other MSS., T-R., W-H.
42. A double point may be lost after σχωμεν.
51. ηδυανθησαν: ηδυανθησαν MSS. The form ηδυανθησαν occurs e.g. in Matt. xvii. 16 (B), Mark vii. 24 (NB).
52. The first ε of ειςξηθεν is written over a double point.
58. συνεκερασμενου: so ABCD, &c., W-H. in text; συνεκερασμενος N, W-H. mg., συνεκερασμενος T-R.
59. γαρ: so BDE, &c.; ουν ΝΑC.
60. την was certainly omitted before κατασχωσιν as in BD; την is found in other MSS. and is read by W-H. and T-R.
63. του: γαρ που T-R., W-H. with all MSS. except 109лат– which agrees with the papyrus in omitting γαρ.
64. κατεξαυσε is a mistake for κατεξαυσεν.
66. ειτελευσογται: so D and some cursive; ει ειτελευσονται other MSS., T-R., W-H.
70-1. The vestiges of [καθημ] are very slight, but are a sufficient indication that the papyrus read προερημαι with NACDE, &c., W-H., rather than ευρηται (correctors of DE, KL, T-R.), since the division καθας does not account for the traces of ink at the end of l. 70.
80. σ of πεση was converted from τ.
81. ενεργην: so NACDE, &c., T-R., W-H.; εναργη Β.
85. ενεργων is for ενεργων.
96. It is almost certain that the papyrus read ευρομενει, since without this word the line would be unaccountably short; B stands alone in omitting it.
99. The line is sufficiently long without τε after δωρα (om. B and an early corrector of D), and in view of the tendency of the papyrus the omission is probable.
106. ουτως, κ.τ.λ.: the MSS. here have καθωσπερ (NABD) or καθαπερ και (om. και CD) Δαρων ουτως, κ.τ.λ., but there is evidently not room for all this in the papyrus. The only
other authority for any omission here is K, which leaves out οὐτὸς καὶ ο Χριστός; but even without these words the line would remain rather too long. To omit καθώσπερ καὶ Αρων suits the space better and does not damage the sense.

112. The papyrus may of course have read αἰματος (DE) for σφήμας and ἀρχιερέως (AC) for άρχειν (NDEKL).

115. αμαρτιας: αμαρτια MSS.

116. The second ν, if it be ν, in προσευκας was converted from ι or υ. The previous υ also seems to have been altered.

118. εὐθεὺς: εὐθεὺς αυτον MSS. The superfluous ι in ποδινυ was a slip due to the preceding υποστηνυ.

124. The scribe apparently began to write αυτούς before επιγραφο, but that the α was meant to be deleted is not certain and its partial effacement may be accidental.

125. αμαρτιῶν: so D and some cursives; αμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν T-R., W-H., with other MSS.

125-6. μημηθητορμαι: I. μημηθητορμαι.

127. αμαρτιας: αμαρτιας MSS. The second ε of εὑρτες has been altered from α.

139. τος προτερων θεμερα: so T-R., W-H., with most MSS.; τα πρ. αμαρτιας Ν, τας προτερας θημερας D.

144. δεσμοί: so AD, W-H.; δεσμοι μου NEHKL, &c., T-R. We cannot of course be sure that the papyrus did not have δεσμοι, but the absence of μου is the important thing and is much in favour of δεσμοι.

147. ευτερους: so ΝΑ, W-H.; ευτερος DE, &c., εν ευτερος T-R. with a few minuses.

κριστοσυν = κριστοσυν: so ΝΑ, W-H.; κριστοσυν DE, &c., T-R.

ναριν: so ΝΑD, W-H.; νπ. en ουσονοι E, &c., T-R.

151. There is an apparently accidental diagonal dash passing from the top of the supposed μ through the ι.

ev[ε]: eti γαρ MSS.

152. χρονους: so ΝD, W-H.; χρονοι AE, &c., T-R.

153-3. The papyrus certainly agreed with DE, &c., in omitting μου, which is found in ΝΑ after δικαιος. δικαιος [μου] W-H., δικαιος T-R.

153. πυτεως: πυτεως μου D.

154. μου η ψυχη: so DE; η ψ. μου T-R., W-H., with other MSS.

156. πραγματο[α][o] αποστωσιες: I. [αποστωσιεσ] is the reverse order to that of all the MSS.; πραγματια is usually connected with Βελομενων.

157. αυτη: so two cursives (47, 115); en αυτη other MSS., T-H., W-H.

159-60. το Βελομενον: so ΝΑDΕ, W-H.; τα Βελομενα ΚL, &c., T-R.

161. προσπρεγκεν: προσπρεγκεν τωθ θεον MSS.

162. αυτου τον θεον τωθ: αυτον was originally written but was altered to αυτω. αυτον τωθ θεον ΝΑD, αυτον του θεου ΕΚΛ, &c., T-R., W-H.

163. λαλει: so ΝΑ, W-H., T-R.; λαλεια DE, &c.

164. ευπρεκτο: so ΚL, &c., T-R.; ηυπρεκτο ΝΑDΕ, W-H.

165. ευπρεκτηρειας: so ΝΕΔ; ευπ. ΑΚL, W-H., T-R. If ευπρεκτηρειας was correctly written this line was somewhat longer than those preceding.

166. θ(ε)ω: so Ν; the papyrus may of course have had τω θ(ε)ω like ADE, &c., (so T-R., W-H.), but in view of its tendency to shortness this is less probable.

169. οθουσια: so Ε only; εκζουσια other MSS., T-R., W-H.

175. λαμβανει εις ηλ.: the usual reading; ηλ. λαμβανει Ν.

178. Ισακ is also the spelling of D; Ισακ other MSS., T-R., W-H.

180-1. αυτης η αρρα is for αυτη Σορρα. The papyrus agreed with ΝΑΕ, &c., in omitting στημα or στειμα ουσα which is found after Σορρα (or after δωμαυμ or ελαβευ) in D and other MSS.
182. It is practically certain that the papyrus did not read ἐτεκεν after γλυκιας with EKL and other MSS. (so T-R.). It is omitted in ΝΑΔ, W-H.
185. ὤς γῆ: so all the best MSS.; ὤς T-R. with a few minuscules.
186. Considerations of space make κομισαμενοι (Ν, &c., W-H.) preferable to λαβοντες (ΔE, &c., T-R.).
187. The papyrus evidently omitted καὶ πεισθεντες which is found in some minuscules and read in the T-R.
188. This line is rather long, and the papyrus may have had ποροικοι for παρεπιδημοι, as P.
192. ήγαν γης: so ΝΑDE, W-H.; om. γης ΚL, &c., T-R.
193. ἐποσα: so ΝΑD, W-H.; ἐπεσε EKL, T-R.
194. πορῃ: ἐπελεγμενη πορῃ Ν.
196. γαρ με: so EKL, &c., T-R.; με γαρ ΝΑD, W-H.
197. The papyrus agrees with ΝΑ (so W-H.) in the omission of conjunctions between the names as far as Δανεδ. B. τε καὶ 2. καὶ Ι. T-R. with other MSS. The spelling Σαμψω is attested as a variant by D. The e of Δανεδ was originally omitted; Δανεδ ΝD, W-H., Δανεδ, Δαδ, and Δαδδ (T-R.) other MSS.
201. μαχαορις: so ΝΑD, W-H.; μαχαρας other MSS., T-R. But the papyrus is inconsistent and has μαχαρας in l. 208.
203. ταυρα &c.: ΝΑD, W-H.; ταυρα &c. EKL, &c., T-R.
206. The size of the lacuna is inconclusive as to whether the papyrus read γυνεκεις] (ΝΑD) or γυναικεις; i.e. γυναικεις (ΕKL, &c., T-R., W-H.).
208. [ἐπαργαζον] ἐπιρροζθησαν: this is also the order of ΑE, &c., and T-R.; ἐπαργ. ἐπρ.
211. ΜSSt: so ΝΑD, W-H.; Εις DE, &c., T-R.
216. τουτοντιον: Ν τηλικουτον.
222. του τουτον: so D; om. του other MSS., T-R., W-H.
223. καθα[χευν: so the uncialis, W-H.; καθα[χευν T-R. with some minuscules.
224. The papyrus agrees with D in omitting του which is read before τουωτην in other MSS. and by T-R., W-H.
225. αυτος: so a corrector of Ν; αυτος ΝDE, W-H., αυτον Α, αυτον ΚL, T-R.
226. μεχρι: so D; μεχρι other MSS., T-R., W-H.
227. αγων[χεμενοι: ανταγωνιζομενοι MSS.
229. καὶ μη: μηδε MSS.
231. εις: so most MSS., W-H.; ει T-R. with a few minuscules.
232. τις γαρ: so ΝΑ, W-H.; τις γαρ εστιν DE, &c., T-R.
233-4. καὶ ουν νοι εστε is also the order of ΝΑD, W-H.; εστε κ. ο. οι. ΚL, &c., T-R.
235. πολυ δε: & is also attested as a variant by D and was added by the third corrector of Ν; πολυ ΝΑD, W-H., πολλω ΚL, &c., T-R.
239. αγιοτητης is a graphical error for αγιοτητος. πασα δε is the reading of ΑKL, &c., T-R.; πασα μεν Ν, &c., W-H.
241. The e of ειρηκουκ has apparently been corrected and the η of αντης was altered from ο or οι, which perhaps reflects the variant & αυτοις recorded in D; but it may well have been a mere slip.
An interesting survival of the Decian persecution of the Christians in A.D. 250 is preserved in this papyrus, which is an example of the *libelli* or declarations which suspects were compelled to make that they had sacrificed to the pagan gods. Two only of these *libelli* have hitherto been published, one at Berlin (B. G. U. 287: Krebs, *Sitzungsb. Berl. Akad.* 1893; Harnack, *Theol. Literaturz.* 1894, p. 38), the other at Vienna (Wessely, *Sitzungsb. Wien. Akad.* 1894; Harnack, *Theol. Literaturz.* 1894, p. 162). Both of those documents were from the Fayum; the present specimen, though from another nome, has the same characteristic phrases, which were evidently a stereotyped formula, and confirms in all respects the emendations and deductions proposed by Harnack in connexion with the Berlin papyrus. Like them also it is addressed to a commission which was specially appointed to conduct the inquisition against the Christians.

*Toais èpi tov ierôn [kal
thetaiôn podleos
par' Aúrhlwv A]. . . . .
blwvov Theodórou mou[trôs
5 Pantonwimiôs apô tê[s
αvthès pôleos. dei mèn
thôn kai spêndôn [tois]
tho[îs [ð]iètel[esa é]ê: ðê
kai vûn enôpion ùð[ô
10 kata tâ keleuvthê[é]v[ta
èspieisa kai èthusa kal[i
 tôv ierôn ègenusâmhn

Àma tôv ulô mou Aûrhlwv
lôw Dîoskôrôv kal tê
15 òugâtrî mou Aûrhlwv
Lâbî. ðêiû ùmas âpo-
sêmiôsaðêvai moî.
(êtonv) a Aûtokrâtoros Kâlâpâos
Gâlou Mêsîou Kûîntou
20 Têmaiônou Dêklôv
Eûsteðov[ûs Eûîpêkôûs
[. . . .]v( ) [ . . . . . .

1. ierôn Pap.; so in l. 12. 12. egeneusaî Pap. 16. lâbî Pap. o of vû[ô above
the line. 19. gaiûv Pap. 20. têmaiônou Pap.

'To the superintendents of offerings and sacrifices at the city from Aurelius . . . -thion son of Theodorus and Pantonymis, of the said city. It has ever been my custom to make sacrifices and libations to the gods, and now also I have in your presence in accordance with the command poured libations and sacrificed and tasted the offerings together with my son Aurelius Dioscorus and my daughter Aurelia Lais. I therefore
request you to certify my statement. The 1st year of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Pauni 20.'

1-2. The Berlin and Vienna libelli are addressed τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσίων ἔρημον, omitting τέρπω.

6. ᾦν μὲν is written in the original rather below the line and there are traces of ink over ἦν, so there seems to have been some correction.

13-4. τῷ θυγατρί: women were clearly included in the Decian Edict; cf. the Vienna libellus, which is from two men with their wives, and the 5th Edict of Maximin (Euseb. de Mart. Pol. ix. 2), quoted by Harnack, πανδημεῖ πάντας ἄνδρας ἃμα γυναῖκι καὶ οἰκεῖοι καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐπομαξίους πασὶ θείῳ καὶ σπένδειν, κ.τ.λ.

23. A signature begins at this line, though whether it is that of the sender of the declaration or of an official is doubtful. The stroke above the supposed υ which we have taken to represent an abbreviation may be only part of a long paragraphus below the date.

II. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

659. PINDAR, Παρθένειον AND ODE.

12·8 x 49 cm. Plates III, IV.

Fragments of a roll containing parts of at least five columns of lyric poetry in Pindaric dialect, written in good-sized round uncialis, which we assign to the latter half of the first century B.C. Occasional accents, breathings, and stops (high and middle point) have been added by the original scribe, who has also made a few corrections of his work; the text, however, was not left in a very perfect condition, and several alterations are necessary on metrical and other grounds. The first three columns, but for the loss of a few lines at the beginning of each, are in good condition; the fourth becomes more fragmentary, while Col. v, which probably succeeded immediately and to which the majority of the small unplaced pieces appear to belong, is hopelessly broken. The position of these is to some extent fixed by the fact that the verso of Cols. i–iii was utilized for a collection of epigrams (662); for since the verso of most of the scraps is blank, they must be placed later than the upper half of the third column.

Although the Pindaric authorship of these new poems is not definitely established by the coincidence of any part of them with already extant fragments, their style and diction leave little room for doubt as to the identity of the poet. It is therefore a piece of great good fortune that the second at
any rate of the two odes comprised by the papyrus (ll. 21 sqq.) belongs to
a class hitherto practically unrepresented in what survives of Pindar’s works.
This poem was composed in honour of Acoladas (l. 29) the father of the
Pagondas (l. 30) who commanded the Thebans at the battle of Delium
(Thucyd. iv. 91–6), and his praises are put in the mouth of a maiden (ll. 26,
46, &c.) — a circumstance which at first led us to suppose that the writer was
a woman. But Blass, to whom we are especially indebted in connexion with
this papyrus, is clearly right in regarding the piece as one of the Παρθένεια, or
choruses for girls, which figure in the lists of Pindar’s works, and are exemplified
in a few meagre quotations (among which is perhaps to be reckoned 221. vii.
6–12). Can the poem be characterized still more closely? In near relation to
the Παρθένεια there stood a series known as Δαφνηφορικά, so called because the
singers bore branches of laurel. The catalogue of Pindar’s works as given
by Suidas distinguishes the Παρθένεια from the Δαφνηφορικά, while the list given
in the Codex Ambrosianus, which is usually recognized as the superior authority,
does not mention the latter class, and apparently includes it in the Παρθένεια; cf. Proclus, Chrest. ap. Phot., Bibl. 239 Παρθ. οίς καὶ τὰ δαφνηφορικά ὡς εἶς γένος πίπτει. It is then quite possible that in the present poem the rather prominent
allusions to δάφνη (ll. 27–8, 73), in one of which the speaker actually describes
herself as carrying a laurel branch, may possess a special significance. On the
other hand there is here no sign of the religious character which seems to have
belonged to the Δαφνηφορικά (cf. Proclus, ibid.); Pindar is indeed said in the
Vita Ambrosiana to have dedicated one of these poems to his son Δαίφαντος,
but the circumstances are unknown. For the present, therefore, it is sufficient
to call attention to these references, and to assign the ode provisionally to the
more comprehensive class of the Παρθένεια, or possibly to the κεκωριμένα τῶν
Παρθενίων mentioned in the Ambrosian list and elsewhere. The obscurity of
the latter category might have the advantage of covering the other poem
partially preserved in the papyrus, which was also in honour of Acoladas (l. 12),
but, as is shown by the occurrence of a masculine participle (l. 11), was not
designed for a female chorus. No doubt if both pieces were Δαφνηφορικά, the
difference of sex would cause no difficulty; but in the absence of further
allusions to δάφνη such an assumption has little to commend it. Perhaps this
ode was an ἐγκώμιον or simply Epinician in character, and the juxtaposition of
the two pieces was merely due to their identity of subject.

The metre of the Παρθένειον is distinguished, like its language, by an ease
and simplicity which fully bear out the reputation of this class of Pindar’s
odes; cf. Dionys. Halicarn. Demosth. 39, where after citing the poetry of
Aeschylus and Pindar as an example of want of connexion, abruptness, and
unexpected changes of construction, the critic proceeds χωρίς ὅτι μη τὰ Παρθένεια καὶ εἰ τίνα τούτοις ὁμοιας ἀπαιτεῖ κατασκευάζει διαφαίνεται δὲ τις ὁμοια κἂν τούτοις εὐγένεια καὶ σεμνότης ἀρμονίας τῶν ἀρχαίων φυλάττονα πίνον. Strophes and epodes consist alike of five verses having a prevailing choriambic element. The scheme is as follows:—

**Strophes.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I} & \quad \text{II} & \quad \text{III} & \quad \text{IV} & \quad \text{V} \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0
\end{align*}
\]

**Epodes.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I} & \quad \text{II} & \quad \text{III} & \quad \text{IV} \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 \\
0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 0
\end{align*}
\]

Lines 1 and 3 in the strophe, 1, (2) and 4 in the epode stand in synaphia with the lines succeeding; and a single long syllable before or after a choriambus is probably to be regarded as lengthened by ‘syncope’ to the extent of an additional short syllable, e.g. \( \ldots 000 \ldots = L00 \ldots \), or \( \ldots 000 \ldots \).

The commencement of each new strophe is marked in the original by an elaborate coronis, and the antistrophes and epodes are commonly denoted in the same way by paragraphi, which are, however, sometimes omitted. The metrical scheme shows that the number of lines missing at the tops of Cols. iii and iv must be either 8 or 23—a larger figure is out of the question. A loss of 8 lines would give a roll of the likely enough height of about 20 cm., and is a satisfactory supposition in other respects. Each column would accordingly consist of from 28–29 lines, and a lacuna of about 8 or 9 lines may therefore be postulated at the beginning of the first two columns. On this view the remains of the second poem extend to the second verse of the eighth strophe, or the 107th line from the commencement; the numeration given in the text below refers only to the lines actually preserved in the papyrus.

The length of the strophe of the first poem (Col. i and the lost portion of Col. ii) is also five verses; the epode was longer, how much longer depends upon the number of lines lost at the top of Col. ii. If it be assumed that no space was left between the end of this ode and the commencement of the next, as the analogy of the Bacchylides papyrus and 408 would indicate, the epode extended to the rather unexpected length of 14 verses; if on the other hand the division was marked by a blank space, this number would be lowered by two or three lines. A different figure would of course result from the adoption of the hypothesis that the loss in Cols. iii–iv amounts to 23 verses, which would bring down the epode of the previous poem to a maximum of 9 lines.
We append the scheme of the metre:

**Strophes.**

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{Lines 4-5 in the strophe and 1-3 and 4-5 in the epode are connected by synaphia.} \\
& \text{Col. i.}
\end{align*}
\]

**Epodes.**

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{Lines 4-5 in the strophe and 1-3 and 4-5 in the epode are connected by synaphia.} \\
& \text{Col. i.}
\end{align*}
\]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Col. ii.

[...][ΧΡΥΣΩΠ[...]
[...]ΔΩΜ[...]ΛΕΩΝΙ[...]ΜΕ[...
[...]ΓΑΡΟ[...]ΙΑΣ
[...]ΦΡΟ[...]ΘΕΑΝΑΤΑΝΧΑΠΙΝ

Col. iii.

[...]ΦΕΝ[
[...]ΚΙΜ[...]ΖΩΝΑ[...]
[...]ΛΑΜΕΝ[...]ΠΑΡΟΙ[...
[...]ΑΙΔΛΟΙ[...]ΠΕΙΝΤΑ[...

- άρος κοισκικών θαλασσών έγ- αντ. γ'}
κεῖμαι χρή μ[ε] λαθεὶν ἀοιδὰν πρόσφορον.
50 πιστὰ δ Ῥάγασικλ(έ)ει
μάρτυς ἥλυθον ἐς χορόν
ἔσοις τε γονεύσιν
ἀμφὶ προξενιαίοι τι-
μαθείσιν τὰ πάλαι τὰ νῦν
55 τ᾽ ἀμφικτῖονεσσιν
ἵππων τ᾽ ἀκτινῶδων πο[λυ-]
γνώτοις ἐπὶ νῖκαις,
αἰς ἐν ἀἵλωνεσσιν Ὤγχη[στοῦ κλυ]τᾶσ
50 χαίταν στεφάνοις ἐκδό-
μηθεν, ἐν τε Πίσσα περι-
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Col. v.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ΔΔΑΔ</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] INAP</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] NOCTIΕΕΣΤΙΑΝ</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] ΓΛΑΙΖΕΤΑΙ</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fragments.

(a) (b) (c) (d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PH</th>
<th>. Ω</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>ΑΪΤ</td>
<td>] ΚΑΛ</td>
<td>ΑΣΤΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] ΔΕΙΔ</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>ΕΟΜΟ</td>
<td>] ΝΑΙΟ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] Ω</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>] ΝΑΙΚ</td>
<td>] ΤΙΓ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) (f) (g) (h) (i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>110</th>
<th>ΑΝΤ</th>
<th>] ΝΑ</th>
<th>115</th>
<th>ΑΤ</th>
<th>]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

120 | [ | ] | [ | ] | | |

195 μὴ νῦν νέκταιρ ἰδοντ' ἀπὸ κράνοις ἐμᾶς
dιψᾶτ' ἀ ὠ — — παρ' ἀλμυρὸν
οἴχεσθον· ἐ — —
1–4. At the top of this column considerable difficulties arise with regard to the place of the two fragments (α) and (δ), which appear in this position in Plate III. Fr. (δ) especially looks as if it should be put here, for the tops of the letters ΤΙΣ in the fifth line exactly suit μάρτις. But the letters on the verso cannot be made to fit in as they should with the last lines of the extant epigram of Antipater; cf. note on 662. 18–20. The two fragments cannot well be placed higher up, since the column on the verso appears to be complete. We are therefore reduced to the alternatives either of supposing that the papyrus had new readings in the last three lines of the epigram or that the fragments come from a previous column; they do not belong to a later column because the colour of the papyrus and the size of the letters on the verso is inconsistent with Col. ii, and the verso of the rest is blank at the top. Neither of these alternatives is satisfactory, but the latter is the safer. The question, however, is not of great importance, for the first few lines of the column would in any case hardly be capable of restoration without the assistance of the metre.

Il. 5–20. '... I will fulfil like a prophet-priest. The honours of mortals are diverse, but every man has to bear envy of excellence, while the head of him who has nought is hidden in black silence. And in friendly mood would I pray to the children of Cronus that prosperity of unbroken duration be decreed for Aeoladas and his race; the days of mortals are deathless, but the body dies. But he whose house is not reft of offspring and utterly overthrown, stricken by a violent fate, lives escaping sad distress; for before...'

7. κεκρημέναι: cf. Νεμ. vi. 3 διιργεί δὲ πάσα κεκρημένα δύναμις.

12. At the end of this line is a Π with a dot or small o between the two upright strokes, like the abbreviation of πολῶν or πόλεων. The surface of the papyrus is damaged immediately after the Π and one or two more letters may have followed. It is difficult
to see what can have been meant, for neither sense nor metre requires any word between ἀολίδα and καὶ; cf. l. 61, note.

13. The diple-shaped marginal sign which appears in the facsimile opposite this line really belongs to l. 17; the small fragment containing it was wrongly placed when the photograph was taken. For another case of the use of an Aristarchean symbol in a non-Homeric papyrus cf. 442. 52.

14-5. The meaning is that, though the individual dies, the race is perpetuated.

17. There are spots of superfluous ink about the letters ΟΙΚΟ, creating rather the appearance of an interlinear insertion in a smaller hand; K was perhaps corrected. Another blot occurs above ΚΑΛΑΤΩΝ in l. 19.

21-4. A fresh ode begins at l. 21, the change being marked in the margin by a symbol of which vestiges appear opposite this line and the next. The name of the person to whom the poem was dedicated and its occasion may have been added, as in the Bacchylides papyrus. The small fragment placed at the top of this column and containing parts of ll. 22-4 is suitable both with regard to the recto and the verso (cf. 662. 39-40, note), but its position can hardly be accepted as certain. None of the remaining fragments can be inserted here, their verso being blank. For [πο]ς[οβρο[ν]], a favourite word of Pindar, cf. e. g. Pyth. v. 117 θεὸς δὲ οἶ γέ τε πρόφρων τελεῖ δύνασιν.

ll. 23-40. 'For Loxias ... of his favour pouring upon Thebes everlasting glory. But quickly girding up my robe and bearing in my soft hands a splendid laurel-branch I will celebrate the all-glorious dwelling of Aeoladas and his son Pagondas, my maidenly head bright with garlands, and to the tune of lotus pipe will imitate in song a siren sound of praise, such as hushes the sudden blasts of Zephyrus and, when chilling Boreas speeds on in stormy might, calms the ocean's swift rush ...'

30. After ΠΑΓΩΝΔΑ an I seems to have been smeared out, but the appearance of I may be merely due to a blot; cf. note on l. 17.

33. σειμήρα δὲ κύματον ... δε Ζεφύρου, κ.τ.λ.: cf. Schol. on Homer, Od. μ. 168-9 (γαλήνη ἔπλετο ημερή κοίμησε δε κύματα δαίμων) ἐπεέθεν 'Ησίόδος καὶ τοὺς ἄνεμους δέλγειν αὐτὰ (σκ. τῶν ζειμηρίαν) ἐφι.

34. ΛΙΧΚΩΝ is apparently a mistake for αἰλόσκων; cf. Ol. iv. 2 ἐδρα ὑπὸ ποικίλοφόρμηγος άιδιάς πλωσμένα. The initial Λ could equally well be Δ but hardly N, nor does νάισκων give so good a sense.

37. M of ΧΕΙΜΩΝΟΣ has been altered from N.

38-9. φρίστων ὑποστότα: cf. Pyth. iv. 81 φρίσσωντας δρμερον which a scholar explains φρίσσων ποικίλης. ΕΠΙΠΙΓΕΡΧΗΣ is a mistake for ΕΠΙΠΙΓΈΡΧΗ; cf. for the word Od. ε. 304 ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον, ἐπιστάρχους δ' ἄλλα. We transpose ὠκύλων and πόντον on account of the metre though this change does not affect an absolute correspondence, ——οοο— taking the place of ——οοοοοο — ὠκύλων μὴ occurs in Opp. Hal. 2. 535.

40. The sense seems to require the substitution of ἐμάλαξεν for the ΕΤΑΡΑΞΕ of the papyrus; cf. Fr. 133 (probably Pindar) of the Adestpota in Bergk, Poet. Lyr. ἐπηρχόμενων τε μαλάξωτας βλαιον πόντων ὠκεας τ' ἄνεμων ρύπας. The displacement of ἐμάλαξεν by ἐτάραξε was easy in such a context; cf. the passage from Od. ε quoted in the note on ll. 38-9. ΚΑΙ belongs to the next line.

42. The reading of this line is difficult. There is a stroke passing through the middle of K to l and another above the Κ, and perhaps this letter or both I and K were to be cancelled. The facsimile rather suggests that Θ was first written in place of Κ, but that is deceptive. The doubtful Ζ may be Ξ. The dot which appears above the first N is very likely the tip of a letter like P or Φ from the line above.
43–61. 'Many are the deeds of old that might be adorned with verse, but the knowledge of them is with Zeus; and for me maidenly thoughts and choice of speech are meet. Yet for no man nor woman to whose offspring I am devoted must I forget a fitting song, and as a faithful witness have I come to the dance in honour of Agasicles and his noble parents, who for their public friendships were held in honour in time past, as now, by their neighbours, and for the renowned victories of swift-footed steeds, victories which decked their locks with crowns at the banks of famed Onchestus or by Ionia's glorious shrine and at Pisa . . .'

44. Cf. Pindar, _Nem._ xi. 18 μελεσουσι τιμαθειτα μελεσον θευμισι. The A of TA was altered apparently from O.

46–7. μεν . . . τε: cf. e.g. _Ol._ vi. 88–9 πρωτον μεν . . . γανωι τ' ἐπειτ'.

49. δοιδαν πρόσφοροι: the phrase recurs in _Nem._ ix. 7.

50. The alteration of ἀγασίκαι to 'ἀγασικλείε is necessary for the metre. Who this Agasicles was is obscure; perhaps he was the παις ἀμφιωγής who ἄρχει τῆς δαφνοφροιας according to the account of Proclus ap. Photius _Bibl._ 239, or he may merely have been some member of the family of Aeoladas. The rather abrupt way in which his name is introduced and the context in which it occurs might suggest that a third poem commenced in Col. iii, a supposition which would be strengthened if the loss at the tops of the columns were extended by another fifteen lines (cf. introd.). But the hypothesis of two consecutive odes in the same metre would require to be justified by stronger evidence than that supplied by the passage before us. For πιστα μάρτυς cf. _Pyth._ i. 88, and xii. 27 πιστοί χρευναν μάρτυρες.

53. τιμαθείουν: ΤΙΜΑΘΕΝΤΑΚ the papyrus, and the accusative may possibly have been justified by the sequel; but as the passage stands τιμαθείουν τὰ πάλαι or τιμαθείνεσσα πάλαι seems an improvement, though the accumulation of datives is not elegant. In any case the division of the lines is wrong, as in ll. 40–1 and 66–7. For the language cf. _Isth._ iii. 25–6 τιμίνες ἀρχαίν ἐγενον πρόξενοι τ' ἀμφικτιών. It is noticeable that the papyrus has the spelling ἀμφικτίωνς which was restored to the text of Pindar by Boeckh in place of the MSS. reading ἀμφικτιῶν.

58. αὐτής is by no means certain. The letter before AC is possibly Τ, but more of the crossbar should be visible.

59. νῦν is a necessary correction of the papyrus reading ΝΑΟΤ.

61. The metre is complete at περι-, and probably the lines were wrongly divided again — unless indeed the same addition was made as at the end of l. 12.

64–76. ‘. . . to [Thebes] of the seven gates. Then jealous wrath at so just an ambition of these men provoked a bitter unrelenting strife, but making full amends was changed to friendship. Son of Damaena, come, lead on now with [propitious?] foot; gladly upon thy way she first shall follow thee stepping with her sandals nigh upon the thick-leaved laurel, the daughter whom Daesistota and . . . perfected with counsel . . .’

64. Another disturbance in the metre has occurred in this line, which will not scan with ἐπιταπηθῶς as the first word. The vestiges before the lacuna suggest a round letter like ς or θ, and ΕΠΙΤΑΠΗΛΟΙΩΗΒΑΙΣ, e.g. may have been written for Θόμπασ ἐπιταπηθῶσιν. But it is just possible to read ΕΠΙΤΑΠΗΛΟΙΩΙΝ, and to suppose that the missing syllable at the beginning of the line was transposed to l. 63.

65. The first Ν of ΕΝΗΚΕΝ is rather cramped; but the writing becomes smaller and more compressed in this column.

66. The transference of σέφρωνος to this line is necessary metri gratia. For μέριμνα in
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the sense of ambition for distinction in the games cf. e.g. Ol. i. 109–11 θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ἔδω τεῖς μίδεται... Ἴρων μερίμνασιν.

67. Π opposite this line marks the 300th verse; cf. 448. 302 and other Homeric papyri. With an average column of 28–9 lines (cf. introd.) this would be the eleventh column of the roll.

The reading άχθραν ἵρων is fairly satisfactory, though NE hardly fills the space between the A and P.

69. With π[ιεστάς the letters ICT must be supposed to have been very close together; cf. note on l. 65.

70. Here again is a difficulty. There is no sign of the second leg of Π in Π1A[,] and a T would in some respects be more satisfactory, but on the other hand the space between this letter and Λ is more consistent with a Π. The name Δάμανα has no authority, but is in itself unobjectionable, standing in the same relation to Δάμων as Δέμαν to Δέων or Τρόφανος to Τρόφαν. The person addressed may be Αεολάδας or Παγονάς, but his identity is of course quite obscure. With regard to the mutilated adjective agreeing with ποδι, immediately following the first lacuna is a vertical stroke (not very clear in the facsimile) with an angular base, which might be the second half of a Ν or the lower half of a letter like ι or ο; in the latter case two letters might be lost in the lacuna. The vertical stroke is not long enough for ρ, so πα[τερ] is excluded. The next letter could be an Α or Λ, but the traces on the papyrus are very indistinct, and there may have been a correction. If πα[τερ] is right the succeeding word must begin with a short vowel, unless indeed πα[τερ] is read as a disyllable; πάτερ has been conjectured in Ol. ii. 84. θεοβαρος is unsuitable; ἐντυπόμομορ might do.

73. ΣΧΕΔΙ[.]Ν: the facsimile is again deceptive, transforming the Χ into Ε and E into Κ. There might be room for two narrow letters between Δ and Ν, but σχέδιον is hardly to be avoided, though δάφνας εὐστήλων σχέδιον βαϊνωσία is not very satisfactory.

75. Δαυιστρότα is another name for which no authority can be cited, but it is quite a possible form, στρατός being the Boeotian for στρατό. Whether the reference is to a goddess or a woman is doubtful. A second name must have followed in l. 76; cf. ll. 80–2, note. For the anaphora of the relative cf. the reading of some MSS. in Pindar, Fr. 75. 10 δν (v. i. τὸν) Ερμομον δν (v. i. τὸν) Ἐρμίδοι τε βροτοὶ καλιμον. The Α of the second ΑΝ is more like Λ. ἐπασκέων is a Pindaric word; cf. Ὀμ. ix. 10 ἐπασκέῳ κλυναῖτι κάρα λιπαί, and Fr. 194. 4.

80–2. 'Do not when in sight of the nectar from my spring go thirsty away to a salt stream.' νέκταρ seems right, though the Τ is not very satisfactory, the length of the vertical stroke rather suggesting Ρ; Τ, however, is an irregular letter. Cf. for the metaphor Ol. vii. 7–9 και ἕω νέκταρ χυτῶν, Μουσάω δόσιν, ᾠδοφόρωσι ἀνδρᾶσιν πέμπων, γλυκὼν καρπῶν φρειάς, διάκομαι. The persons addressed are presumably the two named in ll. 75–6, the masculine form of the dual being used of a feminine subject as e.g. in Soph. Ο. C. 1113, 1676. In l. 81 the original reading δεψαῦντες seems preferable to the correction or variant δεψαόντες since there is no certain instance in Pindar of the latter elision; but of course the question cannot be decided without the following words: δεψαῦντες δῶς, e.g., would give a good sense. It is noticeable that in the next line, though the substitution of Θ for the second Υ is necessary, the Χ has not been crossed out.

Fr. (a) and (b). On the position of these two fragments see note on ll. 1–4.

Fr. (n) 128. ΧΠΑ[,] is very intractable, leading only to ΣΗΡ or ΣΗΡΑΓΕ in some form; but the first letter is plainly Κ and not Θ.

Fr. (r) 140. Above Ν to the right is a mark like a grave accent.
Two fragments, each from the top of a column, which is probably though not certainly one and the same, containing part of what is evidently a Paean. The lines seem to be rather long, and it is hardly possible to make out the sense or to discern in whose honour the paean was composed. Neither is there much clue to the identity of the author; but Blass points out that, while διοισα (l. 8) indicates a lyric poet, the form νέας for νας is decisive against Pindar or Bacchylides. Perhaps the piece may be attributed to Simonides, but a later date is not impossible.

The text is written in a good-sized, but not very regular, round uncial hand, which we should place near the end of the first or early in the second century. A high stop is used, and breathings, accents, and marks of quantity are added not infrequently, all being due to the original scribe.
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20 [. ] ονα[
25 [. ] ους εφιπατην

1-6. The small fragment does not seem to join on directly to the larger, for though that position works well in the first three lines—ἀνευριτοι τε ἀμοροι, στίματοι—difficulties arise in the remainder. In l. 4 χενοι is possible, but not, we think, χορον; the letter before χ is probably η, ι, or ν, but not α. In l. 5 the doubtful с might possibly be ν, but κορυσομελεὶν could not be got into the space if there was no gap in ll. 1-2, nor could μελομενοι (cf. Homer, Η. xxii. 363) be read in l. 6. On the other hand it is not easy to reconstruct ll. 1-2 on the hypothesis of a loss between the two fragments of only one or two letters. In l. 2 there appears to be something above the α of ἀμοροι besides the accent and it is perhaps intended for a smooth breathing, but the effect is rather that of a sign of short quantity. ι in l. 6 may be οι or Ιι.

7. Πνευματικαί ἀνευριτοι. [?]

11 sqq. There is some uncertainty with regard to the number of letters lost at the beginnings of the lines. In l. 10 two letters are required before παιαστήρι, and since there are three other instances of οπαιστήρι or οπαιαστήρι in the fragment [εφ]παστήρι can hardly be avoided. In l. 11 there is rather less room, but something must have stood before παιαστήρι, and if the column leaned slightly to the right there would not be much difficulty in getting μελομενοι into the space. [με]παιαστήρι in l. 16 also looks very probable; and if that be right, there must be two letters missing at the commencement of the preceding and following lines.

11. Possibly ανευριτοι, ουι or ανευριτοι, ου.

13. μεταχρόναι: cf. Hesiod, Θ. 269 μεταχρόναι γὰρ ἐλλον (of the Harpies), where μεταχρόναι is explained as equivalent to μετέωροι.

661. Epodes.

14.1 x 16.4 cm. Plate V.

This fragment contains the beginnings and ends of lines from two columns of Epodes in the Doric dialect. Iambic trimeters alternate with trochaic verses of half their own length. Archilochus, the father of this style of poetry, cannot of course be the author on account of the dialect; and Blass considers that the piece may be attributed to Callimachus, who appears to have
tried almost every variety of poetic composition and employed different dialects. Unfortunately the longer lines are so incomplete that to make out the general drift is impossible.

Palaeographically this fragment is of considerable interest. It is written in handsome round uncialis, of a type not infrequent in papyri (cf. 25, 224, 678, 686, 701), and also exemplified in the great Biblical codices. On the verso of the papyrus are parts of two columns in a cursive hand which is not later than the beginning of the third century, and is quite as likely to fall within the second. The text on the recto then can be assigned with little chance of error to the latter half of the second century. Accents, &c., have been added by two different hands, some being very small and neat, others larger and in lighter ink. To the smaller hand may be attributed also the occasional corrections and the punctuation, but whether this hand can be identified with that of the body of the text is doubtful. The document in cursive seems to be a series of medical prescriptions or directions; it is too fragmentary to give any connected sense, but the occurrence of the words τρελβανος, συνάμεινος and apparently χίραλέος may be noted.

Col. i.

[...]

γος ἄριω μένος.

κάρι με δικτοῖς

ον ώ Παλαίμονες

το θηριον'

ον ώ Παλάμονες

απωθε τον φθόρον

Col. ii.

ποτας μερας βλά[...

καὶ τὸ χ ἀμπυρίζ[...]

ἐληγ' ὁ μυθός· καὶ[...]

πυρδάνωι πυλε[...]

κῆ'γω π εκέ[...]

ταῖς εμαῖς επωδ[...]

οἰ δ εἰπαν [. .]ε[...]

μη τῷ γ' αὕτις ε[...]

η' καὶ με π[...]

ἡ[...]ες σαυνιαστ[...]

ἐν[...]αῦθι δ ἐξ αλο[...]

π[...][...]αλον κατάγφ[...]

ε[...] τας θαλάσσας τ[...]

661. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS 63
3. The corrector apparently wished to alter ἀριω μενος to αγραμ μενος, but the σ is not crossed through. Blass suggests τηρος αγραμ μενος, and notes that in Anth. Pal. xii. 162. 1 ὀμπο τοξοφορᾶν οὐδ' ἀρος the same corruption or the same word occurs.


16. ποτάς is for ποτάς, i.e. ποτι τάς.

17. ἀμπυρίζω, but the vestiges of the letter following η do not suggest α, though that letter cannot be said to be impossible. τυχαμ πυρίζ . . gives no sense.

19. πυλεφί is a vox nihilis: the letters are all quite clear.

24. η = η̂, as the punctuation shows; but the apparent use of the singular form with a plural subject is peculiar. The deleted letters are crossed through and besides have dots over them. ν above υ might be read as λυ, but that is less likely.

26. Above the ι of αἰθ is a small circular mark which seems to be accidental. A high point might be recognized after ἐρρεφαν.

27. κατάγρι may be κατάγρι = καθήμενοι, but then the preceding word should be a noun, and it is difficult to find anything suitable. The β above the deleted η is almost certain, and the vestiges of the first letter of the line strongly suggest π, which leaves us with π[α]βαλον or π[υ]βαλον.

662. Epigrams.

12.8 × 49 cm.

These epigrams, some of which are extant, others new, are written in three columns on the verso of the papyrus containing the new Pindar fragments, 659. The first column, of which only the ends of lines are preserved, comprises two epitaphs of Leonidas (of Tarentum) and Antipater of Sidon, which already exist in the Anthology (= Anth. Pal. vii. 163, 164). These are succeeded in Col. ii by two poems ascribed to Amyntas, one upon the same Samian woman Prexo who is the subject of the first two epigrams and of another in the same style by Antipater or Archias (Anth. Pal. vii. 165), the second upon the capture of Sparta by Philopoemen in B.C. 188. Of Amyntas nothing whatever is known apart from this papyrus; the historical allusions of the second poem and the identity in subject of the first with the similar epitaphs of Leonidas and Antipater warrant the conclusion that he also flourished in the second century B.C. The third column contains two new dedicatory epigrams composed for a certain Glenis by Leonidas and Antipater respectively, with the first two words of another which was left unfinished, apparently again by Leonidas.

The copyist, who wrote an irregular uncial hand, was a careless and unintelligent person, and there are frequent mistakes and corruptions, while a dislocation of the lines has apparently occurred at the top of Col. ii. The date of this text seems to be not much later than that on the recto, and probably it falls within the reign of Augustus like the majority of the papyri with which
it was found. Accents and stops are of rare occurrence; a double point is once used in a dialogue (l. 11). The negligence of the writer and the discolouration of the papyrus render decipherment a matter of some difficulty.

Col. i.

Δεωνιδον

[tis tinos eusa γυναι Παρινυ υπο κηριναι κi]σαι
[Πρηξω Καλλιτελευς και ποδ]απη Σαμην
[tis δε σε και κτερειζε Θεοκρίτος ω με γεγυνες

5 [εφεδουσαν θησκεις δ εκ τινων] εκ τ[ο]κετου
[ευα ποσων ετουν δυο κεικοςιν η ρα γ ατεκνομ]
[ουκ αλλα τριετη Καλλιτελην ελι]πον
[κωι σοι κεινος γε και εσ βαθυ] γηρας ικιτο
[kαι σοι ξεινε ποροι παντα Τυχη]η τα καλα

10 [ Αντιπατρου]

[φραξε γυναι γενεν ονομα χονα : Καλλιτελης μεν]
[o σπειρας Πραξω δ ουνομα γη δε Σαμος]
[σαμα δε τις τοδ εχωςε Θεοχριτος ο πρων αθικτα]
[αμετερας λυσας αμματα παρδειαν]

15 [πως δε θανες λοχιοισιν αν] αλγεσιν ειπε δε πωιαν
[ηλθες εσ ηλικιην δισακις ενδεκετις]

[η και απας ου ξεινε λεξιοπτα γα εν νεοτα]
[Kαλλιτελη . . . . . . . . . . . .] . τις η[πιαχον]
[αλθοι εσ ολβιστην πολιμη] τριχ[α και ουν οδιτα]

20 [ουριοι ιδινοι παντα Τυχη Βιοτων]

Col. ii.

Αμιντου

αυξαλεας νοη[.] . ον υπ οφρυνος ανθεσι δακρυ
νι[.]λων ενβη[.]σεις ψ[.] . ρι[.]απης σπιλαδι
φραξε γναι τις ευα πανι κα] εκ τινως ειπε τε πατρην

25 η[.]μιας εθανες νουσου υπ αργαλης
ονομα κεν Πραξω Σαμη] ξενε εκ δε γονης

F
Καλλιτέλευς γενομαν αλλ εθανον τοκετω.

τίς δὲ ταφόν σταλώσω Θεοκρίτος η με συνευνον
άνδρι δοσαν ποιην δ ἡλθες ες ἡλίκην

30 επταετος τρις ενος γενομαν ετι η ρα γ ατεκνος
ου Καλλιτέλης τριετη παιδα δομω λιπομαν

Αμυντου

tas πέσαρον ἀτρεστον Λακεδαιμονα τας κερα μουνας
πολλακις αυ τολεσι δη]ρων εφριζεν Αρης

35 νυν υπ ανικατωι Φιλοποιμενι δουρι τ Αλχα]ων
πρηνης εκ τρισαν ηρπε μυριαδαν

[κατον δ εκθροφ[κουν]α[γ]εβη[...].] νοετροις

40 [. . .]δρας δερκομεναι [. . . . . . ο]κροπος[λ . . .]

Col. iii.

Αιωνιδου

Ακρωριται Παιν και εντα[. . . .] γυμφαις

[Γ]λημις ο συνγειτων δωρα κυνγεισις

tαυταν τε προτομαν και δ[. . . . . . .]ης . [. .

45 βυραν και ροθιους τους δ ανεθηκε] προδας

Παιν ω και νυμοι τοκ[. . . . . . . αγ]εματηρα

Γληνιν αεξησαθ αιεθ[. . . . . . . .]

Αντιπατρουν

σιλαιων αλοχως αντρημιν ηδε κερασται

50 τασδ Ακρωριται Παιν και ηγεμονι
και προτομαν ακμητα και αυτο νεον τοδε καπρον

δερμα το μηδ αυτω ρηγυμενον χαλυων

Γληνις ανηρτησε καλας χαριτησιον αγγας

δεικνυς ιφθιμου κουρος οραφαις [. .]

Σ[εως][δ]ρου

δρυμνονομου
Fragments.
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daughter of Calliteles, but I died in childbirth." "Who set up the tomb?" "My husband, Theocritus, to whom they gave me to wife." "And what age did you reach?" "Thrice seven and one year old was I." "And were you childless?" "I left in my home a boy of three years, Calliteles."

24. $e$ of $e{x}$ was converted from $e$ and the letters $wv$ have also been corrected.

25. 1. κατ πολίες ἔθανεν. νῆπιος seems to have been originally written, the π being subsequently converted into ρ and another π added above the line. Whether the initial ν, of which only a slight vestige remains, was at the same time altered is doubtful owing to a hole in the papyrus.

26. κεν is a mistake for μεν.


31. The superfluous $ov$ at the beginning of the line is due to the analogy of the two previous epigrams: cf. ll. 7 and 17. 1. Καλλίτελη.

33-8 '... Sparta, of old the dauntless, at whose single-handed might Ares in war was many a time and oft terror-struck, is now cast headlong and defenceless by thrice ten thousand foes, beneath unconquered Philopoemen and the spears of the Achaeans; and the birds looking upon the smoking plain mourn...'

33-4. 1. τῶν πάροσ... τῶν χερα... πολάκις ἐν πολίαν. The last word is however very doubtful; $πο$ may be $τω$ and $σ$ may be $ε$, while of the supposed $ε$ only a slight vestige of the base is left. Blass would retain $δε$ and read $πόλεων οί $πολίεων. A couplet has fallen out either before or after ll. 33-4, since there is nothing to govern $λακεδαίμων$. Perhaps, as suggested above, ll. 22-3 should come in here, though they do not seem particularly appropriate.

35. δ' should perhaps be inserted after νυ.

36. 1. μυριάδων.

37. ξ of $περιζωπχηρον (≈ περισμαχηρόν)$ has been corrected.

38. The letters in the latter part of the line are much damaged; the $φ$ could equally well be $ψ$, $ε$ may be $στ$ or $ε$, and for the supposed $π$, which is not satisfactory, $ε$ should perhaps be substituted.

39-40. The letters $κροφι$ and $κροσοφι$ are on a detached fragment, the appearance of which decidedly points to the position here assigned to it. The contents of the recto create no difficulty (cf. 659. 21-4 note) and $ακρώπολες$ in some form fits the context in l. 40 very well; moreover above $ρ$ of $κροφι$ is the end of a long stroke descending from the line above, which just suits the $φ$ or $ψ$ after the lacuna in l. 38. The cumulative effect of these considerations is undeniably strong.

42-7. 'To Pan of Acoria and the... nymphs were dedicated as hunting-spoils by neighbour Glenis this head and... hide and these swift feet. O Pan and ye Nymphs, prosper the doughty hunter Glenis...'

42. Ακρώπολες was the name of a mountain peak in Sicyon, and 'Ακρωπείτης is given by Steph. Byz. as a local epithet of Dionysus. The mutilated word before $νυμφαίς$ was probably some adjective ending in -ων (cf. l. 49), but the space is very short for $σφωνον$ as required by the metre, and a corruption may be suspected.

43. 1. Μλενω as in ll. 47 and 53. For $καινωνείς$ cf. Anth. Pal. vi. 183. 2; $σινωγρείς$ (vi. 34. 4) could also be read.

44. The first $a$ of $ταυραί$ has been corrected, and to make the result clearer another $τ$ was added above the line.
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45. Cf. Anth. Pal. vi. 34. 2 καὶ κάπρον τούοδε καθάψε πόδας. καθάψε might of course be read for anavηθε here, but the meaning would not be affected.

46. 1. νύμφαι. ἱπποπότηρα must be ἱπποπότηρα or ἱπποπότηρα; perhaps τόῳ [άλκιμον ἄγρεντῆρα.

47. 1. ἀδέξαντων' followed by something like αἰεὶ ἄγασιν καλαί; but the remains of the letter after aie suggest δ, ζ, or ζ. Cf. Anth. Pal. vi. 158. 3-4 αὔτεν δ’ αἰεὶ Πάν ἄγλαν Νύμφαι πίθακα, and vi. 34. 5-6 ἄλλ’ ο’ Παν σκοπητὰ καὶ εἰς ὅπερω Πολύαιων εὔγραφον πέμπειν νεὶα Σμύλεω.

49-54. 'To the cave-dwelling mates of the Sileni and to horned Pan of Acrois their chief these trophies, a scathless head and new boar's hide, that not even steel may rend, were hung up to view as a thank offering for a goodly quarry by Glenis the son of noble Onasiphanes.'

49. 1. Σχινών.

50. 1. ταίν’ for ταύδ.

51. ακομητα may be interpreted in the sense of 'uninjured' or 'permanent' on the analogy of πολαι ἀκμῆται in Anth. Pal. ix. 526 or may be regarded as an epithet which strictly applies only to the living animal (cf. Soph. Antig. 353 οὐραίων τ’ ἀκμῆτα ταύρων).

52. χαλινοι is for χαλβθι; cf. νυμωι for νυμφαι in l. 46. The top of the ο is missing, but β seems excluded.

54. 1. ὅσε(σ)γάλαι[ν]'ι;

56. 1. δρομονθρον ό γρημον ομοιο. The rest of the epigram was never added.

663. **Argument of Cratinus’ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ.**

19.8 x 12.3 cm.

Of all the lost Greek classics there are few of which the recovery would be of greater importance than the plays of Cratinus or Eupolis, and though the present fragment does not give any actual portion of Cratinus' works it nevertheless throws some interesting and much wished for light upon the plots of his comedies, about which almost nothing was known previously. It consists of the argument of the Διονυσαλέξανδρος, one of Cratinus' most famous plays, written in a small uncial hand in the late second century or the first half of the third. The title Διονυσαλέξανδρος ἦ (i.e. the 8th drama) Κρατέινου occurs, not where it would be expected at the end, but at the top of the last column, and is written in much larger uncials. What is meant by this comedy being called the '8th' is uncertain. Similar numbers are assigned to extant Greek plays in their arguments, e.g. the Antigone of Sophocles is the '32nd,' the Alcestis of Euripides the '17th,' the Birds of Aristophanes the '35th.' That the numbers refer to the chronological order is barely possible in the first two of these instances and impossible in the third; and in the case of the Dionysalexandrus also it is very improbable that the arrangement according to which that play was
the 8th was chronological. Körte would make it an alphabetical arrangement. As frequently happens in scholia, there are numerous abbreviations in the text of the argument. In most cases the last letter written of an abbreviated word is above the line; ’Ερμ(η)ς in l. 5 and παραδόθησάμενο(ν) in l. 40 are written ερμ’ and παραδόθησαμεν’. καί takes various forms, κ’ in l. 6, κς in ll. 9, 17, 33, and 43, κ in ll. 11 and 21. μ’ for μεν occurs in ll. 7 and 38, and ο’ for οε in ll. 23 and 40. The high stop is occasionally employed. The MS. is not very accurate, corruptions occurring in two lines; cf. notes on ll. 8 and 12. The extant fragments of the Διονυσαλέξανδρος, apart from single words, number nine, and how little these and the title of the play served to indicate its contents may be judged from the fact that Meineke considered ’Αλέξανδρος to be Alexander the Great, and therefore wished to assign the play to the younger Cratinus. Kock on the other hand inferred from the common occurrence of well-known mythical personages in the titles of comedies that Alexander was the Trojan Paris, and favoured the authorship of Cratinus the elder. The acute hypothesis of Kock is now verified by the papyrus, which shows that ’Αλέξανδρος in the title is indeed the Trojan, and that the plot turned upon an amusing perversion of the story of the Trojan war, in which Dionysus played the part assigned in the legend to Paris. That the play was the work of the elder Cratinus is moreover proved by the note appended at the end, stating that Pericles was attacked for having been the cause of the war. The date of its performance is thus fixed to the year B.C. 430 or 429.

The earlier part of the argument, contained in the upper portion of Col. i and probably in a preceding column, is lost, and where the papyrus becomes intelligible it is describing the παράβασις (ll. 6–9). The chorus apparently consisted of satyrs in attendance upon Dionysus (cf. l. 42 and l. 6, note), and the action took place for the most part on Mount Ida. The παράβασις is followed (ll. 9–12) by a scene between the chorus and Dionysus, in which they mock at him, very likely on account of the guise in which he presents himself. Possibly Cratin. Fr., inc. 281 ποιμὴν καθλότηκ’ απόλος καὶ βουκόλος refers to this incident. Then comes (ll. 12–9) a parody of the judgement of Paris. Aphrodite, who promises to Dionysus that he shall be the most beautiful and most beloved person in the world, naturally is victorious. Dionysus next goes to Sparta and brings back Helen to Mount Ida (ll. 20–3). Upon the approach of the Achaeans they both take refuge in the house of the real Alexander, Dionysus turning himself into a ram and hiding Helen in a basket (ll. 23–33). It is easy to understand the boisterous fun to which this scene must have given rise. A glimpse of it is afforded by the familiar quotation from the Dionysalexandrinus δ’ ἡλιθίος ὀπερ πρόβατον βη βῆ λέγων βαδίζει, which no doubt refers to Dionysus'
appearance in the character of a sheep. Alexander himself now comes on the stage, and detects the lovers; the denouement is that Helen remains with him as his wife, while Dionysus is sent off in disgrace to be delivered to the Achaeans, but accompanied by the faithful satyrs (ll. 33–44).

The papyrus concludes with the scholiast’s remark already mentioned, showing that the play was directed against Pericles, who may well have been satirized in the principal character as Dionysus. Imperfect as it is, the argument well illustrates the perversion of familiar legends which seems to have been a favourite resource of the older comic poets, and of Cratinus in particular.

We are indebted to Prof. A. Körte for several suggestions on this papyrus.
6 sqq. 'These (the satyrs) address the spectators on behalf of (?) the poet, and when Dionysus appears mock and jeer at him. Dionysus, being offered by Hera indestructible power, by Athena success in war, and by Aphrodite the prospect of becoming the most beautiful and most beloved of all, adjudges the victory to Aphrodite. Afterwards he sails to Lacedaemon, carries away Helen, and returns to Ida. Hearing soon after that the Achaeans are ravaging the country, he takes refuge with Alexander, and hiding Helen in a basket like a (cheese?) and turning himself into a ram awaits the event. Alexander appears and detects them both, and orders them to be led away to the ships intending to hand them over to the Achaeans; but when Helen objects he takes pity on her and keeps her to be his wife, but sends off Dionysus to be handed over. Dionysus is accompanied by the satyrs who encourage him and declare that they will not desert him. In the play Pericles is satirized with great plausibility by innuendo for having brought the war upon the Athenians.'

6. Perhaps απερχ’ται, as Körte suggests. ουτοί: sc. the satyrs (cf. l. 42), as Blass thinks. Though of course this is not a satyr play, there seems no reason why a chorus should not be composed of satyrs, especially in a comedy in which Dionysus is the chief character. The verbs in ll. 11–2 are very appropriate too to the satyrs, who occur in l. 42 as if they had been mentioned before.

8. πων παίη( ) is corrupt. Blass suggests υπερ τον ποιη(του), which makes good sense but is a rather drastic change; cf. however the next note. Körte prefers π(ε)τι τον ποιη(τον), which is nearer to the text of the papyrus.

12. παραγειαμενων seems to be a mistake for some word like προτεινομένων. Körte suggests παραγειαμενων.

30. Perhaps ωσπιτέρ τυρών οτε ταριχ(ον); cf. Ar. Ran. 558–60 το πολυ τάρμος ούκ εκρηκα πω. με Δε, ουδέ των τυρών γε τον χαλαρον, τάλαρ, δε οθος αυτοι τοις τυλάροις κατηθεν. γαρον is also possible; cf. Crat. Fr. inc. 280 ο τύλαρος υμι διάπλεως έσται γάρον. Körte prefers ορον(ν) οτε χρη, τάλαρον being the technical word in Athenaeus p. 122 for a bird-basket.

664. PHILOSOPHICAL DIALOGUE.

Height 29 cm.

Part of a philosophical dialogue on the subject, apparently, of government, one of the characters in which is no less a person than Pisistratus the tyrant of Athens. There remain in all portions of four columns, contained in two main fragments which do not join and of which the relative position has to be determined by internal evidence. In Fr. (a), the first column of which is complete, some one who speaks in the first person gives an account of his
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movements at the time of the usurpation of Pisistratus. He had left Athens after that event took place and joined Solon in Ionia; subsequently at the instance of his friends, including Pisistratus himself, and on the advice of Solon, he returned to Athens and was there invited to the house of Hagnothus, a relative of his own and grandfather of Thrasybulus son of Philomelus, a young man whose guardian he himself was. Of the second column we have no more than the first few letters of the lines; but in the lower part of it other speakers evidently intervened (l. 68 ἐ π η ὁ [, l. 81 ὑ π ο λ ά β δ ω ν]. Fr. (b), containing another nearly complete column, is also in dialogue form. Here the persons are, besides the narrator (ἐ π η ν, ll. 7, 12), Pisistratus, Ariphron, and Adimantus, and the principal subject of conversation is the career of the tyrant Periander of Corinth, in whose company Ariphron professes that he and Adimantus had recently been, and whose misfortunes he proceeds to describe. Most probably Fr. (a) comes from near the beginning of the work, and the narrative portion of Col. i is introductory to the whole dialogue. How much, if anything, is lost between Col. ii and Col. iii (Fr. (b)) is of course quite uncertain, but it is improbable that there is any considerable gap. The anonymous narrator in Col. i will accordingly be the same person as the speaker in Col. iii ll. 92-102; but the identity of this intimate friend (l. 13) of Pisistratus and sharer in the exile of Solon remains a puzzle. Ariphron is perhaps to be recognized as the grandfather of Pericles; and Thrasybulus, son of Philomelus, of whom it is here remarked (l. 29) that he was popularly supposed to be in love with the tyrant's younger daughter, is evidently the Thrasybulus of whom Plutarch tells the story (Apophth. Reg. et Imp., p. 189 c, de Ira Cohib., p. 457 f, cf. Val. Max. v. 1. 2) that he kissed the daughter of Pisistratus at a chance meeting, and that the latter instead of being angry gave him her hand in marriage. Polyaenus, who adds an episode of the abduction of the girl by her lover (Strategem. 5. 14), substitutes Thrasymedes for Thrasybulus, but agrees with our author as to the name of his father, Philomelus.

But who was the author of this dialogue? It is written in remarkably good Attic (except εἰς δίκενων for εἰς τῆν δίκενην in l. 40), and so far as the style is concerned it may be a product of the Aristotelian age. Blass, indeed, suggests that it might actually be attributed to Aristotle, with whom Pisistratus was a favourite figure. In support of such a view appeal could be made to certain resemblances in language between this fragment and the Αθηναίων Ρολετά—assuming the authenticity of that work:—compare e.g. ll. 3-6 (Σόλων) προλέγων 'Αθηναίων ὅτι Πεισίστρατος ἐ πιβουλεῖ τιμαρίδι πείθειν αὐτοῦς οὐκ ἦν δυνατός with Ath. Pol. 14. 2 ὅσοι μὲν γὰρ ἀνυψόσι Πεισίστρατον ἐπιθέθηκε Τυραννίδι] ... ἑπεὶ δὲ λέγων [οὐκ ἐπείθην, ll. 8-9 ἀποδήμων ἐντεύθεν ποιησάμενος with Ath. Pol. 11. 1, 13. 1 ἀποδήμων
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\[\text{επονήσατο, ll. 23–4 διὰ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων κατάστασιν with Ath. Pol. 42. 1 ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας, ll. 25–6 οὐδεὶς ἐπεδείκτηκε πρὸς μεγαλοφύειν with Ath. Pol. 37. 2 πολύ πρὸς ὁμότητα (cf. l. 112) καὶ ποιητικὰν ἐπέδοσαν; cf. also l. 115 τὴν ταύτῃ ἔφη} \] and Arist. Fr. 44 τί τοῦτ' ἔφη. But such coincidences are not very conclusive; and on the other hand these fragments do not conform to the normal type of Aristotelian dialogue, in which, as we know both from the allusions of Cicero \(\text{(ad Att. iv. 16, xiii. 19)}\) and his imitations, the leading part was taken by the philosopher himself. It will be safer then to leave the writer anonymous, though he may well be as early as the third or even fourth century B.C.

As will have been observed, this papyrus reopens some important questions of history and chronology, upon which some remarks are made in the commentary (notes on ll. 1–10, 106–9). If Solon went to Asia when Pisistratus became tyrant, his famous meeting with Croesus may have occurred then, and the ‘beautiful myth’ be after all a sober fact. The synchronism of the tyrannies of Pisistratus and Periander is another very interesting point, which with the testimony of Herodotus partly on the same side should not be dismissed too lightly. It is no doubt a question how far the setting of an imaginary dialogue can supply a basis for historical conclusions; but a comparison with such a work as Plutarch’s \textit{Symposium} is hardly fair to the present fragments, which may probably be regarded as an index to the average opinion of the day, and as such deserving of consideration, in spite of the conflict with the ‘so-called systems of chronology, the contradictions of which a thousand correctors have not yet succeeded in harmonizing.’

The papyrus is written in tall columns measuring 22 × 7 cm., in a round uncial hand rather resembling that of \textit{412} (P. Oxy. III, Plate v), which dates approximately from the year 245 A.D.; the present example is more regular and graceful, but no doubt belongs to about the same period. A second hand has made one or two small corrections, and seems also to have added some at least of the paragraphi and stops. Of the latter all three kinds are found (middle at ll. 26, 38, 105, 153; low at l. 18); but they are not used with much discrimination. The double points, which as usual mark a change of speaker, also look more like the second hand than the first. The occasional diaereses, however, and marks of elision, as well as the angular signs sometimes employed for filling up a short line, are with little doubt by the original scribe.

\[(a) \quad \text{Col. i.} \quad \text{Col. ii.}\]

\[\text{προτερον} \eta \text{ Πισιστρατον λαβειν} \quad [\text{θεωι} \]

\[\text{την αρχην απεδημησεν} \quad \text{επει} \quad [\]
δὴ προλεγὼν Ἀθηναίοις οτι
Πισιστρατος ἐπιβούλευει τυ
5 ραννίδι πίθευν αυτοὺς οὐκ ἦν
δυνάτος· εγὼ δὲ καταμείνας

ηδὴ Πισιστρατοῦ τυραννῶν
tos ἀποδήμαν εντευθὲν
ποιησάμενον εν Ἰονιαὶ μετὰ

10 Σολωνὸς διετρίβον χρόνου

dε τῶν φιλῶν σπουδάζουν
tων Ἱερείων καὶ μαλιστα
Πισιστρατοῦ διὰ τὴν οἰκείον
τητα· Σολωνὸς κελευντὸς

15 επανηλθόν Ἀθηναῖε κατὲ

λιπὸν μὲν οὖν εὐταῦθα παῖ
δὰ Θρασυβοῦλον τὸν Φίλο

μηλιν. κατειλήφειν δε μεί
ρακ[ι]ον ἡδὴ μαλα καλον καγὰ

20 θὸν καὶ τὴν οψὶν καὶ τὸν τρό
tὸν πολὺ διαφεροῦτα τῶν

ηλικιωτῶν τεταπεινωμὲ

νὸν γαρ τῶν ἀλλῶν διὰ τὴν

τῶν πραγμάτων καταστάσιν·

25 οὐδέσες επεθεδωκεῖ πρὸς μὲ

gαλοφαν. παύτας δὲ ὑπερὲ

βαλεν ἵπποτροφίαις καὶ κυ

νηγαῖας καὶ ταῖς ἀλλαῖς δαπά

ν[αις] δ[ιε]βεβλητὸ δ ἐν τῇ πο

30 λ[ε] τῆς νεωτέρας τῶν του

τοῦ Πισιστρατοῦ θυγατέρων
eraν ἰδὼν ἀρρηφοροῦσαν

Ἀγριόθεος οὖν ο παππος αυ
tου παρ οι καὶ τρεφομενὸs

Λ[ ]

φι[ ]

50 σω[ ]

π[ ]

λο[ ]

συ[ ]

με[ ]

55 οὐδ[ ]

του πατ[ ]

παρη[ ]

γυ[ ]

του[ ]

60 θη[ ]

dia[ ]

αυτω[ ]

μετα[ ]

τολμ[ ]

65 τη[ ]

tου α[ ]

ζεικ[ ]

φη φ[ ]

ὁρειαν[ ]

70 χρο[ ]

νειχετ[ ]

tage[ ]

ε[ ]

μη[ ]

75 ραν[ ]

κεματ[ ]

κακεινη[ ]

παινε[ ]

νησωμ[ ]

80 ποθημ[ ]
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35 εὐγγεγανεν ὁ Ὑσαυβουλος·
δια το του πατρος και της
μητρος όρφανον καταλει
φηναι· τραχυνθεις τι μοι
δοκε[ι] προς αυτον καλει μ,
40 εις οικου· συγγεγη τε αυτοις
οντα και καταλειμμενον
επιτροπον υπο του Φιλομη
λου· καγω μαλα προβυμως
εβαδιζου και γαρ ην εν ηδο
45 νη μοι το συνδιατριβειν Λυγνο

(b) Col. iii.
μεν ουτως πιθανω βοικεν
ει τους εφην αληθη ταυτ ει
στιν ουτ αν Περιανδρωι λυ
σιτελοιη μαλλον αρχειν η ι
95 φε εταιρο α[ρχ]εθαι· ουτ' αλλωι
ουθει τω[ν] φαιλωσ αρχουνων·
δοκω γαρ α[υτ]ου εφην εν τοις
φιλτατοις [κομ]εισθαι τας αμαρ
τιας· τι γαρ [φιλ]τερον ανδρι
100 νουν εχοι[ντε] πατριδος· και
[κ]ατα φυσιν [ο]ικειον ανδρω
[π]οιν· υπολαβ[ων ουν ο Αρι
[φ]ρων αληθη νη Δι' εφη λε
[γ]εις· και βουλ[α]μεθα σοι μαρ
105 τοις ιτισσαι εγω και Αδειμαντος
[ο]υτοσι παραγενομενοι νων
[Πε]ριανδροι δια την ομοτη
[τ]α κα μεγαλη πανυ συμφοραι
[π]εριπεσοντι· και οι Πισιστρα
110 τοις τινι ταυτη εφη[η :] εγω ει

Col. iv.

υπολαβων
νηδι
γαρ η[
ρουν· [
85 μη γ[
tαιετ[]
γουν [ [οστ][η]
οσω[[
90 αυτο[
[π]εν φρασων προ του γαρ Ἐκν.
[ψε]λον τον Πειρανδρόν πατε
[ρα] λαβειν τιν αρχήν εκάρα
[το]ν της πολεως ο[ι καλο]ν

[με]γαλην λαβ[ον]τος [δε αυ]
[το]ν την αρχήν το[υτων το]
[μεν] πληθος εφυγε τι...[.....]
[...][ν ολιγο[ι] δε και[......]

120 [...][ε][σ]ον ουν ύ[εις][......]
[...]ενε[...]εσον[...]ει[......]
[...]ρηον[...]μεραι[.....]
[...]ενηι[θ][...]ντες[εσ][.....]
[...]οι οι [εσ][...]ως[δε][.....]

125 [...]πος τον Πειρανδρον[.....]
[...]οι μοι[πλησιασε]ιν[.....]
[...]υποτ[...]υπερ τον Πε
[ριαμ]δρον και[...]τις εισα[.....]
[...]κελευσα [.....]στύσ[.....]

130 [...]νεων[...]λεται[.....][.....]
[...]η[...]ε[...]προπρ[.....]
[...]λομαι[κ[...]βουλ[.....]
[...]ο[...]στερ[.....]
[...]ειουτ[.....]

135 [...]εντο[.....]

(c) 150 [...]με[...]και[πα[.....]
[...][ε][φυ[.....]
[...]νο[.....]

160 [...]ο[...]συρο[.....]
[...]σα[.....]
'Solon) before Pisistratus seized the government went abroad; for his warnings to the Athenians that Pisistratus was aiming at a tyranny failed to convince them. I however stayed on; but when the tyranny of Pisistratus was already established I left the country and lived in Ionia with Solon. After some time my friends were anxious for my return, and particularly Pisistratus, on account of our intimacy; so as Solon urged it I went back to Athens. Now I had left there a boy named Thrasybulus, the son of Philomelus. I found him grown into a very handsome and virtuous young man, far superior in looks and manners to the others of his age; for in the general debasement due to the political situation no one had advanced to any nobility of character. He surpassed them all in horse-breeding and the chase and other such expensive pursuits; and it was said against him in the city that he was in love with the younger daughter of Pisistratus, whom he had seen carrying the vessels of Athene. His grandfather Hagnoteus in whose house it happened that Thrasybulus, who had been bereft of both father and mother, was being brought up, being, I think, a little annoyed with him, invited me to his house as I was their kinsman and had been left guardian by Philomelus. I was very ready to go, for Hagnoteus' company was a pleasure to me...'

1-10. This statement that just before the establishment of the tyranny of Pisistratus Solon left Athens and went to Ionia is not only new but conflicts with the account of Plutarch (Sol. 39-1), who represents Solon as refusing to fly and as living on at Athens in friendly relations with the usurper. The 'Δημοκρίτου Πολιτεία (14. 2) does not suggest that Solon retired from Athens, though on the other hand there is nothing there inconsistent with such a view; it is simply stated that Solon's warnings and opposition proved fruitless. Diogenes Laertius indeed asserts (i. 51, 62) that Solon died in Cyprus, and this statement may now have to be treated with more respect than heretofore. A new light is thus turned upon the much discussed question of the meeting between Solon and Croesus as king of Lydia. The usurpation of Pisistratus and the accession of Croesus to sole sovereignty are placed in the same year, B.C. 560, and there will be no chronological objection to the interview described by Herodotus, if it is transferred to this period. With regard to the date of Solon's death, χρονος in l. 10 here is too vague to build any argument upon; according to Heracleides Ponticus he survived the overthrow of the constitution ουχι δε χρονος, according to Phanicles of Ephesus less than two years (both ap. Plutarch, Sol. 32).

5. A. Neil.
11. This construction of στοιχάζειν with the infinitive is common in Aristotle, e.g. Alh. Pol. 38. 4 οδη αυτής ξεπούλασεν εικέων. 15. κατελέιπον is probably for κατελέιπον. 26. ιππείδαια(λεόν. 29-32. This is the first mention of a second daughter of Pisistratus. With αρρηφοροῦσαν cf. Polyaeus, Strategem. 5. 14 θεσπρομήθης φιλόμηλον της Πειαστριτίνος θηραμίδας λέοντας πολεμίσουσαν αυτῇ προσδραμόν ἐπιλήσον. Apparently the author of our dialogue either did not know of or did not accept this more romantic version, for αρρηφοροῦσαν and πολεμίσουσαν can hardly refer to different occasions. For διαβαλλόμενοι with the infin. cf. Hdn. 2. 6. 10 αλλά ἑπερ ἐς αποκλίθης μισοθαλατεία ἦναι, but the construction is unusual.
37. αρρηφανο: 1. ἀρρηφανὸς.
82. All that remains of the supposed τ over the line is a rather coarse horizontal stroke, immediately above a break in the papyrus.
88. The letters αςτ have each had a short horizontal stroke drawn through them, probably by the first hand; the doubtful τ was perhaps also deleted.
664. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS** 79

91-114. "This accordingly seems probable. If then," said I, "this be true, it would be of no more advantage to Periander to rule than be ruled by another nor to any other bad ruler. For I suppose," I said, "that he will reap the reward of his misdeeds among those dearest to him. For what is dearer to a sensible man than his country and his blood-relations?" "Yes, by Zeus," struck in Ariphron, "you speak truly, and I and Adimantus here wish to bear you out, having just been with Periander when his cruelty plunged him into a terrible disaster." "What disaster?" said Pisistratus. "I will tell you," he said. "Before Cypselus, the father of Periander, obtained the supremacy, the great clan of the Bacchiadæ, as they are called, ruled the city. When he became supreme the majority of them fled ... a few however remained. ..."


106-9. Unless the present conversation is to be supposed to have occurred while Pisistratus was still a private person, which is eminently improbable, this passage plainly implies that Periander of Corinth was not yet dead when the tyranny of Pisistratus was established at Athens. The ordinary chronology places the accession of Periander in B.C. 625 and his death in 585, thus leaving a very considerable interval before the first tyranny of Pisistratus, which no one desires to put earlier than B.C. 560. According to one passage of Herodotus, however, Periander and Pisistratus were contemporaries; for he makes the former arbiter in a war between Athens and Mytilene which followed upon the capture of Sigeum by Pisistratus (v. 94-5). The usual method of avoiding this difficulty is to suppose that there were two wars with Mytilene, and that the arbitration of Periander occurred in the first. But for this there is no kind of evidence, and, as Beloch has pointed out (Rheinisches Museum, vol. xlv. p. 466 sq.), the difficulties involved in this explanation are hardly less than those which it attempts to solve. He himself suggests that the mistake of Herodotus consists in referring an arbitration by Periander in a dispute between Tenedos and Sigeum (Arist. Rhet. i. 15. 13) to the period of the war against Mytilene; at the same time Beloch considers that the chronology of Periander is quite insecure, and that he might with advantage be put several decades later. But other references in Herodotus clearly point to the earlier date, for the tyranny of Periander at Corinth synchronized with that of Thrasybulus at Miletus (Hdt. i. 20, v. 92), which was established at the beginning of the reign of Alyattes king of Lydia (i. 18-22); while the eclipse of the sun which ended the war between Alyattes and Cyaxares of Media (i. 74) provides a securely fixed point of departure (approximately B.C. 585). Herodotus' chronology is probably past mending.

108. μεγαλὴ πᾶσιν συμφοράς: to what this refers is not clear. As the Bacchiadæ were in some way involved, the misfortune is apparently not one of those ordinarily ascribed by tradition to the private life of Periander.

115. Cf. Hdt. v. 92 ἐν ἀληφαρχίᾳ, καὶ οὖν Βακχάθαι καλιέμενοι ἐν μον ἐν τῶν πόλεω ἐδίδοσαν δὲ καὶ ἠγοντο εἰς ἄλλοις. It is doubtful whether the mistake of the original hand in the spelling of the name was anything more than ν for ι; but there is barely room in the lacuna for ἀδαι.

119. καὶ: the third letter is quite uncertain; perhaps καὶ ἐμεληέων | ἐπελείπθην | οὐν. The question of the reading here is complicated by the doubt concerning the position of the fragment containing the first part of ll. 120 sqq. Lines 125-6 and 127-8 will suit the arrangement adopted in the text, which moreover brings out a column of exactly the required length. In l. 120 this fragment contains the doubtful ε and part of the ι; the rest of the ι (which apart from the fragment could be read as ι) is on the upper piece. Another break occurs between l. 133-4, but here the junction is almost certain. The latter parts of
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ll. 128 | τοις εὐσήφοις | 132 | βοῦν | are also on a detached fragment the position of which, though probable from the appearance of the papyrus, is by no means secure.

150–63. This fragment from the bottom of a column very likely belongs to Col. iv; it does not appear possible to find a place for it in Col. iii.

665. HISTORY OF SICILY.

Fr. (a) 10:5 × 4:6, Fr. (b) 10:3 × 4:6 cm. Plate I.

These fragments, which belong evidently to the same column, of which they formed the upper and lower portions respectively, are notwithstanding their small size of no slight interest and importance. They contain an abstract or summary of events in Sicily, the different items, which are stated in the concisest manner, being marked off by paragraphe and further distinguished from each other by the protrusion of the first lines into the left margin. The papyrus was a regular literary roll, written in a fine uncial hand, which bears a very strong resemblance to that of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus of the Προοίμια Δημοσθένους (facsimile in P. Oxy. I, p. 54), and also to that of the Bacchylides papyrus, to which it presents a still closer parallel than was provided by the Demosthenes MS. We should assign it, like the Demosthenes, to the second century A.D.; an earlier date is not at all likely. Probably this is part of an epitome of a continuous history of Sicily, and it may well be that, as Blass thinks, the work epitomized was the lost History of Timaeus.

The period to which the fragments refer seems to be that immediately following the general overthrow of the tyrannies in the Sicilian cities which took place about the year 465 B.C. (Diod. xi. 68. 5). This period is indicated by the frequent mentions of conflicts with the ξέροι, by whom are meant the mercenaries settled in the cities by the tyrants as a support of their rule. Diodorus, who is the sole authority for the history of this time, narrates the course of the hostilities at Syracuse between these new comers and the older citizens (xi. 72, 76); and implies that Syracuse was not peculiar in this respect:—‘Almost all the cities,’ he says (76. 5), ‘... with one consent came to terms with the strangers (ξέροι) settled there.’ The papyrus fills in some of the intermediate details passed over by the historian. We hear of an expedition of ξέροι from Enna and Cacyrum against Gela, which received aid from Syracuse. This was apparently followed by overtures from the ξέροι to the Syracusans (cf. note on l. 5), which, however, proved ineffectual, for the next event is a battle between them. Shortly afterwards the mercenaries settled at Minoa were defeated
by the combined forces of Syracuse and Agrigentum. The activity displayed by Syracuse warrants the inference that she had herself already got the upper hand of her own ξένοι, who, as Diodorus relates, were finally defeated in a pitched battle. The campaign of the Syracusans against Catana mentioned at this time by Diodorus (76. 3) is part of the same anti-foreign movement. But hostilities seem to have extended beyond the opposing sections of the various city states. The fragments also supply information of an expedition of Agrigentum against Crastus, and an engagement subsequently occurred at the latter place between the Agrigentines and forces from Himera and Gela, which may be supposed to have come to the assistance of Crastus. These new facts may not be very weighty, but they convey a more adequate idea than was before possible of the period of unrest, the στάσεις and ταραχαί, which intervened between the overthrow of the tyrannies and the establishment of general peace.

[Cακυρω ξένων επί
[Γ]έλαιον στρατεία
βοηθοί εις Συρακοσίων
5 Τε[λω]ιοίς καὶ π ἦν. . . .
των ξένων προς Συρακοσίους
μαχη Συρακοσίων καὶ των ξένων [. . . . . . .]
10 Γλαυκών πεί. . . .
[. . . . . . .]
[Ακρα[γαν]τινων επί]

Κραστον στρατεία
η γενομενη περὶ
15 Κραστον Ημερα[ιων]
και Γελων[ων] προς Α[κρα]
γαντινους μαχη
ος οι την Μυνοιαν
των ξενων οικη
20 ζοντες οτι Ακρα
gαντινων και Συρακοσίων
κοσιων ηπεθησαν
[Ακρα[γαντιν . . .

1. Ομφαλων: cf. Cic. Verr. 4. 48 Hennensium nemore, qui locus... umbilicus Siciliae nominatur, and the spurious line in Callim. H. in Cer. 6. 15 τρις θ' έπι καλλιστης νήσου δραμετ ομφαλον έτους.
2. Κακυρων: the site of this town, which is mentioned by Ptolemy, has been placed at the modern village of Cassaro, near Palazzolo; the present passage seems to indicate that it should be looked for further west, and the position given in Kiepert's Topogr. Hist. Atlas is probably not far from the truth.
3. All that remains of the letter at the end of the line is a straight stroke which
suggests ε, η, or η. ρ is not impossible, but there is no trace of the tail, and we therefore hesitate to introduce προτρπτικός, which is otherwise attractive, into the text.

10. Πλαύκων is evidently a personal name, but nothing is known of this bearer of it.

11. The gap between the two fragments probably extends to about 10 lines, but it may be larger.

13. Cratus is described by Steph. Byz. as τόλε Σικελίας τῶν Σικανών, citing the Σικελία of Philistus. Its position is unknown; no doubt it was in the neighbourhood of Agrigentum.

22. The vestiges of the letter after ηρς do not suggest θ, but can hardly be said to be inconsistent with that letter, since there is no other example of a θ in the text. If the shape of the θ was tall and narrow, as in the Bacchylides papyrus, the effect of mutilation is that actually presented in the fragment. Of the supposed η only a small speck remains.

23. A fresh entry probably commences at this line, and in that case there would be one or even two letters before Λεί[γα]νη[ν . . , e.g. η or το 'Λεί[γα]νη[ν.]

666. ARISTOTLE, Προτρπτικός.

27.2 x 9.8 cm.

A sheet containing two practically entire columns, preceded by the ends of lines from a third, the text of which includes a lengthy passage quoted by Stobaeus (Flor. 3. 54) from Aristotle, and now generally assigned to the Aristotelian dialogue Προτρπτικός or Exhortation to Philosophy (Rose, Fr. 57). Besides additions at the beginning and end of the excerpt the papyrus supplies a sentence omitted by Stobaeus in the middle of his quotation. The evidence of these supplementary passages, though bringing no direct proof of the identity of the treatise of which they formed part, tend to support the attribution to the Προτρπτικός, in particular ll. 161 sqq., where the foregoing argument on the worthlessness of external goods as such results in a recommendation of philosophy (cf. note on l. 170).

The text is written in narrow columns (width 4 cm.), placed very close together, in rather small informal uncials, which we should date about the middle or latter part of the second century. No breathings or accents occur, and stops are also absent, the sentences being divided off by paragraphi only. The common angular sign is used to fill up short lines. Parts of the initial letters of the first few lines of a fourth column remain, but all that is recognizable is a doubtful ε opposite l. 118 and an ω opposite l. 120. The papyrus is dirty and rubbed in places.

The appended collation is derived from Hense’s edition of Stobaeus, iii.
3. 25. The MSS. referred to are the Escorialensis Mendozae (M), Parisinus (A), and Marcianus as embodied in the edition of Trincavelli (Tr.). Other authorities are Maximus Monachus, Gnomologium, c. 17 (= Max.), where the earlier part of the quotation in Stobaeus is given with some slight textual variations, and the Florilegium Laurentianum (Laur.), where the extract of Maximus reappears (Meineke, Stobaeus, iv. 225, 25). The papyrus sometimes supports one, sometimes another, of these witnesses, and occasionally corrects them all. It is, however, itself far from being impeccable, and in one or two places where it is the sole authority emendation is necessary.

Col. i. | Col. ii. | Col. iii.
---|---|---
\( \chi \eta \) | \( \tau \varepsilon \pi ραττε \iota \nu \tau \omega ν \) | 115 δια της \( \psi χ \eta \) αγαν
\( \nu \epsilon i \) | \( \delta \epsilon ων \tau i \ \pi rο \) | \( \theta \omega \nu \) πλεονασασα
\( \tau \epsilon \) | 60 αιρομενονος | \( \epsilon i \) \( \alpha u t o n \) \( \epsilon i να\)
\( \nu \delta o u \) | καλυμη διο δει | τα \( \kappa τηματα \) \( \pi aν \)
\( \kappa αι \) | \( \tau \nu η [.] \) | των \( \alpha i οχιστον \)
\( \lambda αν \) | \( \chi αν \) \( \phi ευγεων \) | 120 \( \omega σπερ \) \( \gamma αρ \) \( \epsilon i τις \)
\( \tau ον \) | \( \tau η \) \( \tau ουν \) \( \alpha τυ\) | \( \tau ον \) \( \alpha i καταγε\)
\( \lambda α\) | \( \tau η \) \( \epsilon uδαιμονιαν \) \( \lambda αστος \) \( \alpha n \) \( \gamma ονοιτο \)
\( \pi λε \) | \( \sigma ν ατ \) \( \epsilon υ τι \) \( \pi oλ \) | \( \rho ο\) \( \epsilon \) \( \kappa ταγε\)
\( \lambda αν \) | \( \lambda α \) \( \kappa ετσι\) \( \gamma i \) \( \eta \) \( \epsilon i τ\) \( \pi oσ \) | \( \lambda αστος \) \( \alpha n \) \( \gamma νοιτο \)
\( \lambda ον \) | \( \nu \) \( \sigma ν ατ \) \( \epsilon υ τ\) \( \pi o\) | \( \nu \) \( \epsilon i \) \( \kappa ταγε\)
\( \mu α \) | \( \nu \) \( \nu \epsilon θα\) \( \mu αllον \) | \( \lambda οσ\) \( \pi λεον\) \( \alpha \) \( \zeta\)
\( \delta εν \) | \( \tau η \) \( \psi χ \) \( \eta \) \( \delta iα \) \( \gamma αρ \) | \( \tau η \) \( \κτημα\) \( \epsilon i να\)
15 | \( \sigma \omega μα \) \( ω ν \) \( \tau \) \( \lambda αμ \) | \( \sigma αμε\) \( \beta ηεθηκε\) \( \tau \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) | 125 \( \tau ον \) \( \α του\) \( \tau ορο\) | \( \sigma αμε\) \( \beta ηεθηκε\) \( \tau \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
\( \tau \) \( \iθεσ\) \( \iota \) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \tau \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \chi αρ \) | \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
\( \iota \) | \( \sigma ναμ ον \) \( \tau \) \( \lambda α\) \( \pi τ\) \( \epsilon υθητι\) \( \kappa ε\) | \( \kαi \) \( \tau ου\) \( \kατ\) \( \alpha\)
\( \lambda α \) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
\( \kappa ου \) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
\( \iota \) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
23 lines lost.
43 | \( \alpha \phi ιο\) | 130 \( \ου\) \( \tau ου\) \( \epsilon i να\)
\( \nu \) \( \mu ιο\) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
45 | \( \beta iατ\) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
\( \mu \nu μι\) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
\( \). \( \delta iτον \) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)

G 2

23 lines lost.
43 | \( \alpha \phi ιο\) | 130 \( \ου\) \( \τ ου\) \( \epsilon i να\)
\( \nu \) \( \mu ιο\) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
45 | \( \beta iατ\) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
\( \mu \nu μι\) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
\( \). \( \delta iτον \) | \( \kappa ει\) \( \τ\) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \) \( \iota \)
ai\[\upsilon\]ν

50 [αι\[\upsilon\]νον

ς\[\gamma\]ρ

55 [\[\upsilon\]νον

ϕα\[\xi\]της

ι\[\upsilon\] όταν

τος

μή]

tων προειρήμη
tων αυτων παρη
tου αυτου δε τρο

85 που και ψυχήν
ean \[\epsilon\] πεπαιδευ
μενη την τοιαυ
την και του τοιου
tου ανθρωπου

90 ευδαιμονα προσ
gορευτευν εστιν
ουκ αν τους εκτος
ηι λαμπρος κε
χορηγημενος

95 αυτος μηδενος
αξιοις ων ουδε γαρ
[i]πον εαν ψαλια
χρυσα και σκευ
ην εχη πολυτε

100 λη φαυλος ων
tου τοιουτον
αξιοι τινος νομι
ζομεν \[\[\tauινος \ νο
μιζομεν\]] ειναι

105 αλλ εαν διακειμε
νος \(\eta\) σπουδαιως
tουτον μαλλων
eπαινουμεν

110 χωρις δε των ει
ρημενων συμ
βαινει τοις μηδε
νος αξιοις ουσιν
οταν τυχωσι \[\chi\]
[\[\ρηγι\]ας και των

σιας ανοιαν τοις

140 γαρ διακειμενοι
τα περι την ψυ
χεν κακως ου
τε πλουτος ουτ i
σχυ ουτε καλλος

145 των αγαθων εστιν
αλλ οσωι περ αν \[\alpha\]
tαι μαλλων αι δια
θεσεις καθ \[\upsilon\]περ
βολην υπαρξωτι

150 τοσοτω μει\[\xi\]ω
και πλειω τον
κεκτημενον

βλαπτουσι \(\epsilon\) α\[\epsilon\] α\[\epsilon\]
φρονησεω\[\nu\]

155 ραγεωντα\[\upsilon\] το
γαρ \[\mu\] σαι\[\upsilon\] μα
χαιραι τουτ \[\epsilon\]τι
το \[\mu\] τοις \[\phi\]αι
λοις την εξουσια

160 αν εγχειριζει\[\nu\]

την \[\de\] φρονη\[\eta\]σιν
αποτελες αν \[\omicron\]ομολο
γησειαν εις το \[\iota\]μαν
θανειν γεγραβα\[\iota\] (και)

165 \[\[\delta\] να\[\epsilon\]ις \[\phi\]ιλο\[\sigma\]
περιη\[\phi\]θεν \[\omicron\]

tε πως ουκ απ\[\iota\]ρο
φασιτως \[\phi\]ιλο\[\phi\]σο

170 \[\[\pi\]\[\tau\]ν εστι και
58-170. '... nor prevent them when purposing to do a right action. We ought to be warned by the spectacle of their plight to avoid it ourselves(?), and should regard happiness not as dependent upon the acquisition of wealth rather than upon a particular state of the soul. Bodily blessings would not be held to consist in adornment with magnificent apparel, but in the possession of health and in sound condition, even in the absence of the other advantages which I have mentioned. In the same way happiness is to be attributed to the disciplined soul and to a man of such a character, not to the man who is magnificently supplied with externals and is in himself worthless. We do not consider a bad horse to be of any value if it has gold chains and costly trappings; we rather give our praise to one that is in sound condition. Besides what we have said, too, worthless persons, when they obtain wealth and value their possessions more than the goods of the soul, are in the worst case of all. For just as a man who was inferior to his own domestics would be ridiculous, so those who come to find their property of more value than their own nature ought to be held miserable. And this is the truth of the matter, for "satiety breeds insolence" as the proverb says, and want of discipline combined with power breeds folly. In a bad state of the soul neither wealth nor strength nor beauty are good things, but the greater the abundance of these qualities, the more do they injure their possessor, if they are unaccompanied by reason. "Do not give a child a knife," is as much as to say, "Do not entrust bad men with power." Now reason, as all would admit, exists for the acquisition of knowledge, and seeks ends the means to which are contained in philosophy; why then should philosophy not be pursued without hesitation ...

61-4. This sentence might be correct if, as Diels suggests, θεωροῦσαν referred to some preceding substantive such as ἡ τῶν σπουδαίων αἵρεσις. But more probably some correction is required; the simplest perhaps is to emend θεωροῦσαν to θεωροῦσα τι στρατίων, with the sense given in our translation. Other expedients would be to read τοὺῶν οὖν for τοῖῶν, 'the wretched state of mind which neglects this,' or to insert τι after τοῖῶν, 'which pays great consideration to any of these external things,' but the latter interpretation of θεωροῦσαν is hardly so natural.

65. The extracts of Stobaeus and Maximus Mon. begin after καί. νομίζει δὲ Μ, νομίζει Λ, νομίζει Τρ., νομίζει δὲ Μαξ., νομίζει δὲ Λαυρ. 68. γνώσθαι: so Max., Laur.; γνώσθαι ΜΑ, Τρ. 69. μᾶλλον η: μᾶλλον δ(θ) ΜΑ, Μαξ., Λαυρ., ΆΛ έν Τρ. 70-2. πως την ψυχὴν: την ψ. εῦ ΜΑ², την ψυχῆς εὖ Α¹, Τρ., Μαξ., Λαυρ. Above the ω of πως there are in the papyrus some faint vestiges, which if not accidental might perhaps represent a cursorily written εὖ; but we have considered this too doubtful for insertion in the text. In any case πως has not been cancelled, and if the intention was to indicate a reading εὖ πως the εὖ should have been written further to the left. 73. σῶμα οὐ το: so ΜΑ, Μαξ., Λαυρ.; οὔδε τὸ σῶμα αὐτῷ Τρ. 76. τις αὐτο: so ΜΑ², Μαξ., Λαυρ.; τις εὖ Α¹, τις Τρ. 78. Considerations of space made it more probable that νομίζων or νομίζων (Α, Τρ., Μαξ., Λαυρ.) was written than νοιειν (Μ). 82. προερημένων: so MSS. except Μαξ., where παρακερεμένων is found. 85. ψυχὴ: so Μ, Τρ., Μαξ., Λαυρ.; ψυχῆ Α. 86. καί η πρέπ.: so Μ, Τρ., Μαξ., Λαυρ.; εἴη τινι άλλην πρέπ. Τρ. 88. καί: Λαυρ. substitutes εἰς. τοὐτὸν is omitted in Μαξ. 92. τοις: so ΜΑ, Λαυρ.; τις Τρ., Μαξ. εκτοσ: so ΜΑ, Μαξ., Λαυρ.; εκ τοῦτων Τρ.
93. λαμπρῶς: so MA, Max., Laur.; λαμπρᾶς Α, Tr.
κεκορηγμένους: κεκοσμήμονος MSS. (κεκοσμήμονος Laur., putting λαμπρῶς after κεκοσμ.)
95. αυτῷ: Max. and Laur. add δὲ.
96. οὖν: so Α (and conjecturally Meineke); οὖν Α and the other MSS.
97. εἰς φαλα: εἰς ψελλα ΜA, Max., Laur.; κάν ψελλα Tr.
100. The papyrus does not support Meineke's insertion of αιτῶσ before φαίλος which is adopted by Rose.
105. εἰς: ὅτι Α MSS. except Laur., which has ὅτι άν and adds ὃ before στονοδιώσ.
106. The insertion of ÷ (so MSS.) is necessary.
109-19. The excerpts of Stobaeus and Maximus omit this passage, and unfortunately its meaning and construction are obscured by a corruption. Apparently πλεονασασαι conceals something like πλέονων ἡ ἡ, and we may either add συμβῆ (cf. ll. 125-7) and place a comma after κτήματα, when the sense will be as in the translation above, or connecting τον διὰ της ψυχης αγαθων with τυχωι insert δ or ὅπερ (so Diels) before παρτων αισχυτων. 'It sometimes happens that worthless persons have both external and mental gifts, and value the former above the latter, which is the most disgraceful thing of all.' Corruptio optimi pessima. The latter remedy produces an easier construction and a more pointed sentence.
122. τον is omitted in the MSS.
125. πλείωνος: πλείωνος MSS.
128. συμβήγκειν: συμβήγκε MSS.
130. τοῦτων εἰςι: so MSS. except A, which transposes the words.
131. The excerpt of Maximus ends here.
150-1. μείζοντι καὶ πλείω καὶ μείζον τρ. πλείω καὶ μείζο MA.
153-5. Stobaeus here has χωρὶς φρονήσεως παραγενόμενη, which is the conclusion of his quotation. In l. 153 we have supposed that the repetition of αυ led to the loss of ειν. To read (ε)αυ [χωρὶς would make the line too long.
164. There would hardly be room for the necessary καὶ after γεγραμμένα, but the homoioeleuton may easily have caused its omission; cf. note on 153-5.
169. ψυχοσφάγατων was the key-note of the Προτρεπτικός, as of the similarly named work of Iamblichus: cf. Bywater, ibid., pp. 68-9.

667. Aristoxenus?

8 x 8 cm.

Parts of two columns, the former of which comprises thirty complete lines, containing an analysis of certain musical scales. To the authorship of the fragment we have no real clue. It is natural in such a case to think first of
Aristoxenus, the greatest name among the ancient writers upon musical theory; and there is no reason why the piece should not come from his "Aρμονικά Στοιχεία" or some similar work. But on the other hand there is no particular reason why it should, for any treatise on the same subject might include some such discussion as that found here. The papyrus probably falls within the third century. It is written in a clear semi-uncial hand, without stops or other lection marks; a short space, which is indicated in the transcript below, is used to divide the several sentences.

The highly technical language employed in the fragment can hardly be understood or discussed without some preliminary explanation of the composition of the Greek scale. We must here acknowledge our great indebtedness to Mr. H. S. Macran, to whose excellent edition of the Harmonics of Aristoxenus the reader is referred for further information.

The fundamental unit which was the basis of the Greek scale in all its later developments was the tetrachord, typically consisting of two dieses, i.e. semitones or smaller intervals, and a complement, or the interval remaining when the dieses were subtracted from the concord of the fourth. The magnitude of the three intervals determined the genus of the tetrachord as enharmonic or chromatic, the enharmonic variety containing two quarter-tones and a ditone, and the chromatic other divisions, e.g. two semitones and a tone and a half. The more familiar diatonic tetrachord, composed of a semitone and two tones, was distinguished by having only one diesis. Larger scales were effected by the arrangement or combination (άρμονία) of such tetrachords in two ways, (a) by conjunction (συναφή), when the last note of one tetrachord coincided with the first note of the next; or (b) by disjunction (διάκεφαλις), when the tetrachords were separated from each other by a tone. The combination of a pair of tetrachords in these two methods produced respectively the heptachord and octachord scales of the seven-stringed and eight-stringed lyres. Further additions resulted in what was known as the perfect scale, which took the following form (t = tone, d = diesis, and c = complement):—
It will be observed that this system diverges at a certain point into a conjunct and a disjunct scheme, the heptachord scale being the basis of the one (the 'lesser complete system') and the octachord that of the other (the 'greater complete system'). The additional note at the bottom was technically known as the προσλαμβανόμενος.

To come now to the passage before us. The writer is examining and locating different scales, and has proposed for consideration a heptachord scale of the form \( \underbrace{\text{\(\text{\(d}}\text{\(d}}\text{\(c}}\text{\(d}}\text{\(d}}\text{\(c}} \). A scale of this type would be enharmonic or chromatic (ll. 1-2) and also a conjunctive arrangement (ll. 2 sqq.). Such conjunction would occur in three places in the perfect scale (ll. 10 sqq.; see the scheme above), i.e. in the tetrachords \(\upsilon\pi\alpha\tau\omega\) and \(\mu\varepsilon\sigma\omega\), \(\mu\varepsilon\sigma\omega\) and \(\nu\pi\tau\omega\) (συμμείνων), \(\nu\pi\tau\omega\) (διεξευγμένων) and \(\upsilon\pi\rho\varepsilon\beta\alpha\lambda\omega\). Disjunction, on the other hand, is only found in the case of the tetrachords \(\mu\varepsilon\sigma\omega\) and \(\nu\pi\tau\omega\) (διεξευγμένων). To the given scheme is then (ll. 19 sqq.) added at the lower extremity a tone, corresponding to the προσλαμβανόμενος (see above), and the resulting eight-note system is said to occur in the same three combinations as before (ll. 22 sqq.). Here, however, a difficulty arises, for as will be seen on reference to the perfect scale such a scheme occurs in it not thrice but twice only, i.e. in the two halves of the 'greater complete system.' The simplest remedy is to suppose a defect in the text; cf. note ad loc.

Col. i. \hspace{10cm} Col. ii.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\mu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\alpha\rho\mu\nu\iota\nu\eta\chi\rho\omega & \xi
\\
\nu\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\nu & \xi
\\
\sigma\nu\alpha\phi\eta\kappa\epsilon\mu\iota\nu\eta\iota & \lambda
\\
\tau\varepsilon\omega\nu\eta\epsilon\iota\epsilon\kappa\iota & \lambda
\\
5 \text{pet} & 35
\end{array}
\]
667. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

ης μελωδοίτο τα πολ
λα εἰδ ὑπερβατώς η
μὲν γὰρ διαξευξίς αἰει
νῆτας καὶ μεσαὶ ἐφαί

10 νετο ποιεῖν τὴν δὲ
συναφῆς συνεβαιν
κοινωνεῖ τριών
συστημάτων ὡστε
σημαίνειν εξαπτωθ

15 ἐν τοπω τιν ποτε
ρον δυναῖα υπάτας
καὶ μεσαὶ [ξ[η]]ητας
καὶ μεσαὶ ἡ ὑπερβο

20 δὲ καὶ τοιοιον ἐπι
το βαρυ προσκείμενον
ἐπὶ τοῦτοις κοινοῖ

25 τὸν εἰρημενον τρι
ὡν συστήματων κα
[θ]ατερ εγενετο γνω

30 φερομενον συστήμα

1–30. ‘[Such a scale is in the first place] enharmonic or chromatic, in the second place it is a conjunctive system, whether its melodic succession be complete or partial, and mainly consecutive or broken. For disjunction was shown always to occur in the “lower” and “middle” tetrachords, while conjunction was found to enter into three scales, so that it did (not) immediately signify the region in which it lay, i.e. whether it applied to the “upper” and “middle” tetrachords or the “lower” and “middle” or the “lower” and “extreme.” Now let a note be added to these at the bass extremity; then this scheme of the octachord will be common to (two of) the three scales already mentioned, as was proved in the foregoing argument when a scale was propounded . . .’

2–7. μελωδοίτο is to be taken with ὅλη and ἐν μερεῖ as well as with διὰ τῶν ἐγεῖν and
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

υπερβατος. Scales might be curtailed either by diminishing their compass, i.e. dropping notes at the extremities (εν μερει), or by omitting inner notes (υπερβατος); cf. Aristox. Harm. p. 17. 30 (Meibom), and Aristid. Quint. pp. 15–6 τα μεν αυτων εστι συνεχι, ος τα δια των εξης φθογμων, τα δ' υπερβατα, ος τα δια των μη εφεξης μελετουμενα. For συναφη and διαζευγη generally cf. Aristox. Harm. p. 58. 15 sqq. τα πολλα in l. 6 seems otiose.

13 sqq. The construction and sense of this passage are not very clear. If the words are to be left as they stand, something like δειν ἡμας must be understood with σημαινειν; but the subject of the fragment is very awkward, and we prefer to suppose with Mr. Macran that μη was dropped out before σημαινειν. The similarity of the following syllable ση would help to account for the loss.

15. εν τοπω τιν: sc. κειται ἣ συναφη ου κεισθαι τηρ συναφην, according as τιν is accented τιν or τινι. τόπος means technically region or direction of the scale.

22 sqq. This sentence is the crux of the fragment, for, as already explained in the introduction, the series of notes apparently indicated only occurs twice in the perfect scale, not three times as here stated by the author. The easiest way out of the difficulty is to adopt Mr. Macran’s suggestion that δων has fallen out of the text before των ειρημενων.

668. EPITOME OF LIVY, XXXVII–XL AND XLVIII–LV.

Height 26 cm. Plate VI (Col. viii).

Literary papyri from Egypt which are now numbered by hundreds have hitherto, with a few trifling exceptions, been Greek; and Latin literature has been represented only by a small piece of Vergil and a few unimportant historical or juristic fragments. The discovery of an important literary text in Latin is therefore a welcome novelty. This consists of parts of eight columns of an epitome of a history of Rome, the events being grouped together in strict chronological order under the different consular years, and the division of the several books being noted. That the author of the history in question was Livy, though not stated, is obvious from a comparison of the arrangement of the books as numbered in the papyrus with that of the corresponding books in Livy’s work.

The epitome is written on the recto; on the verso is the text of part of the Epistle to the Hebrews (657). The presence of the latter enables us to decide the relative position of the different fragments of the Livy with the exception of a few small pieces, two of which had been gummed over places of the recto in order to strengthen the roll, and one of which seems to have been cut off from a much later portion of it (II. 218–25). The handwriting is a medium-sized upright uncial, with some admixture of minuscule forms (b, d), and belongs to the same class as the Vergil fragment (P. Oxy. I, Plate viii) and
the Bodleian Chronicles of Eusebius (Palaeographical Soc. ii. Plate 130), but
is an earlier example of the mixed style than has hitherto been known. The
papyrus was found with cursive documents varying from the second to the
fourth century (chiefly third), and the text of the Epistle to the Hebrews is
certainly not later than the fourth century (cf. introd. to 687). The Livy
epitome must therefore have been written not later than the beginning of the
fourth century, and it more probably belongs to the third. Abbreviations are
commonly employed in praenomina, in official titles such as cos., pr., trib. pl.,
and liber in the headings is written lib. Other abbreviations are rare; but
cf. ll. 15 pass(a), 122 Masiniss(ae), 207 omnib(us). A middle point is placed
after abbreviations, but there are no stops. Each column consists of 27–28
lines which are broad and contain on an average 37 letters, but the ends
are very uneven although the scribe has no objection to dividing a word
between two lines. The lines which mention the consuls for the year project
by about three letters into the left margin. In spite of the handsome appearance
of the MS., which has a broad margin above and below the calligraphic writing
and is certainly not the work of a schoolboy, the text is extraordinarily corrupt.
Mistakes in proper names, the occasional omissions of letters, and easy palaeo-
graphical errors such as the confusion of e and g (e.g. l. 27 intergessit) are not
surprising; but forms such as coniurium for connubium (l. 17), fictie grimonibus
for fictis criminibus (l. 72), planus for primus (l. 217), and still more pug-
namentasi (? Pergamenos missi, l. 111), trigem reddeterbuit (?... ens deterruit,
l. 184), show that the scribe understood little of what he was writing. It is
strange that having swallowed such monstrosities he should have in a few
places taken the trouble to make minor corrections, Chartaginientium e.g. being
altered to Chartaginiensium in l. 22, fodem to fidem in l. 95, and the super-
fluous s of Lussitanorum in l. 187 being erased. The epitome briefly chronicles
events one after the other in the barest manner with no attempt at connexion
or literary style, thereby presenting a marked contrast to the extant epitome of
Livy; but this bald, strictly chronological arrangement hardly excuses the
grammatical errors both of accidence and syntax which are scattered through-
out the text. The lack of confidence which the scribe's Latin necessarily
inspires, coupled with the length of the lines, renders the task of restoring the
lacunae, which occur in nearly every line, exceptionally difficult, and we have
generally abstained from conjectures which did not seem fairly certain. Yet in
spite of all these drawbacks, and though it is just when it reaches a new and
therefore specially interesting fact that the papyrus is apt to present unusual
obstacles to interpretation, the historical value of the new epitome is considerable,
as will presently be shown.
The papyrus falls into two main divisions, the first (Cols. i–iii) covering Books 37–40, where Livy’s history is extant, the second (Cols. iv–viii) covering Books 48–55, of which only an epitome constructed on quite other lines has been preserved. The first section, which deals with events between B.C. 190 and 179 and necessarily contains no new information, is chiefly interesting because it enables us to see the principles on which the epitome was composed, and hence to form a better estimate of the value of the second section, where no comparison with the actual work of Livy is possible. When allowances are made for the point of view of the compiler, the impression which he leaves is by no means unfavourable. Being limited to the barest catalogue of actual events, he naturally ignores Livy’s discussions of origins and causes as well as speeches, but he does not omit any of the more important occurrences. With regard to the less striking incidents his choice is capricious; he tends to insert notices of picturesque stories, e.g. that of Ortiagon’s wife (ll. 14–7), the tents in the forum (ll. 60–3), Theoxena (ll. 70–1), even when rather trivial; and the amount of space which he devotes to an event is often in inverse proportion to its importance. The account of the war in Ambracia, to which Livy gives nine chapters, is for instance dismissed in two words (l. 12). It is noticeable that he is more interested in home affairs than the author of the extant epitome, who in Books 37–40 mentions fewer events though entering into more details about them. The language of the papyrus is in the main borrowed from Livy, from whom whole phrases and even clauses are reproduced (e.g. in ll. 78–80), but the epitomizer frequently summarizes Livy in his own words (e.g. ll. 8–10)—a process which sometimes leads to apparent errors (cf. l. 3, note). Twice he seems to have distorted Livy’s chronology through combining two separate notices (cf. notes on ll. 7 and 17), but in other respects the chronology of the papyrus faithfully represents that of Livy.

After Col. iii a good many columns are lost which contained the epitome of Books 41–7. With Col. iv begins the second and important section of the epitome, giving a few lines from the end of Book 48 and most of Books 49–55, Col. iv–vi and vii–viii are continuous, but between Cols. vi and vii one column is lost, as is proved by the lacuna in the Epistle to the Hebrews at the corresponding point. Books 50, 54, and 55 are the best preserved, then come 49 and 51. Of Book 52 we have only the beginnings of lines, and Book 53, which was treated at exceptional length, is spoilt by the loss of a whole column. The period with which the papyrus deals, B.C. 150–137, is one of great interest. Abroad there were the Third Punic, Fourth Macedonian (against Pseudophilippus), Achaean, and Spanish Wars, and at home events were leading up to the Gracchan revolution. The existing authorities are far from satisfactory. For
foreign affairs the only sources of the first rank are the fragments of Polybius and the extant epitome of Livy. Where these fail we are dependent mainly upon Appian, supplemented occasionally by such writers as Valerius Maximus, Florus, Eutropius, and Orosius. Of the internal history almost nothing is known except what is to be gleaned from the epitome of Livy and some references in Cicero. Thus wherever the papyrus supplements the existing epitome, the information is extremely welcome, and fortunately they differ from each other in two important respects. The extant epitome (henceforth called Epit.) is a connected narrative, and though the sequence of events is chronological to the same extent as the original history, the epitomizer has not thought it worth while to make clear to which year every event recorded belongs. The papyrus on the other hand being arranged on strict chronological principles, not only do we learn the precise year to which each event mentioned in it was assigned by Livy, but the dates for the parallel portions of Epit. can now be exactly determined, a proceeding which entails several changes in the chronology which Epit. has hitherto been supposed to prove. Secondly, though Epit. is as a rule much longer than the papyrus because it often describes events in greater detail, the brief summary in the latter frequently includes events which are passed over in Epit. Some of these are naturally trivial (e.g. ll. 84-5, 111-5, and 164-6), but others are quite important. The proportion allotted to the different books in Epit. is very uneven. Thus Book 49 in Epit. occupies a good deal of space, the epitomizer entering into some detail both with regard to the Third Punic War and the rise of the pretender in Macedonia. Beside this the account of Book 49 in the papyrus (ll. 87-105) is very meagre, though even so it mentions at least one event which does not occur in Epit. On the other hand Book 53 of Epit. is dismissed in a few lines, the author apparently attaching little importance to the events of B.C. 143-1, and Book 54 (B. C. 141-139) does not occupy much space. Here the papyrus is considerably fuller than Epit., the proportion assigned to each book being more equal. Which of the two epitomes was constructed first is uncertain. The extant one is now generally considered to have been composed not earlier than the second century, and Zangemeister (Festschr. d. xxxvi philol. Versamml. 1882, pp. 86 sqq.) would assign it to the fourth, while the author of the compilation in the papyrus no doubt lived in the second or third century, when chronological epitomes were much in vogue in Egypt; cf. 12, 665, and the Strassburg fragment edited by Keil. The numerous errors in the text show that we have to deal with a copy some degrees removed from the original composition; but the interval of time need not be long, as is shown by the Oxyrhynchus fragment of Julius Africanus' Κεστοῖ (412), which though written within about fifty years of the composition of
that work is already quite corrupt. The discovery of an epitome of Livy in which the names of the consuls in the ablative case are prefixed to the events of each year goes far to confirm an acute conjecture of Mommsen (Abh. d. k. Sächs. Ges. viii. p. 552), who inferred from the internal evidence of Cassiodorus and Orosius that an epitome of such a character, rather than Livy’s complete work, lay at the basis of those authors’ compilations; the papyrus is, however, much less elaborate than the epitome of which the existence was postulated by Mommsen, and which Zangemeister (ibid.) even regards as the basis of the extant epitome of Livy.

We append a brief summary of the chief historical results to be gained from the new find. In foreign affairs the papyrus gives no new information about the Third Punic and Achaean Wars and confirms the generally received view. The chronology of the Macedonian war against Pseudophilippus, which was previously somewhat uncertain, is now fixed more precisely; cf. ll. 101, 106, and 126–7, note. The names of the ambassadors to Bithynia in B.C. 149, which are given in ll. 112–3, enable us to emend a corruption in the name of one of them as found in Polybius; and a hitherto unknown defeat of the Romans in B.C. 141 in Illyria is recorded in l. 175. But much more valuable are the references to the Spanish war, especially the campaigns against Viriathus. Not only does the papyrus supply new facts of importance, a victory (apparently) in B.C. 147 (l. 136), the defeat of L. Metellus in B.C. 142 (l. 167), and the delay of Q. Caepio (ll. 182–4); but it is now for the first time possible to construct the right chronology of the governors of Southern Spain in B.C. 145–39, and the chief events connected with them. Hitherto the few references to the Spanish war in Epit. were insufficient to correct the unsatisfactory account in Appian, whose text is in parts defective. A detailed examination of the changes introduced into the received chronology of this war and of the new light thrown upon Appian is given in the note on l. 167. More interesting, however, than defeats and victories are the references in the papyrus to home affairs. With regard to events previously known the most striking novelty is the date of the famous accusation of L. Aurelius Cotta by Scipio Africanus, which is placed by the papyrus in B.C. 138 in place of B.C. 133–29, a change which brings about a conflict between Livy and Cicero. Lines 115–6 probably fix the hitherto uncertain date of the Lex Scantinia. Among details which are new are the important military reform introduced by Appius Claudius in B.C. 140 (ll. 177–8), the dispute between the consul and the tribunes in the same year (ll. 182–4), and the statement about the ancestry of A. Gabinius, author of the Lex Gabinia (l. 193). It is also a matter of interest that we can now connect with Livy several statements of later writers, e.g. Dio Cassius (ll. 195–6, note), Valerius
Maximus (notes on ll. 161–3, 164–6, and 192), Frontinus (ll. 188–90, note), and Obsequens (ll. 127–9, note). Though the sadly imperfect condition of the text prevents this list from being much longer, and the numerous fragmentary references to hitherto unknown events serve only to accentuate the sense of loss, the papyrus is nevertheless a very serviceable addition to the authorities for the period from B.C. 150–139, and is a welcome violation of the monopoly hitherto enjoyed by Greek philology in the recovery of classical literature from Egypt.

For many suggestions and references in the commentary on this papyrus we are indebted to Mr. W. Warde Fowler. The first proofs of our publication were submitted to Profs. Kornemann, Reid, and Wissowa, who have also contributed much to the elucidation of several problems.

Col. i.

[. . . . .]. pax iterum data est. P. Lepidinus {maximus}
[pontif]ex maximus Q. Fabium pr(aetorem) quod flamen
[Quirin]alem erat proficisci in Sardiniam
[. . . . .]ant. Antiök den regi pax data. Lusitani
[vastati.] Rhodonia desolé deducta.
[Glærio c]ensuram petens minantes
[acculus]tionem compellitoribus composito
[destiti]. lib(er) xxviii
Book 38.

[Ambræ]cia capta.
[Gallog]raecis in Pamphylia proelio vastatis
[. . . . .]a liberata. Origia coniuris captian nobilis
[centuri]enem cuius vim pass(a) erat aurum admit
[t . . . . .] poscentem occidit caputque eius ad virum
[secum? tuit.] Campanis coniurium datum. [ ]
[inter Achæos et Lacedaemonios cruenta [pr]œelia.

[M. Valerio Lucilio Calinatore cos. B.C. 188.
[. . . . .]praeda ex Gallograecia per Cra [. . . .
ducta. L. My[n]cious Myrtius et L. Man(i)l(i)us

[pr]er legatps Chartaginien[ium qu[i]
[pulsi eran]t [avecti?].

[M. Aemilio C. Flaminio cos. B.C. 187.]
25 [P. Scipio] Africanus a Quintis Metellis die{s}]
[dicta in Li]ratum abi(i)t, qui ne revocaretur
[Gracchus tyr(ibus) pl(ebis) intergessit.  L. Cornelius

17. 1. commubium for conturium.  19. 1. Lyvio Salinatore.  20. 1. per Thr[a]ciam.  25.
1. Petillius for Metellis.  26. 1. Li{sterinum.  27. 1. intercessit.

Col. ii.

Scipio dam{natus . . . .].  eni.
[lib(er) xxxvi]iiii

30 per C. Flam[ynium et M. Aemiliu]m cos. Ligures
perdomiti.  "iae Flaminia e't Aemiliana munita.e
Latinorum [. . . . . . . . . . num coacta
ab Roma re[dire.  Manlius . .]n de Gallo-
graecis in triumpho . . . . .an. pe'cunia
quae translata erat . . . .yis p[e]s[o]luta.

35 Sp. Postum(o) [Q. Marcio co]s.
Hisphala F{acen}ia meretrique et pupillo
Aebutio quem T. Sempronius] Rutilius
tutor et mat[e]r Duronia c[yrcunscr]ibserant

40 iudicium re[fere]ntibus Ba[c]cha-
(n)alia sub[ta . . . . . . . . His]pa[n]
subacti. at[latarum cer]tamina
primum a Fr[vli]o Nobilior[e edita.
Gal]li(s) in Itali[am transgressis Ma]rcellum

45 [p]ersusasit [ut trans Alpes redire'nt.  L. Cornelius
Scipio po'st bellum Antiochi] ludos voti-
vos con[lata pecunia fecit].

47 App[i]o Clau(dio M. Sempronio] co.
Ligures fu[gati. . . . . .y]lis accepta

50 P. Claudio Pulchre[o L. Porcio Li]cinio cos.
homini ca[d [a Naevio pr(aetore] ven]efici(i)] damnati.
L. Quintius Fl[ammininus . . . .] Gallia
quod Philipp[ Poeno scorto] suo deside-
rante gladi[torium spectac]ciulum

37. 1 F{acen}ia.  39. 1. c[yrcumscr]ibserant.  40. 1. iudicium.  44. 1. Ma)rcellus.
51. 1. hominum circa d[no] (milia)?
Col. iii.

55 sua manu Boni|m nobilem occiderat
a lanatone cen|sore senatu motus est.
vastata Porcia [facta.

M. Claudio Marcello |Q. Fabio Labeone cos. B.C. 183.
P. Licini Crassi pontificis maximi

60 ludis fune|dribus [. . . . . . . . . . in foro
tabernaculis positis eventi id quod
nate|s c]ecin|erate [tabernacula . . .
in foro futura. 16 letters
dim[. . . .] m. Han|nibal 12 letters

65 [ . . . . ]bhe| 19 letters
lib(er) xxxx

L. A|emilio C|n. Berio [cos.
[. . . . .] bellum f| 16 letters
[. . . . .]ellitesin| 16 

70 [. . . . .] Theoxen[a 15 
in mare m|i. p|gien| . . . . . . Demetrius
fictie grimonibus [accusatus . . .
per patrem coactus| 14 letters

P. Lentulo M. Paebio [cos.
B.C. 180.

75 in agro L. Nerylli scribæ libri Numae inventi.

A. Postumio C. |Calpurnio| [cos.
cum Liguribus His|hani subacti.

L. Livius tri|bis(annis) pl(ebis) quod [annis nati quemque
magistratum pet|rent rogatio lata

80 est.

Q. Fulvio M. Manlio |cos.

M. Lepidi et Fulvii Nobilioris . . .

55. l. Boin|m. 56. l. M. Catone for lanatone. 57. l. basilica for vastaila.
62. l. va|t(s) for nate[s]. 67. l. Baebio for Berio. 72. l. fictis criminibus.
61. Cornelio (or Cethego) for Lentulo and Baebio for Paebio. 74.
1. a L. Villio for L. Livius and quot for quod.

Col. iv.

C. Corneliu|s . . . .ceus quod P. Decim su| . . .

H
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

85 a. iictam ingen[a]m stupraverat d cu. ....

damnatus.

li[br(e)] xxxvi[iii]

L. Marcio Censorino M. Man(i)lio cos.
bellum Punicum tertium exortum. Uti[ci]enses

90 [b]enigne locant auxiliae. Chartagin[i]enses

[i]n [d]edictionem venerunt, tussi omni[a] [sua

in alium locum transferre] mol. ............

redierunt. Romanios .... i. ..........

pepulerunt. Scipio[ ] 21 letters

95 Aemiliani f[ ]dem f[. ............] Aemili-

liani virtute exercitus qui obsessus

a Poenis erat liberatus. 16 letters

h

per Caridemum poe[. ....] Ser. Galba a Lusi-

tanis reus product[ ] 20 letters

fili quos fiens com[plexus est. Andrisko ...]

[i]i se Philip[i]um ferente Macedonia

per arma occupata. [ 20 letters

Man(i)lio et Marc(i)o cos. quarti ludi saecula-

re[s] factos quos op[ortu]it Diti ex Sibyllinis

carminibus [Ter'en]ti facti sunt.

[ lib(er) ] l

per socios populi Romani Pseudophilippus

in ultimam e[ ] 24 letters

laf[. . .].[. ]sf[ 17 „ Prusias?

90. l. auxiliati; cf. p. 104. 101. l. filiu[m.

Col. v.

110 [rex Bithyniae] positus est. ad Attalum regem

[. . . . . . .] in pugnamentasi sunt legati Marco

[. . . poda]gricus A. Hostilius Mancinus capite

[. . . . . . .]a quondam L. Manilius Volso stolidus

[. . . . . . .] ligationem dixerunt M. Cato respondit

[nec caput] nec pedes nec cor habere{nt}. M. Scaini[ti{n}i]us

[. . . . . . .]am tulit (de') in stupro deprehens{is}.


B. C. 148.
Masinis(sa) ult[i]nae senectutis liberos IIII
[. . . . . . . . ]s reliquit decedens, cuius re-
gnum natu maximis filis per miliaannum distributum.
[Marcellus leg]atus ad Masinissam missus
[obrutus. Ha]sdrubal quad adfinis Masinissae erat
[. . . . . . . . ]ta subsellii socius est. Scipio Aemilianus
[consul creat]us.

[Ma]{nilius} in Af{rica[1]} pr[o]spere dimicatus [es].
[Invenit] pr[ae]toris in Thessalia exercitus caesus.
[Philippus a] Metello captus. sacrarium
[. . . et laur'us soci maxino incendio
[inviolata. ]

[lib(er) li]

[P. Cornelio C. Livio] cos.
[. . . Carthage]inein Appius crudelissime
[. . . . . . . . ]ne obsidentiis Romanos non
[. . . . Carthag]inem crebris proel(is).

[per Achaearum pr[ae]torum] Corinthi legati Romano
[pulsati. Lu[i]sitani subalti.

III. l. in Pergamenos(t) missi for pugnamentasi (cf. p. 105) and M(arcus) . . . . for Marco. 114. l. legationem. 120. l. Aemilianum for miliaannum. 123. l. occisus for socius. 125. l. dimicavit for dimicatus [es]. 133. l. obsidentes. 135. l. Romani.

Col. vi.

Cn. Cornélio L. Mummio cos.
[per Scipionem Carthago.
[d]irepta. qu[ ]

visset uxor(em
duobus fil[iis
potestate [Aemilia qu[ ][lib(er) lii

L. Munumanus C[orinthum diruit.
uxore o[peruriam]
a Lusitanis clades
accepta. [ ]

H 2
Q. Fabio Maximo L. Hostilio cos. B.C. 145.

M. Petronii

adversus Viriathum

Ser. Galba L. [Cotta cos.]

L. Metellus

conscriptum []

qui invisus plebi

petitur vi

Syria va[stata]

[confecti]

lib(er) liii

Q. Metello [Appio Claudio cos.]

Rethog[en]

liberos t []

proposito a[

145. l. Mumnius.

One column lost.

Col. vii.

occidit, a Tyresio quem devict gladiu]n

don[ accepit sagu]que rem[i]ss[so am]ici-

[ti]ae dextram dedit.

[Metellus cos. a Lusitanis vex(atus. )

[signa statu(a)s tabulas Corinth[i]as L. Mummius

distribuit circa oppida et Rom[i]...vit.

Q. Fabius Maximus Lusitanis cae[ses ]

Viriathum fugavit.

lib(er) liii

Pompeius cos. a{n} Nu{a}mantinis de[dictu]s. in

Scordiscis cladis accepta.

Q. Caepione Q. Pompeio cos. B.C. 141.

Q. Fabius Maximus Lusitanis cae[ses ]

Viriathum fugavit.

lib(er) liii

Pompeius cos. a{n} Nu{a}mantinis de[dictu]s. in

Scordiscis cladis accepta.

Q. Caepione Q. Laelio Salasso eos.

Appius Claudius evicit ne duos [delectus?] annus

haberet. Uemilius Torquatus D. S[i]la]num

filium suum] de Macedonia damnavit, f[umeri

non interfuit, eademque die [i]n do[mo] sua

consultantibus respondit.
668. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

[C]aepio cos. indelegem Ti. Claudiam Assilium
[185] [Q.] Fabius Maximus a Viriath[i]o devictus de-
[s]uam l[i]ctores trigem reddeterbuit.

185 [f]ormam cum hostibus pacem fecit. Q. Occius

[176.] l Sapiente for Salasso. 178. l. T. Manlius for Uemilius. 182. l. Claudium

Asellum. 184. l. . . . ens deterruit ; cf. p. 112.

Col. viii.


Chaldaei urbe tif 20 letters

A. Cabinius verna[e . . . . rogationem tulit

suffragium per tabellam ferri. . . . . . .

195 Servilius Caepio ab equitibus quos periculo

obiecerat clavo [ictus 15 letters

Audax Minurus [D]itdlco 17 "

Viriathum iugula[verunt.

lib(er) [vo

190 Book 55.

P. Sc[i]pione D. Junio [cos.

interfectores Viriath[i . . . praemium

negatum. c[um Scipio]em Nasicam et
decemviri[m co]s. Licinius et Curialius

trib(uni) p[ebis] in carcerem [c]ollocarent, . . . .

200 P. Africanus cum L. Cottam [accusar]et . . .

magnitudinem nonin[iis . .], cae[. . . . . .

Lusitani vastati. a[n] Numan[tinis clades accepta.

205 Diodotus Tryphon Antioch[um regem occi-
dit Suriague potitus [st. ]

Book 55.

B. C. 139.

B. C. 138.


Fr. (a). Fr. (b). Fr. (c). Fr. (d).

| . . . . | . . . . | . . . . | . . . . |
| . . . Sullanis | famili[ | 235 ]hij[ | ]vir[ |
| . . . neum | ] | ] | ] |
| . . . . | 230 | ] | ] |
| . . . | mom | y e | ] |
| . . . | samini | is me | ] |
| . . . | avit p| custodia | ] |

1. Cf. Livy 37. 46.
2. Cf. 37. 47.
3. y is probably Actol's, for it is difficult to see what chapter can be referred to if not 51; but pax iterum data est somewhat perverts the truth, since the embassy of the Aetolians was summarily ordered to depart under threats of punishment and no terms were offered by the Senate. A negative would seem to have been omitted.

P. Lepidinus: his correct name was P. Licinius (37. 51). maximus is a repetition of part of his title.
6. [. . . ]ant: this word must be corrupt; tenueit or retinuit (cf. 37. 51) would be expected.

An[i]cho regi pax data: cf. 37. 55.
Lusitani [vastati]: cf. 37. 57 and for vastati li. 13, 83, and 212.
7. Two events seem to be confused here, the Rhodian embassy about Soli (ch. 56 ad fin.) and the foundation of Bononia (ch. 57), the latter being what is really meant, as shown by the intervening mention of the Lusitanians. de Soli(s), if more than a mere interpolation from ch. 56, probably represents colonia or de Gallis.
8-10. Cf. 37. 57; destitit is the word used by Livy.
13. Cf. 38. 12 sqq. in Pamphylia, as Prof. Kornemann remarks, is not strictly accurate, the Gallograeci being defeated in Galatia.
14–17. For the story of Ortiagon’s wife see 38. 24. *captian* must be *captiva*, but *uxor* is much wanted and *nobilis* is probably corrupt. Possibly an *nobilis* is due to a reminiscence of the words *Anyram nobilum* which occur at the beginning of the chapter. *admit ...* also seems to be a corruption of a word meaning ‘promised,’ while *poscentem* is for *pensaniem*, the word used by Livy.

17. On the right of intermarriage granted to the Campanians see Livy 38. 36, where the event is placed in B.C. 188, and is the consequence of the census ordered to be taken in B.C. 189 which is mentioned in ch. 28. The papyrus records the event mentioned in ch. 36, but puts it in the place corresponding to ch. 28. Cf. note on ll. 44–5.

19. Cf. 38. 35.
24. Cf. 38. 42.
25–7. Cf. 38. 50–3. Though *die dicta or dicto* is necessary for the construction, it is very likely that the scribe wrote *dies dicta or dictus*.

44–5. Cf. 39. 22, where the incursion of the Gauls is described. But the apparent mention of Marcellus refers to ch. 54, where it is stated that in B.C. 183 they retired to their own country, Marcellus being then consul (cf. also ch. 45). The epitomizer seems therefore to have made the same kind of mistake as in connexion with the concession to the Campanians; cf. l. 17, note.

45–7. Cf. 39. 22 *L. Scipio ludos ... quos bello Antiochi vocuisse sese dicebat ex collata ad id pecunia ... fecit.*

49. The defeat of the Ligurians by the two consuls occurs in 39. 32, and the next event related is the elections. What *ulis accepta referis to is not clear. Possibly multa *millia capta* was meant (cf. 39. 32 *multa millia hominum in iis cepit*); or *ulis* may represent part of *cladis*, and *in* or a *Hispanis* may be supplied (cf. ll. 174–5 and 212), the reference being to the defeat mentioned in ch. 30. This however was soon remedied, and a mention of this campaign would have been expected to precede instead of following the allusion to the Ligurian war.

51. Cf. 39. 41.
52–6. Cf. 39. 42. If ... *] Gallia* is not corrupt it is out of place, and ought to follow *quad*.

57. Cf. 39. 44.
58. Cf. 39. 45.
59–63. Cf. 39. 46.

64. *Hannibal*: a reference to his death; cf. 39. 51.
67. Cf. 39. 56.
68. Perhaps [*Hispani*] should be restored before *bellum*; cf. 40. 1.

70–1. Cf. 40. 4. Prof. Reid suggests *in mare* [*fugient* se dedit (or iecit)]. Livy’s phrase is in mare sese deicit.

72. Cf. 40. 6–16. It is not clear whether *per patrem coacti* in l. 73 also refers to the accusation against Demetrius or to his death by poisoning, which is described in 40. 24. *coacti* does not seem to be right on either hypothesis.

74. Cf. 40. 18.
75. Cf. 40. 29. The restoration is however rather long for the lacuna.
76. Cf. 40. 35.
77. Cf. 40. 39–41.
78–80. Cf. 40. 44 *eo anno rogatio primum lata est ab L. Villio tribuno plebis quot annos nati quenque magistratum pelerent caperenique.*
81. Cf. 40. 45.
82. Cf. 40. 45–6. *composita inimiciia* may be supplied. After this several columns are lost, corresponding to the break between 657. iv and v.

83. *adversus Cethegum*; i.e. the war with Masinissa; cf. Epit. 48 ad fin. *Carthaginenses cum adversus foedus bellum Masinissae intulissent* …

*Lusitani va\text{\'}tili;* cf. l. 212. The reference is to the treacherous attack of Sulpicius Galba (cf. l. 98), on which see Appian, *Iber.* 59–60, Orosius, iv. 21. 10, Val. Max. ix. 62, and Suét. *Galba 3.* Epit. 48 has *S. Sulpicius Galba praetor male adversus Lusitanos pugnavit,* which has generally been interpreted as implying a defeat of the Romans. But, as Kornemann remarks, it is now clear that *male* means not ‘unsuccessfully’ but ‘dishonourably.’

84. Probably *Ceth\text{\'}ecus,* i.e. Cethegus; cf. l. 14 *Origiacontis* for *Ortiagontis.* The incident is not recorded elsewhere, nor is any C. Cornelius Cethegus known at this period. L. Cornelius Cethegus was one of the accusers of Galba (Epit. 49) and M. Cornelius Cethegus was consul in b.c. 160.

*Decim* seems to be corrupt for *Decimi* or *Decii,* and *su\text{\'}* is very likely the beginning of a cognomen. What *a. ictam* (or *auci*am) in l. 85 means is obscure; Reid suggests *ancillam.* Kornemann prefers *Decii* (or)*\text{\'}ym … ingenium* (or) *\text{\'}ym,* comparing Val. Max. vi. 1. 10 *quod cum ingenuo adolescuento stupri commercium habuisset.* The doubtful u after d c can be i.

87–93. ‘Book 49. Consulship of L. Marciius Censorinus and M’. Manilius. The Third Punic War began. The inhabitants of Utica willingly assisted (the Romans). The Carthaginians surrendered; being ordered to transfer all their possessions to another site they returned …

90. *auxiliare* is for *auxiliati* (sc. *sunt*), and *loca* perhaps conceals the object (*Romanis*). *loca* *auxiliare,* though in itself a possible phrase, is unlikely, for the verbs in the papyri are uniformly in the perfect tense and generally come at the end of the sentence.

91–2. Cf. Epit. 49 *tunc cum ex auctoritate patrum inerent (sc. consules) ut in alium locum dum a mari decem milia passuum ne minus remolatum oppidum facerent, indignitatem ret ad rebellandum Carthaginenses compilerunt.* For *facere* Gronovius had conjectured *transferre,* which seems to have been the verb employed in l. 92. The embassy of the Carthaginians mentioned in ll. 90–1 came to Rome (cf. Epit. *legati triginta Romam venerunt* per *quos se Carthaginenses dederunt*); but the demand to evacuate Carthage was made by the consuls after reaching Africa, and if *redierunt* refers to the return of the ambassadors to Carthage, the statement of the papyri is inaccurate. It is more likely that
redierunt refers to the renewal of the war. ma after transferr'e may well be a mistake for in. The whole phrase would then be an antithesis to in dedicacionem venerunt in l. 91.

93—5. The subject of pepulerunt must be the Carthaginians, since the siege began with the repulse of the Romans. Lines 94—5 refer to the distinction gained by Scipio Aemilianus in the early engagements; cf. Epit. 49 and Appian, Pun. 98—9.

95—7. This refers to the occasion on which Scipio saved the Roman army at Nepheris; cf. Epit. and Appian, Pun. 102—3.

97—8. Who this Charidemus was is unknown. pos is possibly poetam.

98—100. Cf. Epit. The prosecution of Galba is described more fully. In l. 99 either productus agreeing with Galba, or producti agreeing with fili may be read.

101. Unless Philippus is an error for Persei, Reid is probably right in correcting 'iii se Philippi to Per' se Philippum; cf. Epit. Persei se filium serens et mutulo nomine Philippus voculus . . . totam Macedoniam aut voluntate incolentium aut armis occupavit.

103—5. The Epitome of Book 49 ends with the description of the revolt of Macedonia, but carminibus in l. 105 strongly suggests that this passage refers to the celebration of the games of Dis at Terentum in accordance with the Sibyline books, a fact which is mentioned near the beginning of Epit. 49 Dicti patri ludi ad Terentum ex pracepto librorum Sibyllinorum facti, qui ante annum centesimum primo Punico bello quingentesimo et altero anno ab urbe condita facti erant. This is confirmed by a passage in Censorinus, De die natali 17, 8, to which our attention was called by Kornemann and Wissowa, de quartorbus ludorum anno triplici sententia est. Anias enim et Varro et Livius relatos esse prodiderunt L. Marcio Censorino, M. Manilio consultibus post Romam conditam anno sexcentesimo quinto. at Piso Censorius et Cn. Gellius sed et Cassius Hemina qui illo tempore vivebat post annum factos tertium affirmant Cn. Cornelio Lentulo, L. Mummio Achaico consultibus, id est anno sexcentesimo octavo. in quaddecim virorum autem commentariorum notatur sub anno sexcentesimo vicesimo octavo Mam. Aemilio Lepido, L. Aurelio Oreste consultibus. The restorations of ll. 103—4 are due to Wissowa, who (Religion und Kultur der Römer, p. 364) considers that Livy's date for the games (b.c. 149) is wrong, and that Cassius Hemina was right in assigning them to b.c. 146.

107—8. Cf. Epit. 50 Thessalia cum et illam invadere armis atque occupare Pseudo-philippus vellet per legatos Romanorum auxilis Achaorum defensa est.

109. Possibly the death of Cato was referred to here, this being the only place in the papyrus where a mention of it can be inserted. That event is referred to this year by Cicero (Brut. 15), and cf. l. 56 where Catone is corrupted into lanalone.

110. The death of Prusias is noticed in Epit. If Prusias in l. 109 is right, positus is probably corrupt for some word meaning 'killed' (?oceius, cf. l. 123); but (de)positus is just possible, for Prusias seems to have been first abandoned by his subjects (Justin 34. 4). depono in the sense of 'depose' is however not classical. Kornemann would retain positus and supply Nicomedes in l. 109.

110—5. The embassy which gave rise to the jest of Cato is also mentioned in the Epitome immediately after the death of Prusias, though the incident took place in Prusias' lifetime.

Line 111 is very corrupt. si before sunt must be the termination of a participle such as miss'; but what is pugnamenta? Pergamonus is not very satisfactory since the mention of Pergamus seems unnecessary after ad Altalum regem. The names of the ambassadors are given only by Polybius (37. 1') as Marcus Licinius (gouty), Aulus Mancinus (broken head), and Lucius Malleolus (the fool). The last name can now be corrected to Manlius, which is meant by Manilius in the papyrus as is shown by the cognomen Volso (Vulso). The Manlii Vulsones were a distinguished patrician family in
the earlier part of the republic, and members of it were consuls as late as B.C. 189 and 178. *Marco* in l. 111 is probably *Marcus* followed by the first part of another name which was more probably a cognomen (cf. Archias) than Licinius.

The first half of l. 113 seems to be corrupt. *ä* may be the termination of *testä* (cf. Polybius, l. c. κεραμίδος εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔπεσόντα); but a participle is also required, and even if there were space for it before *testä* the order of *capite ... quondam* would be awkward.

115-6. This event is omitted in the Epitome. Should *deprehensi* be corrected to *deprehensus*, and some word like *repulsäm* be supplied? A certain tribune C. Scantinius Capitolinus was accused of *stuprum* by M. Claudius Marcellus, as aedile, in B.C. 222 (Val. Max. vi. 1. 7; cf. Plutarch, *Vit. Marc. 2*), but the Marcus Scantinius here must be different. As Warde Fowler remarks, it seems very unlikely that there were two Scantinii condemned for *stuprum*, one in B.C. 208, the other in B.C. 149, and that there should also be a *Lex Scantinia* on the same offence, of which the date is unknown (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, p. 703). He therefore thinks that the present passage refers to the passing of the *Lex Scantinia*, and that *ä* is corrupt for the termination of *plebiscitum*, while in *stupro deprehensi* is for *de in stupro deprehens*.

118-21. 'Masinissa dying in extreme old age left four children, and his kingdom was divided by Ae米兰ianus among the elder sons.' Cf. Epit. *Masinissa Numidiae rex maior nonaginta annis decepit ... adae etiam in seneclam viguit ut post sextum et octogesimum annum filium genuerit.* inter tres liberis eius, maximum natu Miciptsam, Gulussam, Mastanabalem ... P. Scipio Aemilianus ... partes administrandi regni divisit. The fourth legitimate son who received no share of the kingdom was no doubt the one born when his father was 86; but other writers differ from Livy regarding the number of Masinissa's children. The death of Masinissa is placed by Mommsen at the end of B.C. 149, but according to the papyrus it took place early in B.C. 148.


122-3. Cf. Epit. *Carthaginienses Hasdrubalem Masinissae nepotem ... proditiónis suspectum in curia occiderunt.* Appian (Pun. 111) in describing the death of Hasdrubal uses the equivalent of *subsidium* οἱ δὲ τιττωνες αὐτῶ τοῖς ἵπποβάτοις κατιβαλον. *ä* is very likely *fragmentum* in some form. Kornemann aptly compares Orosius, iv. 22. 8 *Asdrubal ... subsidiorum fragmentis ... occiit est.*

123-4. Cf. Epit. *P. Scipio Aemilianus cum aedilitatem pateret ... legibus solutus et consul creatus est.*

125. The Epitome is more explicit: *M. Mamilius aliquot urbes circumpositis Carthaginis expugnavit.*


127-9. The burning of the *sacarium* is not mentioned in Epit., but is explained, as Kornemann and Wissowa point out, by Obsequens 19 (78) *vaso incendio Romæ cum regia quoque urretur, sacarium et ex duabus altera lauris ex mediis ignibus inviolata extulerunt*, upon which passage the restorations of ll. 128-9 are based. *soci* is corrupt, possibly for *Opis*.

130. The blank space between ll. 128 and 131 is barely sufficient for two intervening lines, and there is the further difficulty that the letters of the books are elsewhere placed near the middle of the line, so that the termination of the title ought to have been visible here. But since verbs are generally placed at the end of the sentence in the papyrus
innovata or an equivalent is required for l. 129, and to suppose the omission of the title 'liber li' and to assign ll. 131-143 to the 50th Book would introduce a serious conflict between the papyrus and the extant Epitome with regard to the arrangement of Books 50-53. If the title therefore of Book 51 was omitted, this was probably a mere accident.

132-4. This passage is very corrupt. No Appius is known in connexion with the operations at Carthage at this period. crudelissime suggests that Appius is a mistake for Hasdrubal, and that ll. 132-3 refer to the cruelty of Hasdrubal towards the Roman prisoners described by Appian (Pun. 118). 135-6. Cf. Epit. quod legati populi Romani ab Achaenis pulsati sint Corinthi. The Achaean praetor referred to was CritoIamus.

136. The simplest correction for subalti is subacti, but no victory over the Lusitanians at this period is known. Appian (Iber. 60-1) passes straight from the treachery of Galba (cf. ll. 83 and 98) to the defeats of Vetilius and Plautius (cf. ll. 146-8, note). The Epitome does not mention Spanish affairs in this book, but gives an account of Viriathus' earlier successes in Book 52. If however there was really a victory over the Lusitanians in b.c. 147 the explanation may be as follows. The reverse sustained by Vetilius recorded by Appian (Iber. 61) is represented as the direct and immediate result of a preliminary success obtained by the Romans, but it is not unlikely that Appian has combined the events of two separate campaigns by Vetilius into one and that Lusitani subacti here refers to his success, while his reverse took place in the next year, b.c. 146; cf. ll. 146-8, note. The papyrus mentions only one defeat by the Lusitanians.

138. The destruction of Carthage is mentioned in the Epitome before the attack upon the embassy at Corinth, but owing to the strictly chronological system adopted by the author of the papyrus it is here correctly placed in b.c. 146.

139-43. These lines, as Kornemann and Reid suggest, probably refer to the story of the death of Hasdrubal's wife, who first threw her two children into the flames; cf. Epit. 51. 145. Cf. Epit. Corinthon ex senatus consullo diruit.

146. uxore: probably, as Kornemann remarks, this entry refers to the death of Diaeus by poison after killing his wife; cf. Pausan. vii. 16. 2-4, Zonaras ix. 86, Auctor de vir. ill. 60. 147-8. a Lusitanis clades accepta (cf. l. 175) may refer to the defeats of Vetilius and C. Plautius mentioned in Epit., or to one of them; cf. note on l. 136. 150. A certain C. Petronius who was an ambassador to Attalus and Prusias in b.c. 156 is mentioned in Polyb. 32. 26, but no M. Petronius is known at this period.

151. adversus: this probably refers to the dispatch of the consul Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus against Viriathus; cf. Epit. 52 tantumque terroris is hostis intulit ut adversus eum consulari opus esset et duce et exercitu, and note on l. 167. If the reverse mentioned in l. 148 (cf. ll. 147-8, note) refers to Vetilius, possibly the defeat of Plautius occurred in b.c. 145, instead of 146, as has been generally supposed.

153. L. Metellus is perhaps the brother of Quintus and the consul in b.c. 142; cf. l. 167, note. But the mention of consulatum suggests a reference to the two failures of Q. Metellus' candidature for the consulship before he obtained it for b.c. 143, and Kornemann is probably right in regarding L. as a mistake for Q. On the confusion of the two brothers cf. notes on ll. 164-6 and 167. For invisus plebi cf. Auct. de viris illust. 61 invisus plebi ob nimiam severitatem et ideo post duas repulsas consul agere factus.

161-3. Reid is no doubt right in connecting this passage with the story told by Valerius Maximus (v. i. 5) of Rhoeotogenes' children, to save whom Q. Metellus abandoned the siege of a town in Spain.

164-6. This passage, elucidated by Reid and Wissowa, clearly refers to the two exploits of Q. Occius (cf. l. 186) in Spain recorded by Val. Max. (iii. 2. 21), whose account
of the second is *idem Pyressum* (v. l. *Pyressedum*) nobilitate ac virtute Celtiberos omnes praestantem... succumbere sibi coegit; nec erubuit flagrantissimi pectoris iunvi gladium et suum et sagulum... tradere. Ille vero etiam petiti ut hospitii iure inter se iuncti essent... This corresponds to *a Tyressio, &c.; occidit in l. 164* belongs to the story of the first exploit (the killing of a Celtiberian warrior) described in the lost column. In Val. Max. *sagulum* is coupled with *gladium*, but the order of words in ll. 164–5 indicates that *saguloque remisso* is an ablative absolute and *sagulique* is not to be altered to *sagulumque*. With regard to the name of the Celtiberian, the form *Tyressius* found in l. 164 is supported by Orosius v. 8. 1 (a reference which we owe to Dr. Greenidge), where a *Celticus princeps* called *Thyressus* is mentioned in connexion with the pacification of Spain after the fall of Numantia. Clearly the same name, and very likely the same person are meant, so that the MSS. of Val. Max. are probably wrong in giving the forms *Pyressus* or *Pyressedum*. There is also a slight divergence between the papyrus and Val. Max. concerning the date of Q. Occius’ achievements, which the former assigns to b.c. 142 while Val. Max. represents Q. Occius as *Q. Metello consulti legatus*, thus indicating the year b.c. 143. Since Q. Occius in any case remained in Spain until b.c. 140 (l. 186) and Q. Metellus was there in both b.c. 143 and 142 (l. 167, note) the inconsistency is trifling, but *Q. Metello consulti* may easily be a mistake for *L. Metello consuli* or *Q. Metello proconsuli*; cf. notes on ll. 153–6 and 167.

167. This fact that L. Metellus, consul in b.c. 142, went to Spain and was there defeated by the Lusitanians is new, and is the first of a series of references to the war against Viriathus which throw much light on its history. Owing to the extreme brevity of the extant Epitome of Books 53 and 54 the principal authority has hitherto been Appian, whose account of the Spanish war is preserved in a single very corrupt codex. The generally received chronology from b.c. 143–37, e.g. that of Mommsen, is as follows:—b.c. 143. Q. Caecilius Metellus, governor of Northern Spain, is successful, but the praetor Quinctius, governor of Southern Spain, is defeated by Viriathus.

b.c. 142. Q. Metellus as proconsul continues to be successful. Q. Fabius Maximus Serrilianus, consul, who succeeded Quinctius in Southern Spain according to Appian (*Iber. 67*), invades Lusitania, but is compelled to retreat.

b.c. 141. Q. Fabius Maximus as proconsul is at first victorious, but is afterwards defeated and compelled to conclude a disgraceful peace. Q. Pompeius, consul, the new governor of Northern Spain, is also defeated.

b.c. 140. Q. Caepio, consul, the new governor of Southern Spain, invades Lusitania. (The death of Viriathus is placed in this year by e.g. Peter, *Zeitlotheln*, p. 69.) Q. Pompeius remains as proconsul in Northern Spain.

b.c. 139. Viriathus is killed at the instigation of Q. Caepio, who remains in Southern Spain as proconsul. M. Popillius, consul, became governor of Northern Spain.

b.c. 138. M. Popillius, proconsul, is defeated by the Numantines. D. Junius Brutus, consul, becomes governor of Southern Spain, and in this year and b.c. 137–6 subdues the country, and is the first Roman to cross the river Oblivio.

From this chronology the papyrus has important variations after b.c. 143, of which year the account is unfortunately lost.

b.c. 142. Victory of the Lusitanians over the consul L. Metellus, who must therefore have been governor of the Southern province. The success of his brother, Q. Metellus, in the Northern province, which is mentioned in Epit. 53, was no doubt referred to in the lost portion of the account of b.c. 142.

b.c. 140. Q. Caepio delayed in starting for his province (ll. 182-4). Q. Fabius is defeated, and concludes a disgraceful peace with Viriathus (ll. 185-6). Q. Occius distinguishes himself in an engagement with the Lusitanians, in which the Romans fell into an ambush (ll. 186-8).

b.c. 139. Death of Viriathus (ll. 197-8).

b.c. 138. Refusal of a reward to the murderers of Viriathus (ll. 201-2). Victory over the Lusitanians, and defeat by the Numantines (l. 212).

b.c. 137. D. Brutus crosses the river Oblivio (ll. 216-7).

Comparing the two arrangements, we may note that no conflict arises in connexion with events in Northern Spain, nor in b.c. 138-7 with those in Southern Spain. The death of Viriathus is assigned by the papyrus to b.c. 139, not 140, thus confirming the opinion of Mommsen; and if our conjecture in l. 147 is correct, the papyrus perhaps supports the date assigned to the defeat of Plautius. But in the years b.c. 142-0 there are marked differences between the new evidence and the received chronology. Beginning at the end, only one campaign (b.c. 139) is obtainable for the governorship of Q. Caepio instead of two (b.c. 140-39). The governorship of Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus is assigned to the years b.c. 141-0 instead of b.c. 142-1; and while the papyrus agrees with the ordinary chronology in placing his victory in b.c. 141, his defeat and the peace are assigned not to b.c. 141 but to b.c. 140. Lastly in b.c. 142 the papyrus tells us of a hitherto unknown governor of Southern Spain, the consul L. Metellus.

It will hardly be disputed that Livy’s chronology of the war against Viriathus, now that more detailed information on it is obtained, carries much more weight than that of Appian or the other still inferior authorities. It remains to investigate how far in the light of the new evidence there is a real inconsistency between Livy and the other authorities, and to explain, if possible, the origin of the divergences. As to the governorship of Caepio there is no great difficulty. The events related by Appian (Iber. 70-1) need occupy no more than one year. The fact that Valerius Maximus (ix. 6. 4) and Eutropius (iv. 16) speak of Caepio as consul when Viriathus was assassinated, and therefore assign his principal campaign in Spain to b.c. 140 instead of b.c. 139, is of trifling importance in the face of the explanation afforded by the papyrus (ll. 182-4) of his delay in starting. Moreover, although the campaign in the summer of b.c. 140 was conducted by Fabius Maximus Servilianus, Caepio may well have arrived in Spain before the end of the year. The reason why two years have hitherto been assigned to his governorship was that he had to occupy the interval between Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus and D. Brutus, and that the former of these had been assigned to b.c. 142-1.

Nor does the transference of Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus’ governorship to b.c. 141-0 produce any serious conflict with other statements. That Livy assigned these two years to him rather than b.c. 142-1 might have been guessed from the extant Epitome, for he was consul in b.c. 142, yet Epit. 53 mentions his successes as proconsul, and Epit. 54 (ad fin.) his defeat. But these indications that Fabius was already proconsul when he became governor of Southern Spain—a fact which is made quite clear by the papyrus—were disregarded, partly owing to the statement of Orosius (v. 4) that Fabius in his consulship (i.e. in b.c. 142) fought against Viriathus, partly owing to an inference from Appian, Iber. 67, where the opening words τούτ’ ἐπίστατος ἑτούς Κοῦτρω μὲν ὁ ἀδελφὸς Λιμιλαίονος Φάβιος Μάκιμος Σερονυλαῖος (Λιμιλαίου ΜΣ.) ἦλθαν ἐπ’ τὴν στρατηγικὰν δαίδαλος have in connexion with the preceding events been supposed to refer to b.c. 142. To leave for the moment the question which year Appian meant by τούτ’ ἑπίστατος ἑτούς, his account of Fabius Servilianus’ achievements accords well enough with that of Livy. It is true that the successes of Fabius in Appian’s account seem to belong to the later rather than to the earlier part of his
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governorship, but it is not difficult to suppose that Appian omitted to record some trifling successes such as the capture of Baccia mentioned by Orosius (I. e.), probably one of the urbes which were expugnatae according to Epit. 53; cf. ll. 171-2. Two campaigns are implied by Appian, as is more clearly stated by Livy; but Appian does not call Servilianus consul. Where the facts known from Livy conflict seriously with at any rate the present text of Appian is in the events which took place between the departure of Fabius Maximus Aemilianus and the arrival of Fabius Maximus Servilianus. The governorship of Aemilianus is expressly stated by Appian to have lasted two years (Iber. 65). Aemilianus was consul in b.c. 145, and that of his governorship were b.c. 145-4 is unquestionable; cf. Epit. 52 tantumque timoris is hostis intulit ut adversus eum consulari opus esset et duce et exercitu. The disaster to Plautius which led to sending an experienced general is, as we have said, very likely alluded to in l. 147 of the papyrus, and l. 151 may well refer to the dispatch of Aemilianus. So far as is known, Aemilianus had both Spain under his command; but who succeeded him on his departure in b.c. 143? Northern Spain at any rate seems to have fallen to the consul for b.c. 143 Q. Caecilius Metellus (cf. Val. Max. iii. 2. 21, ix. 3. 7; Appian, Iber. 76), and that he remained as proconsul in b.c. 142 is attested by Epit. 53; but the question who obtained Southern Spain is very complicated. From Val. Max. ix. 3. 7, where Q. Metellus utramque Hispaniam consul prius, deinde proconsul ... subsegisit is the reading of the MSS., it would be inferred that Metellus was governor of both Spain; but utramque has been altered by some editors to provinciam on the ground that Metellus was only governor of Northern Spain, the governorship of Southern Spain in b.c. 143 being generally assigned to Quinctius, who is supposed to have been a praetor and to have been the immediate predecessor of Fabius Servilianus on the evidence of Appian, Iber. 65-7. This passage, which is very corrupt, now requires a fresh examination in the light of the new evidence. After recounting the achievements of Fabius Aemilianus in b.c. 145 and b.c. 144, Appian proceeds (ed. Mendelssohn): καὶ τάδε μὲν ὁ Αἰμιλιανὸς (Σερουλιανὸς MS.) ἐφιγασάμενος ἐς Ρώμην ἀπέβαλε διαδεξαμένον τὴν ἀρχήν Κοίντων Πομπήιον (τοῦ) Ἀδυν. (ὁ δὲ ἄδελφος αὐτοῦ Μάξιμος Αἰμιλιανὸς MS., omitted by editors). ἐπὶ οὖν ὁ Οορίατος ὁμίλου ἐς καταφθονίων Ἀρουκαῖος καὶ Τίκθους καὶ Βῆλλους ... ἀπέτυχον ἀπὸ Ῥωμαίων, καὶ πολεμῶν Ἀλλος ἄνεθ ἔπὶ ἄνιων ἐπολύμων ἐν ἑκ πάλαισ αὐτῶν μᾶς Νομισμάτων ἐγώνυμα ... καὶ συνάξε τέκνα ἐς ὑπὲρ Ὄοριατος. Οορίατος μὲν ἐπὶ ἄλλοτρα τῆς Ἰθρίας ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίων Κοίντων (Q. Pompeio in a 16th century translation of Appian made from another MS., now lost) συνεπλέκτω, καὶ ... ἕκτεν τῶν Κοίντων ἐς (τοῦτο Κοίντου ΜΣ.) χελίους καὶ σημεία τινα ἄρα .. . Κοίντων (Κοίντου MS.) δὴ διαλωσ καὶ ἀπεριφ οὐκ ἐπιθυμηθοῦτος, ἀλλὰ ἐν Κορδήθη χειμαζοντικὸν ἐκ μέσου μεταφόρον ... τοῦ δ' ἐπιστὰς ἔτος Κοίντω (Κοίντου other editors) μὲν ὁ ἄδελφος Λιμιλιανὸς Φάβιος Μάξιμος Σερουλιανὸς (Λιμιλιανὸς MS.) ἢθεν ἐπὶ τῆν στρατηγίαν διάδοχος. From this confused and corrupt account it has been generally inferred that a praetor Quinctius succeeded Fabius Aemilianus in Southern Spain in b.c. 143, was defeated in that year, and was succeeded in b.c. 142 by Q. Fabius Servilianus. We now know that in Livy's account the governor in b.c. 142 was the consul for that year, L. Metellus, and that Fabius Servilianus became governor in b.c. 141. Assuming that Livy is right, the discrepancy may be explained in two ways: either Appian has made several mistakes in his facts or the MS. is still more deeply corrupt than it has appeared to be. On the first hypothesis Quinctius or Quintus, the supposed praetor, may he retained, for owing to the loss of a column between Cols. vi and vii of the papyrus it is uncertain who in Livy's history was the governor of Southern Spain in b.c. 143. We must however assume that Appian omitted L. Metellus altogether, thus setting the chronology wrong by a year. But considering the corruptions in the proper names in Appian, Iber. 65-7, it is, we think, far more likely that the story of the defeat of the supposed Quinctius, who appears
nowhere else in history, is a distortion of the defeat of L. Metellus mentioned by Livy. With two brothers, Q. Metellus and L. Metellus, governing the two Spains in 142 B.C. it is not at all surprising that mistakes should arise, and if Κώντος in Iber. 66–7 is a corruption of Λούκος or Καυκίλος, there will be no conflict between Livy and Appian as to the predecessor of Fabius Servilianus. Dismissing therefore the supposed Quinctius, there still remains the governorship of Southern Spain for B.C. 143 to be accounted for. The passage in Appian referring to Aemilianus’ successor Κάυντος Πομπηίου Άδων is obviously quite corrupt. The insertion of τοῦ before Αδων (Schweighauser, followed by Mendelssohn) does little to mend matters. There is no point in the mention of the father’s praenomen and there is clearly a confusion in the text between this person and the Κόντος Πομπηίου Άδων mentioned in Iber. 76. That Q. Pompeius was consul in B.C. 141 and succeeded Q. Metellus as governor of Northern Spain in the same year (cf. l. 174). His cognomen was Rufus, so that editors bracket Άδων in ch. 76. In any case this Quintus Pompeius cannot be the successor of Aemilianus in B.C. 143, and the best course seems to be to fall back on the statement of Valerius Maximus (ix. 3, 7, v. sup.) that Q. Metellus governed utramque Hispaniam. Seeing that Aemilianus governed both provinces for two years, there is not the least difficulty in supposing that his successor did the same for one, but that in the second year a separate governor was sent to the Southern province. On this hypothesis we would suggest that Κώντος Πομπηίου Δάδων in Iber. 65 is corrupt for Κάυντος Καυκίλου Μετέλλου, and that the following words δ ἄδελφος αὐτοῦ Μάξυμος Αλμιλιστός, which are simply omitted by editors, really contained a reference to the brother of Q. Metellus, L. Metellus. The sentence is in that case incomplete and the lacuna may well have supplied some details about the events of B.C. 143–2 which would have made ch. 66 much more intelligible. Our conclusion therefore is that the divergence between Livy and Appian’s account of the war against Viriathus is due less to mistakes on the part of Appian than to the extraordinary perversions of the proper names in the MS. of the Iberica, and that Appian’s chronology of this war can without much difficulty be made consistent with the newly found material.

For the sake of clearness we append in parallel columns a list of the governors of Southern Spain from B.C. 145–37 as they are known from the two epitomes of Livy, compared with the list given by Mommsen. Concerning the governors of Northern Spain there is no dispute, Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus holding office in B.C. 145–4, Q. Caecilius Metellus in B.C. 143–2, Q. Pompeius Rufus in B.C. 141–0, and M. Popillius Laenas in B.C. 139–8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Livy</th>
<th>Mommsen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>(Q. Caecilius Metellus cons.?)</td>
<td>Quinctius praetor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Q. Fab. Max. Servilianus proc.</td>
<td>Q. Servilius Caepio cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Later Q. Servilius Caepio cons.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Q. Servilius Caepio proc.</td>
<td>Q. Servilius Caepio proc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

168–9. Epit. mentions the triumph of Mummius at the end of Book 52, L. Mummius de Achaeis triumphavit, signa aerea marmoreaque et tabulas pictas in triumpho tulit. Epit. 53 begins with a mention of Appius Claudius, consul in B.C. 143; hence the triumph of Mummius has naturally been assigned to B.C. 145, the year after the destruction of Corinth.
The distribution of the works of art mentioned by the papyrus is to be connected, as Kornemann remarks, not with Mummius’ triumph, which can hardly have taken place so late as B.C. 142, but with his censorship which occurred in that year. By oppida are meant the country towns of Italy, and perhaps of the provinces as well.

171–2. On the victory of Q. Fabius (Maximus Servilianus) cf. Epit. 53 a Q. Fabio proconsule pars magna Lusitaniae expugnatis aliquot urbis recepta est, and, for the chronology, l. 167, note.

174. This defeat of Q. Pompeius by the Numantines agrees with the received chronology; cf. Epit. 54 ad inst. and l. 167, note. For d\textsuperscript{e}vir\textsuperscript{i}us cf. l. 185.

175. The defeat of the Romans by the Scordisci, a Pannonian tribe, is a new fact. The Roman commander may have been the other consul, Gn. Caepio.

176. The corruption of Sapiente into Salasso seems to be due to a reminiscence of the campaign of Appius Claudius against the Salassi in B.C. 143; cf. Epit. 53.

177–8. What was this obviously important measure due to Appius Claudius, one of the most striking figures at this period? The papyrus fails us at the most critical point, and in the absence of any other reference to this reform, we are reduced to conjectures. We have adopted in l. 177 duos [\textit{delectus}], a suggestion of Mr. Warde Fowler based on \textit{duo stipendia} proposed by Dr. Greenidge. The old Roman system of a single annual levy in which the soldiers swore allegiance to a general for a single campaign could not survive the growth of Rome as a world-city, and though the successive modifications which were introduced in the later period of the Republic cannot be clearly traced, it is in itself likely enough that the wars of the third and second centuries B.C. had led to the occasional or frequent holding of levies twice instead of once in the year. Such an attempt to frustrate the constant demands of the generals as we have attributed to Appius Claudius does not seem improbable, and may even be connected with the refusal of the senate a few years later to send Scipio the reinforcements which he asked for at Numantia.

178–81. Cf. Epit. 54, where the incident of the condemnation of Silanus by his father is related more fully.

182–4. These lines are very corrupt, and in the absence of any parallel account of the incident it is difficult to restore them in entirety. So much is clear that the consul Q. Caepio’s departure for Spain was delayed by the interpellation of a tribune, but that Caepio successfully overcame the obstacle. It was doubtless owing to this episode that Caepio arrived in Spain late in the year after the defeat of Fabius Maximus (l. 185–6); cf. l. 167, note. Assilium is for Asellum; cf. Gell. 3. 4, where a tribune called Claudius Asellus is mentioned as having accused the younger Scipio Africanus postquam de Poenis triumphaverat censorque fuerat. Since Scipio was censor in B.C. 142 (Fast. Capitol.), B.C. 140 is very suitable as the year of Asellus’ tribunate. \textit{Reddeterruit} is probably for \textit{deterruit}, and if \textit{lictores} is right \textit{trigem} probably represents a participle ending in \textit{ens}, e.g. \textit{adhibens}. Omitting \textit{indelegem}, which is hopeless, the passage may be restored thus: \textit{Quintus Caepio consul ... Tiberium Claudium Asellum tribunum plebis interpellantem professionem suam lictores ... ens deterruit}. What form the interpellation took is not clear. Did the tribune veto the Lex Curia conferre imperium upon the consul? Possibly, as Greenidge suggests, he tried to prevent the consul from taking out his troops, as in Sall. \textit{Jug.} 39 \textit{consul impeditus a tribunis plebis ne quas paraverat copias secum portaret}. From the mention of the lictors it seems that Caepio actually ventured to retaliate by using force of some kind.

185–6. On the date of Fabius’ defeat see l. 167, note.

186–7. Valerius Maximus (iii. 2. 21) relates two exploits of Q. Occius; cf. l. 164–6, note. The present incident is one of the \textit{reliqua eius opera} which Valerius Maximus passes over.
188–90. A verb such as *pugnavit* is wanted at the beginning of l. 188, and there is then no room for more than two or three letters before *vinae*. Probably *devola est* is to be connected with *aqua Anio* (cf. ll. 111 and 116, where the verb does not come at the end of the sentence), and *aqua Marcia* begins a fresh sentence. On the repair of the *aqua Anio* and the construction of the *aqua Marcia* see Frontinus, *De Aquaeuctibus* i. 7. He there states that in B.C. 144 the praetor Marcus Rex was commissioned to repair the Appian and Aniensian aqueducts and to construct a new one, his praetorship being extended for a year on that account. Then follows a passage which is much corrupted in the editions of Frontinus, and which we quote from the reproduction of the best MS. in C. Herschell’s edition: *eo tempore decemviri dum aliis ex causis libros Sibyllinos inspicienti invenisse dicuntur* (space in MS.; supply fas) *aquam Martiam seu potius Anienem, de hoc enim constantius traditur, in Capitolium perduci, deque ea re in senatu M. Lepido pro collegio verba faciente actum Appio Claudio Q. Caecilio consulibus* (B.C. 143); *eodemque post annum tertium a Lucio Lentulo retractatam C. Lacio Q. Servilio consulibus* (B.C. 140), *sed utroque tempore viissce gratiam Marcii Regis atque iia in Capitolium esse aquam perductam*. Frontinus’ statements about the construction of the *aqua Marcia* are thus in complete accord with Livy, from whose history they were no doubt derived. But what is the meaning of *seu potius Anienem, de hoc enim constantius traditur*, and has this anything to do with the mention of the *aqua Anio* in l. 188? That passage in the papyrus is unfortunately extremely obscure. If *devola est* is correct, it must mean that the Anio aqueduct was consecrated to some deity; but *devola* does not seem the right word, and it is more likely to be corrupt, possibly for some word like *renovata* or *refecta*. The *aqua Marcia* began not far from Tibur, the water being apparently taken from a tributary of the river Anio from which the *aqua Anio* was also derived. But the two aqueducts were quite distinct, and *seu potius Anienem, de hoc enim constantius traditur* seems, as Reid remarks, to indicate that there were two interpretations of the oracle, one permitting the *aqua Anio* to be brought to the Capitol, the other the *aqua Marcia*, but the general opinion was in favour of the former interpretation; cf. the statement in l. 189 that the construction of the *aqua Marcia* was *contra Sibyllae carmina*. Since Frontinus implies that the *aqua Anio* was not carried up to the Capitol, to read in ll. 189–90 *aqua Anio (et) aqua Marcia in Capitolium ... perductae* is unsatisfactory, apart from the difficulty of placing a stop after *devola est*.

192. Probably the scribe wrote *urbetilia* meaning *urbe et Italia*; cf. Val. Max. i. 3. 2 C. Cornelius Hispallius praetor peregrinus M. Popilio Laenate Cn. Calpurnio cos. edicto Chaldaeos intra decimum diem abire ex urbe atque Italia iussit*, a passage no doubt based upon Livy.

193–4. On the *Lex Gabinia tabellaria* see Cic. Legg. iii. 35. Cicero says that it was *lata ab homine ignoto et sordido*, which confirms the present reference to Gabinius’ base ancestry. What degree of relationship to the *verna* was alleged by Livy is uncertain. *vernæ filius* is unlikely, for the son of a slave could not be made tribune, and though two cases at least of a son of a freedman becoming tribune are known (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, i. p. 460), the phrase *vernæ filius* does not suggest the meaning ‘son of freedman’ or ‘of a freedwoman,’ though perhaps not incompatible with it. *vernæ nepos* is better, but of course some more indefinite word may have been employed. It has been generally supposed that A. Gabinius the tribune was the son of the Gabinii who held a command in Illyria under L. Anicius in B.C. 167 (Livy 45. 26); but this is quite uncertain.

195–6. As Warde Fowler suggests, it is probable that these two lines refer to the mutiny of Caepio’s cavalry mentioned by Dio (Fr. 78 Boissevain), in consequence of his apportioning to them a specially dangerous operation. Caepio had to take refuge from
their violence in flight, and with this clue the passage may be restored on the lines which we have suggested. Since a nail is not a very effective weapon of attack, *clavo* may be altered to *clava*, a ‘cudgel’ or ‘foil.’ Reid well compares Oros. v. 9 *clavae etu* (of Tiberius Gracchus’ death).

197-8. The names of the murderers of Viriathus are not given in Epit., but occur in Appian, *Iber. 74*, where they agree with the papyrus, and in Diodorus exc. c. 24, where Nikorones is found instead of Minurus.

201. For the refusal of a reward to Viriathus’ murderers cf. Dio, Fr. 80, and Eutropius, iv. 16. Appian (*Iber. 74*) mentions the bribe, but not the refusal, διαβδαρέως ὑπὸ τοῦ Καπίωνος δόρος τε μεγάλος καὶ ὑποχώσει πολλαί. The Epitome does not mention either, but has *Viriathus a proditoris consilio Servilii Caepionis interfactus est*. From the fact that the refusal took place in the year after Viriathus’ death it clearly came from the senate; and if there is any truth in the story of Dio and Eutropius about the answer given to the murderers that the Romans did not approve of a general being killed by his own soldiers, this must have been made by the senate, not, as they state, by Caepio.

202-5. Cf. Epit. 55 P. Nasica, cui cognomen Serapion fuit ab irritante Curiaio tribuno plebis impositum, et D. Iunio Bruto consultibus detectum habentibus in conspectu tironum res saluberrimi exempli facta est: nam C. Matienus accusatus est apud tribunos plebis quod exercitum in Hispania deserisset, damnatusque sub furca diu virgis caesus est, et sestertio nummo venit. tribuni plebis guia non impetrarent ut sibi denos quos vellent milites extimere liceret, consules in carcerem duci usserunt. The papyrus presents several new details. In the first place the condemnation of deserters (ll. 207-9) comes after the dispute with the tribunes, not before it. Besides the probable mention of Curiatus, to whom Cicero (*Legg.* iii. 9) assigns the responsibility for throwing the consuls into prison, the papyrus names another tribune, Licinius, thus justifying the plural *tribuni* in Epit. From l. 205 it appears that the imprisonment was unpopular and that the tribunes had to yield. For the use of *multa* by Livy in the general sense of ‘penalty’ cf. 24. 16. In l. 202 *Scipio* enim is very doubtful. There may have been some corruption as in the case of *Decimini Brutum* in l. 203.

205-7. (ab) *omnibus luctus* seems a better correction of *omnib. lucti* than *omnibus luctui*, though whether Livy would have used *luctus* is doubtful; cf. note on l. 110. These lines refer to the death in B.C. 138 of a popular tribune who ‘having done much for the good of the people expired amid universal regret.’ His name was given at the end of l. 209. It would be expected that this individual was important enough to be known to history, and, as Warde Fowler and Reid suggest, there may well be a connexion between ll. 205-7 and a passage in Pliny (*H. N.* xxii. 10) *florum quidem populus Romanus honorem Scipioni tantum habuit*. Whether by *Serapio* Pliny meant Scipio Nasica Corculum, the consul of B.C. 162 and 155, or his son, the consul of B.C. 138, in either case the statement that he died as tribune is an extraordinary error. It is very significant that the papyrus also mentions the death of a popular tribune immediately after a mention of Scipio Nasica the younger, and, as Warde Fowler remarks, if something like *Nasicae filius* or *frater* be restored at the end of l. 205 and Pliny’s *Serapio* be the same person, the difficulties in the Pliny passage would be largely reduced.

207-9. *co.] may be the beginning of a short sentence complete in itself. If it is connected with ll. 208-9, it probably refers to the part taken by the consuls in the punishment of the deserters. On this cf. the passage from Epit. 55 quoted in ll. 202-5, note, where only one individual, C. Matienus, is mentioned. Frontinus, however (*Strateg.*
iv. i. 20), agrees with the papyrus, qui exercitum deseruerant damnati, virgis caesi publice venierunt. sesteriis singulis is equivalent to sesterio nummo singuli.

210-1. It is probable that these lines refer to the famous accusation of L. Aurelius Cotta by Scipio Aemilianus. This resulted in the acquittal of the accused because the judges did not wish the influence of Scipio to appear too overwhelming, if we may believe Cicero, Pro Murena 58 saepe hoc maiores natu dicere audivi hanc accusatoris eximiam dignitatem plurimum L. Collae profuisse. noluerunt sapientissimi homines qui tum illam iudicabant ita quemquam cadere in iudicio ut nimir adversarii viribus abiectus videretur (cf. Divin. in Caec. 21), though Appian (Bell. Civ. i. 22) is probably right in saying that bribery was employed. (propter) magnitudinem noniinis would accord very well with the eximia dignitas of Cicero. The objection to this interpretation is that Cicero (Pro Mur. and Divin. in Caecil. locc. cilt.) says that Aemilianus had been twice consul when he brought the accusation, and the second consulship of Aemilianus was in b.c. 134 while the event recorded in the papyrus took place in b.c. 138. Against the evidence of Cicero, however, must be set the circumstance that in the earliest editions (based on the Codex Sangallensis, now lost) of the commentary of Pseudo-Asconius upon that passage in the Divin. ad Caecil. occurs the remark L. Collam P. Africanus ante secundum consulatum et censuram dictur accusasse. Other MSS. of Pseudo-Asconius have post instead of ante, and post has generally been regarded as correct, though the remark is then rather pointless since it simply repeats the statement of Cicero. But the agreement between the papyrus and one version of Pseudo-Asconius is remarkable, though it is difficult to believe that Pseudo-Asconius can be right in placing the trial before Scipio's censorship, which took place in b.c. 142. The question is further complicated by the uncertainty regarding the nature of the accusations made against Cotta and the official standing in which he had rendered himself liable to them. Was he the consul of b.c. 144 or the consul of b.c. 119 (so Jahn in his note on Cic. Brut. 81)? If the former, the date which the papyrus suggests for the trial, b.c. 138, is more suitable than Cicero's. If the latter, then Cicero's date is the more probable, for the younger Cotta might well have been praetor about b.c. 133-29, and his insignificance would suit the peculiar feature of the case which seems to have impressed itself upon the popular imagination.

On the whole, in spite of the evidence of Appian who connects the acquittal of Cotta with C. Gracchus' law de iudiciis, and the circumstance that Cicero mentions it (Divin. in Caecil. loc. cilt.) together with the trial of Aquilius which certainly seems to have taken place after Scipio's return from Numantia, we incline to the view not only that Livy placed the trial of Cotta in b.c. 138 but that he was right in so doing. Cicero, in the Pro Murena passage at any rate, had a point to make which would be helped by assigning the trial to the period after Scipio's second consulship, and it is not difficult to suppose him guilty of a chronological error in a speech. Moreover, the commentary of Pseudo-Asconius seems to indicate that there were ancient doubts as to Cicero's correctness on this matter; and if Livy was right with regard to the date of the trial, L. Cotta was probably the consul of b.c. 144, who, as Valerius Maximus states (vi. 4. 2), was in that year prevented by Scipio from going to Lusitania, and against whom Scipio may well have continued to bear a grudge.

212. Lusitani vastati: the proceedings of D. Junius Brutus in Southern Spain are meant; cf. Epit. 55 Junius Bruthus consul in Hispania iis qui sub Viriatho militaverant agros et oppidum dedit, quod Valentia vocatum est, Appian, Iber. 71, and notes on ll. 167 and 216-7.

a Numantinis clades accepta: for the restoration cf. l. 175. The allusion is to the defeat of M. Popilius; cf. Epit., which is more detailed, and l. 167, note.
213-4. Cf. Epit. which is longer in its account of Antiochus' death but mentions it at the end of the book after the successes of Brutus, and omits the detail that Diodotus took possession of Syria. The year to which Antiochus' death is referred by the papyrus (b.c. 138) conflicts with the date (b.c. 143-2) recently proposed by Niese (Gesch. d. gr. u. mak. St. iii. p. 283), chiefly on the evidence of coins.


218-25. This fragment which was gummed on to Col. iv probably, if Sullanis is correct, belonged to a much later book.

226-32. This fragment was gummed on to Col. v.

669. Metrological Work.

17.5 x 15.3 cm.

On the recto of this papyrus are parts of two columns of an account of corn, mentioning the second = first and third = second years, i.e. of Diocletian and Maximian (A.D. 285-6 and 286-7). On the verso, written in a cursive hand not more than a few years later than the writing on the recto, are parts of two columns of a series of metrological tables concerning measures of length and area. As in the contemporary metrological fragment from Oxyrhynchus (θ verso) the spelling is bad, and from the unsystematic way in which the details are arranged they seem to be private memoranda compiled from a larger treatise. Lines 1-4 deal with the σχοινίων, the measure of length usually employed in land-surveys, of which the square was the aurora. In ll. 5-8 we have a general description of cubits arranged according to the three dimensions of space; ll. 9-10 treat of the οἰκοπέδικοι πηχεία, a peculiar kind of cubit which differed from the three previously mentioned, and ll. 11-24 of the measurements and uses of the ξυλον. Col. ii begins with a list of measures of length in which Graeco-Egyptian and Roman names are, as would be expected at this period, mixed (ll. 26-30). There follows (ll. 30-42) a table of the sizes of these from the δάκτυλος or παλαιότης to the δέκαπε' or perhaps δίμα. Then begins another section describing the δάκτυλος, in the middle of which the papyrus breaks off. In both columns the lines are incomplete, and it is impossible in some cases to fill up the lacunae; but the papyrus usefully supplements the existing evidence concerning the σχοινίων and οἰκοπέδικοι πηχεία, and provides some interesting new information about the names and length of different kinds of πηχεία used in Egypt. The section dealing with the ξυλον, most of which can be restored with
certainty, not only shows that there were two kinds of ξύλα which stood to each other in the ratio of 9 : 8, but provides an important indication of the size of that much discussed measure, the ναύβιον, which was probably a cubic ξύλον; cf. note on ll. 11–20.

It is to be hoped that the whole subject of Graeco-Egyptian metrology will soon be rehandled by a new writer. The Metrologie of Hultsch is now antiquated, and the recent articles of the veteran metrologist in the Archiv für Papyrusforschung and Abhand. d. kön. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss. 1903: Die Ptolemätischen Münz- und Rechnungswerte, show an inability to appreciate the new evidence of papyri.

Col. i.

[ἔχει τὸ σχοινίον] τὸ γεωμετρικὸν ὁγδόα η,
[τὸ δὲ ὁγδόον ἔχει] πῆχις ἅβ, δοτε ἔχειν τὸ
[σχοινίον τὸ γεωμετρικὸν πηχῶν ὑφ.]
[τὸ δὲ ............ ὑκὸν ἑστιν πηχῶν ρ.

5 [ὁ εὐθυμετρικὸς πῆχεῖς ἑστιν ὁ κατὰ
[μῆκος μόνον] μετροῦμενος, ἐμβαδικός
[δὲ ὁ κατὰ μῆκος καὶ πλάτος, στερεὸς δὲ ὁ κα-
[τὰ μῆκος καὶ πλάτος καὶ βάθος ἦται υψός.
[ὁ ............... ] s (ο)ἰκοπεδικὸς πῆχις ἔ-

10 [χει ἐμβαδικοῦς πηχὶς ρ.
[τὸ δὲ ἕξυλοφ καταμετρ[τα]'],' τὸ ναύβια: τὸ μὲν βα-
[σιλικὸν ἑστὶ πηχῶν γ,]
[παλαιστῶν ] ιη,]
[δακτύλων ] οβ.

15 [τὸ δὲ ............ ἑστιν πηχῶν ββ',
[παλαιστῶν ] ις,]
[δακτύλων ] ξδ.
[δοτε ἔχειν τὸ σχοινίον] τὸ γεωμετρικὸν
[ἔχει πασιλικὰ ] λβ,]

20 [ἔχει ......... ] λς.
[......... τετραγώνου ἔχει ἔξυλον α,]
[......... ] α,
[......... πῆχεῖς γ,
The schoenium used in land-survey has 8 eighths, and the eighth has 12 cubits, so that the schoenium used in land-survey has 96 cubits, while the ... schoenium has
100 cubits. The linear cubit is that which is measured by length alone, the plane cubit is that which is measured by length and breadth; the solid cubit is that which is measured by length and breadth and depth or height. The ... building cubit contains 100 plane cubits. Naûba are measured by the εύλον; the royal εύλον contains 3 cubits, 18 πολυσταί, 72 δάκτυλα, while the ... εύλον contains 2 3/8 cubits, 16 πολυσταί and 64 δάκτυλα; so that the schoenium used in land-survey contains 32 royal εύλα and 36 ... εύλα.

31-41. '2 πολυσταί make a λιχάς, 3 πολυσταί a στβημή, 4 πολυσταί an (Egyptian?) foot, 5 a cloth-weaver's cubit ... 6 πολυσταί a public and a carpenter's cubit, 7 πολυσταί a Nilometric cubit, 8 πολυσταί a ... cubit, 10 πολυσταί a βήμα, which is the distance of the outstretched feet. 3 cubits make a public εύλον, 4 cubits an ἀργώνa, which is the distance of the outstretched hands. ... cubits make a κάθμος, 6 2/3 an ἀκῶν.'

1-4. On this σχοινίον, which was unknown when Hultsch wrote his *Metrologie*, see Kenyon, P. Brit. Mus. II. p. 130, and P. Tebt. I. p. 386. The details of the papyrus exactly fit the previous evidence, which was that the σχοινίον corresponded to the ancient Egyptian measure κητ or κητ nnuh of 100 royal cubits, but nevertheless was divided into the series 3 3/8, 1 1/3 and so on like the aoura. The papyrus now shows that in surveying land the σχοινίον was sometimes treated as having 96 cubits, probably for the sake of convenient fractions, but that there was also a σχοινίον of 100 cubits. The name of the latter in I. 4 may be οἰκοπεδικόν. The ratio of these two σχοινία of 96 and 100 cubits corresponds, as Mr. Smyly remarks, to the ratio of 24:25 between two kinds of cubits in Roman times; cf. note on ll. 34-5.

9-10. The οἰκοπεδικός πῆχυς was supposed by A. Peyron (P. Taur. I. pp. 133-6) to be a parallelogram measuring 100 cubits by 1 cubit. His explanation, which has been accepted by all editors, is now confirmed by the papyrus, which states that an οἰκοπεδικός πῆχυς contained 100 square cubits. The adjective lost in the lacuna is very likely περίστατον which is found in P. Brit. Mus. 119 and Wilcken, *Ost. II.* 1301 before πῆχυς as a measure of area. But how the abbreviation is to be resolved is uncertain. Wilcken (*Ost. I.* p. 780) suggests περιστατοτικός: περιστατικός seems to us more likely.

11-20. The restoration of this important passage, though at first sight it may seem rather hazardous, is really practically certain. It is clear from το μέν in l. 11 that the figures in ll. 12-4 are contrasted with those in ll. 15-7, and since those in ll. 12 and 15 refer to πῆχυς, those in ll. 13 and 16 must refer to πολυσταί, of which there were 6 in an ordinary πῆχυς (cf. ll. 34-5), and those in ll. 14 and 17 to δάκτυλοι of which 4 make a πολυσταί. This being granted, the figures in ll. 12-7 refer to a measure of length, and the substantive to be supplied with το μέν cannot be ναύβος, which is known to be a measure of cubic capacity. There is only one measure of length known to have contained 3 πῆχες, and that is the εύλον (l. 38), and though no εύλον of 2 3/8 πῆχες was known previously, the fact that in ll. 38-9 the εύλον of 3 πῆχες is called δημόσιον indicates that, as would be expected, more than one kind was in use. If then το μέν in l. 11 means a particular kind of εύλον, some such restoration as [το μέν εύλον καταμέτρητα] becomes necessary, and the correctness of this hypothesis is confirmed by ll. 18-20. The figure in l. 20 stands to that in l. 19 in the same proportion (9:8) as those in ll. 12-4 to those in ll. 15-7. το γεωμετρικόν (l. 18) has already (l. 7) been applied to the σχοινίον, and l. 19 with the restoration suggested will be the corollary of l. 3. The only difficulty that arises is that the εύλον of 3 πῆχες is in l. 11 called βασιλικόν while in l. 38 it is said to be δημόσιον; but in view of the extent to which δημόσιον in Roman
times supplanted the Ptolemaic term βασιλικός (e.g. in connexion with τράπεζα and γεωργός; cf. 500. 13, note), this objection is not serious. The chief interest of this section about the ξύλον lies in the light which it throws upon the size of the ναύβιον (l. 11). On that obscure cubic measure used in digging operations see P. Tebt. 5. 15, note, and P. Petrie III. From the fact that the ξύλον was the particular measure used for calculating ναύβια, it is difficult to avoid the inference that a ναύβιον was a ξύλον in length, and since there is every reason to think that its dimensions were equal, most probably a ναύβιον was a cubic ξύλον, and as there were two sizes of ξύλα so there were also two kinds of ναύβια.

21–5. The subject of these lines is obscure; but from the occurrence of τετράγωνον in l. 21 it appears that some area was under discussion. It is not unlikely that τό μέν μήκος is to be supplied at the beginning of l. 21 and [τὸ δὲ πλάτος ξύλον] in l. 22, and that the four-sided figure in question was the square face of a ναύβιον or cube measuring 3 πήχεις each way. ναύβια are probably still under discussion in l. 24.

26–30. For this list of measures of length cf. the Tabulae Heronianae, especially I (Hultsch, Script. Metrol. i. pp. 182 sqq.).

29. άκον: both forms άκον and άκον are commonly found, but the latter is the more correct; cf. Hultsch, op. cit. p. 29.

30. It is probable that the list ended with μέλον like those in Tabulae Heronianae III and VII. The only larger measures of length were the σχοῖνος and παρασάγγυς. δῆμος may be the beginning of διάκτυλος, since the following details proceed in an ascending scale, and ought to have begun with the smallest measure. But we should expect ofί διάκτυλον παλαιστής, which is much too long, and the διάκτυλος has a section devoted to it in II. 43 sqq.

31. The size ascribed in the papyrus to the λιγάς, σπιθαμή (l. 32), πυγών (l. 34), βῆμα (l. 37), ὀργνυ (l. 39), and άκον (l. 41), agree with the statements of the Tabulae Heronianae and add no new facts.

32. The names given by the ancient metrologists to the ordinary foot of 4 παλαιστή is to distinguish it from the 'Ρωμικός or 'Ηρωλεκτικός ποδός of 3⅔ παλαιστή is βασιλικός, Πτολεμαϊκός, and Φαλατρακός; but none of these will suit. Ανάγκησις is not unlikely; the first letter is certainly α or λ, δ or μ being excluded.

33. καὶ might be supplied in l. 32 instead of οί κ, which would then follow λανθασίας; but no cubit smaller than the normal one of 6 παλαιστή was known previously, and it is therefore much more probable that the 'cloth-weaver’s cubit’ contained 5 παλαιστή than 4.

34–5. This cubit of 6 παλαιστή is the common πήχεις, found in the Tabulae Heronianae, but is there also called λιγάς and ξυλοπροικός. Α πόθεμον τέλειον ξυλικός τεκτονικός occurs in P. Brit. Mus. 164. 7; for δημολογίας cf. l. 38 ξύλον δημολογίας and l. 11–20, note. There was another cubit introduced into Egypt in Roman times which stood to the cubit of 6 παλαιστή in the ratio of 25:24 (Hultsch, op. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 753), but this does not seem to be mentioned here by the papyrus, though it is perhaps, as Mr. Smyly suggests, implied by the number, 96, of cubits in a κοχυνίων in l. 3.

35–6. The title Νιλομετρικός πήχεις is new, but that the cubit used in measuring the rise and fall of the Nile contained 7 παλαιστή instead of 6 was known from the inscriptions on the subject at Elephantine; cf. C. I. G. 4863. This cubit of 7 παλαιστή is that normally used in official measurements upon ancient Egyptian monuments, and Mr. Smyly thinks that it was also employed in measuring the mysterious ἀνδρία which occur in the Petrie papyri. Its usual title (not found here) was the ‘royal’ cubit (Hultsch, Introd. to Scrip. Metrol. p. 25, &c., is wrong on this point).
This cubit of 8 palmæōtai or 2 feet is frequently mentioned in the Tabulae Heronianæ, but without any special designation. Since it was apparently introduced into Egypt by the Romans (Hultsch, Script. Metrol. p. 42, Metrol. p. 618), ἴματος or ἰμαῖος is very likely to be supplied in the lacuna.

37. The βήμα of 10 palmæōtai is the ordinary one, but βήματα of 8 and 12 palmæōtai also occur; cf. Hultsch, Script. Metrol. pp. 194. 3 and 197. 23.

38–9. No ξίλον except that of 3 cubits was known previously; on the δημάτσιον and the other ξίλον with which it was contrasted see II. 11–20, note.

40. The κάλαμος, which was according to Tabulae Heronianæ I an ancient Egyptian land-measure, is stated in the same table (Hultsch, Script. Metrol. p. 183. 3) to contain 63 cubits or 10 feet of 4 palmæōtai. This is also the size assigned in the Tabulae Heronianæ to the ἅκων or ἅκων; cf. l. 41. Hence Hultsch supposed that κάλαμος and ἅκων were convertible terms. But from the position occupied by the κάλαμος here between the ὅργανα of 4 πῆχες and the ἅκων of 63 cubits, it size should be not 63 but something between 4 and 63 cubits. A μέτρον τοῦ κάλαμου which differs apparently from the ordinary κάλαμος occurs in a passage quoted by Hultsch, op. cit. p. 153, but the language seems to be corrupt, and if Hultsch is right in inferring from it a κάλαμος of 13/4 cubits in length, that cannot be the κάλαμος meant here. There is more reason to connect the κάλαμος of the papyrus with the κάλαμος of 27 3/8 palmæōtai mentioned by Pediasmus, a Byzantine writer of the fourteenth century (Hultsch, op. cit. i. p. 58 and ii. p. 147). This κάλαμος would contain 43/8 cubits of 6 palmæōtai, and 4 3/8 would satisfy the conditions which, as we have said, the number found in l. 40 would be expected to fulfil. Assuming that this is correct, the κάλαμος of 4 3/8 cubits is much older than has been supposed; but there is no particular objection to this, for the information provided by ancient metrologists is extremely defective.

41–2. After the ἅκων, which has the customary 63 cubits, came no doubt a higher unit of measurement, very likely the δῆμα (40 cubits), which follows the ἅκων in l. 29. οἱ ἄρα πῆχες may be corrupt for οἱ ἄρα πῆχες, followed by another unit of measurement omitted. But it is more likely to be something like τοῦτοι ἄρα πῆχες (cf. 654. 1), 'so much for cubits.'

43–5. The meaning is that the δίκτυλος being the smallest measure of length with a name, all other measures of length are referred to it as the unit; cf. Tabulae Heronianæ I and II ἐλάχιστον δὲ τούτων ἢ τὸ δίκτυλον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐλαχίστα μόρα καλεῖται, and ΠΙΙ δίκτυλος πρῶτος ἐστὶν ὅπερ καὶ μονὸς. Line 43 is probably to be restored καὶ[αμεπείται τά τούτων], with καὶ ἰ in l. 44; cf. l. 11.

670–678. Poetical Fragments.

These nine miscellaneous pieces in verse do not appear to be extant, but are too fragmentary to call for detailed treatment.

670 is a strip from a short column of hexameters, written in a small sloping uncial hand of the third century. The metre proves that the part preserved is near the beginnings of the lines, but the remains are too scanty to show the subject or the quality of the poem. There is a mention of Dionysus in l. 22,
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and apparently a reference to Hephaestus in l. 11. Some corrections have been made by a second hand, which also inserted the diaeresis in l. 26.

671 is from a series of epideictic epigrams, as is made clear by the heading in l. 1 τίτας ἀν εἰποι [λόγονς . . . , a formula frequent in the Anthology (cf. e.g. Anth. Pal. ix. 126, 449, &c.). Opposite l. 3, where the epigram commences, is the abbreviation ὤ( —or ὤ( —which may give the name of the poet, e.g. Nicarchus, or of the speaker. The handwriting is an irregular uncial, dating probably from the latter half of the third century.

672. A small fragment from the bottom of a column, containing the latter parts of nine lines, written in a rather irregular uncial hand of, probably, the first century. Lines 4–8 may be hexameters, but the metre of l. 9 seems to be different. There is no clue to the subject.

673 contains parts of eleven lines from the top of a column, written in well-formed sloping uncials of the common oval type, and dating most probably from the third century. In the margin at the top are the beginnings of three blurred lines of cursive, apparently mere scribblings; the writer was perhaps the person responsible for some corrections and accents in the text below. This seems to be of a lyrical character, though the majority of the verses might also be hexameters.

674, written in careful round uncials of about the latter part of the first or the beginning of the second century, is a fragment of a lyric poem, which may be by Pindar. The form ἵαρος (l. 6) is indeed not found in the traditional Pindaric dialect, but it has a parallel in σίναι ὅς (Ol. iii. 14, 18). The high stops and the accents which have been occasionally added may be by the original scribe, but there is a question of a second hand in ll. 1 and 7; cf. note ad loc.

675. The upper parts of two columns of a lyrical poem written in rather short lines, and evidently to be classed as a paean (cf. ll. 1 and 12). The mention of Alexandria in l. 4 is an indication of a comparatively late date, but Blass thinks that the piece may be by Callimachus, who is known to have composed μελη of this description. The paraphrasmus below l. 2 may mark the commencement of a fresh strophe, but no metrical correspondence can be followed out between the two columns. The MS. is in a large uncial hand of an early type, and seems to date from about the middle of the first century.

676. This small fragment contains the ends and beginnings of lines from two columns of a tragedy, written in a sloping uncial hand of the third century. High stops occur at ll. 2, 6 and 7, and a middle stop apparently at l. 3. The correction in l. 9 and the rough breathing in l. 14 are no doubt original, and the accents may be so; but the addition of the iota adscript in l. 15 seems to be subsequent.
670–678. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

677 and 678 are fragments of comedies. 677, containing the latter parts of nine lines from the bottom of a column, is written in neat round uncial which may be assigned to the latter part of the first century. 678, from the top of a column, is in an upright and rather heavy calligraphic hand similar to 661, and probably, like that papyrus, of the latter part of the second century. The accents seem to have been added later.

670. 15.6 x 3.7 cm.

\[ \text{\[\lambda e i s \ \tau i \ \delta \ \alpha v \ \alpha l l o \ \pi . \ [} \]
\[ \nu \ \delta e \ kai \ \alpha u t o s \ \alpha y [ \]
\[ . \ [. \ ] \ \alpha u t o m a t o s \ \lambda i s e n [ \]
\[ \os \ [. \ ] k a \phi o u s e i \ a e i \ \gamma e [ \]
\[ \text{\[\pi \lambda e \ \tau a r t a r p h i s a i \ \alpha l u k t[\sigma p e d h e i \ ? \]
\[ \varepsilon \ \phi i l \eta \ \lambda o u s e i e n \ \varepsilon p i \xi o[ \]
\[ \pi a v] t o b e n [\alpha \mu] f i \beta e \beta e k e \ \pi [ \]
\[ \os \ a r \ \varepsilon \f i [ \ [. \ . \ . \ \nu \eta \ \mu e r \mu [ \]
\[ \nu \ \alpha s t i [\varepsilon f e l i k t o n \ \varepsilon o s [ \]
\[ \text{\[\mu a d e \[\ldots \ \ldots \ \tau e k e s \ \nu i [ \]
\[ \tau e x]|n e i s [\kai] \ \chi a l o s \ \varepsilon o n [ \]
\[ \text{\[\nu \ \pi r o[\sigma b e \ \pi o]d o n \ a g a b [ \]
\[ \mu e i o[\ldots \ \tau e e i s k o t e \ . [ \]
\]

6.  $\nu$ of $\lambda o w o$ is corrected apparently by the second hand from 4.

18. The mistake corrected was the common one of writing $\alpha$ for $\epsilon$; the same thing has happened in l. 25.

671.  Fr. (a) 9.6 x 7.3, Fr. (b) 15.5 x 8.1 cm.

\[ \text{\[t i n a s \ \alpha v \ \varepsilon i p o i [\lambda o y o u s \ \varepsilon p o s [} \]
\[ \text{\[t o n \ \upsilon[\iota] o r t o n \ \Delta [ \]
\[ \text{\[\delta[\ \alpha r t e k e s \ a i g h e n e s a [ \]
\[ \text{\[\kappa[\ldots \ \gamma e i \ \beta a s i l e u s [ \]
\[ \text{\[\alpha[\ldots \ \alpha o d o s i a s [\pi] \]
\[ \text{\[\ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \] \]
\[ \text{\[\delta [\text{\[\eta] \ \varepsilon [ \]
\[ \text{\[\delta \ \kappa a i \ \nu v n \ \varepsilon [} \]
\[ \text{\[\ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \] \]
\[ \text{\[\nu \ \upsilon \ \varepsilon \ \varepsilon \ \upsilon \ \varepsilon [ \]
\[ \text{\[\ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \ \ldots \] \]
\[ \text{\[\alpha l l [\alpha] \ \k l y o i s \ \varepsilon \ \varepsilon \ o o [} \]

\[ \text{\[\sigma k \ [\pi t r o n \ e x e i [ \]
\[ \text{\[\chi r i s e o n \ a b r i s a [ \]
\[ \text{\[\alpha l l [\alpha] \ \k l y o i s \ \varepsilon \ \varepsilon \ o o [} \] \]
1–2. A name, possibly Νο( ) (cf. introd.), is to be supplied after λογος. Δε may be read in place of Δε in l. 2. This may be the top of the column.

14. There is a break in the papyrus at this point, and four or five lines at least are lost.

672. 8 x 5.5 cm.

. . . . . .
[νον δό]
[φαί λη]
[αμη] [ισιν ετιμήσαν]

5 [ι] Νηρηίδες
[πον ειδίαξθη]
[σεις ταφόν αντιασε] [θηρ οςον ἐξειδίδαξε]
[κον διχα εἰς πολυποικίλ] [και κουρ[ο]ις]
[kai kouropois]
[ουπῳ πορφυρῆς πι] [ουπω πορφυρης πι]

673. 10 x 4.7 cm.

[δων θερα]
[μοπατρας]
[μενα γλυκ]
[. . ἵπποβοτο]

5 [νομος αλς]
[μτος ὑπο]
[π ἀιωνων ε]

10 [εν[δ]]αμικοκουρ[φνετο]

672. 9. The high point is really over the ρ̄ and is possibly to be connected with the point between ρ̄ and θ in the line before. The double point usually indicates a change of speaker, but is also found as a mark of punctuation, e.g. in 657.

673. 1–2. Perhaps Περ[δων] θερα[πον] and οβρι[μοπατρα], as Blass suggests.
4. The letter before ἵπποβοτο has been corrected.
5. The mutilated letter before the lacuna might be e.g. μ or ρ; Οιμ[πον].
9. π]οκαμοις is no doubt part of a compound adjective like εἰπλόκαμος or καλιπλόκαμος.
10. The doubtful ρ has been converted from ω by a second hand, which also crossed out the δ.
5.1 x 5.2 cm.

... ... ...

\[πτάλι[\]
\[κώνευο[...]. ...[
\[Λοινου: εμμεν[\]
\[ένοι Δελφοι ναο[\]
5 \[ε Παρνασσον θέμε[θλα
\[ϊος τερπθευ ιαροις [\]
\[ζματ αγίλαοις. ীδοις [\]

\[νιαπολλω[..]. [\]
\[ας τοι δ αυτ[\]
10 \[ορφ[...].[\]
\[τον[\]
... ... ...

1. The letters of this first line are smaller than those in the lines below and differently formed, and they might be by another hand; but there is no trace of an erasure, nor can the words be an interlinear addition.

4. \(ε\) or \(σ\) might be read in place of \(ν\) between \(ν\) and \(δ\).

5. \(θέμ\): cf. Pindar, \(Pyth.\) iv. 180 Παγγαίοι θεμέλιοι. Perhaps \(τρέμε \delta\) κ.τ.λ., as Blass suggests.

7. The letters of \(ιδοις\) are smaller than usual and have a slight slope, while elsewhere the hand is upright; they seem to have been written by the original scribe, but may be a marginal note or gloss.

8. Something like an \(ο\) enclosed between two dots (cf. e.g. 16. ii. 4) has been written above the letter after \(πολλ\), which is probably \(ω\). The words may be divided \(ινα\) \(πολλ\) ... or \(ιν\) \(Απολλ\) ...

675. 11.8 x 14.5 cm.

Col. i.  Col. ii.
\(παια[νι] φιλοστεφα[νω]\)  \(κε[...] μελψ[...].
\(μελπ[ον]τες ο[...].[\)
\(ιερα[ν] κ[α]τεχον [...]. [\)
\(Δελφ[ον] καιαν [...]. [\)
5 \(πολιν [...]. και β[α[...].[\)
\(ευερων πελα[νων ...\]
\(δυμα δεδωκατ[ε ...\)
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\[ \text{o} \mu \nu \pi [\ldots] \text{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu [\ldots] \]
\[ \tau \alpha \iota \iota \text{de} [\ldots] \]
\[ \sigma \pi \nu \nu \delta \alpha [\ldots] \]
\[ \delta \omega \iota \iota \nu \mu [\ldots] \]
\[ 10 \sigma \varepsilon \beta \iota \alpha [\ldots] \]

1. \( \pi \nu \nu \alpha \nu \): the vestiges of the last two letters are very slight, but \( \iota \) is much more probable than \( \alpha \).

2. There is a short blank space between \( \mu \varepsilon \pi[\omega]\nu \nu \) and the letter following.

3. \( \varepsilon \lambda \nu \chi \omega \nu \) is very uncertain; the letter after \( \nu \) could be almost anything. \( \nu[\bar{o}]\pi \varepsilon \chi \omega \nu \) is quite possible.

9. Probably -\( \delta \omega \iota \nu \nu \nu \).

673. 5 \times 7.4 \text{cm.}

Col. i. Col. ii.

\[ \text{\gamma} \nu \ [\ldots] \]
\[ \text{\eta} \nu [\ldots] \]
\[ \text{\theta} \varepsilon \tau \omega \iota [\ldots] \]
\[ 5 \text{\gamma} \nu [\ldots] \]
\[ \text{\eta} \nu [\ldots] \]

10. \( \kappa \varepsilon \tau \rho \iota \omega \iota \) [\ldots] \( \text{\omega} \nu [\ldots] \)

15. \( \varepsilon \chi \theta \rho \omega \pi \alpha [\ldots] \)

1. \( \gamma \nu \), if right, no doubt ended the line, but there would be room for two letters more.

8. There is a blank space before \( \mu \nu \nu \), which is possibly the name of the speaker, e.g. \( \text{M} \varepsilon \theta \alpha \omega \alpha \omega \). Apparently there was also a slight space between this and the preceding line.

16. \( \sigma \phi \alpha \lambda \) is a word of the use of which there is no other example. The root is that of \( \sigma \phi \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \theta \alpha \) and \( \dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi \alpha \lambda \).
679–684. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>677.</th>
<th>8.6 x 3.9 cm.</th>
<th>678.</th>
<th>11 x 4 cm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ε]εν κελευ[</td>
<td>] ουκ ἐστιν [</td>
<td>τριῳβολο[</td>
<td>] σου ὡς κακον [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρεχειν ἐκ γειτ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>] τον το[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τί λυπησας τυχ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τα πειθαρχουντα [</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] τινι λαλεις [</td>
<td>] ἀραιν δυνα[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]μαν Νουμηνιε [</td>
<td>γ]λισχρο[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ερος ενεγμαι μ[</td>
<td>]τη[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μα τ]ους δωδεκα θε'ους</td>
<td>]το[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

677. 6. There is a blank space in the papyrus on either side of τινι λαλεις. Probably two feet are to be supplied at the end of the line.
8. ενεγμαι is apparently for ἐνήγμαι or ἑνήγμαι. The doubtful γ might be τ, but that gives no word.
9. Cf. 409. 86, &c.

678. 1–7. It appears on the whole probable that the fragment preserves the beginnings of the lines and that there is no loss on the left side till l. 7, which must have projected somewhat, owing to the column having, as often happens, a slight slope. But this is not at all certain, and what we have taken to be a paragraphus between ll. 4–5 may be a rough breathing over ω.
8. The syllable preceding τη had an acute accent.

679–684. PROSE FRAGMENTS.

The following group of unidentified prose fragments corresponds to the foregoing collection of minor poetical pieces. The first, 679, is historical, and consists of the upper parts of two columns, both unfortunately fragmentary, written in neat upright uncialis of the first century B.C. Military operations are being described, and there is a mention in ll. 2–4 of some one dispatched by an Alexander in Cilicia, and of a king or kingdom in l. 42. Perhaps, then, this is a fragment from a history of the campaigns of Alexander the Great, and it may even belong to the lost work on that subject by the first Ptolemy.
680 seems also to come from some historical work, but its sense is not easy to follow. Parts of 15 lines from the top of a column are preserved, containing mentions of Cilicians, Attica and the Athenians, and Soli in Cyprus. The hand is a sloping uncial of the middle or latter part of the third century. A low stop apparently occurs in l. 3.

681 is a piece from the top of a column containing the latter parts of 15 lines from a geographical or historical treatise. A description of some Thracian tribes, among which are the Triballi and Paeonians, is given, but the passage is too mutilated for satisfactory restoration. The fragment is written in rather irregular, but not ill-formed, uncials, which may date from the second century; a high stop is used.

682. Two fragments, both probably from the same column, of which one of them forms the top. The graceful upright hand seems, like that of 689, to be a rather early example of the oval type, and it may go back to the latter part of the second or the beginning of the third century. The common angular sign is used for filling up a short line (l. 12). The pieces are part of an oration, perhaps a lost speech of Hyperides.

683 contains the ends of lines of part of a column, with some traces of the column following, \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \), opposite ll. 16 and 19, being all that is legible. The fragment is not easy to classify; citations of previous writers are made in ll. 4 and 12–3, and a Dionysius is mentioned in l. 9. The piece is written in rather small round uncial, which may be assigned to the latter half of the second century. An angular sign is used at the end of short lines. On the verso are parts of two lines in cursive of about the time of Septimius Severus.

684, containing 23 nearly complete lines from the bottom of a column, is much more intelligible. The fragment comes from some ethical treatise, the comparatively late date of which is indicated by the occurrence of the form \( \pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha\iota \) (ll. 6 and 22) as well as by the subject, the characteristics of sovereigns and advice for intercourse with them. The piece is written on the verso of the papyrus—the recto being blank—in sloping oval uncial, probably of the middle or latter half of the third century.

---

679. 12·5 x 6·1 cm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots ) ( \omega \nu ) ( \text{Ελληνικων} )</td>
<td>( \tau \varepsilon \cdot [ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \nu ) ( \tau \nu ) ( \epsilon ) ( \text{Ε} \gamma \text{ικι} )</td>
<td>( \alpha [ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha i ) ( \text{α} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau ) ( \alpha \lambda \mu \nu \nu \omicron \nu \text{π} ) ( \text{Α} \lambda \epsilon )</td>
<td>( \gamma [ )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
679–684. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

680. 6.5 x 4 cm.

[. . . . ]ων Κιλικων [ 680. 6-5 X 4 cm.
[. . ]ληστο οι δε ολ[ 680. 6-5 X 4 cm.
[. . ]α. μεγα τι . . [ 680. 6-5 X 4 cm.
[ε]ξελθειν φ[ 680. 6-5 X 4 cm.
5 Αττικης μετ[ 680. 6-5 X 4 cm.
τους Αθηνα[ο]ν [ 680. 6-5 X 4 cm.
π αυτου τεθεινυ [ 680. 6-5 X 4 cm.
tous αναστρεψη[ 680. 6-5 X 4 cm.

38–45. These lines are written smaller and closer together than the rest.
3. τι is very doubtful; the vestiges representing τ might be taken for a double point.

14. Οι υπογιος.

681. 

11 × 7.1 cm.

[ταρό[...]] [..... π]ροτε [γεγονασι τοις α... α...]
[ς αυτα βια[...]] [πλειστοι τ[ω]ν προσπε]
../[τοικ..[.]] [..].ς' ποτ[...].] 10 [υτων Τριβαλλ[ω]ν και]
[κρουσμ.. το. τ[.]] [προτερον μεν.. τ]
5 [και κρατηθεν[τω]ν των] [μονην την προς τον]
Τριβαλλ[ω]ν δ[ι] μεν α[λ]λοι κατα
[ντες ειλον τε δ[.].ει] [καθηκουσαν νων δε]
15 [καλουμενων και]

6. If Τριβαλλ[ω]ν is right not more than six letters are missing at the beginnings of ll. 1–9 or from seven to eight in the remainder.

8. The letter between α and υ is very likely σ. Above the o of τοις is a spot of ink which seems to be accidental.

682. 

Fr. (a) 8 × 2.8, Fr. (b) 5.1 × 4.7 cm.

Fr. (a) [τα]ις δημοκρατιας οι [..... εισ]αγγελια[12 letters γιγυνε[]
νομοι παντ[ων εισι] των [10] [10 ιων τ]ουτων [autoς νομον θησειν]
[εν τη] πολει κυριοι και [και πασιον των εν]
[ν]μον εκαστ[.......

5 μους τε [..[.]] [.....] [τοις δικαστηριοις ρ[αι]
[.].ς ουδε[ 12 letters διως αποφευγουτας]
Fr. (b) 7 [ 12 letters ] δημ[.]
15 [..] δε δημος..... ω [α]νδρες Δ[θηναιοι]

1. [τις was probably preceded by εν. Mr. Smyly aptly quotes Hyperides, Euxenip. xxii. ἐν δημοκρατια εύρισκοι οι νόμοι έστοιται καὶ αἱ εἰσαγγελία καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι κρίσεις κατὰ τοὺς νόμους εἰσίασαν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον.

8–10. Nothing need be missing at the end of these lines.

15. [o] δε δημος or Δημοσθένης or [η] δε δημοκρατια are possible supplements.
679-684. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

683. 9:3 x 4:4 cm.

[τα κυρί]ον
[αράσης αὐν]
ορομαστόν
[ἐ φητι τας
5] πολειτείαις
[πασαν εἰς τα
[μονωι διαπρα]
[ασιν οι τα πε]
[τει Διονυς]
10 [πλε. ησαν
[της [. [. κε

[εισ εν τη]
των ιστοριων
[πο δε τους
15 [ακατον λα

[μα]λα εικοσι[ω]σ ακμαὶ μεν γαρ εἰσι[ι...
... [.ἀματων χαλασων ... [. .
15 [. τοι και πυρς [ούδεν δε ευτω [. .
... ε] και κυμαίνει και ανάξ[ι ως
θυµος βασι[λιω[ς] ατε γαρ μεγας [ων και
αυτοκρατορ κα] χα] παλη τη ειδο[σια
χρ]ομενος οὕς εστιν και άκιδα[σχε
20 τος] και προς τε τας τειμας προχ[ερω
προ[ς τε καλασεις ακωλυτος [χρη
ου] τον προσελευσομεν τω το[εω
δε κ]αι τηλικωδε χ[ρ]ησθαι μεν [κ

5. ἑργαστηρα[ν]: the final ρ scarcely fills the available space, and another letter may be lost.
6. The second λ of μα[λ]ων if written would be very cramped and may have been omitted.
9. The traces of the supposed ο after [. Ω are rather closer than they should be

K 2

684. 12 x 6:5 cm.

...τιθοςεις ο. μ[ι]δοι [. .
... των εργων ενος εισω [. [. .
...]σων βουλονται πραγματ[. .
...]φειν εχει δε τινα και αυ[ι].
5 ἑργαστηρα[ν] η τροπο [. τι δε
σο]μενος βασιλει η του αξιώματος
... ρημιν τι δε[ι] ενυθα[ι τι δε
10 [. η οφεί υπ[. [. ον τι δε τη ο[. .
εσ]τιν ετερον το[ι]ουτους αι [. [. .
[δε]ι γιγνεσ[θ]αι προς τους βασιλει[ας και

μα]λα εικοσι[ω]σ ακμαὶ μεν γαρ εἰσι[ι...
... [.ἀματων χαλασων ... [. .
15 [. τοι και πυρς [ούδεν δε ευτω [. .
... ε] και κυμαίνει και ανάξ[ι ως
θυµος βασι[λιω[ς] ατε γαρ μεγας [ων και
αυτοκρατορ κα] χα] ρε παλη τη ειδο[σια
χρ]ομενος οὕς εστιν και άκιδα[σχε
20 τος] και προς τε τας τειμας προχ[ερω
προ[ς τε καλασεις ακωλυτος [χρη
ου] τον προσελευσομεν τω το[εω
δε κ]αι τηλικωδε χ[ρ]ησθαι μεν [κ

5. ἑργαστηρα[ν]: the final ρ scarcely fills the available space, and another letter may be lost.
6. The second λ of μα[λ]ων if written would be very cramped and may have been omitted.
9. The traces of the supposed ο after [. Ω are rather closer than they should be

K 2
both to the β and to the following ν and perhaps do not represent a letter, and on the other hand a narrow letter may be lost between the doubtful σ and i. βους[σι]νον ... ευητον might be read, but would make no sense here. Perhaps there is some corruption.

14. κυματων would be expected and should no doubt be restored (cf. l. 16 κυμαινει); perhaps καυματων was written by mistake.

18. πολη; l. παλαι or πολλη? There is room for a letter between π and α, but the α seems clear.

23. The final ν of μεν is rather spread out and was possibly the last letter of the line.

III. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

685. HOMER, Iliad XVII.

12.5 x 10.5 cm.

This fragment, containing the ends of ll. 725-32 of the Iliad, from the top of a column, is of interest owing to the presence of some marginal scholia, one of which, that on l. 728 mentioning a reading of the Κουφι, is with little doubt by the original scribe, while those below were added subsequently in cursive. The MS. was a fine specimen of Greek calligraphy, being written with great care in a large, round uncial hand, very similar to that of 661 (Plate v). It is probably to be assigned, like 661, to the latter half of the second century, a date to which the cursive adscripts opposite ll. 730-1 also point. High and middle stops (ll. 728-9) occur, and accents and breathings are used in the first scholium. There is a broad margin at the top of the column.

725 ε[πι καπρων]
θη[ρηφων]με[μαωτες]
πεποιθωσ.
] αλλος.

η κ' αλλ' ητε δή ρ'
686—688. FRAGMENTS OF EXTINGUISHED CLASSICAL AUTHORS

730 πο[ρτο
αμφι]γνωσιν
αυτοὺς

731. The marginal note evidently refers to the Aristarchean method of writing ὅτε δὴ, namely ὅτε, and implies that the word had the Aristarchean accent in the text. Cf. Schol. A on Λ 493 'Ἀρισταρχος ὁτε ὡς δηλαδὴ παραλόγῳς ἀνέγνωσκε, and the discussion of the question in the scholia of Ammonius, 221. i. 1—8, where the ordinary accentuation is upheld. For the reference to the Κουνη cf. 445.

732. The marginal note below this line, which should refer to 1. 733 σταίσαν τῶν δὲ τράπετο χρῶς, ὁδὲ τις ἐν τῆ, is obscure. The only word here of which an explanation seems at all likely to have been given is τράπετο, which in the Schol. Didymi is glossed ἱλλασφερόν ἡ θέλα τοῦ προσώπου; but the present note was phrased differently. The doubtful λ may be μ and four or five letters may be lost in front of it since 1. 733 is not a long one. Λαιντρ. [ cannot be read.

686—688. HOMER, Iliad II, III, AND XI.

The three following Homeric fragments of which the text is printed below are reproduced in facsimile on Plate vii, and have a palaeographical value as practically contemporary specimens of the literary hand of the early Augustan period. 686 and 688, from the bottom and top of a column respectively, are very similar in type, 686 being the more regular and ornamental of the two, and both have a decided resemblance to the hand of the new Pindar fragments (659), which is perhaps slightly older. 687, which is also of some interest on account of the presence of two critical signs in the margin of Col. ii, shows a stiffer and more angular style of writing. No stops or other lection signs occur in any of the three pieces. We give a collation with Ludwich's text.

686. 7.3 × 5.1 cm. Plate VII.

ii. 50 [αὐτὰρ ὁ κηρύκεσσι καὶ] γυψογγοισι
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[kπρυσσείν αγ]φορ[ην δε καρποκομωντας]
[οι μεν εκηρυσσον τοι δ ηγειροντο]
[βουλην δε πρώτον μεγαθυμιων]
[Nεστορη παρ]α νην Πυλογειφεσ]

55 [touς ο γε συνκ]αλεσας πυκνην
[kλυτε φιλοι θειοι μοι ενυπνου]
[αμβροσιαν δια νυκτα μαλιστα []
[eιδος τε μεγ]εθος τε φυιν τ αγιχιστα]

53. The papyrus probably read βουλην, as do the great majority of the MSS.; but the lacuna is too large to give a real clue. *Boulh* Ludwig, with Aristoph. and Aristarch.
54. *Πυλογειφεσ*: so Lud. with AB, &c.; *Πυληγ. SM, &c.*
56. *θειο*: so MSS. and Aristarch.; θειων Zenod.

687. 7·9 × 4·5 cm.  Col. ii.

Col. i.  Plate VII.

70€ι τους ως εγω
αμφιστερων
αλλ ο[τε]
σταν[των] 210
iιι. 185  αιολο[π]αλους
]
Σαγγαριοιο
ε]κεχθην
αντιανειραι

207. There is a diploe against this line in Ven. A with the note δι ηκαρλήλων εξειναι κατ εφιλησα' το γαρ φαλειν ελθον αετι τοι επικεφην τιθησαι.
211. Ven. A has a diploe periestigmene opposite this line.

688. 8·1 × 4·5 cm.  Plate VII.

οι δ ετι καμ μεσο]υν
ας τε λεων εφοβησε [α]ιεν αποκτεινων

πολλοι δε πρηνεις
689. **FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS**

179–80. These two lines were athetized by Aristarchus and omitted by Zenodotus; Ludwich prints them in small type.

### 689. Hesiod, Scutum.

Fr. (a) 9·2 x 3·6 cm.

Three fragments from the top of a column, containing the concluding fifteen lines of the *Scutum* of Hesiod. The text is written in round, rather heavy uncialis of medium size, which appear to date from about the end of the second century. The occasional accents, &c., and the punctuation are probably due to the original scribe, as well as the corrections in ll. 475 and 480. In the collation we have made use of the edition of Rzach (1902); a couple of otherwise unrecorded variants occur.


---

689. Πάπας τη δε τ η αυ[αφαίνεται

[Ἀτρείδεω ὑπο [180

καλα] οτε δη τα[χ

[ιε]ροι τοτε [δη

[Iδη]ς εν [κορυφησι

---

180

xi. 175 της δ εξ αυξεν εαξ[ε

πρωτον επειτα δ[ε

ως τους Ἀτρείδης

---
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[Ἀντοιδῆς ἡνωξ οἴτι πα κλει[τας εκατομβα]ς

480 [ος τις αγοι Πυθοίδε] βη βυλ[ασκε δοκεων]

466. μακλ[ων is for μακρον, a case of the common confusion of λ and ρ.
473. πόλις: πόλιος Rzach with Ε, πόλις other MSS.; the papyrus reading will at
least scan.
474-5. Rzach follows Goetling in regarding these two lines as a later addition. The
papyrus shows that they belong to an ancient tradition. ἐγειρετο in l. 475 is a new
variant; ἔγειρετο, εγειρετο or ἤγειρετο MSS.
480. βη βυλ[ασκε is the ordinary reading. The scribe seems to have imagined that the
verb was υλασκε; what he supposed the σ meant or why he made a mark like a sign of
elision after the overwritten ι we are unable to conjecture. There is a break in the papyrus
immediately below this line; the title of the book presumably followed as usual.

690, 691. APOLLONIUS RHODIUS, Argonautica III.

690 13 x 5·2 cm., 691 3·3 x 3·3 cm.

We here group together a couple of fragments from the third book of the
Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, but derived from two distinct MSS. The
larger fragment, 690, which is from the bottom of a column and comprises
ll. 727-45, is in a third century semi-uncial hand. A variety of lection signs
occur, of which the marks of elision are certainly due to the original scribe; the
breathings and accents have rather the appearance of being a later addition. 691,
containing parts of ll. 908-14, is earlier in date, being written in rather
heavy, but not very regular, round uncials, which may be attributed to the
second century. The texts are remarkable for the confirmation of two con-
jectures, Porson's ναυτλοι for ναυται appearing in l. 745, and Stephanus'
correction of μερά for καρά in l. 909. Our references to the two chief codices,
the Laurentianus and the Guelferbytanus, are taken from the edition of R. Merkel (1854).

690.

[Χαλκιοτη ως] ἵμοιμυ
[ος ερξω μη γιαπ μοί]
692. **FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS**

691. 

692. **APOLLONIUS RHODIUS, Argonautica IV.**

11.5 x 8.7 cm.

Two fragments from the bottom of a column, containing parts of ll. 77–90 of Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*, Book iv. The handwriting, a neat upright uncial, has a certain resemblance to that of the Thucydides papyrus (16, 696), and is apparently a rather later specimen of the same type; we should assign it to the second century. Occasional accents and stops (high usually, but
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a middle point apparently occurs in l. 89) are used, and may be due, like the insertion of an iota adscript in l. 90, to the original scribe.

[ηρως μετα τηνηθ θους ἐλασσὸν ερετμοις
[ουπω πε'σσματα νηος επ ηπειροιο περαιηθ
[βαλλον ό] δε κραυνους [χερω ποδας ηκεν Ιησων
80 [υ]ψου επ ικριόθεη μετα [δε] Φροντις τε και Δρογος
[υς] δυο Φριξους Χαμαδις θορον η δ αρα τουσγε
[γου]πων [αμφο]τερη[ησι περισχομενη προσεειπεν
[εκ] με φι[λοι μυσασθε δυσα]μορον· ως [δε και αυτους
[υμε]ας Αηςσαρ προ γαρ τ α'ναφανδα [τετυκαι
85 [π]αντα μαλ ουθε τι μηχ]ος ικανεται αλλ επι νη
[φει]γωμεν πριν τον γ[ε] θοων επιθημεναι ἵππων
[δω]ις δε χρυσειον εγω δερος ευνη[θασα
[φρο]υρον οφιν· τυνη δε θεους [εν]ι σοισιν εταιροις
90 [ποι]ησαι· μηδ ένθεν εκ[αστερ]ω ορμ[ηθεισαν

80. επ: 50 L; δ' G, Merkel.
86. τον γ[ε]: τωνε G (Merkel), τωνε L; the letter before the lacuna is certainly not δ.
90. The size of the lacuna makes it pretty certain that the papyrus had the right reading έκαστερών; έκαστερο GL. The iota adscript was probably added by the person who put in the accents, but whether he is to be identified with the original scribe is doubtful.

693. Sophocles, Electra.

8.6 × 3.6 cm.

A narrow strip from the top of a column, containing ll. 993–1007 of Sophocles' Electra. The MS., which is a good specimen of the oval type of uncials, was probably written in the first half of the third century. The correction in l. 1002 and the occasional lection signs, with the exception of the mark of elision in l. 993, are probably all by the original scribe. A rare variant occurs in l. 995. Our collation is derived from the Jahn-Michaelis edition of 1882.
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[ενυχ]α'ν αυτη μη [κακων εσωζετ αν
[την ε]μιλαβειαν [ωσπερ ουχι σωζειαι]
995 [ποι] γαρ ποτε βλεψασα τοιουτον θρασος
[αυτη θ'] σπιλιζη καμυ υπηρετειν καλεις
[ουκ ε]ξασας γυνη [μεν ουδ ανηρ εφυς
[σθε]νεις δ ελασσον [των εναντιων χερι
[δαιμ]ον δε τοις μεν ευνυχη καθ ημεραν
1000 [ημι]ν δ απορρει καπι μηθεν ερχεται
[tις ο]νυ τοιουτον ανδρα βουλευων ελειν

[αλυ]πο ατης εξαπα[λαξθησεται
[ορα κ]ακος πρασσοιντε μη μειζω κακα
[κτησουμεθ'] ει τις τονυδ ακουσεται λογουν
1005 [λυει γ']αρ ημας ουδεν ουδ επωφελει
[βαξιν] καλην λαβοντε δυσκλεος θανειν
[ου γαρ θ']αυτειν [εκδιστον

996. σπιλιζη: so all the chief MSS. (σπιλιζη); σπιλιζει editors.
998. ελασσον: so Brunck and vulg.; ηλασσον MSS.
1002. Perhaps αλλ οπο was originally written.

694. THEOCRITUS, Idyl XIII.

14.2 x 8.4 cm.

A small fragment from the thirteenth Idyl of Theocritus, written in a good-sized upright round uncial hand of the second century, probably the earlier half of it. Numerous stops (high point), breathings, accents, &c. occur, all of which, as well as a few corrections or variants inserted above the line, seem to be due to the first hand. The text has a new variant in l. 34, and an error in l. 30, but elsewhere agrees with the MSS. Our collation is with the edition of Ziegler.
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ικετο κω ταλαεργος

20 Δλκμηνας νιος []

συν δ' αντω κατεβαλινεν

ατις κυνεαν οι χενα

αλλα διακεαις θαθυν

αιτος [σ] α[ς] μεγα λατηµα

25 ἀμος δ' αντελλοντι

ἐραν νεον βοσκοντι

π[α]υος ναυτηλιπ[α]ς []

ηρων κο[ι]λιαν δε []

Ελ[λ]ασσοντον νικοντο

30 εισω δ' ορµον ικοντο

ανλακας ευρονοντι

εκβαινες δ' επι θεινα


[λειµ]ων [σ]φι[γ]ν παρεκειτο

19. κω : χω MSS.

20. Δλκμηνας: so most MSS. "Αλκμηνας Z(iegler) following the Ambrosianus.

21. Against this line are two dashes, of which the meaning, if any, is obscure.

22-4 were rejected by Ahrens. In l. 23 διακεαις is corr. to διακεαξες.

25. It is not certain what was written above the initial a. The supposed η between two points (i.e. ημος for ηµος) is possibly an accent and breathing.

30. ικοντο: ιθενο MSS., Z. ικοντο is a repetition from the previous line.

34. [σ]φι[γ]ν παρεκειτο: γιρ σφιν ικειτο MSS., Z.

695. Herodotus V.

24:3 × 7:6 cm.

Part of chapters 104-5 of Herodotus, Book V, written in a good-sized third century uncial hand of the broad oval type. Two corrections and a breathing have been inserted by a second hand. The text offers no variants from that of Stein. On the verso, in a late third or early fourth century cursive hand, is part of a list of names of persons, with sometimes a statement of the villages to which they belonged, e.g. . . . απο Θωλθεωσ, Ψευμονις απο Ταλαω.
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696. THUCYDIDES IV.

Fr. (c) 15 x 19 cm.

In view of the peculiar excellence of the Oxyrhynchus Thucydides papyrus originally published in the Egypt Exploration Fund’s Archæological Report for 1896-7, and reprinted as P. Oxy. 18, the discovery of some more fragments of the same MS. was a welcome surprise. The new pieces comprise portions of six more columns, covering, with considerable lacunæ, chapters 28 to 35 of the fourth book; and at the same time supply some of the missing beginnings of lines in the first column of the fragment originally found, which succeeded immediately.

The present part of the MS. possesses the same features which distinguished that published previously, and readers are referred to the description given in P. Oxy. I. p. 40. We see no reason for altering the date (first century A.D.) there proposed for the papyrus. We are, however, inclined to doubt whether the final v which has been inserted occasionally in the text is after all by a hand different from that to which the other numerous corrections and variae lectiones.

22. The second a of κατὰ has been corrected from o; i.e. the first hand wrote οὐκ ἀποπραβότα, which was altered to οὐ καταπραβότα.

23. Final s of ἀποστάτες was put in (by the first hand) later.
are apparently due, and which is not to be distinguished from that of the original
scribe.
As before, the papyrus shows a number of small differences from the
ordinary text, the most noteworthy being those in ll. 4, 13, 16, 38, 62–3 and 87.
Our collation is with the text of Hude.

Fr. (a) Col. i. 28. 4. Col. ii. 29. 3.

\[\text{\underline{αμαρτημιατα \ woste \ προσπει}}\]
\[\text{πτειν \ α[ν \ αυτους \ απροσδοκη}}\]
\[\text{οι} \]
\[\text{5 \ τ-ως \ η \ βουλιουντο \ επ \ εκει} \]
\[\text{νους \ γαρ \ ειναι \ αν \ \ την \ επιχει} \]
\[\text{[οη]σιν} \]
\[\text{ι \ column \ lost.} \]

Fr. (b) Col. iv. 32. 1.

\[\text{πρωτους} \]
\[\text{[φυλακας \ ois \ επεδρα]μον \ ευθυς} \]
\[\text{10 \ [διαφθειρουσιν \ en \ te] \ ταις \ ευναις \ της} \]
\[\text{[αναλαμβανοντ'ας} \ \text{,} \ \text{επι. ta \ oppla}} \]
\[\text{[και \ λαθοντες} \ \text{την} \ \text{αποβασιν} \ \text{οι}} \]
\[\text{tas \ ναις} \]
\[\text{[ομενων \ αυτων \ kata \ to \ ειω} \]
\[\text{[θos \ es \ εφορμον \ της] \ νυκτος \ πλειν} \]

Fr. (c) Col. v. 32. 4. Col. vii. 34. 3.

\[\text{χωρησειαν \ οι} \ \text{π[ολ]εi} \]
\[\text{[μοι \ εσεθαι} \ \text{ψελοi} \ \text{και \ οι \ απο} \]
\[\text{[ρωτατοι] \ το\[ευματι} \ \text{και} \ \text{a}} \]
\[\text{25 \ [κορτιοι] \ και \ λιθοις} \ \text{και} \ \text{σφεn} \]
\[\text{[δο]\[μαις} \ \text{πολλου [ε]χοντες} \ \text{αλ} \]
\[\text{60 \ λων \ \text{dia} \ \text{to} \ \text{εν} \ \text{τοι \ αυτω} \ \text{ανα} \]
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[κη]υ o[ις] μηδε επελθειν οιον
[τη]ν] φευγοντες τε γαρ ε’
[κρατουν] κα(ι) αναχα’ρουντες επε

Col. vi. 33. 2.

χωρι]ων τι βαΩ
30 [πο]ητ[ι και] υπο της πριν ε
[ρημ]ιας τραχεων [οντων εν
[ναντο] διωκειν οπλα εχον
[τες χρο]νον μεν ου[ν τ]ινα
35 [ολιγον οι]τω προς αλληλους
[ηκρο]βολισαντο των δε
[Λακεδαιμονιων ουκετι ο
[ξεως] επεχειν η προσπειτοι
[εν δυναμενων γ]ηνευτες αυ
40 τους ο[ι] ψειλοι βρα[η]υτερους ηδη
α ονται τωι αμυνεθα][ι και

αυτοι τη τε ουφε τ’ουν δαρβε[ε][ι]
το παλιστον ειληφ]ο]τες πολ
λαπλασιον φαινομενοι και

45 ευνεισμενοι μαλλον μη
κετι δεινους αυτους ομοιοι
σφαιρα] φαινομεθαιι ητ[ι] ουκ ευθυς
αξια της πρ[ο]σ]δικ[αις ε]πε
[πονθεαν] ωσ[ι]περ στρο
50 [τον απεβαινον] τη γ[υ]μήνι
[δεδουλωμενοι] οσ επι[ι] Λακε
[δαιμονιους] καταφρονη
[σαντες και εμ]βο]νεσα]ντες
[αθροι ωρη]σαν επ αυτουν
55 [και εβαλλον λι]ό[ης

στρεφοθαι συγκληθαντες
ανεχωρησαν εσ το εσχατον ερυ
μα της μηρου ου πολυ απεχον
γε και τους εαυτους φυλακας ους
65 δε ενεδοσαν ενταυθα δη πολ
ςαυ επι πλει’ονοι βοηι τεθαρ
ρηκτες οι ψειλοι επεκεντω.
και των Λακεδαιμονιων
οσοι μεν υποχωρουντες εν
70 κατελαμβανοντο απεθνη
ςκον όι θεν Πολυ διαφευγον
τες προς το ερυμα μετα των
ταυτή]ι Φυλακων εταξον
το παρα πα]υν ους αμυνουμε
75 [νο]ι [ηπη]ρ ην επιμαχον []
[οι Αθη]ναιοι επιστα[μενοι]
/ [περιθαι]νοι μεν αυτων και
κυκλωσιν χωριου εις υν
οικ ειχον προσισυντες

80 δε εξ εναντιας ωσαθαι επει
[ροντο και χρο]νοι μεν
[πολυν και τ]ης ημερας το πλει]
[στοι τα]λαιπ[ω]ουμενοι αμφο
[τεροι υπο] τε της μαχης και
85 [διψης και] η]λιων αντειχ[ον]
[πειρωμενοι] οι μεν
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2 lines lost. \( \text{\textcopyright} \lambda \omega \text{ou} \)
\( \nu \text{[i]} \text{ou} \) 95 \( \alpha \text{ou} \)
\( \nu \text{ites} \)
\( \pi \text{ow} \)
\( \varepsilon \text{ Kapinhs} \) \( \varepsilon \text{mypomat}i \)
[ \( \mu \text{eyalo[i]} \)
\( \text{100 } \mu \text{opulais} \)
\( \tau \text{h} \) 11
\( \tau \text{ow} \)

4. \( \alpha \text{prosdoke}t\text{os} \): for the variant \( \alpha \text{prosdoke}t\text{os} \), which is not otherwise recorded, cf. e.g. ii. 93. 4 \( \alpha \text{prosdoke}t\text{es} \) \( \text{episxovntes} \). It may be doubted whether \( \alpha \text{to} \text{os} \) was retained with this reading or was replaced by \( \alpha \text{to} \) 10.

5. \( \eta \): the omission of iota adscript is unusual in this papyrus.
6. \( \alpha \text{v\\alphaia} \text{av} \) : this is the order of CEGMF; \( \alpha \text{v\\alphaia} \text{ABF} \).
10. \( \alpha \text{analybawntas} \) \( \text{eti} \) was the original order, but \( \text{eti} \) was subsequently inserted at the end of l. 10 and cancelled in l. 11. \( \text{eti} \) \( \alpha \text{analybawntas} \) is the reading of all MSS. Hude prints \( \alpha \text{analybawntas} \), a modification of Abresch’s conjecture \( \kappa \alpha \text{v\\alphaia} \text{ABF} \).
12. It is unfortunate that the beginning of this line is lost since editors have suspected a corruption in \( \lambda \text{abantes} \) \( \tau \nu \) \( \alpha \text{posbaion} \). The ordinary reading suits the size of the lacuna well enough.
13. \( \text{ras knw} \), which is added above the line, is found in all MSS. It is not absolutely essential, and may be an explanatory adscript which has become incorporated into the text.

\( \varepsilon \text{io} \text{[o]os} \): \( \varepsilon \text{io} \) MSS. The new variant is supported by other examples in Thucydides of \( \kappa \alpha \text{t\alpha} \) \( \text{or} \) \( \text{p\alpha\beta} \) \( \varepsilon \text{io} \) \( \text{\varepsilon} \text{v\alphaia} \text{\varepsilon} \text{io} \) 17. 2, 55. 2, 67. 4.
14. \( \text{io} \) \( \text{[o]os} \) \( \varepsilon \text{v\alphaia} \) \( \tau \nu \) is rather long for the lacuna, and possibly \( \tau \nu \) was omitted.
16. \( \alpha \text{tebainon} : \) \( \text{epi\betaaion} \), the reading of the MSS., has been commonly changed by editors to \( \text{epi\betaaion} \), an alteration which is now sanctioned by the papyrus. The singular \( \alpha \text{tebainon} \) may also well be right.
22. Eleven lines are lost at the top of this column.
23. \( \psi \text{elw} \) \( \text{ki} \) \( \text{oi} \) : so the MSS. The papyrus gives no support to the suggested emendations (\( \psi \) \( \text{lo} \) \( \text{ki} \) \( \text{ou} \) \( \text{Cobet, ou} \) \( \psi \text{lo} \) \( \text{ki} \) \( \text{Madvig} \)).
28. \( \text{e\varepsilon}\text{vion} \): there would not be room for Hude’s conjecture \( \text{e\varepsilon}\text{vion} \).
29. Similar insertions of \( \nu \) \( \varepsilon \text{v\alphaia} \text{\varepsilon} \text{v\alphaia} \text{\varepsilon} \) occur in l. 47, 16. ii. 9, &c.
30. The original omission of \( \chi\alpha\text{riw} \) \( \tau \nu \) may have been caused by the homioioachon of \( \chi\alpha\text{lepontt} \), but it is noticeable that the words have not been supplied in quite their right position.
35. The addition of the \( \tau \) of \( \text{o} \text{w} \) is parallel to the insertions of final \( \nu \); cf. note on l. 29. \( \alpha \text{v\\alphaia} \) MSS., Hude.
38. \( \varepsilon\text{peh} \text{[eiw} \) MSS. \( \varepsilon\text{peh} \text{[eiw} \) here might be supported by such a use as \( \tau \nu \) \( \text{as} \)
696. **FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS** 145

ēi σφώς νοῦς ἐπεχούσας (viii. 105. 3), but it may be a mere graphical error; ἐπεκθέω would be more likely to become ἐπεχεῖσθαι than vice versa. The ι has been rewritten.

41. The superscribed reading, ἀμνεσθαί, is that of the MSS., but ἀμνεσθαί is far preferable. It is noticeable that the interlinear α has a stroke above it instead of, as usual, the letter which was to be replaced.

42–3. The MSS. reading in this passage is τοῦ βαρρείων τὸ πλέιστον, Dobree's conjecture πιστῶν for πλέιστον having been generally adopted by subsequent editors. It is nearly certain that the papyrus agreed with the MSS. in having πλέιστον, for though there is a hole at the crucial point, the distance between the letters π and ε strongly suggests that another letter had intervened. There is no trace of any correction. It may then be assumed with little chance of error that the tradition of τοῦ βαρρείων or βαρρείων τὸ πλέιστον goes back at least to the first century A.D.; and this reading is no doubt intelligible, if not very satisfactory. The interlinear variant των βαρρειω, so far from helping matters, only creates fresh difficulties, and seems indeed quite impossible. It may be noted that the top of the ν of τοῦ has been rewritten (by the first hand), but no importance should be attached to this circumstance; the same thing has been done again in the case of ν of πολύ in l. 63.

45. The ι written above ει of ξενεδιαμενα has been again cancelled.

47. σφώι MSS., H.; cf. l. 29.

59. The blank space at the end of this line has been filled up by two angular marks; elsewhere one only is usually employed for this purpose.

60. διὰ τὸ αἰεί is the MSS. reading. The o of το has been corrected from ε (?).

61. συγκλίησαρτες: elsewhere in the papyrus ει is written.

62. ανεκχωρησαν: the first syllable was added afterwards, most probably by the first hand; ἐγκωρησαν MSS.

63. ou πολύ σεχει: δ ου πολύ ἀπειχε MSS.

65. For the insertion of an elided ε in δε cf. l. 80, and 16. iii. 8; δε MSS.

57. The alternative spelling πλεον is that of the MSS.

71. διαφραγματες: l. διαφραγματε, with the MSS.

72. πρός: ης MSS. The π is quite certain.

76. καὶ ἢ καὶ 'Αθ. MSS. It is just possible, though unlikely, that the papyrus had καὶ at the end of the previous line; there is not room in l. 76 for καὶ before ou.

80. For the inserted ε cf. l. 65, note.

86. περιφερεσαί scarcely fills the lacuna, in which three or four more letters would be expected.

87–102. The papyrus here supplies some of the letters missing at the beginnings of lines at the top of the first column of 16. The vertical strokes in the text show the line of fracture.

87–8. πιστευοντες: πιστεύοντες MSS. The reading of the papyrus may be right.
A leaf from a codex of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, containing most of i. 6. 3–11, and a small piece of another leaf containing a few letters from ii. 1. 30, written in a neat uncial hand which is probably not much later than A.D. 200. Several corrections or variants have been added above the line, chiefly by a second and more cursive hand. The numerous stops (high, middle and low point) are for the most part due to the original scribe.

The condition in which the text of the *Cyropaedia* still remains after centuries of use as a schoolbook is deplorable. Dindorf's Oxford edition, which alone gives a serious critical apparatus, omits several of the most important MSS., and the accuracy of the collations is not to be depended on. Hug's Teubner edition is mainly based on C, a Paris MS., which is one of the best, but since Hug's apparatus is not sufficiently detailed for his silence about the readings of C to be a trustworthy argument, we are unable to infer what they are except where he actually records them. Mr. E. C. Marchant, however, whose forthcoming edition of the *Cyropaedia* may be expected to reduce the existing chaos to order, has very kindly placed at our disposal the passage covered by the papyrus his unpublished collations of two of the chief MSS., the Bodleianus (Bib. Canon. 39, which in the *Anabasis* is generally called D, though different from Dindorf's D), and the Etonensis, which is closely related to C.

The MSS. of the *Cyropaedia* divide into two main families; one group consists of AG, which are the basis of Dindorf's edition, C, which in the early part of the *Cyropaedia* supports AG and is the basis of Hug's edition, and the Etonensis (Et.); while the other group consists of Dindorf's D and the Bodleianus (Bod.), and is supported through a large portion of the passage covered by the papyrus by Stobaeus. The character of Dindorf's R and the relation of it to the two main groups is uncertain. The papyrus on the whole supports the group represented by D, Bod. and Stobaeus, with which its readings agree against the AGC, Et., group about twice as often as vice versa, and adds a number of variants peculiar to itself. Though not of equal importance to that of the Oxyrhynchus fragment of the *Anabasis* (463), the text of which seems to represent the archetype from which the existing MSS. of that work are descended in two main traditions, the papyrus is of considerable interest.

Our collation is with the edition of Dindorf, supplemented occasionally by that of Hug. But the only MSS. of which the accurate collation is guaranteed
are the two for information about which we are indebted to Mr. Marchant. Fortunately these are typical and important representatives of the two main groups.

Verso.

γαρ εφη ακούσας τοτε σοι οτι εικοσις αν κα[i] παρα θε
ων πρακτικωτέρος εις· ωσπερ και παρ ανθρωποιναι· οστις
μη ο[π]οτε εν αποροις εις· τοτε κολακευοι· αλλ [ο]τε αριστα
πρατιτο[ι]ς τοτε μαλατα των θεων μεμη[ν][ος] τοι· [κα]ς των φι
5 λον δ εφησθα Χρησαίι ωσαυτως επιμελεισθα[ι] ουκοιν νυ
εφη οι πα[i]ς δι εκεινας τας επιμελειας ηδειον μεν ερχη
πιρος τουσ θεους δεησομενοι ελπιζεις δε μ[α]λλον τευξε
σθαι ον εαυ δεη οτι συνειδειναι σαυτω δοκεις ου] παπτοτε
αρεινθοις αυτοι· παιν μεν ουν εφη οι πατ[ε]ρ ος προς

10 φιλους μοι τους θεους ουτας ουτω διακει[αξ] [οι]. τι γαρ ε
φη νοι επι εκεινα μεμησαι α ποτε εδοκει ημινι· οποσα γαρ
δηπον δεδοκασιν οι θε[ος] μαθοντας ανθρω[πους] θελτει
ο[ν] πρατειν. η ανεπιστημονας αυτων ουταις· και εργαζο
μενους μαλλον ανυτειν η αργουτας και επιμελομε

[πιερ]α]ς επι τας αυτων ωιος δει· ουτως ημιν ενδικεις δειεν και
αιτεις δοθαι τα αγαθα παρα των θεου· ναπ μα Δι ε[φη] ο Κυρος
§ 6

σον γ
μεμησαι μεντοι [οι] πα[ι]ς ακοουας και ερ αναγκη ην
πι[ει]ς θεσαι του λογου τουτω· και οιδα σε επιτιθεντα αν
20 πα[ι]ς οι ουδε θεις εις αιτησθαι παρα των θεων ουτε
πα[ι]ς εμειν ημα μαθοντας ιππομαχουτας ικανων· ουτε
μη ειποταμενους τοζειν αυτοιντας κρατειν των ε
πισταμενους τοζειν· ουτε μη ειποταμενους κυβερ
να[n] σοζειν ειεκεις ην [ο]τε μη οστει

φιλα[τ]ου· [οι]ς εν εν πολεμω σωτηριων αιτησθαι· πα
ρα γαρ] τους των θεων [οι]ς [οι]ς σαυτα και τας σους πα
I. 2
\[\tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu \alpha i\] τούς δ' ἐ[α\(\theta\)βεμιστὰ ευχομενοὺς. ὁμοίως εφησθα [εἰκὸς εἰ]ναι παρα θεων αὐτοχειν. ὁσπερ καὶ παρ ἀνθρωπω

30 [ἀπὶ]κ[τ]ειν τοὺς παρανομὰ δεομενους. εκείνων δὲ ε

[φη] ὦ ταῖ επελαθου α ποτε εγω καὶ συ ελογι[ζομεθα. ὥς
[ικα]νοίν] ἁν εἶνη καὶ καλῶν α[ν]δροι εργ[']ον ει τις δυναιτο επιμε
[λη]θη[ναι ὁπδωσ αὐτὸς καλὸς τε καγαθὸς δοκ[ί]μως γενοτ[ο]

[φαινετο ναι μα Δι εφη ὦ πατερ[ο] μεμνημαι καὶ του

[ναι εργον το καλωσ αρ]χε[ιν καὶ νυν γ]εφη ταυτα] μοι δο
[ταν μεντοι προς αι]λο]ν α[νθρωπων ιδων καταιν
[ησο οιου τε ουτε διαγι]γη[νονται αρχοντες και οιου ουτε

45 [ανταγωνιστα] ημι[ν ε]σονται παν χοι δοκει αισ]χρον ει
[οντ]οι

[ναι τοιο]ντους υποπ]ης]ει

14 lines lost

Recto.

η

61 ερχη τοις παρα Κυαζαρε[ίω] Χρημασιν' εγογε εφη ο Κύρος:

οισθα δε εφη ὁποσα αυτοι εστιν. μα τον Δι εφη ο Κύρος'

ομως δε

ου μεν δη ομως δη τουτως πιστευει τοις αδηλοις' σοι
de πολιων μεν ου δεσει πολια δε και αλλα νυν αναγ

65 κη δαπαναν αυτων γινωσκεις' γινωσκο εφη ο Κύρος'

eαν ουν εφη αυτων επιλιπη η δαπανη και ε[ξ]ων ψευδη
tαι' πως σοι εξει τα της στρατιας δηλον οτι ου καλως'

αταρ εφη ο πατερ σου ει ενοραις τινα πορον και απ εμων

75 συμμαχον εσται: ποιον ονν εθνος των περιξ ον δοκεις και χαριζεσθαι βουλομενον μην ὑπηρετησεις. και φοβου μενον μὴ τι παθη α χρη σε συνν Κυναξαρει κοινῆ σκοπει.

σθαι μηστον επιληπτη [κτι] υμας ον δει υπαρχειν· και εθους ενεκα μῆ]χανομενον προσδον πορον· το[δ]ε δε [παν

80 [των μαλιστα μοι μεμισο μηδεποτε αναμενει τω]

πορεσι[βα] τα επιτη[δε]α [εσ'] αν η χρεια σε αγαγαση αλλ ὅταν μαλατα ευπορησ τοτε προ της αποριας μ[α]λλον μη χανω και γαρ τευχει μαλλον παρ ων αν δεη μη αποριων δοκων· και αναιτιος ε(σει) π[α]'α τοις [σε]αυτον στρατιωταις


90 κανον ον και ευ και κα[κως αλλ] εφη ο πι'ατερ [α]λ[α]φις τε

§ 10

§ 11

μοι δοκεις ταυτα παντα καλως λεγειν και οτι [ων] [μεν

νυν ληφονται οι στρατιωται ο[μ]δεισι αυτων εμοι χαριν εισεται· ἵσασ γαρ ἐφ οι αυτους Κυναξαρης ἀγεται συμμαχους

οτι δοιαν προς τοις [ειρη][μεν]ς λαμβανη τις ταυτα και τι


THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

100 [οις αν εργαζότα τε [εως δή] την γην αργούσαν ανω
[φέλητον ειναι ως γ εμου εφη μηδεποτε αμελησοντος του]
[τα επιτηδεια τοις στρατιωτατεσ συμμηχανονθαι]
[
]οδ[
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]

16. αυτον (i.e. αυτος): ιαυτος D, Bod., Stob.; ουν τουτους ιαυτους AGR, Dind.; e' ouν τουτους ιαυτους Et.

17. τα αγαθα: so D; ταγαθα AGR, Et., Stob., Dind.; τα γαθα τα Bod. ται γαθα δε τα Bod. And there is certainly not room for ἄναυαντα.


και αυθα σε επιτιθετα αυτων: so D, Bod.; και αυθα προστιθεντα αυτω Stob.; επιτιθεντα αυτω G (second hand in marg.); και γαρ αυθα σε λεγοντα αει ΑΓ (first hand) R, Et., Dind.

20. ουτε: ουτως corr. to ουτε by second hand Bod.; ουτε other MSS., Dind. Similarly with ουτε in l. 21.

23. τοϕειαι: so D, Bod., Stob.; om. AGR, Et., Dind.

24. ευπε[ε]θαυι: so DGR, Bod., Et., Stob., Dind.; ξεσθαυι A.

ναιον: so Stob.; ναις MSS., Dind.

[α]ποτε: so Stob.; αβδι MSS., Dind. [στειριανας]: so MSS., Dind.; στειριατας (Stob.) is equally possible.

25. αυτος αυτον: so DG (second hand), Bod., Stob. AG (first hand) R, Et. agree with the original reading of the papyrus in omitting σινον (so Dind.).

ουτε: αβδι MSS., Stob., Dind.

26 παρα: so ADR, Bod., Et., Stob., Dind.; περι G.

27. ταυτα και τα τουτα παντα[α]: so Bod., Stob., and (with the omission of παντα) D; παντα τα τουτα AGR, Et., Dind.


παρ: so Stob.; παρι MSS., Dind.

30. παρανομα: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; τα παρανομα Et.


31. α παρε: so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; δποτε R.

32. αν: om. MSS., Dind. After δεναιρο Bod. has φπθη (sic).

33. οπ[ο]ις: so D, Bod.; οπως ουν ΑΓΡ, Et., Dind.


34. δοκιμων: so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; om. R.

35. ται ε[ε]τηδεια: so MSS. here and in l. 37; ταιτηδεια Dind.

[ο]ποιος: so D, Bod.; om. AGR, Et., Dind.

αι: so AD, Bod., Et., Dind.; om. G.; above the line in Dind.

36. αυτ[ο]ω[ς [ο]]ποιος: so D, Bod.; δποτος ουτος AGR, Dind.; φγαθων δποτος ουτως Et.

ψηφισταθαι: so DR, Bod.; επισταθαι AG, Et., Dind.; εφι with dots underneath before επισταθαι L.

36. εξονην απαντα: so D, Bod.; εξονην παντα AGR, Et., Dind. What reading the papyrus had is uncertain.

37. απαντες: παντες MSS., Dind.

38. τοτε (σφαιρητα: απαντε (ευναι MSS., Dind.

40. σου: so AGR, Bod., Et., Dind.; διε σου D. It is unlikely that the papyrus had D's reading for τουτο is rather long for the end of l. 39.

συνεβεθακε: so D, Bod., Stob.; συνεβεθει ουν AGR, Et., Dind.

41. νυν γα: γα is omitted by R, Et., and Stob., inserted in ADG, Bod. (so Dind.). Considerations of space make it probable that the papyrus read γ.

taυτα] μισι δοκει: the restoration of this is uncertain. We have followed the reading
of Stobaeus ταύτα μοι δοκεῖ, which suits the lacuna best. ταύτα μοι τα αυτά AG, and, with the addition of δοκεῖ, CR, Et.; ταύτα μοι δοκεῖ ταύτα D.
43. [μετοι]: so D, Stob.; μετοιγέ AGR, Et., Dind. Which reading the papyrus had is uncertain.
44. [οιο τε]: so D; om. τε RG (second hand in marg.), Dind.; οἱοι τε δυτες διαγύρωνται δρχοντες καὶ is omitted by AG (first hand), Et., owing to homoioteleuton.
46. The restoration is uncertain. CR, Et. have είναι το τοιούτους αυτός δυτας υποτεθεῖαι, and so D with the omission of τό; είναι το τοιούτους υποτ. A (so Dind.); είναι το τοιούτους (apparently) υποτ. G, αυτός δυτας being added over the line by a later hand. Probably the papyrus originally had είναι τοιούτους υποτεθεῖαι, ουτας and perhaps αυτους being added over the line by the corrector.
61. εφη: so MSS.; έφη Dind.
Κυαβηρετα, the corrected reading of the papyrus, agrees with D. CAGR agree with the reading of the first hand Κυαβηρετα. Κυαβηρετα Bod., Dind.
ενεγο: ένεγο Dind.
61-2. ο Κύριος οισθα δε εφη: ο Κύριος τί δε έφη οισθα CDR, Bod., Et., and in marg. by a later hand G, Dind.; om. AG (first hand).
62. εστιν: έστι MSS., Dind.
63. ομος δη, the reading of the first hand, is clearly an error, and ought to have been erased by the corrector when he inserted ομος δε. ου μην δη αισθα δρας δε D; ου μην δη δρως δε AGR, Bod., Et., Dind.
πιστευει: so most MSS., Dind.; πιστευεις Bod.
64. ου δεθει: ου δεθει CR; δεθεις AG, Dind.; ου δεθαι Et. πολλα δε και αλλα γιναι δεθαι αυτων: om. αυτων AGR, Et., Dind.; πολλα δε αναγκαι αυτων νιν δεθαιν D, Bod.
65. γεννακεις: om. Bod.; έκεινο ου γεννακεις AGR, Et., Dind.; έκεινο ου γεννακεις D in marg. by later hand; δεθαιν έκεινον ου γεννακεις Hug following Madvig.
66. ενον εφη αυτων επιληθη η δεθαιν και: ενον εφη αυτων η δεθαιν επιληθη η και D, and with αποληθη for υποληθη Bod. ην ουν εφη επιληθη αυτων η δεθαιν η και A, Et., Dind., R (with επιληθη by the first hand) and (with a added by a later hand) G.
67. πως ου εκι: so CDR, Bod., Et.; έ παι πως αρ’ εκι (or perhaps αρ’ G, Dind.; έ παι πως αρεθη A.
θηρον ουν ου καλως: so AGR, Et., Dind.; ου καλως θηρον οτι D and (reading θηλωντι) Bod.
68. εφη ο ρατερ: so AGR, Et., Dind.; έ παιτερ έφη D, Bod.
69. προσγειομενοι: so DR, Bod., Dind. AG, Et. agree with the reading of the first hand προσγαι(γ)νομενον.
70. α παι τουτο: so AG (first hand) R, Dind.; τοιτο α παι DG (in marg. second hand), Bod., Stob. Flor. 48. 70; α παι Et.
eι τις [αν]: so DG (second hand in marg.), Bod.; ει τις Stob.; πως αν R; ποιν αν AG (first hand), Dind.; τις αν Et.
προσγειωντο: so D, Bod., Stob., Dind.; γεννατο AG (first hand, τακτικων being added in the margin) R, Et.
71. δε: so ADGR, Et., Stob., Dind.; δει Bod.
εικον: so D, Stob.; εικον έστι CAGR, Et., Dind.; om. Bod., which also omits πορον.
γενεθα: so D, Bod., Et., Stob. (Hug); προσγειομενοι AGR, Dind.
εχων ενδεικτε: so D, Bod., Et.; ενδεικτε εχον AGR, Dind.
73. [ρχ’]: so MSS.; έρχει Dind.
οι: so AG (first hand) R, Et., Dind.; ει οι DG (second hand), Bod.
74. Μηδῶν: so ADGR, Dind.; τῶν Μηδῶν Bod., Et.
75. συμμαχοῦ: so ADG, Bod., Dind.; om. R; δοκεῖ εἶναι σύμμαχον ὅταν Et.
76. δοκεῖ: so Bod.; δοκεῖ τι (apparently) D; δοκεῖ σαί AGR, Et., Dind.
77. παύσῃ: so ADGR, Bod., Dind.; πᾶδοι Et.
κωπή: this word is placed before σω by the MSS. and Dind.
79. επιλέπτῃ: so AGR, Et., Dind.; ἕπολετο D, Bod.
ναύς: so ADG, Bod., Dind.; ήμέν Et.
εἶδος: ἔδει Dind. with all MSS. except Et., which has καὶ ἔδει μοι μέμνησο added by a second hand in the margin against ἕνεκα μηχανᾶσθαι προσανακόμα πόρον τῆς δὲ πάντων μίλιαστα.
80. τὸ δὲ: so CDR, Bod., Et., Stob. Flor. 48. 71, Dind.; τὸ AG.
81. τὰ εἰσηγήθηκα: cf. note on l. 34.
τοῦ ἄγγελου: so ADG, Bod., Et., Stob., Anon. ap. Boisson, Anecd. i. p. 113, Dind.; ἔῳ R.
82. στατὴ... εὐπορεῖ: so AGR (second hand), Et., Stob., Anon., Dind.; ἤτο... εὐπορεῖς D; ἢτε μὲν... εὐπορεῖς Bod.; ἢτο... εὐπορεῖς R (first hand).
μᾶλλον μυ̂ μανόεσαι: so DG (in marg. by second hand), Stob.; om. μᾶλλον AG (first hand)
R, Et., Anon., Dind.
83. τευξέ: so D, Anon. (?), Et., Dind.; τευξη Ἄριον; τευξη GR, Bod., Stob.
ἀπορεῖ: so D, Bod., Stob.; ἀπορος δοκῶν εἶναι Ἄριον, Anon., G (omitting δοκῶν), and (ἀπορος being added in marg. by a later hand) L, Dind. ἀπορος εἰναι is too long for the lacuna.
84. καὶ: so D, Stob.; καὶ ἔδει GR, Bod., Et., Dind.; καὶ ἐλέφαντα.
85. παύσῃ: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; τοῦτον Καρπ.
86. αὐξάνει: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; τῶν ἀνθρώπων D, Bod., Stob.
88. βουλὴ: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; βουλεύει Et.
89. εὐπορεῖ: so ADG, Bod., Et., Stob., Dind.; ποιεῖται R (first hand apparently).
80. τὴν διωκήσα: so here AGR, Et., Dind.; D, Bod., and Stob. place it after βουλή.
81. εἶναι τὰ δεόντων οἱ στρατιώται ὑπηρετοῦσιν: so: so, with the exception of ἐχόμεν for ἐχόμεν, AGR, Et., Dind.; ἔως ἐν ἑχόμεν ὑποτε οἱ τρ. ἑχοῦσι τὰ δεόντων D, Bod.; ὑπηρετοῦσιν οἱ στρατιώται ἑχοῦσι τὰ δεόντων Stob.
82. πιστικοτάτους δὲ λόγους αἰθιατεῖ τοτε δύνησει λέγειν: so, with δυνήσει corrected from δυνησα by second hand, D, and, with δυνήση, Stob.; πιστικότερος τοις δὲ λόγους κ.τ.λ. corr. to καὶ πιστικότατος τοῖς λόγους κ.τ.λ. Bod.; καὶ πιστικότατος σφαλατεῖ δύνησε λόγους τότε λέγειν Et.; πιστικότατος σφαλατεῖ δύνησε λόγους τότε λέγειν AG and, with δυνησα λόγους, R; πιστικότατος σφαλατεῖ δύνησε λόγους τότε λέγειν Dind. It is tolerably certain that the papyrus had δυνήσει not δυνησα.
83. οὐτὲπερ: so CDR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; οὐτὲπερ Α; οὐτὲπερ G; οὐτὲπερ Et.
84. ποιεῖν ἑκατον ὁιν καὶ εὐ: so D, Stob.; καὶ εὐ ποιεῖν ἑκατον ὁιν AGR, Et., Dind.; εὐ ποιεῖν ἑκατον ὁιν καὶ κακῶς (καὶ κακῶς ἐν ταύτη) Bod.
85. δοκεῖ τοῦτο παντα καλὸς λέγειν: so D; καλῶς δοκεῖ τοῦτο λέγειν παντα AGR and (with λέγειν) Et., Dind., and (omitting παντα and with καλῶς... τοις ἐν ταύτῃ) Bod.
86. οὐτὲπερ: so CDR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; οὐτὲπερ Α; οὐτὲπερ G; οὐτὲπερ Et.
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92. τοῦτον χάριν MSS. (except Et. χάριν τούτων) Dind.; but there is not room for τούτων in the lacuna.

93. αὐτοὺς: so ADGR, Bod., Dind.; αὐτός Et.

95. For εἰκὸς D and Bod. have πλείστην εἰκὸς, and πλείστην is added in the margin of G by a later hand. There is not room for πλείστην in the lacuna, so the papyrus probably agreed in omitting it with AG (first hand) R, Et., Dind.

96. το: so AG, Dind.; τῶν D, Bod.; τῶ Et.

97. εἰσὶ: so ADG (second hand) R, Bod., Dind.; εἰσίν G (first hand); εἰσίν (with a above i) μὲν Et., omitting μὲν after ἐστι. The supplement at the end of the line is longer than it should be by three or four letters, but the only variant is ποιοῦντα (R) for ποιοῦντα ADG (corrected)

98. πορίζεσθαι: so ADG, Dind., agreeing with the first hand; πορίζεων R, Bod., agreeing with the corrector.

99. εξαν [μὲν: so ADGR, Bod., Dind.; μὲν εξαν Et.

100. δὴ: so G in marg.; om. ADR, Et., Dind. The reading of the papyrus is uncertain.

109. καὶ τοῦτο: τοιοῦτο AD; τοιοῦτον G, Dind.

698. Xenophon, Cyropaedia I.

23.5 x 7.9 cm.

Two fragments from the conclusion of the first book of Xenophon's Cyropaedia, with the title, which is written, as usual, below the final column. We assign the small detached piece from § 45 to the previous column owing to the height of the papyrus. It is remarkable that what according to the accepted division are the opening words of Book ii, τοιαυτὰ μὲν . . . Περσάδος, are here made the last sentence of Book i. The text does not otherwise differ from that of Dindorf.

On the verso of the papyrus are parts of two columns of a money-account in a cursive hand, which apparently is not later than about the middle of the third century. The text on the recto, therefore, which is written in sloping
oval uncial of the common type, is to be assigned to the earlier part of the century.

Col. i.

μ[ε]χρι των ορει'ων τῆς Περ

σιδός.

ιο

Ξενοφων'τος

Κυρον [a]

παιδεία

Col. ii.

[ονδε]ν θαυμαστ[ον] ου

γαρ αν[αγκη αυτ[αι] εστων

5 α[ν] α[ν] μ[η] εθελωσιν [επὶ

μ[ε]λε[σ]θαι τοιαύτα [μεν δη

αφ[i]κοντο δ[ας]εγο[μενοι

5. The vestiges are rather in favour of εθελωσιν (R), but θελωσιν (ADG) is not impossible.

6. τοιαύτα: so AD; ταύτα G corr. marg.

As already observed in the introduction, this sentence commences the next Book according to the ordinary division.

699. Theophrastus, Characters.

7 × 4.2 cm.

The text of the Characters of Theophrastus is notoriously insecure, and offers a problem upon which an early papyrus of any part of the book might be expected to throw some light. The present fragment, which contains the end of ch. 25 and the beginning of ch. 26, is however disappointing in this respect, giving a version which seems to be not less of the nature of a compendium than that of the Codex Monacensis. Unfortunately that MS. includes only the first twenty-one chapters so that an actual comparison is not possible. The interest of the papyrus, therefore, chiefly lies in showing the antiquity of such compendia of the Characters. It is written in rather small oval uncial, which probably date from the earlier part of the third century.
I—4. The conclusion of ch. 25 (περὶ ἐξελίξας) in the ordinary version is καὶ διαγείωθι ὡς κυδωνίσθαι ἕνα σέκωκα τῶν φίλων· καὶ εἰσῆγεν πρὸς τὸν κατακείμενον σκέψομένου τοὺς δημότας καὶ τοὺς φιλέτας, καὶ τούτων ἀμα ἐκστρω διαγείωθαι ὡς αὐτὸς αὐτῶν τοῖς ἐνοτῷ χεραίν ἐπὶ σκηνήν ἐκόμισεν. Περὶ λεγέων in l. 2 is right there is no room for εἰκομαίν. λίτην (not φιλέτην), which is an alternative, suggests nothing. In l. 4 after την is a broad blank space marking the end of the chapter.

5. Ch. 26 (περὶ ὁλογραφίας) begins δίδυμον (δ') ἐν εἶναι ἡ ὁλογραφία φιλορχία τις ἑσχυρῶς κέρδους γλυκομηνία. ὁ δὲ ὁλογραφηκὼς τοίνυν οὗτος τοὺς δήμους βουλικομένου (βουλιμ. MSS.) τίνας τῷ ἀρχαιοποιήσαται (πρώιμ. MSS.) τῇ πομπῇ τοὺς συνεπιλησμένους παρελθόν ἀποφήματι (ἀποφήματι ἐξει MSS.) ὅτι δὲ αὐτοκράτορα τούτων εἶναι κἂν ἄλλου προβάλλωντα δέκα λέγειν λεκάνος εἰς ἑστὶ, τούτων δὲ ὅτι δὲ ἀνεβρὰ εὑρεῖ. καὶ τῶν ὀρμήνων ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐν μῶνοι κατέχειν, ὅτι οὐκ ἄγαθῶν, ἐ.π.λ. (omitting ἐς βασιλείς). The definition of ὁλογραφία has generally been recognized as unsatisfactory and the MSS. disagree, Pal.-Vat. omitting φιλορχία and the others reading ἑσχυρῶς for ἑσχυρῶς. The papyrus variant ἑσχυρῶς, which gives the sense aimed at by Fischer’s emendation of κέρδους to κράτους, is very likely right, though the word at the end of l. 6 remains doubtful. The first letter, if not ι, seems to be γ, η, or π. Besides being much more compressed the text of the papyrus shows a different order, ll. 12—4 corresponding to what in the MSS. precedes the Homeric quotation. In ll. 9 sqq. it is not certain that μεν, νος, κ.τ.λ. are the beginnings of the lines since the papyrus is broken immediately before those letters; but the arrangement proposed is the most probable.

700. Demosthenes, De Corona.

This fragment is a strip from the bottom of a column containing parts of pp. 230—1 of the De Corona. The lines being incomplete both at beginning and end, it is doubtful how they should be divided; the arrangement given below is therefore hypothetical. The hand is a rather irregular upright uncial of medium size, and more probably of the second century than the third. A high point is occasionally used, this and the diaeresis being the only lection.
marks that occur. Our collations in this and the other oratorical fragments (701–4) are with the Teubner edition of Blass.

5 ουν εκαστα θεωρητικων τον γαρ Φωκι
κων συνσταυνος πολεμιζον δι ε
με ου γαρ] εγώνηε επολιτευόμεν πω
τοτε πρωτον μεν μησεσ ο[υτο τι
[κεισθε ωστε Φωκεας μεν θουλε]
10 σθαι σω[θηναι κα[ιπερ ον δικαιον πο
ουντα]ς ορωντες [Θησαυρις δο ο
τιουν αν] εφησκοναι πα[θουσιν
ουκ αλογως [ο]υθ αδικος α[υτοις οργη
ζωμενο ο]ης γαρ εντυχηκαςαν εν
15 Δευκτρο]ς [ο]ν μετρως εκε[ξωηντο ε
πειτα η Πελοποννησος απ[εσα δι
ευσηκει] και ουθ ο[ίς μεθοντε
Δακες]μονιους ισχυον [ουτως
ωστε α[υτες αυτους οι οι προ
20 τερον δι] εκεινων αρχο[ντες κν
μοι των] πολεων ησαυ α[λλα τη
ν ακρι]τος και παρα τουτοισ . . . .
. . . ερι|ς και οραχη|ς ταυτα δο ο
ρων ο Φιλ]ιππος ου γαρ ην α[φαι
25 τοις παρ] εκαστοις προδοται|ς Χρη
ματα αν|αλισκων παντας [ }'

Ειλιθησι οι

3. ιμας, which Bl(ass) omits after θνιωμενον with SL, may have stood in the papyrus.
4. παροντα which was first written was a mere slip.
5. The correction is probably by a second hand.
8. The papyrus most likely had either τοις or ποιε, like the other MSS. [τοις] Bl.
14. ευπρόκεισθαι: ηδυπρόκεσσαν Bl.
18. συνέν τουτος: συνέν Iσχυρόν MSS.

22-3. The usual reading here is καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἄπασιν ἐπὶ, but some MSS. (including FYQO) omit παρά, O adding Ἐλληνων after ἄπασιν, which is noticed as a variant also in FQ. It is manifest that none of these readings suits the papyrus, for only six or seven letters are required between τουτο[ις and ἐπι]. καὶ παρὰν οὐ απα[σιν might be read, or we may suppose that the scribe was led by the homoioteleuton of τοῦτος and ἄλλοις to write simply τουτος ἄπασιν. The entry at the bottom of the column (probably by a second hand), where O’s variant Ἐλληνοι is followed by οὐν (cf. e.g. 223. 126), evidently refers to this passage; but how much, if anything, stood before Ἐλληνοι cannot of course be determined. In 1. 23 l. τοραχή.

701. DEMOSTHENES, Contra Timocretam.

15.7 x 14.6 cm.

Parts of three rather short and narrow columns (about 16 x 5 cm.), covering pp. 720–1 of Demosthenes’ speech against Timocrates. Of the first and third columns only a few letters remain, but the lower portion of the intervening one is complete. The text, which is written in handsome round uncials (cf. 661, Plate v), probably of the end of the second century or of the first half of the third, seems, so far as can be judged, to be a fairly good one.

Col. i.

... to[ν]ς εν
[δεκα εις το θυκαστη]
[ριον τριακονθη η]
[μερον αφ ης αν]

Col. ii.

5 η απο[ε][ς]σαι εαν
δε αργυριον τιμη
θη η δεδεσθω τε
ως αν εκτιση ο τι
αν αυτων καταγνω

15 εαν δε αργυριον τι
μηθη εδεσθω
τεως αν εκτ[ε][ς]ην

πεπαυσο εστιν
ουν οπως εναν
FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

10 σθηι ακοντει ω
/ άνδρες δικασται λε
γε αυτοίς αυτο τουν
το παλιν
'νομος

20 τιωτερα τις δυν
θειν του δεδεσθαι
τεως αν εκτεινω
σιν τους αλοντας

Col. iii.

ενιντια αυτος
25 αυτω νομοθετειν
γι[ξιωσει]ν ουδε τους
αλλοις τους νο
μων εωντων εμοί
μ'εν γαρ εινεκα αν
30 α'ιδειας ο τοιον

3. The length of the line indicates that ενιντια was omitted before τιωτερα, as in A; so Bl(ass).

7. τεως: so Bl. with B; τε ενω SA. Cf. ll. 17 and 22, where S has τεως, A τε ενω as before.

5. For the deletion of the ε of αποτεωσει cf. ll. 17 and 22, and l. 8, where εκτεινει is written. -τεως- Bl. in all these passages.

19. αυ is similarly omitted before ενεντωτερα in A. ενεντωτερα' αυ Bl., following a conjecture of Weil.

24-33. The vestiges of the initial letters here are with two or three exceptions too slight for certain recognition, and the arrangement of the lines is therefore insecure. α[ and μ'] in ll. 27-8 are not very satisfactory, more especially the latter, in place of which α or λ would be more suitable. A greater difficulty however arises in l. 32, where the traces would suit μ much better than α[. But the division πα[ν is extremely improbable, especially as l. 31 is a short one; moreover the papyrus is rather rubbed, and α can therefore hardly be absolutely excluded, though very doubtful.

702. DEMOSTHENES, Contra Boeotum.

13.5 x 6.5 cm.

A small fragment from Demosthenes' oration against Boeotus, pp. 1023-4, written in good-sized uncials which on the whole approximate to the square
type, though ε and C have a tendency to become narrow, and which we should ascribe to the second century, and perhaps the earlier part of it. The text has no variants of importance.

703. Aeschines, *In Ctesiphonem*.

9 x 9 cm.

This small fragment, containing parts of §§ 94 and 96 of Aeschines' speech against Ctesiphon, belongs to what must have been an exceptionally interesting text, for in spite of its insignificant size it has three new readings, all of which are or may be improvements. The handwriting is in oval sloping uncial of the usual third century type. High stops and a paragraphus occur.

Col. i.      Col. ii.

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{δεινοπαθὼν τῆς ν} \\
\text{προικα μου τῆς μη} \\
\text{πρὸς ἀποστερησεί} \\
\text{αλλ' Ἱμεῖσ ὁ ἄνδρες} \\
\text{δικαστά} \mu \text{πρὸς Διὸς} \\
\text{καὶ θεὸν μὴ κατα} \\
\text{πλαγητε} \upsilon \text{πο τῆς} \\
\end{array}\]
704. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Ωρεοὶ [συν]
[ταξίς καὶ τα] εἴ Ἐρετρι
[σα τα δέκα ταλ]αντα ζων
[των . . . . .]
καὶ π[ραξίς πραττειν]
ετερα[s δι] απορρητων
καὶ το[ντων ειναι τιναι]
20 μαρτυρας
2 lines lost
ῥε[καλε]

8. ζων[των]: the MSS. have ὁρῶντως φρονοῦσιν βλεπότων. Whether the papyrus inserted ζῶντων before ὁρῶντως or had ζῶντων in place of one of the other three verbs (probably ὁρῶντω) cannot be determined. ζῶντων makes a more forcible prelude than ὁρῶντως το φρονούσιν βλεπότων.

14-5. ἀπορία[ν] εἰσαθαί: ἐσεθαί ἀποριαν Bl. with MSS. The papyrus reading avoids a hiatus.

16. δῆ: om. MSS., Bl. The insertion of δῆ is an improvement.

704. ISOCRATES, Contra Sophistas.

7·9 × 10·3 cm.

Parts of two columns containing portions of §§ 16–18 of Isocrates’ oration (xiii) against the sophists, written in sloping oval uncialis of the usual third century type. The text contains no striking variants.

Col. i.

§ 16
[προελεσθαί και]
[μιξασθαι προς αλ]
[ληλας και ταξα]
[σθαει κατα τροπον]
5 ετι δε των καιρων
μη διαμαρτειν αλ
[λα] και τοις ενθυμη
μας[i π]ρεποντως
ολο[ν] τον λογον κα
10 τα[π][θ]ει[λαι και]
τοις ονομασιν ευ

Col. ii.

tων διδακτων
παραλιπειν περι
de των λοιπων
τοιουτοιν αυτον
20 παραδειγμα παρα
σχειν ωστε τους
εκτυπωθεντας και
μυμησε[σθαι δυ

§ 18
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\[ \text{pustmos k[ai \mu]ousi} \quad \nu \text{thevtai\[s eu\[vus} \\
\[\kappa]\[\omega]s \text{eipein toanta} \quad \S 17 \quad \text{25 an\[th]e\[r]oteron ti ?} \\
\text{de pol\[l]h\[\eta]s epime} \quad \kai \chi[\[a\[r]o\[e]t\[e]\[r]on} \\
15 \[\lambda\[e]ia\[s \[\delta\[e\[i\[s] \[\theta\[ai \[\kai} \quad \text{to\[v]n all\[o\[n fai} \\
\ldots \ldots \ldots \]

2. [\mu\[e]\[s]\[a]thai: so \text{\Gamma\Delta} (first hand) \text{\Theta} ; \text{Bl. follows Plan. and \Delta (corr.) in reading \mu\[e]\[s\[a]thai, which is too short to suit the papyrus. Cf. the next note.}

3-4. \text{tau\[\eta\[s\[th]\[\i]\[\mu]} \text{so \text{\Gamma\Delta\Theta}; \tau\[\alpha\[\i]\[\mu} \text{Bl.}

23. \text{\mu\[m]\[a]i\[e]\[\sigma\[\theta]\[\i]\[\mu]} \text{\mu\[m]\[a]i\[e]\[\sigma\[\theta]\[\i]\[\mu}\text{Bl. with \text{\Gamma\Delta\Theta}; \mu\[m]\[a]i\[e]\[\sigma\[\theta]\[\i]\[\mu\text{vulgo. The papyrus reading is an error for \mu\[m]\[a]i\[e]\[\sigma\[\theta]\[\i]\[\mu\].}

\text{\[\delta\[n\[\eta\[\sigma\[\nu\[\tau]\[\i]\[\mu]} \text{so in the Antidosis of E and vulgo; \text{\[\delta\[n\[\eta\[\sigma\[\nu\[\tau}\[\i]\[\mu] \text{Bl. with all the best MSS.}

25. \text{an\[th]e\[r]oteron by itself is not sufficient to fill up this line; \text{\tau e or \tau}, which is not found in the MSS., may be inserted.}

IV. DOCUMENTS, CHIEFLY OF THE ROMAN PERIOD.

(a) OFFICIAL.

705. TWO PETITIONS TO THE EMPERORS WITH REPLIES.

21.2 \times 46 \text{cm.} \quad \text{A.D. 200-2.}

A generous effort to lighten some of the burdens which weighed upon the unfortunate Egyptians in the Roman period is recorded in these copies of two petitions to Septimius Severus and Caracalla, to which the Emperors' replies are, as usual, prefixed instead of being appended. The document, which is written in a rude uncial hand on the verso of 740, contained four columns, but of these the first and last are too incomplete to have any value. A mention of the praefect Lactus in l. 40 fixes the date within the years 200-2.

The writer of both petitions is Aurelius Horion, who had held high offices at Alexandria and was a rich landowner in the Oxyrhynchite nome; his object
in both cases was to secure the Imperial guarantee that certain benefactions which he proposed to found in that district would be permanently maintained. In the first petition (ll. 15-53) it is Oxyrhynchus itself which is to be the recipient of his favour, and the earlier part of the letter, as far as l. 42, is devoted to an interesting sketch of the claims which that city possessed upon the Imperial consideration. After the lengthy introduction (ll. 15-21), which can be restored on the analogy of ll. 65-8, and nine mutilated lines, Aurelius Horion reminds the Emperors (ll. 31-5) of 'the loyalty, fidelity, and friendship towards the Romans which the Oxyrhynchites had displayed both by helping them in the war against the Jews, and continuing up to the present to celebrate the day of victory by an annual festival.' This war refers to some Jewish rising in Egypt which perhaps took place not long before the date of the letter, like the Jewish rebellion in the reign of Hadrian mentioned in B. G. U. 889; but it would seem from the use of the word πόλεμος to have been on a larger scale than the revolt in Hadrian's time. Aurelius Horion's next argument (ll. 36-9) is 'Moreover, you yourselves honoured the Oxyrhynchites when you visited the country, by allowing them to enter your judgement-seat first after the Pelusioti.' This well illustrates the importance which Oxyrhynchus had attained by A.D. 200, when it was one of the chief towns in Egypt, and already ranked above Memphis. Thirdly (ll. 39-42), Aurelius Horion appeals to the opinion of the city held by the praefect, Laetus, who will, he says, bear evidence in its favour. After these preliminaries the writer comes to his scheme (ll. 42-51). Owing to the imperfect condition of ll. 42-6 the details are not quite clear, but apparently Aurelius Horion proposed to devote, nominally in the form of a loan, a large sum of money which was to be invested, and of which the interest was to be expended upon maintaining the annual contests of ephebi at Oxyrhynchus upon the same scale of splendour as that of similar contests elsewhere, perhaps at Antinoë (cf. l. 50, note). The petition concludes (ll. 51-3) with the request that the Emperors will give orders forbidding the diversion of the benefaction to any other purpose than that intended by its founder. The answer of the Emperors (ll. 1-14) is for the most part lost, but that it was of a favourable character is made certain by direct references to it in their answer to the second petition (cf. l. 59 καὶ ταύτης, 61 ζ[ά]ροιον δή καὶ καὶ ζ[πί]λ τούτων ψυλαχθήσεται). It is pleasing to know that Oxyrhynchus enjoyed the fruits of Aurelius Horion's generosity for more than a century; for in 80, written in A.D. 323, we find the logistes, unmindful of the clash of empires, quietly issuing a notice that the gymnastic display by the ephebi will take place on the following day.

The second petition (ll. 65-90) is practically complete, so far as it goes, and
deals with a plan for benefiting certain villages in the Oxyrhynchite nome, the inhabitants of which had been so exhausted by the annual λειτουργίαι in the form of contributions to the State and compulsory obligations to act as guards that there was a prospect of the land being deserted. Aurelius Horion therefore proposed to present each village with a sum of money to be invested in hay, the yearly revenue being devoted to the assistance of the inhabitants on whom the λειτουργίαι fell. To this the Emperors reply (ll. 54–63), signifying their approval of this scheme as of the former one, and guaranteeing the continuance of the benefaction.

Col. i.

[Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Λαύκιος Σεπτίμιος]

[Sεούρης Εὐσεβής Περτίναξ Σεβαστὸς]

[Ἀραβικὸς Ἀδιαβηνικὸς Παροδικὸς]

[Μέγιστος καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ]

5 [Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀντιούνιος Εὐσεβῆς]

[Σεβαστὸς]

[Αὐρήλιος Ὀρεάων χαίρειν.]

[15 letters]. ἦκα[...]. ἔπεδο-

[13]. τῷ[...] Ὁξυρονχεῖτων[...][σφ.]

10 [16]. ἀπίστευμα... ἀγ[...][ν]

[16]. ἁ[...] ἐτ. [...] [.]λ[...]

[15]. μας εἰς[...][...][π]

[15]. τισει[...] [.][...][π]

[15]. ἔστειν[...] ἑ[...] ωσις[...]

15 [τοὺς εὐμενεστάτους Αὐτοκράτοροιν [Σε] εὐ[...] ὑφ]

[καὶ Αὐτούνιῳ τοῖς] πάντων [ἀθυρώπων]

[στιγμῆς καὶ ἐπερήγηταις Αὐρήλιος]

[Ὀρεών γενόμενος στρατηγός καὶ ἄρχι-

[θυκασθῆς τῆς λαμπροστάτης πόλεως τῶν]

20 [Ἀλεξανδρέων] χαίρειν.

[...] ἑ[...] ψωμώτατοι Αὐτοκράτορες]

[14 letters]. ἓ[...] πόλεμοι μεγάλη

[14]. ἔνει καὶ ἔτι[...] ωσύ[...]

[13]. [...] νεα[...] κατ[...] κισα[...] π[...] π[...]

25 [15]. [...] τιτ[...] τιτ[...] [.][...][π]
α[...

Col. ii.

30...[.] π[λ]έω δὲν ὁ [λ]όγος ἐμὲ τ[... λ]αμβάνει,]
πρόσεκτ[.] δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ πρὸς 'Ρωμαίους εὐφροινά τε καὶ πίστις καὶ φιλία ἦν ἐνεδείξαντο καὶ[τ]
κατὰ τὸν πρὸς Εὐσυναίους πόλεμον συμμαχήσαντες καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν τὴν τῶν ἐπινεικῶν

35 ἡμέραν ἐκάστου ἔτους πανηγυρίζοντας.

ἐπιεικήσατε μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐπιδήμησαν[...] ὑ[...] τῶν ἐνότον καὶ ἐξευθειο-

40 τάτοις ἔχουσιν τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας καὶ[π[... μείων[.] ἐπιεικεστάτους. διὰδι
tὴν πόλιν ἡθέλησα μηδὲ[ 13
tῶν[ν] ὕμετέρων καταλιπέ[ 13 ]

45 τρῆτ[.]άμην καὶ τοὺς ἕπνοι[ 13 ]
oῦκ [ε] ὁ[...] τῶν Ἀττικῶν μυρ[... η[...] τῶν[. ...]
tας δανειζεθαί τε καὶ φυλάσσες θαυμα τῆς[τῶν προτέρων ἀριστο, τῶν δὲ] συναγόμενον
τῶν χωρεῖν εἰς ἑπαθλα ἐφήβων τῶν παρῄ λαβ

50 τ[.]ο[.] κατ’ ἔτος ἀγωνισμένων ἐφ’ οἷς καὶ[ οἱ Ἀγ-

32. πιστὸς οἱ πιστὲς σῶμας. 35. Πανηγυρίζοντες. 38. Μεταδότες. 40. Ἁ[...] 41. ὑ[...] 42. ἐνοικοῦντας. 44. ἔπαθος. 45. ὑπὸ Πάπ. 46. ἀγωνίζονται.
Col. iii.

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Δ[ό]κιος [Σ]πετῖριαυοι Σεβαστὸς Ἀραβικοῦ Ἀδιαβηνικὸς
Παρθικὸς Μεγίστος [καὶ] Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ
Μάρκος] Αὐρήλιος Ἀρωνίνος Εὐσεβῆς Σεβαστὸς
Αὐρήλιος Ὀρεῖων χαῖρειν.
ἀποδεχόμεθα σε καὶ ταῦτης τῆς ἐπιδίσεως ἦν
ἀξίοις ἐπιδοῦναι ταῖς κόραις τῶν Ὀξυργχειτῶν
ἀποδιδοὺς ἀμοίβην ἐνκήσεως. τ[δ] ὁμοιον δὴ καὶ
ἐ[π]ί τούτων φιλαχθῆσαι καὶ καθότι ἡ θέλησας ἀμε-
tάστρεπτον εἰς ἑτέρων τι δαπανήσεσθαι τὴν χάριν.
ἐστιν δὲ ἡ ἀξίωσις.

65 τοῖς εὐμενεστάτοις Αὐτοκράτ[ο]ραί Σε[ουρή]ρως καὶ Ἀρωνίνῳ
tοῖς πάντων ἀνθρώπων σωτήριαν [καὶ] εὐεργέταις
Αὐρήλιος Ὀρείων γενόμενος στρατηγὸς καὶ ἀρχιδικασ-
tῆς τῆς λαμ[π]ροτάτης πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείων χαῖρειν.
κἀμα τίνις τοῦ Ὀξυργχειτοῦ νομοῦ, ὅ φιλανθρωπότα-
tοι Αὐτοκράτορες, ἐν αἷς ἐγὼ τε (καὶ) οἱ νῦιοὶ μου χωρία κεκτήμε-
θα σφ[ι]δρα ἔθησθεν ἑαυτῶν ἐνοχλοῦμενα ὡς τῶν κατ' ἐπος
λειτουργῶν τοῦ τε ταμείου καὶ τῆς παρα[φ]υ[λ]ακῆς τῶν
tόπων, κινδυνεύουσι τε τῷ μὲν ταμείῳ παραπολέ-
σθαι τὴν δὲ ύμετέραν γῆν ἀγεώργητον καταλαβεῖν.

75 ἐγὼ [ο]ῶν καὶ τοῦ φιλανθρώπου καὶ τοῦ χρησίμου στοχα-
ζ[όμε]νος βούλομαι εἰς ἀνάκτησιν αὐτῶν ἐπίδοσιν
τ[ινα] βραχείαν ἐκάστη ποιήσασθαι εἰς συνώνη
χ[όρτου]ν ὃ ἡ πρόσοδος κατατεθῆσαι εἰς τρόφος καὶ
δ[ι]απάνας τῶν κατ' ἐπος λειτουργησόντων ἐπὶ τῷ

55. ἐ σεβαστὸς inserted later, τοῖς being above the line. 1. Ἀραβικός. s of ἀδιαβηνικός
corr. from v. 56. 1. Παρθικὸς Μέγιστος. 57. Final s of εὐσεβῆς inserted above the
line. 70. ὠμοιος Παπ. 74. 1. ἕμετέρας(?).

Col. iv.

(80) lost, (81) [, (82) λ[, (83) τ[, (84) το[, (85) βο[ [, (86) ἐπ[, (87) ναι[, (88) µητου[, (89) τοχ[, (90) φ[ . [
8. The first word probably was or corresponded to ἀποδεχόμεθα; cf. l. 59.
20. The position of χαίρειν after, instead of before, the nominative (cf. l. 68), is unusual.
42. Perhaps διὰ δὲ ταύτα.
46. οὐκ ἔλατον Ἀττικῶν μῦρίων would refer to the sum which Aurelius Horion proposed to spend, but if τολάντων is supplied at the end of l. 45 (it cannot come in l. 46) the amount seems enormous. Possibly Ἀττικῶν is masculine and should be separated from μῦρίων.
47. ἐνακέρδεσαί: the benefaction apparently took the form of a loan to the city, but since the interest was devoted to public purposes, it was to all intents a gift; cf. the similar case in ll. 76–8.
50. Ἀντ(ί[με]στ[έρ]α ὅν is very doubtful, though a proper name would be expected. The ó at the end of l. 50 is fairly certain, the only alternative being γο, but the second ó could equally well be i. For óνι, εὐνι can be read.

54–79. 'The Emperor Caesar Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax Augustus Arabicus Adiabenicus Parthicus Maximus and the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Augustus to Aurelius Horion, greeting. We approve of this benefaction also which you request leave to confer upon the villages of the Oxyrhynchite nome, giving (to different persons) a succession in the enjoyment of it (?). The same rule shall be observed in this case also, and, as you wish, no change shall be introduced which would divert the gift to any other purpose.

'The request is as follows:—

'To the most gracious Emperors, Severus and Antoninus, the savours and benefactors of the world, Aurelius Horion, formerly strategus and archidicas of the most illustrious city of Alexandria, greeting. Certain villages in the Oxyrhynchite nome, most humane Emperors, in which both I and my sons own estates, are utterly exhausted by the burdensome demands of the annual λειτουργία required both for the Treasury and the protection of the districts, and there is a danger of their being ruined as far as the Treasury is concerned and leaving our (?) land uncultivated. Accordingly having before me a both humane and useful object I wish, in order that they may recover, to make a trifling benefaction to each one for the purchase of hay, the revenue of which shall be devoted to the maintenance and support of those who are annually subject to the λειτουργία on condition that . . . .' 

61. ἀρµῷδην ἐνεχῆσοι no doubt refers to something which was explained more fully in ll. 80 sqq., and owing to the loss of these the meaning is uncertain. We have supposed the sense to be that the inhabitants would enjoy the fruit of the benefaction successively as they were called upon to undertake the λειτουργία.

62–3. ἀνεµοστρέπτων εἰς ἑτέρον κ.τ.λ.: two ideas seem to be confused, (1) the gift is to be ἀνεµοστρέπτων, (2) it is forbidden (sc. μὴ ἔχεσαι) to spend it on other purposes.

74. ἤµετέραν may be right, referring to βασιλικὴ ὑπὸ φύσεως γῆ; but since the scribe is not very accurate, and Aurelius Horion has mentioned his own land in l. 70, the correction ἤµετέραν is more probable.

77. εἰς συνωνήν χ[ρὴν]οῦ: cf. 507. 24. The details of the scheme are somewhat obscure, but it is clear that the benefaction would extend over a series of years, and unless the ἐπίδοσια was an annual present (in which case the necessity for having an Imperial guarantee for its continuance seems pointless), it must have been a capital sum of money which produced a yearly revenue; cf. the first petition, especially ll. 48–9. Apparently the revenue of the ἐπίδοσια was to be assigned to the different villages, i.e. placed in charge
of the chief men, and invested in hay, the profits from the sale of which were to be assigned to the persons who in any year were burdened with λειτουργία. Why Aurelius Horion selected this particular form for his benefaction we cannot say; but 507 suggests that good profits were to be made out of hay, presumably by buying it cheap and selling it dear.


16-6 x 10-8 cm. About A.D. 115.

Conclusion of a report of a case tried before M. Rutilius Lupus, praefect in A.D. 114-7. The litigants were Damarion, apparently a freedman, and his patron Heraclides; but owing to the mutilation of the papyrus the precise nature of the question at issue is not clear. Damarion asserted that Heraclides had accepted from him a sum of money in settlement of all claims, but the praefect nevertheless gave an entirely adverse judgement, and threatened to have him beaten if further complaints were made. The most interesting point is the opposition between the native Egyptian law and the ἀστικὸς νόμος, i.e. the law of Alexandria, which conferred certain powers upon the patrons of liberated slaves in relation to the slaves so liberated, and upon which the decision of the praefect is based. No doubt Heraclides was an Alexandrian citizen.

[11 letters] παρ’ Αἰγυπτίων 18 letters
[tois ἀστελλῆροις tois πάτρωι, τὸν δὲ Ἡρακλείδην
[. . . . ἀπειλη]φέναι παρ’ αὐτὸν ἀργύριον καὶ γεγρα-
[φέναι χειρόγραφον περὶ τοῦ μηδὲν ἐξειπ πράγμα
5 [πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ] ἀναγνώστο τὸ χειρόγραφον Δοῦτος
[βουλευσάμενος μετὰ τῶν φίλων ἀπεφήνατο ὦτος
[‘ἐν μὲν τοῖς τῶν] Αἰγυπτίων νόμοις οὐδὲν περὶ τῆς
[14 letters] ἔξουσίας τῶν ἀπελευθερωσάτων
[15 ] ἄκολοθος τοῖς ἀστικοῖς νόμοις
10 [12 ” Δαμαρίων Ἡρακλείδη τῷ πάτρωι
[10 ” κατὰ τῶν νόμων. καὶ τῷ Δαμαρίωνι εἴπεν’
[11 ” οὐ καὶ προστίθημε εάν σε μέμψηται
[ 9 ” ἐν]λοκοπηθῆναι σε κελεύσω’.
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6. βουλευτικος κ.τ.λ.: cf. e.g. P. Catt. iv. 12, 19, and P. Goodsp. 29. iii. 1, where read Δισεραλισ (?) λαλήσας.

9. τοις ἀστικοῖς νόμοις: cf. the common use of ἀστός and ἀστή to designate citizens of Alexandria, e.g. 271. 3, 477. 14. That Alexandrians enjoyed certain privileges, especially with regard to taxation, is well-known, but the present seems to be the first direct reference to a peculiar code of law. Lumbroso had indeed already inferred (†Egitto, p. 65) from the distinction drawn between citizens of Alexandria and others in the matter of corporal punishment (Philo, in Flac. c. 10) that there were also differences of law and procedure; and this view now finds ample confirmation. Cf. the contrast in the Ptolemaic period between the πολιτικοῖ νόμοι (i.e. laws particularly affecting the Greeks, P. Tebt. I. p. 58) and the τῆς χώρας νόμοι in P. Taur. i. iv. 17 and vii. 9.

13. ἔναλλοκοπηθήσαν: cf. 653 ἐὰν μὴ ποιήσῃς οὐ μόνον κατακριθῇς ἀλλὰ καὶ δαρήσ[ei]. Perhaps Ἰρακλείδης is to be supplied at the beginning of the line, though this would place Damarion entirely at his opponent’s mercy.

707. REPORT OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS.

26 x 31.5 cm. About A.D. 136.

What remains of this account of a trial before some magistrate—the particular court is not specified—consists chiefly of the opening speech of the counsel for the plaintiff Plutarchus. The prime cause of the dispute was the failure of one of the defendants, Philinus, to fulfil the terms of a contract, a copy of which is prefixed (Col. i), made by him with a woman named Demetria for the lease of a vineyard and orchard. Philinus had undertaken to carry out certain improvements, in consideration of which he had received from Demetria a sum of 2000 drachmae. The promised improvements, however, were not effected; and the obligations of Philinus were subsequently taken over by his brother Antistius. At the expiration of the term of the lease the land seems to have been let to a new tenant, the plaintiff Plutarchus (cf. note on ll. 15–7); but the papyrus breaks off before the relation of the latter to the two brothers or the occasion of the present dispute are elucidated.

This document is on the verso of the papyrus. The recto is occupied with three columns of a survey of different pieces of land, written probably early in the second century. Mention is made of ψιλ(οι) τὸπ(οι) ἐν ο[ι] κέλαλε ἐπι(ουθ-μνει?) ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων and of τὸπ(οι) ἱερατικοί.

Col. i.

\[\nu \delta\mu\sigma\sigma\omega\nu \ \kα\i\]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

π. . . . . υπὲρ φόρου οἶνου
εξαιτίας ἐκτακτα

5 ὡν ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτήν εξαιτίαν δημο-
σίων ἢ τῇ αὐτῇ εξαιτία ἑπάναγκον δὲ ἔως
οἰκοδομῆσαι τροχὸν ἐκ καινῆς τῶν ἐπάνω με-
ρῶν ἡ παρὰ τῆς Δημητρίας (δραχμᾶς) 'Β ἀρ' ὧν εἰσιν
Δημητρίας ἤζευγ(γ) β βοῦν (δραχμα) νῦ καὶ καταθέ-
ν πάντα σύμφωνα καὶ ἔμφορα καὶ ἄκολουθον
κ. . . . . . ίσων καὶ ἐνδοκό. χρ[άνος] ὃ αἰ(τός).

Col. ii.

[Πλοῦταρχος . . . . πρὸς Φιλίν[ο]ν καὶ 'Ανθέστοιον ἀμφοτέροις
[. . . . . . ἀπὸ 'Οξυργύχον π[όλεω]σ]. Σαραπίαν ρήτωρ ὑπὲρ
Πλοῦταρχον εἶπεν ὁ συνηγοροῦμενος Πλοῦταρχος ἐμισθώ.

15 [σατο παρὰ Δημητρίας τινὰ π]ἐρι τὸν 'Οξύργυχεῖτην ὑπαρξιν
[ 21 letters ]η Δημητρία προσποίηται τοῖς
[ ἐπὶ " μισθοφόρωσι] ὁ νεότερος τῶν ἀντιτετ[α]γμέ-
[νων Φιλείνοι] μισθωσάμενος παρὰ αὐτής ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱδ (ἔτους)
'Αδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἔτη ἡς ἀμπελώνα καὶ πω-

20 μάρ[ιον περὶ κόμην Σερόφιν κατ' ἐν φροτον μίσθωσιν δι' ἡς
δεδηλω[τά] εἰς μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ τετραετία μὴδὲν ὑπὲρ φόρου
tελεῖσαι ἀλλὰ μόνα [τὶ] δημόσια διαγράψαι ἐπὶ τῷ πάσαν

25 τὴν ἐν τῷ κτῆματι διαψεῦλον γῆν ἀνάξιοι ἀμπέλῳ τῇ
dὲ λοιπῇ διεῖται τῆς διὰ τῆς μισθώσεως ὑπὲρ φό-

ρου ἀνειλημμένα ἀναρ[τῆς]σαὶ τὰς τῶν κτήματος
καὶ παμμαρίου πλάτας ἐπὶ μέτρους καὶ λαμβάνοντα
παρὰ τῆς Δημητρίας (δραχμᾶς) 'Β ἀνοικοδομῆσαι τροχὸν ἐκ κα-
νής εἰς [πόλις] πλὴνον ἐπὶ μέτρους ὄρισμενοι. ὅν-

30 περ λαβόντα τὰς (δραχμὰς) 'Β τῶν μὲν τροχὸν μὴ πεποιηκέναι
ἐπὶ τοῖς δ[η]ς λωθεῖσι μέτρους ἀλλὰ ἀνυπέλευστον κατα-
λελοιβάναι τοῦ τε κτήματος τέλειον ἡμεληκέναι
καὶ μὴ δὲ τὰς πλάτας περιβεβληκέναι. τούτων οὕτως
ἐχόντων τῷ ἵδ (έτει) 'Αδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου ἐγγυηθῆς
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geinetai tou adelphou Philinous [Δ]ψεστίστον πάντων τοιν
35 dia tis m[εθάσεις] aneilen[μ]ε[ν]ων kal eixe autous ta sun-

gyrammena a[,] v . aI[a] . . . y m[η] anaxheisa [α]μπέλω

αξρι τουτου δ[ 13 letters ]ημ . . . ας δέ εκ του ἐποικιον

καὶ ἐτε[ρ] 16 7 ἀντιτεταγμένως καὶ . . . [ .

ovkol[ 18 ], δatos kal δραχμάς . . . .

κοιταίς 16 ἀμενα υπὸ τινος γ[ε]. . . .

Δημιουτρία 15 ἀρ[. . . .]ν ἀρ[. . . .]

αὐτὸν ἃ[ 17 7 δὴ]

λωγ . [ . . .

τῷ κ [ἐτε] [ . . .

9. ka of kata written above πα. 17. l. neopteros . μ of antiteφαμε corr. from λ?
22. ai of τέλεσαι written above ἤ. 27. In the left margin against this line is an oblique
dash. 36. a of αι corr. and λ above the line over a deleted letter.

Col. ii. 'Plutarchus son of ... against Philinus and Antistius, both sons of . . ., of
Oxyrhynchus. Sarapion, advocate for Plutarchus, said:—My client Plutarchus leased from
Demetria a property in the Oxyrhynchite nome following upon (?) a lease previously made
with Demetria by Philinus, the younger of our opponents, who rented from her for 6 years
from the 14th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord a vineyard and orchard at the village of
Seruphis in accordance with a written agreement, in which it was stated that in the first
four years he should be charged no rent but only pay the taxes on condition of his planting
vines over the whole of the open space in the vineyard, that for the remaining two years he
should pay the rent set forth in the lease, that he should restore on a certain scale the
walls (?) of the vineyard and orchard, and on receiving from Demetria 2000 drachmae should
build on a fixed scale a new wheel of baked brick. It appears that having taken the 2000
drachmae he did not make the wheel according to the stated scale, but left it uncompleted
and entirely neglected the vineyard, not even putting up the walls round it. In these
circumstances in the 19th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord Antistius became surety on
behalf of his brother Philinus for all the obligations of the lease and himself took over . . .'

4. ἐκτακτα: cf. 646 ἐ ἔται καὶ ἐκτακτον τοῦ . . . αφιλικος.

8–9. The value of the two pairs of βοες, 460 drachmae, was apparently included
in the 2000 drachmae received by Philinus from Demetria (cf. ll. 26–9), and l. 9 is
probably to be restored τῳ δὲν ἐν χῷ παρὰ τῆς Δημιουτρίας ἑν(γών) β βοῶν (δραχμαί) ὑ. Cf.
729. 39 sqq., where βοες are a good deal more expensive. καταθή might perhaps be read
ta kathη[kousa (?)], the ka being above the line.
10. σύμφυτα: cf. 729. 22. ἐμφορος is otherwise known only from Hesychius, ἐμφορα'
προβεβλημενα' ἀγέλη προβάτων, where commentators have supposed some corruption.

15–7. The restoration of these lines, which involve the relations of Plutarchus to
Demetria and the brothers, is a doubtful matter. If Δημιουτρία is made the subject of
προσεποιηται, the nominatives ὁ νεότερος . . . μεθωσάμενος, are left suspended. We are
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therefore inclined to read Δημητρία, connecting δ νύστερος with προπεσοίται, and suggest τάπερων. ... εῦς τῇ αὐτῇ γῇ (οί σῶν τῇ) Δημητρία προπεσοίται τоῖς ἱμπροσθεν χρόνοις μισθοθάσεως, κ.τ.λ. τῇ τῶν ὕζευγοι πετάξεται is unusual; εἰ δέ 'Ο. would be expected.

23. διάφευλον γῆ: this phrase, which here occurs for the first time, throws light upon two passages in the B. G. U. which have hitherto remained unexplained (cf. Wilcken, Oxf. I. p. 404). These are entries in two very closely related taxing-lists from Socrateai Nextus, B. G. U. 10. 8 ψυγιαν καὶ διαβείλ(ου or -ων) (ἀρουρῶν) νδ and 277. ii. 5 διαμψαμάτων καὶ διαψείλων πρὸς ἐλαία(νί) (ἀρουρῶν) νδ, the heading in each case being followed by two or three names. The 54 aurei are evidently the same in both documents, and consisted of a ψυγιός or διαψύγματα (cf. P. Tebt. 86. 45 and 522. 4) and διάψευλα (or διάψευλος γῆ, upon which certain payments had to be made by the persons named. How διάψευλος differed from ψυλή γῆ, if at all, does not appear. The word is found in Hesychius, ψηφων ψεδων, διψυλος.

25. ἀνυδηλμένα: the verb recurs in the same unusual sense in l. 35. B. G. U. 277. ii. 10 οἱ φιμ(ων) ἐν οὔσιακῷ λόγῳ ἄναλυμβάνασκε is hardly parallel.

26. πομαρίν: is of course the Latin pomarium. The use of πλάτας here is strange. The word πλάτας or πλάτης occurs in several inscriptions from Aphrodisias (e.g. C. I. G. 2824; cf. Boeckh’s remarks ad loc.) meaning apparently the substructure of a funerary monument. Here the πλάτας seem to be surrounding walls; cf. I. 32 τὸς πλάτας περιβεβληθέναι.

37. Apparently not ἰμενον. The supposed δ of δέ is more like α.

708. TWO LETTERS TO A STRATEGUS.

19.2 x 9.7 cm. A.D. 188.

The recto of this papyrus contains part of an account of corn, very large amounts in artabae (e.g. 168, 486 ½ 36θ) being mentioned, as well as the κλασματικά (σπά) κεφ (ζόνες), which refers to the reign of Commodus more probably than to that of Caracalla. On the verso are copies of two letters from Antonius Aelianus, a high official whose rank is not stated, but who was probably epistratege or dioecetes, to the strategus of the Diospolite nome in the Thebaid, stating that two ship-loads of wheat from that nome had on examination proved to be adulterated with barley and earth, and ordering the strategus to exact the deficiency from the sitologi responsible for it. From a mention of a chiliarch in l. 13 it appears that the corn was required for military purposes. The first letter, which is practically complete, is dated in the 29th year, probably of the reign of Commodus. The second follows the same formula, so far as it goes.
[708. OFFICIAL]

5 [ἐν τῇ] [ἡμι] δειγμάτων ἄρσει οἵ καθαροῦ φανέντος
[καὶ] βαλολογηθήναι, καὶ εξεβῆ ἔλασσον

[κριθῆς] μὲν [((Tempás)] ἐκατοσταὶ δύο βάλων δὲ ὅμοιο
[καὶ] καταστήσις ἡμίου. τοὺς [ὁμοί τὸν πυρὸν [ἐμβα-

10 [λο]μένους στιόλογους πραξάν τῷ σῷ κινιδίωφ
[τὰς] συναγαμένους σῖτον διαφόρῳ (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβας) ν (ἡμίου) δ' καὶ τὰ
[πρὸ]ς(ετρούμενα) καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δαπάνας, καὶ προσθέμε-
[νος] τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ χλιάρχου δήλωσον μοι. (ἔτους) καὶ Φαώ(φι) λ.

[καὶ] εξεβῆ (η) δῶο, / β.

15 [Ἄλλης]. Ἀντώνιος Αἰλιαίδος στρα(τηγῷ) Διοπ(όλιτον) Θηβ(αίδος) χαῖρειν).
[τοῦ] καταχθέντος γόμου ἐκ τοῦ ὑπὸ σοὶ νομ(ῶ) διὰ
[. . .] μουχ [ΠΙ] ανορθοσαίος ἐν (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβας) αὐν
[ἐν τῇ] τῶν δ[ε]ι[γκριθη]τῶν ἄρσει οἵ καθαροῦ φανέν-
[το]ς ἐκδελευε (ἡμίου) (ἀρτάβας) κριθὸδο(λογηθήναι) καὶ βωλο(λο)γηθή(ηναι)
[καὶ] εξεβῆ (η)

20 [ἔλασα]σον κριθῆς μὲν ἐκατοστῇ αδ' [βάλων δὲ ὅμοιος].
[τοῦ]ς οὖν τῶν [πυρῶν] ἐμβαλομένους [στιόλ(όγους) πραξαν
[τῷ σῷ] κινιδίῳ] [τὰς συναγμένους] σῖτον δ[ε]ι(α)ψ(όρφ) (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβας)
[. . . καὶ τὰ]

2–13. 'Antonius Aelianus to the strategus of the Diospolite nome in the Thebaid,
greeting. Since the cargo dispatched from the nome under you in charge of [λαυσις son of
Sipos and his companions, amounting to 2000 artabae of wheat, appeared at the weighing
of the samples to have been adulterated, I ordered that the amount of barley and earth in
half an artaba of it should be ascertained, and it proved to be under measure by 2 per cent.
of barley and likewise ½ per cent. of earth. Accordingly exact at your own risk from the
sitologoi who shipped the wheat to ascertain the whole amount of the corn, 50 2/3 artabae
of wheat, and the extra payments and other expenses, and when you have added this total
to the account of the chiliarch let me know. 'The 29th year, Phaophi 30.'

11. ν (ἡμίου) δ': 2 ½ per cent. on 2000 artabae (l. 4) is 50 artabae, so Antonius Aelianus
has added on ½ art.

13. χ(λίαρχου): or perhaps (δεκάδα)ρ(χου). The i is drawn through the χ.

14. The meaning of this line is obscure. For ἐκ(ομισάμεν) cf. P. Petrie II. 12 (1) verso.
β might be read instead of χ, and there is a horizontal stroke above o. ἐκατ(οσταί) cannot be
read. ἐπιστολάς is apparently to be supplied after δῶ.
709. Tour of Inspection.

14.7 x 11.5 cm. About A.D. 50.

This fragment of a letter gives some important geographical information about Egypt in the first century. It describes a tour of inspection throughout the country about to be taken by a high official, probably the praefect or δικαιοδότης. Starting from a place which is not mentioned (Alexandria?), he was to go first to Pelusium, thence through the nomes situated along the eastern side of the Delta, the Tanite and Sethroite, Arabia, and another nome, not previously found in Greek (l. 6, note), to Memphis. Next he was to travel direct to the Thebaid, and come back through the Heptanomis, the Arsinoite nome, and the other nomes in the Delta which he had not visited on his upward journey, finally reaching Alexandria. The chief point of interest is the mention of the Heptanomis and Arsinoite nome. Wilcken (Ost. I. pp. 423-7) attributes the creation of the Heptanomis to the period between A. D. 68, when the edict of Tiberius Alexander seems to be ignorant of its existence, and 130, and adopts the view of Schwarz (Rhein. Mus. 1896, p. 637) that the Arsinoite nome originally belonged to the Heptanomis, but was separated from it by Hadrian to make room for the newly-founded Antinoite nome. The papyrus, however, which quite certainly belongs to the first century and yet mentions the Arsinoite nome as distinct from the Heptanomis, disposes of Schwarz's hypothesis altogether, and pushes back the latest possible date of the creation of the Heptanomis far into the first century. The handwriting of the papyrus is by no means of a late first century type, and we should assign it to the reign of Claudius or Nero rather than to that of one of the Flavian emperors. In any case it is now clear, on the one hand, that the Arsinoite nome was on account of its isolated position never reckoned in the Heptanomis, and on the other, that some hitherto unsuspected nome belonged to the Heptanomis before the creation of the Α'Άρτυνοίτης. The most probable explanation is that Antinoite was a new name given to a previously existing nome, and that Hadrian only did what Ptolemy Philadelphus had done in the case of the λυστήρι (Rev. Laws, p. xlix). Strabo, who is a little earlier than the papyrus, does not help; but his list of nomes has not so far accorded very well with the evidence of Ptolemaic and Roman papyri.

[. . . . . ζιν . . ] τὸ λογιστήριον . . . . .
710. OFFICIAL

710. Order for Payment.

Fr. (a) 7 x 13.5 cm.

This papyrus, which is one of the few Ptolemaic documents found at Oxyrhynchus, contained an order, probably addressed to a royal bank by an official, to pay various sums of money to 47 persons. Of these 44 were carrying documents, and they were accompanied by a ἐφοροὺς, i.e. a precis-writer, a title not hitherto found on a papyrus, an ἐφοδος who acted as escort, and
176
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a 'camel-man,' this being one of the rare references to the use of camels in the Ptolemaic period. The 7th year mentioned in 1. 5 must on palaeographical grounds belong to the reign of Ptolemy Soter II. In Fr. (δ) ὄφογράφω, ἐφόδωι or καμηλίτη is probably to be supplied at the beginnings of II. 7 and 8.

(a) 
[...]
χρημάτισθεν τῷ[.]]
ἐν τῷ Ὠξυργχήτῃ βυβλιαφόροις
ἀνδράσι μὲ ὄφογράφῳ α'/ ἐφόδωι α καμηλίτη α, μ/]
τοῦ Θεσθ τοῦ ζ (ἔτους) κατὰ

(b) 
[...]
(τάλαντοι) α []
α (τάλαντοι) α []
α (τάλαντοι) α []

711. Census—List.

7 x 18.5 cm. About B.C. 14.

A fragment from an official statement or list connected with the census and poll-tax. There are parts of two columns, but the first has only the ends of lines (not printed), and the second is, unfortunately, disfigured by lacunae which deprive it of much of its value, though any fresh items of information may be welcomed on the interesting question of the Egyptian census in the early years of Augustus. The existing evidence on the subject was collected in P. Oxy. II. pp. 207—14, where it was shown that the fourteen years' census-cycle could be traced back with security to A.D. 19—20, and with probability to A.D. 5—6 and B.C. 10—9, but no further, although censuses and poll-tax are attested still earlier in Augustus' reign, and now appear from the Tebtunis papyri (103, introd.) to go far back into the first century B.C. The present document mentions certain 'youths (ἐφηβευκότες) registered (or 'entered') on a poll-tax list by us (the λαογράφοι?) in the 15th year of Caesar,' ἐφηβευκότες in this context probably meaning boys above the age of fourteen, when they became liable to the tax in question. Reference is also made to a wrong entry in a previous list of some persons 'as having... before the 6th year.' This is too vague to be of much use; but the 6th year (B.C. 25—4) would seem to be a recognized landmark in the history of the census or the poll-tax, and some important step in the reorganization of the system may possibly have then been made. The
6th year, however, does not fall in with the fourteen years' cycle, being one year too early.

On the verso of the papyrus are parts of two columns, written not much later than the recto, of a series of names with some figures opposite, no doubt a taxing-list of some kind, and not improbably also concerned with the poll-tax.

2. τας may be the article and connected with the participle following παράν, or the termination of a word in the previous line like τελούτας. Cf. P. Tebt. 103. 1-3 λαογρ(αφία) ... τελούταν σύνταξιν, and τελόν (so Wilcken) σύνταξιν in P. Grenf. I. 45. 8.

4. χρ is quite doubtful, since all that remains of the letter is part of a long vertical stroke projecting above the lacuna, which might equally well represent e.g. the sign for ἤς. But it does not seem possible to get either another year or a conjunction into the short space available, and we therefore conclude that λαογραφμίων and ἐφηβευκήτων are to be taken together, with some qualifying term between them; ἤς [ἀμφίδρο]ων might suit. At the end of the line ως with ως written above the ω is difficult; if ως was intended the accusative may be governed by . μενοι in l. 5.

5-6. ὡς πρό τινι ἤς (ἔτους): cf. similar instances of the use of πρό in 257. 25, 481. 15.

712. Collection of a Debt.

11.5 x 10.3 cm. Late second century.

The imperfect condition of this papyrus is much to be deplored, for if more complete it would probably have gone far to solve the uncertainties attaching to the functions of that much discussed official, the ἐξεικόν πράκτωρ. As it is, the lines being throughout incomplete both at the beginnings and ends, and the amount lost being shown by ll. 12-3 to exceed 40 letters between each line, the papyrus whets our curiosity without satisfying it. There are two documents,
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the first written (ll. 9 sqq.) being an application to the overseers of the ἕλευκών πρακτορία of the Athribite nome from a member of the Sosicosmian tribe, stating that he had in A.D. 146-7 lent 300 drachmae at interest to two brothers, called Potamon and Pathermouthis, upon the security of some house-property at Monthmereu. Repayment not having been made at the proper time, a writ was served upon the brothers (ll. 16-7), but since this had no effect, the applicant requests the overseers to foreclose upon the house and exact payment (ll. 18-21). In the margin above this application is (ll. 1-7) a letter from the overseers to the keepers of the record office, apparently requesting them to take possession of the property and collect the debt and interest, as well as the miscellaneous charges for collection made by the State. The title, ἐπιτηρηταί ἕλευκών πρακτορίας, is new, and, since ἐπιτηρηταί are generally connected with ὁφαί, suggests that the profits made by the State from collecting debts were farmed out, like most other revenues. That this was actually the case is proved by 825, an account rendered to the μισθωταί ἕλευκών πρακτορίας by one of their πραγματευταί. By the second century therefore, at any rate, the functions which in the Ptolemaic period and perhaps still in the first century A.D. seem to have been combined in the person of the ἕλευκών πράκτωρ (cf. P. Tebt. 5. 221, note, and 286), were divided, and we find side by side the parallel bodies of official ἐπιτηρηταί and private μισθωταί with subordinate πραγματευταί. But while 712 and 825 are a valuable illustration of the second term in the phrase ἕλευκών πρακτορία, they throw little light upon the first, in which the main difficulty lies. The explanation of ἕλευκών which we offered (ll. cc.) that it means debts contracted by ἑίνοι, i.e. persons living at places outside the district to which they properly belonged, still remains the only one which rests on the evidence of parallels from the use of ἑίνος in papyri, though it is not clear why e.g. in P. Tebt. 5. 221 debts of ἑίνοι should be a subject of legislation and not debts in general. Our hypothesis gains some support from the circumstance—which may be a mere accident, but if so is a very remarkable coincidence—that both 712 and 825 have to do with debts from persons who were not living in the Oxyrhynchite nome. In 712 the ἐπιτηρηταί belong to the Athribite nome, but about the property distrained upon the only fact that is certain is that it was not in the Oxyrhynchite nome (Μωνθμερεῖο and its toparchy, Ναρασεῖης, in 1. 20, are both unknown), while the nome to which the officials addressed by the ἐπιτηρηταί belonged, as well as that of the writer of the application, is doubtful; cf. notes on ll. 1 and 13. In 825 the πραγματευτής was concerned with the Memphite nome, but that the μισθωταί belonged to the Oxyrhynchite nome has only a general probability resting on the provenance of the document.

The date of the papyrus is lost, but it was certainly posterior to the 10th
year of Antoninus mentioned in l. 13 (cf. ll. 16–8), and may be as late as the beginning of Commodus' reign; cf. note on l. 7.

καὶ ὁ ἐπίτηδε(ρήτα) ἐξεικνύειν πραξάτερείας Ἀθρέ(βίτω)ν
βίβλοις (ἀκρίσιν) ἔγκειται [καὶ τοῦ]... [καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν]... [καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν]... [καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν]
Παθερμοῦθε καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν... [καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν]... [καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν]... [καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν]
τὸν ἄρχονταν αὐτοῖς καὶ τῶι ἀνδρῶν αὐτοῦ Παθερμοῦθε
(μοί) ὁ θεός καὶ θεός
καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τέλη
καὶ δαπάνεσιν, προκειμένους ὀστῆσαι τῷ δήμοσιῷ καὶ[i]
(ἔτους)... // Παῦλος κ.

2nd hand ὁμιλεῖ ἐπιτηρήσεις ἐξεικνύων πρακτικάς Ἀθρέ(βίτω)
παρὰ
[καὶ τῶν Νεοπολεόμου Ξανθομείου τοῦ καὶ Ηλία]
[καὶ τῶν Νεοπολεόμου Ξανθομείου τοῦ καὶ Ηλία]
[καὶ τῶν Νεοπολεόμου Ξανθομείου τοῦ καὶ Ηλία]
καὶ τῶν Ποτάμωνος ἀδελφοῦ Παθερμοῦθεις ἐξ ἀλλήλης εὐγνώμονα κατὰ
dημοσίους χρηματισμὸν γεγονότα
dιὰ τοῦ ἐν
pόλει ἄρρητοῖν τῷ δεκατω ἐτε[ι Ἀν][πονείνου Καίσαρος
tο[ῦ κυρίου]
[καὶ τῶν Ποτάμωνος ἀδελφοῦ Παθερμοῦθεις ἐξ ἀλλήλης εὐγνώμονα κατὰ
dημοσίους χρηματισμὸν γεγονότα
dιὰ τοῦ ἐν]
[καὶ τῶν Ποτάμωνος ἀδελφοῦ Παθερμοῦθεις ἐξ ἀλλήλης εὐγνώμονα κατὰ
dημοσίους χρηματισμὸν γεγονότα]
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713. **Claim of Ownership.**

38.5 x 9 cm.  A.D. 97.

A declaration addressed to the keepers of the record office by a certain Leonides, requesting the formal registration (παράδεσις) of his prospective right to some property at present in the ownership of his mother. The claim to the property in question depended upon the marriage contract of the writer’s parents, in which their joint possessions were secured (κατέχου) on their demise to their children. The father had died, and his property had been duly divided between Leonides and his brother and sister. The mother was still living, and had already made over two-thirds of her real estate to this brother and sister upon the marriage of the pair. Leonides, who was probably the younger son, therefore wished that note should be taken of this division, and that his own title to the remaining third of the property should be placed on record.

The document is dated in Phamenoth of the 1st year of Nerva, i.e. A.D. 97. It is not known that a general ἀπογραφή of real property occurred in that year, while 481 shows that such a registration took place in A.D. 99. There is evidence that general ἀπογραφή, separated only by a two years’ interval, were held in A.D. 129 and 131 (75, 715, B.G. U. 420, &c.), but that these both...

---

1. Λαμπόκτησον is possible at the end of the line.

7. The occurrence of two dashes after the number of the regnal year and the omission of the Emperor’s name point to a date in Commodus’ reign, when both these practices became common. The difficulty is that the debt was contracted in A.D. 146–7; cf. l. 13. The mention of Sulpicius Similis in l. 22 recalls the praefect of that name in 237. VIII. 27, whose date is not certain; cf. p. 262.

13. ἄρχειον: the use of this term suggests that Oxyrhynchus was not meant, since there ἄγοραματιον or μνημονιον are the more usual terms, though an ἄρχειον probably at Oxyrhynchus is found in 509. 3.

---

**(δ) APPLICATIONS TO OFFICIALS.**
affected the same nome is not yet ascertained. Pending further data it will therefore be best to suppose that the present was a special declaration called forth by the peculiar circumstances of the case.

1st hand

parcelēth(η).

Δημητρίου καὶ Ἀπολλωνίου καὶ
Διογένει βιβλιοφύλ(λαξι)

2nd hand

παρὰ Δεσωνίου Διοδώρου τοῦ

5 Διοδώρου μητρὸς Σαραείτου Δεσωνίου ἀπὸ Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως.
καθ' ἢν οἱ γονεῖς μου Διόδωρος Διοδώρου τοῦ Ἀγαθείνου καὶ Σαραεῖς
Δεσωνίου τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου μη-

10 τρὸς Ἰσιοδώρας Κάλα ἀπὸ[5] τῆς αὐτῆς
πόλεως πεποίηται πρὸς ἄλ-
ῆλου τοῦ γάμου συγγραφήν διὰ
τοῦ ἐν Ὀξυρύγχων πόλει ἀγορανο-
μίου τῷ δωδεκάτῳ ἔτει θεοῦ

15 Κλαυδίου μηνὶ Σεβασσίου κατέσ-
χου τῇ ἐς ἄλληλων γενεᾶς τὰ
ἐαυτῶν πάντα πρὸς τὸ μετὰ τῆν
teleutήν αὐτῶν βεβαιοῦ καὶ
ἀναφαιτέως εἶναι τῶν τέκνων,

20 ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ πατὴρ ἐπελυθητησεν ἐπὶ ἐ-

μοὶ καὶ ἄδελφος μου Διοδώρῳ
καὶ Θαῖτὶ καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς
καθήντησε, ἢ δὲ μήτηρ ἀφ’ ὅν
ἐχει περὶ μὲν Νέσλα ἀρουρᾶν

25 έννεα ἡμίσους περὶ δὲ {περὶ δὲ}
Πεινων ἐκ τῆς Ὑθασμάχου παρα-
ετέρης ἀρουραί δῦς ἡμίσους
τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀρουρὰν δεκά-
δου ἐμερίσα τοῖς προγεγραμμέ-

30 νοις μου ἄδελφο[ῖς] ἀπὸ τῶν πε-

ρὶ Νέσλα ἐκατέρω ἀρουρας τέσσα-
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8. Second a of σαράντα corrig.

1 Inserted on the register.

To Demetrius and Apollonius and Diogenes, keepers of the records, from Leonides son of Diodorus son of Diodorus, his mother being Saraeus daughter of Leonides, of Oxyrhynchus. My parents, Diodorus son of Diodorus son of Agathinus, and Saraeus daughter of Leonides son of Alexander, her mother being Isidora daughter of Calas, of the said city, in accordance with the contract of marriage made between them through the record office of the said city in the month Sebastus of the 12th year of the deified Claudius settled upon their joint issue the whole of their property, in order that after their death it might be the secure and inalienable possession of their children; and whereas my father died leaving me and my brother and sister, Diodorus and Thais, his heirs, and his property devolved upon us, and whereas our mother possesses at Nesla 9 a surræ, and at Peënno 2 a surræ of the concessional (?) land of Thrasymachus, together making 12 a surræ, and bestowed upon my brother and sister aforesaid through their marriage contract 4 each of the aforesaid 12 a surræ: I too declare for registration my right to the remaining 4 a surræ of my mother; and the aforesaid contract of my parents remains in force and uncancelled to the present day. The 1st year of the Emperor Nerva Caesar Augustus, Pharmenoth 19. Signature of Demetrius and date.

1 The editor reads καὶ ἔνωσαν, but this makes no sense, and the correction proposed, which is palaeographically very close, seems in the light of the passages quoted above practically secure. The context in the Berlin papyrus further requires a negative like μηδὲν in place of καὶ τῷ before ἔσεσθαι ἐμπόδιον.
12. The marriage contract referred to contained also testamentary dispositions; cf. C. P. R. 28. 8 sqq.
20. ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ καὶ διδάσκας : sc. κληρονόμοι; cf. 481. 17–8, &c.
26. ἡς Ῥαναμάχου παρεμένης: παριάνα as a technical term applied to land seems to be new, and the present passage gives no clue to the meaning; perhaps 'conceded to' or 'abandoned.'

714. Selection of Boys (ἐπίκρισις).

Fr. (a) 4·2 × 5, Fr. (δ) 29 × 5 cm. A.D. 122.

An application addressed to a variety of officials by an Oxyrhynchite who enjoyed the privilege of paying a reduced poll-tax of 12 drachmae, requesting that a slave who had been born in his house and had reached the age of thirteen might be placed on the same privileged list. This papyrus thus confirms the evidence of 478 and B. G. U. 324, that the liability of slaves in respect of poll-tax was determined by that of their owners. A discussion of the general question of ἐπίκρισις is given in P. Oxy. II. pp. 217 sqq.

This papyrus is interesting palaeographically, being carefully written in a semi-uncial hand approximating to the sloping oval type, examples of which are often too indiscriminately assigned to the third century.

. . . . . .
Φιλονείκω [τῶι
cαι 'Ερμοδόρῳ βαζ[ικο]ν
γρα(μματε)ι καὶ Διονυσίῳ καὶ
έτερῳ Διονυσίῳ
5 βιβλ(ιοφόλαξ) καὶ ἐπικριτάις
καὶ Ἀπολλονίῳ ἐξηγή(τεύσαντι)
γρα(μματε)ι πόλεως
πα[ρά] Ἀπολλ(λωνίου
. . . . . .
[. . . . . ἀπ' Οξυρύγ-]
10 [χων πόλεως ἐπ'] ἀμ-
[φόδου Νότου Κρη-]
πείδος [. . . . .
ρος δούλος μου

20 Καίσαρος τοῦ
κυρίου, δθεν δ[η-
λῶ εἶναι με (δωθεκάδραχμον)
διὰ λαογραφίας
β (ἐτοὺς) Ἀδριανοῦ
25 Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ [ἀμ-
φόδου και ὅμι][ω
Ἀὐτοκράτ[ορα
Καίσαρα Τραιανὸν
30 Ἀδριανὸν Σεβαστὸν
μη ἑσυντ[αι. (ἐτοὺς) 5
Ἀὐτοκράτ[ορος
Καίσαρος Τραια-
νοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ
'To Philonicus also called Hermodorus, basilico-grammateus, and Dionysius and a second Dionysius, keepers of the archives and officers in charge of the selection, and to Apollonius, ex-exegetes and scribe of the city, from Apollonius ... of the city of Oxyrhynchus, living in the West Quay quarter. My slave ..., born in the house to my female slave ..., has reached the age of 13 years in the past 5th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord. I therefore declare that I am rated at 12 drachmae by a poll-tax list of the 2nd year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord at the said quarter, and I swear by the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus that I have made no false statement.'

Date and docket of registration.

1-7. The papyrus is incomplete at the top and there are traces of ink above the first line, so no doubt the strategus (cf. 257. 14) preceded the βασιλικὸς γραμματέως. It is noteworthy that only two persons in this long list of officials, namely the βιβλιοφύλακες, are called ἐπικρίται (cf. P. Fay. Towns 27. 3, and B. G. U. 562. 15, where ἐπικρίτης should be read); while 478 is addressed to the βιβλιοφύλακες alone. The βασιλικὸς γραμματέως recurs in this connexion in 257. 15 and B. G. U. 562. 17. Applications of this class from the Fayûm are usually sent to ex-gymnasiarchs δότες πρὸς τῇ ἐπικρίτῃ.

13-4. The supplements hardly fill the available space, but the lines vary a good deal in length.

23. διὰ λαογραφίας: cf. 478. 22-3 (δωδεκάδραχμον) δι' ὀμολόγου λαογραφίας.

37-8. A similar docket occurs in 478, and ἐπικρίτης may now be supplied there at the end of l. 49 on the analogy of the present papyrus; cf. also 786.

715. Registration of Property.

30-7 x 11-5 cm. A.D. 131.

A return of house-property in the Heracleopolite nome, addressed, as usual, to the keepers of the archives, in A.D. 131, when a general ἀπογραφὴ of real property took place; cf. B. G. U. 420 and 459, and 237. viii. 31, note. The formula is practically the same as that found in the Oxyrhynchus returns, e.g. 75 and 481. At the end is a docket of the βιβλιοφύλαξ.
'Ἡράι καὶ Ὡριγένει γεγυμνασιαρχηκόσι βιβλιοφύλακι ἐνκτήσεων Ἡρα-
kλεσμο(ολίτου)
παρὰ Γοργίου καὶ Γαλέστου ἀμφοτέρων
Πολέμων τοῦ Γοργίου μητρὸς Διονυσιά-

5 δος τῆς Γαλέστου τῶν ἀπὸ κόμης
Τοιμίσεως. ἀπογραφόμεθα ἰδίων
κυδώναι κοινῶς ἐξ ἱσού εἰς τὸ ἐνέσ-
tὸς εἰ (έτω) Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
κατὰ τὰ κελευθέντα τὰ ἐληλυθότα(α)

10 εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ ὀνόματος τοῦ μετήλ-
λαχότος ἡμῶν πατρὸς Πολέμων
Γοργίου μητρὸς Ταπουτότος ἀπὸ
tῆς αὐτῆς Τοιμίσεως, τὸ ἐπιβάλλων
αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ Τοιμίσει τρίτον

15 μέρος οἰκίας καὶ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον αὐτῶι
μέρος ψιλοῦ τότου, καὶ πρότερον
τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ Ἐλένης Γοργίου
μητρὸς τῆς αὐτῆς Ταπουτότος
κατὰ διαθήκην τήν καὶ λυθείσαν

20 τῶν ἢς (ἐτεί) Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
περὶ κόμην Ἰβίωνα Παχνοῦβιν ἐκ τοῦ
Ζωίλου καὶ Νομημίου κλήρου γῆς
κατοικικῆς ἡμὶσὺ τέταρτον
δύοναι καὶ περὶ Ψελεμαχ( ) ἐκ τοῦ Μενίπ-

25 πού καὶ Ἀρτεμιδώρου κλῆρον γῆς κατοικ[ε]ξη[ς]
ἀροῦρης τέταρτον. καὶ ὑμνύομεν
τὴν Ἀυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ
Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ τῆς(ην) καὶ τοῦ(ς) πατρῴου(ς)
θεῶς ἐξ υἱ(ειας) καὶ ἀπ' ἀληθ(ειας) ἐπιδεδωκ(ἐναι) τὴν

30 προκιμένη(ν) ἀπογραφῆ(ν) καὶ μηδὲν διενεύσθ(αι)
ἡ ἐνοχὴν εἴημεν τῶι ὀρκῶι. (έτους) εἰ
Αυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ
Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ μηνὸς Καίσαρειοῦ ἐπι(αγο(μένων) ε.

2nd hand Γοργίας ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἐπιδέδω-


35 ka. (3rd hand) 'Ἡρᾶς γενυ(μνασιαρχηκώς) διὰ Ἰπποδὴ(γραμματέως) συσταθ(είντος) κε[α]τακεχώρικα αδίακ(ρήτων) κινδ(ύνω) τῶν ἀπογρα(φομένων) μηδενὸς δημοσίου ἂν ἰδιωτικοῦ) καταβλαπ(τοιμένου). ἐπαγο(μένων) ε.  


'To Heras and Origenes, ex-gymnasiarchs, keepers of the records of real property in the Heracleopolite nome, from Gorgias and Galestus both sons of Polemon son of Gorgias, their mother being Dionysias daughter of Galestus, from the village of Toemisis. We register at our own risk jointly and equally for the present 15th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord in accordance with the command the property which has devolved upon us from our deceased father Polemon son of Gorgias and Tapontos, from the said Toemisis, viz. the third share which fell to him of a house at the said Toemisis and his share of a piece of open ground, and what previously belonged to his sister Helene daughter of Gorgias and the said Tapontos, in accordance with a will which was opened in the 15th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord, near the village of Iblon Pachnoubis in the holding of Zoilus and Numeni 1/4 arourae of cateoecic land, and near Pselmah( ) in the holding of Menippos and Artemidorus 1/4 arourae of cateoecic land. And we swear by the Fortune of the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus and by our ancestral gods that we have honestly and truly presented the foregoing declaration and that we have made no false statement, or may we be liable to the penalties of the oath. The 15th year of the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus, 5th intercalary day of the month Caesareus. I, Gorgias the aforesaid, have presented the declaration. I, Heras ex-gymnasiarch, through Hippod( ), scribe, my representative, have entered it on the register jointly at the risk of the declaring parties, no public or private interests being injured. 5th intercalary day.'  

10. Above the o of ἀπὸ the scribe has written μη, which makes no sense and seems to be a mere error.  

36. αδίακ(ρήτως) apparently corresponds to κοινὸς εἰς ισοῦ in l. 7.

716. Auction of a Slave.

18-8 x 11-8 cm.  

A.D. 186.

An application to a gymnasiarch from the guardians of three minors for a public auction of their wards' respective shares, amounting to two-thirds in all, of a male slave. The remaining third part of the slave was the property of the minors' half-brother, but had been emancipated by him; and this combination of circumstances led to the present request for an auction (οδεν ἐπιδίδομεν, l. 18), though the legal point involved is not very clear. It is however certain, as Professor Mitteis remarks, that neither this papyrus nor 722, where a partial
manumission is also concerned, can be brought under Roman law, according to which, at this period, in the case of a joint ownership of a slave, a manumitted share simply passed to the other owners (Ulpian, Fr. i. 18). There can therefore be only a question of Greek or Egyptian law; and in the absence of parallels recourse must be had to more or less probable hypotheses. At the outset a doubt arises whether or not the partial manumission was the direct cause of the public auction. It is quite possible that the parties concerned merely wished to wind up their joint ownership, and that the details respecting the liberated share are accidental. If, however, the manumission was an essential factor, as ὅθεν in l. 18 would rather indicate, the course here followed may be supposed to have been prescribed either in the interest of the slave or of the owners. In a sale by public auction the rights of a partially freed slave could be safeguarded in a manner which would not be practicable in a private treaty; and this consideration supplies a very likely explanation of the present proceedings. Or, on the other hand, as Mitteis suggests, a sale by auction would protect an owner who wished to retain his share of a slave against a partner or partners who desired manumission. A sale of this kind would place the larger owner at an advantage against the smaller, since the former, if successful, would pay the latter only a fraction of the purchase-money, while the higher the bid of the small owner the greater the sum due from him to the predominant partner.
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ὁς (ἐτῶν) λ ὁ ὁ τὸ λοιπὸν τρίτον ὅν τοῦ ὁμοπα-
τρίου αὐτῶν ἀδελφοῦ Διογένου'ς ἥλεθε-
σται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. δὲν εἰπίδιδομεν τὸ βιβλί-
διὸν ἀξιοῦντες κατὰ τὸ δηλούμενον
20 τῶν ἀφηλίκων δίμοιρον μέρος τῆν προ-
κήματι γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν ἀμείνονα
αἱρεῖς εἰδότει παραδοθῆναι. (ἐτοὺς) κὲ
Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου Ἀδρηλίου
Κομμάδου Ἀντωνίνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς
25 Σεβαστοῦ Ἀρμενικοῦ Μηδικοῦ Παρθικοῦ
Σαρματικοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Μεγίστον
Βρεταν[ι]κοῦ Θοβ. (2nd hand) Ὀρίων Πανεχῶτον
ἐπίδεδωκα. (3rd hand) [Ἀπο]λλονο[ς Αὔριονος σὴν-
ἐπίδεδωκα. (4th hand) Ἀβάσκατο[ς] ἀπελεύθερο[ς]
30 Σάμου Ἡρακλείδου συνεπ[ε]δεδωκα. Διο[γένης]
Θεωνος τού] καὶ Διονυσίου ἐγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ
μὴ εἴδοτος γράμματα.

1 To Asclepiades also called Sarapion, gymnasiarch, greeting, from Horion son of Panechotes son of Doras, his mother being Taous, and from Apollonius son of Dorion son of Heras, his mother being Thaësis, and from Abascantus, freedman of Samus son of Heraclides, all three of Oxyrhynchus and guardians of the children of Theon also called Dionysius, namely Eudaemonis, whose mother is Sintheus, and Dionysius and Thaësis, whose mother is Taurus, being minors and all three of the said city. The said minors own, Eudaemonis one-sixth and Dionysius and Thaësis a half, together two-thirds, of a slave of their father's named Sarapion, aged about 30 years, the remaining third share of whom, belonging to Diogenes their brother on the father's side, has been set free by him. We therefore present this memorandum requesting that in respect of (?) the aforesaid two-thirds a public auction should be held, and that the property should be handed over to the highest bidder. The 27th year of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus Armeniacus Medicus Parthicus Sarmaticus Germanicus Maximus Britannicus, Thoth.' Signatures of Horion, Apollonius and Abascantus, that of the last-named being written for him by Diogenes son of Theon.

19–20. The exact meaning of this passage is uncertain owing to the ambiguity of κατὰ, which may be connected with either ἀξιοῦντες or τὴν προκήματι γενέσθαι. In the former case κατὰ means 'because of,' and the request would be for the sale of the whole slave; in the latter κατὰ signifies 'in respect of' (cf. 722. 14), and no more than the two-thirds would be involved,—a sense which would have been more clearly expressed by the simple genitive τοῦ . . . μέρους.

22. αἱρεῖς διδότει: cf. B. G. U. 656, an advertisement of property to let, ὁ βουλόμενοι μισθώσασθαι . . . προσρέστωσαν τοῖς πρὸς τούτοις ἔρεσιν (l. αἱρεῖς) διδόντες.
Part of a complaint addressed, no doubt, to some official, with reference to a dispute about the fairness of a measure between the writer, who seems to have been responsible for a cargo of corn, and another person. Owing to the imperfect condition of the papyrus, of which a preceding column or columns are lost, and of which only the first line is complete, the details are obscure. A curious new word, διλετον, occurs in ll. 5 and probably 12, apparently denoting some kind of measure. The writer's style suggests that he was still labouring under much excitement.

μέτρων ἐνβαλλομαι. ἐκβοῶντος δὲ μου καὶ κράζοντος τὰ τοσάτα
[... ] ψατο μὲ λέγον ὅτι τοῖς μέτροις σου οὐ θέλω ἵσχυσασθαί, ἦ-
[νάγκασμα] δὲ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ [ἀ]πλομ μέτρον ἀγοράσαι. ἀγοράσαντος δὲ μου
[αὐτὸ πα]ρέχωι ἕχων τὸν κυβερνήτην καὶ συνβάλλω αὐτῷ κατε-
5 [... ] εὐρίσκωι αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ διλετόν, εἰσπορεύομαι εἰς τὴν αὐ-
[... ] ἔχων αὐτὸ καὶ παραλαμβάνω Λεσίν τὸν ἀδελφὸν 'Ερασίππου
[... ] οὖν εἰσπορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν στρατηγοῦν ἔχων αὐτό καὶ
[συμβάλλω] αὐτὸ πρὸς τὸ χαλκοῦν μέτρον ἐν τοῖς συνεδρείοι, εὐρίσ-
[κω αὐτὸ...] μείζωι δύο ταῖς ἔκατον. ἐγὼ οὖν ἔβοι καὶ ἐκραζον
10 [... ] ἔρων τὸ χαλκοῦν ἀδικόν ἔστι καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιον
[12 letters ἐν τῷ συνεδρείῳ σὺν τῷ στρατηγῷ ἐκ(ρ)άζοσαν
[22 " β]ρόντων 8 αὐτῶν εἰσφέρω τὸ διλε-
[τον 21 letters ] βοῶν καὶ κράζων ὅτι τοῦτο ἔστι
[26 letters ἡν]άγκασμα βοῶν αὐτῶι ὅτι
15 [ 28 " ] δὲ οὖκ ἐνβάλλομαι διδὲ
[ 28 " ] ἐντυγχάνωντος πυκνὰ
[ 24 " ] τῇ δρόμου τ[...]

4. 1. συμβάλλω. 16. 1. ἐντυγχάνωντος.
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2. [... ἡμεῖςπαρο] or [ἀντιμεῖςπαρο] would suit the context. For ἡμάκαμα cf. l. 14.

5. The meaning and even the construction of πρὸς τὸ δίλετον (the reading of which is quite certain) is very obscure. From l. 12 it appears that the δίλετον was portable, and perhaps it was a species of measure, though whether it was that to which the writer's opponent objected (l. 2) or an official measure of some kind is not clear. Assuming this to be the meaning of δίλετον, it is tempting to connect πρὸς τὸ δίλα. with συμβάλλω αὐτό in l. 4; but the intervening words εἰρίσκει αὐτό are then very difficult. Possibly πρὸς τὸ δίλα. is parallel to μείζω δίο ταῖς ἑκατον in l. 9, since the general construction of ll. 4–5 and 8–9 seems to be the same; but πρὸς τὸ δίλα. can by itself hardly mean 'equal to the δίλετον' and έκεῖ would have to be supplied.

eἰς τὴν αὐτ.: probably εἰς τὴν αὐτό, i.e. the person referred to in l. 2, or τὴν Αὐτ... (perhaps)

8. For the use of bronze in official measures cf. P. Tebt. 5. 85–92, and P. Amh. 43. 9–10.

718. PETITION TO THE EPISTRATEGUS.

25·8 x 17·5 cm. A.D. 180–192.

A petition from Antistius Primus, who had held the chief priesthood and other offices at Oxyrhynchus, complaining that a payment due to the government upon 4 arourae of Crown land had been demanded from him, although his property included no land of that character. The land in question had perhaps been the subject of a perpetual lease, and owing to lapse of time and deficiencies in the survey-lists its identity had become doubtful; cf. a similar case in P. Amh. 68. 52 sqq.

From the character of the handwriting the papyrus must belong to the latter half of the second century, and there can be little doubt that the Xenophon here addressed, who was evidently a high official, was T. Claudius Xenophon, known to have been epistateagi in the reign of Commodus (C. I. L. III. 6575, 8042).

[Tίτῳ Κλαύδιῳ Ξ]ενοφάντι [τῷ κρατίστῳ ἐπιστατήγῳ
[παρὰ . . . . . . .] Ἀραθστίου Πρειμίου τοῦ καὶ Δολιανοῦ
[12 letters σ]αντός καὶ ἀρχιερ[ατεύσαντος]
[10 τῆς Ὁξυρρυγχεῖτων [πόλεως
5 [... ἐπιράμην μ]ὲν παρὰ Διουνσίο[ῦ]
[12 letters οὐ σον τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῶς περὶ Σέκνιν
[. . . . ὑπαρχοῦσας αὐτῷ ἕκ διαιρέσεως γενόμενης πρὸς
[. . . . καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀπολλώνιον νεώτερον ἄρουρας [σειτικὰς πεντήκοιν-
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[ta dvo ήμισυ] και εν ο[κοπέδο]ς αρουρης ήμισυ καθαράς από βασιλικής και
10 [οὐσιακῆς καὶ εἰρα]ς ἀκολούθως ἤ πεποίημαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀδέλφους διαιρέσει
[τελευτής μου τά] τῆς ἱδιωτικῆς μόνης δημοσία. Χρόνῳ δὲ παμπόλλῳ ὄστε-
[ρον μετὰ τ]εςοφράκτου αἰτή σος οὔκ οὔδ' ὅπως τοῦ πράτου Διονυσίου ἀποβαίνον-
[τος δ'esth ... ] ἀ κομογραμματεύς περὶ δν ἐστιν καὶ ἡ Σέγγις ὡς εἰς ἕπερω-
[τήσεως κτήματος παρ'] οὗ δεήσει τὴν ἀπαίτησιν σοι[σα]θεὶ δημοσίων
15 [ἀρουρῶν τεσσάρων βασιλικῆς ἐν πυροῦ ἀρτάβαις δεκάπεντε προσεφώνησην]
[tὰς τέσσαρας ταύτας ἄρουρας τῆς βασιλικῆς συναναμέγους εἶναι τῇ ὑπαρ-
[χούσῃ μου γῇ τῶν πνευκόντων τιρίων δὲ ἐπιράμην παρὰ τοῦ Διονυσίου καὶ
[13 letters ο]ου, ὡς ἐκ τούτου δεῖν τὰ δημόσια υπέ ἐμού ἀποδοθήμαι
[13 „] μήτε βασιλικὴν συνανάμενον ἐσχήκοτος μὴ αὐ γεωρ-
20 [γούντος μηδ' ὀλοί]ς γνωρίζοντος τί τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ κομογραμματέως
[προσφωνηθέντων] ἐπὶ δὲ ἀναφέροντο τῶν δημοσίων ἀποδιδομένων
[ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν] ἄρουρων τεσσάρων ὡς εἰκὸς ὑπὸ ἑτέρων. ἐπεὶ οὖν
[βλαβὴ ἐπιθολούν οὐκ ὀλίγα, ἀδικοῦ δὲ μὴ γεωργοῦντα ἀπαιτεῖσθαι μὲ δημό-
[σια ὑπὲρ ἀλλοτρίας] γῆς, δέομαι, εάν σοι δέξῃ, γράψαι τῷ τοῦ νομοῦ στρατηγῷ
25 ['να ο] προσήκον] ἐστίν τούτῳ πραξή ἐπιστείλῃ κατὰ τὰ διαταγματέαν ενευρ
[13 letters τ]έ[ς] πρὸ τοῦ κομογραμματέως προσφωνηθέντος
[ἀρουρας τέσσαρας βασιλικῆς συναναμέγους εἶναι τῇ ἱδιωτικῆς]
[καὶ ... . . . . προσφωνηθῇ τῶν ἐπικρατοῦντα παρ'] ὧν καὶ εὐλόγως ἡ
[ἀπαίτησις τῶν δημοσίων γενήσεται]. περὶ γὰρ δὲν ἀπητήθην οὐ δέον δημο-
30 [σών μενεί μοι ὁ λόγος πρὸς τὸν φι'αυθομόνον ἀντίποιόμενον, ἶν] δὲ
[βεβοσθημένον. διεμπυ][χεῖ.] 2nd hand [. . . . . . . Αντέστιος Πρειμὸς ὃ καὶ] Δολλιάνος διὰ Ἀπολλώνιου
[επιδέδωκα]

25. 1. πραξ. 26. πίνακας ἢ ποιος ἄρρητος;
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demand should be made of the impost of 4 arourae of Crown land amounting to
15 artabae of wheat, stated that these 4 arourae of Crown land were included in
the 53 arourae belonging to me which I bought from Dionysius and . . ., and that therefore
the impost ought to be paid by me . . ., although I have never had Crown land included
in mine nor cultivate any and am altogether ignorant of the statements of the komo-
grammateus, and although the impost for the said 4 arourae have for years been paid
in the regular course by others. Therefore since I have incurred no small loss and it is
unjust that I should be asked to pay the impost on land which does not belong to me
and which I do not cultivate, I beg you, if you think fit, to write to the strategus of the
nome, in order that in accordance with the decrees he may direct the officials whose
duty it is to . . . the 4 arourae of Crown land declared by the komogrammateus to be
included in my private land, and may state the owner from whom the demand for the
imposts may reasonably be made; for I shall retain a claim for the sums with which I was
wrongfully charged against the person proved to be responsible for the payment, that
so I may obtain relief. Farewell. (Signed) Presented by me, . . . Antistius Primus
also called Lollianus, through Apollonius . . .

3. Probably διοραννυμνοντος, the municipal titles being usually arranged on an
ascending scale; cf. Preisingke, Städtisches Beamtenwesen in röm. Äeg. p. 31.
8. [σείας: or possibly [διωμένας (cf. ll. 11 and 27), but [σείας makes a better
contrast to ἐν οἴκοπεδοίς, if that be right.
13. . . . a is the name of a village or ἐπόλιον.
14. κτητορός, if right, is an objective genitive depending upon ἐπερῶ[τήσεως ; cf. l. 28.
An alternative supplement is πράκτορος constructed subjectively, but the relative παρ’ οὗ
is then awkward.
δημοσίως: i.e. the rent, the rate of which upon βασιλικῆ γῆ was usually about
4 artabae the aroura; in the present case it was 3½ artabae. In l. 11 on the other hand
δημόσια has its ordinary meaning of taxes.
16. συναντίμετρος appears to be a new compound.
18. Perhaps [τού †Αλεξάνδρου or [τού †Απολλωνίου. But it would appear from l. 12
that there was only one πράτης.
25. ενεν at the end of the line is clearly written, but suggests nothing; some word like
ἐπισκέψαθι is wanted.

719. REGISTRATION OF A DEED.

19.8 x 16.6 cm. A.D. 193.

A notice addressed to the strategus by a certain Didymus of an authorization
received by him from the archicastes in answer to an application which he had made for the registration of a purchase of some house property. A copy
of the application, itself enclosing a copy of the agreement of sale, is appended,
and gives some interesting information concerning the formalities attending this
process of registration, which we think has not hitherto been understood. Texts
of the same class already published are B. G. U. 455, 578 and 717, to which an important Leipzig papyrus will shortly be added (cf. P. Grenf. II. 71. 6, B. G. U. 970. 20–2, 983. 10). The object in all these cases is to effect the ‘publication’ (δημοσίωσις) of private agreements made by note of hand (χειρόγραφα), and the publication consisted in the registration of the agreements at the Library of Hadrian and the Nanaeum at Alexandria (cf. l. 35 below, B. G. U. 578. 19, and 34). For such registration of a copy of an agreement the fixed charge of 12 drachmacs was payable (ll. 30–1), to which is added in the Leipzig papyrus a tax proportionate to the value involved; a declaration had to be made that the document registered was really written by the person by whom it purported to have been issued (ll. 33–4, B. G. U. 717. 26, &c.); and a notice of the transaction was served in the ordinary way through the strategus upon the other contracting party, who would of course raise objections if any irregularity had occurred (ll. 3–4). We are unable to find here, with Gradenwitz (Einführung, pp. 36–7), any question of a comparison of deeds or handwriting. The purpose was rather to obtain for the agreement concerned a validity which, as a mere χειρόγραφον, it did not previously possess, notwithstanding the formula ὄς ἐν δημοσίῳ καταχειρωσμένῃ (l. 28, &c.). In B. G. U. 578 the δημοσίωσις was preparatory to an action at law arising out of the non-fulfilment of the terms of the χειρόγραφον. In the other cases no such purpose is specified, and the step taken is only precautionary. This δημοσίωσις of χειρόγραφα is to be distinguished from the simple notification to the archidicas of contracts without any reference to καταχειρωσμός at the two libraries (cf. 727, introd.).

The papyrus bears the date Phaophi of the 2nd year of Pescennius Niger; other documents dated shortly before the collapse of his power are 801 and P. Grenf. II. 60.

Ἀχιλλῆς τῶν καὶ Κασίῳ στρατατηγῷ
2nd hand παρὰ Διδύμου Ἀμμωνίου μητρὸς Ἐλένης ἀπὸ [οίκο]ν Ἡλίου πόλεως.

[Δ]έποδρο[σ]α
ἐκ τοῦ καταλογεῖαν χρηματισμοῦ ἐστιν ἀντίγραφον. Ὀψιτάλιος ὀ ἱερεὺς καὶ
[ἀρχιδ][μακάτης Ὁ[ξε]ψυγχεῖτον στρατατηγῷ] χαὶ ἱερεὺς. τοῦ δεδομένου ὑπο-
μνήματος ἀντί[γραφον] μεταδόθη ὁγς

5 [ὑπὸκείται]. ἐπιγραφή. (ἔτους) Β Γαίου Πεσκεννίου Νέγερου Ἰούστου
Σεβαστοῦ[ο]ῦ Φαόφι κη.

[.. . . . . . . η ρη] ( ) [σ]εσμη[είσ]ου. Πολεμίων Πα [ . . .] γραμματεύ[ει]
καταλογο[είσ]ου [ . . . . . . . . . . ο] ἐγραφα.
Οὐδείς ἀρχή ἐπεὶ ἀρχὴ ἡ στίς καὶ πρὸς [τῇ] ἐπί [με] [ε] [α] [τού] [χρισματίστων] καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κριτηρίων παρὰ Διδύμου Ἀμμα[νία]ν μη[τρ]ος ['Ελένης ἀποليكου Ἡλίου πόλεως, τοῦ προμένου μοι ἀπλοῦ χειρογράφου] ἀντί-
[γραφου] ὑπόθεκεται.

10 Παποντᾶς Βίθνος μητρὸς Τεσσαπαχώτος ἀπὸ τοῦ Τρόφωνος [Εἰσείτο] [τοῦ 'Οξυρυγχείτου νομοῦ Διδύμω 'Απολλωνίου μητρὸς 'Ελένης ἀπολ[S]κου Ἡλίου πόλεως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ πεπρακέναι καὶ παρακεχω[ρ[ή][κέναι] σοι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐς τῶν αἱ χρόνων ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων μια ἐν τῷ [αὐτῷ] Τρόφωνος Εἰσείτο ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ νότου μέρει τῆς κώμης ἡμ[ίσ]ου ἡμέρας ἀνίκητον δύο διστέγοι καὶ αἰθρίων κοινῶν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν μου Παποῦν, δόν γείτονες τῆς μὲν μᾶς τοῦ αἰθρίου νότου εἰσοδος καὶ ἔγενος βορρᾶ [κλ]ηρονόμων Διογάτου ἀπηλιώτου κληρονόμων "Ὀρων λίβδος δημοσί[τα] βύ-
μη, τῆς [δὲ] δευτέρας νότου Παποντᾶτος Μοῦθιος βορρᾶ Ἡρακλείδου Ὀρείων ἀπηλιώτου δημοσία βύμη λίβδωσ Μικείου Μέλανου,

20 τιμής τῆς συμπεφωνήμενης πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑπὲρ παραχωρητι-
κοῦ ἀργυρίου Σεβαστοῦ νομίσματος δ[ρ]αχμῶν δισεχεῖλω[ν],] ἀς αὐτόθι ἀπέσχον παρὰ σοῦ διὰ [χειρὸς . . . . . . .]δρασὴ γενομένους ἐβεβαιοῦν δὲ με αὐτὸς τὰς οἰκίας καθαρὰς ἀπὸ τὸ δημοσία καὶ[λ] ἰδιοτικῆς ὀφειλῆς καὶ ἀπὸ ἀπογραφῆς ἀνθρώπων κατοικοῦσι [εἰδοὺς


30 ἐν δημοσίῳ γενοῦσαι ὁ αὐθεντικόν χειρόγραφον δίδοις τὰς ὀρισθέσας (δραχμᾶς) β[ε] ἕνεκα τοῦ μή περιέχειν με τὰς περὶ [δημοσιω-

33 σεως διαστολάς καὶ μοναχὸν δημοσιούσθαι ἐξίω ἀν[αλαβόντα

35 τὸ αὐθεντικὸν χειρόγραφον ἔχειν μοι χειρογραφίαν [περὶ τοῦ εἶναι αὕτι διδογραφὸς τοῦ Παποντᾶτος συνανακορίζεσθαι πάλιν τῷ

2. Second δ of διδόμου corr. from first half of a μ. 5. φαινέω apparently over an erasure. 7. ἱερι Παπ. 9. προσμένου. 10. χ of τεσσαπαχώτος corr. from γ by another hand. 11. απολλωνίου corr. from αμμα[νία]ν by another hand. 14. ἡμιαν. 31. A correction after με; cf. note below. 33. ἐν.
Petitions

To Achilles also called Casius, strategus, from Didymus son of Ammonius and Helene, a settler from Heliopolis. Appended is a copy of the official response received by me from the record office. "Vitalius, priest and archidicastes, to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome, greeting. Let a copy of the petition which has been presented be served as follows. Good-bye. The 2nd year of Gaius Pescennius Niger Justus Augustus, Phaophi 28. Signed by me... Written by me, Polemon son of... scribe of the record office... To Vitalis, priest, archidicastes and superintendent of the chrematistae and other courts, from Didymus son of Ammonius and Helene, a settler from Heliopolis. Appended is a copy of the bond issued singly to me. Papontos son of Bithys and Tsenpachous, of Ision Tryphonis in the Oxyrhynchite nome, to Didymus son of Apollonius and Helene, a settler from Heliopolis, greeting. I acknowledge that I have sold and ceded to you from henceforth for ever of my property in the said Ision Tryphonis in the southern part of the village a half share of two houses, one having two storeys, the other a yard, owned jointly by me and my brother Paous, the boundaries of which are, of the one with the yard, on the south an entrance and exit, on the north the property of the heirs of Diogas, on the east that of the heirs of Horus, on the west a public road, and of the other, on the south the property of Papontos son of Mouthis, on the north that of Heraclides son of Horion, on the east a public road, on the west the property of Minus son of Melas, at the price agreed upon between us for the cession namely 2000 drachmae of the Imperial silver coinage, which sum I have received immediately from hand to hand... and I guarantee the houses free from public and private debts and unaffected by persons' property-returns or any other claims, the right resting with you to cede to others and to manage and dispose of them as you choose. This contract, written by me, Papontos, in my own hand without erasure or insertion, is valid as though publicly registered. The 1st year of Gaius Pescennius Niger Justus Augustus, Pauni 20. Being therefore desirous that the authentic bond should be publicly registered I offer the prescribed 12 drachmae, in order that the regulations concerning publication may not apply to me (?), and that a single copy may be published, and request you to take this authentic bond bearing my attestation that it is the autograph of Papontos and register it together with this petition at the Library of Hadrian...”

3. ἐκ τοῦ: in 485. 3 ἐκ should also be read instead of ποδα.
6. γραμματί(ες) καταλογά(ειον): this no doubt was also the position of Hephaestion in 485. 8 and Flavius Aurelius in B. G. U. 578. 8. The καταλογέων was presumably at Alexandria.
22. ἡράη looks like the termination of a place name.
23–4. καθαρὰς... ἀπὸ ἀπογραφῆς: cf. 577 καθαρὰ (a share of a house) ἀπὸ ἀπογραφῆς πᾶσι καὶ ἀπὸ γεωργίς(ιῶν) βασιλικῆς καὶ ἐστιακῆς καὶ παντὸς ἑδους.
31–2. This is an obscure passage, the difficulties being increased by a slight uncertainty concerning the reading of με, which is followed in the original by something having the appearance of a tall ν. To read μου is unsatisfactory because the ε does not seem to have been touched, and we prefer to suppose that the tail of the φ of χειρόγραφον in l. 30, which is immediately above, descended into the line below and was cut off by a curved cross-stroke, so producing the effect of a ν. With μου, supposing that were intended, the meaning would be 'because it (the χειρόγραφον) does not comprise my διαστολαί?'; and the words may be construed in a somewhat similar sense with the more probable reading με 'because I do not possess the orders for publication,' the reference to the διαστολαί being in either case quite unexplained. On the view adopted
in our translation the ἰσαρχικὸς περὶ δημοσιῶσεως may be supposed to have prescribed certain penalties or disabilities if the form of procedure followed by the petitioner was neglected.

720. Request for a Guardian.

21.5 x 9.8 cm. A.D. 247. Plate VII.

A petition in Latin addressed to the praefect, Claudius Valerius Firmus, by a woman named Aurelia Ammonarion, that he would appoint a particular person as her guardian in accordance with the lex Iulia et Titia. This measure, which is supposed to have been passed in B.C. 31, empowered the praefects of provinces to assign guardians to women and minors who were without them. Appended to the document, which is signed in Greek by the petitioner and her proposed guardian, is the reply of the praefect making the appointment as desired. The rarity of accurately-dated specimens of Latin cursive gives the papyrus a considerable palaeographical interest.

rogo domine des mīhi
auctorem Aureli[um] Plutammonem
5 e lege Iulia Titia et .... [...

2nd hand [Ἁ]ψηλία Ἀμμωνάριον [τιθεδώκα.
3rd hand [Ἁ]ψηλία Πλωτάμῳ[ν εὐδόκῳ τῇ]
10 [ἐς]ησι.
4th hand (ἐτοὺς) ὙἹβτ υ. [...]
5th hand. quο ne ab[, .........
abat Plutammonem
15 do. (6th hand?) cepi.


'To Claudius Valerius Firmus, praefect of Egypt, from Aurelia Ammonarion. I beg, my lord, that you will grant me as my guardian Aurelius Plutammon in accordance with the lex Iulia Titia ... Dated in the consulship of our lords Philippus Augustus
for the 2nd time and Philippus Caesar. (Signed) I, Aurelia Ammonarion, have presented the petition. I, Aurelius Plutammon, assent to the request. The 4th year, Tubi 10.

(Endorsed) In order that ... may not be absent, I appoint Plutammon as guardian in accordance with the lex Iulia et Titia. Received by me.'

1. Valerius Firmus is already known as praefect at this time from P. Amh. 72 (A.D. 246) and 81 (A.D. 247). With regard to the date of P. Amh. 72 Wilcken considers (Archiv, II. p. 127) that the regnal year should be read as ζ instead of γ, as in our text; but we still hold that γ is right and that the facsimile, so far from throwing any doubt upon our reading, thoroughly confirms it.

5. lege Iulia Titia: cf. Gaius, Inst. i. § 185 si cui nullus omnino tutor sit, ei datur in urbe Roma ex lege Atilia ... in provinciis vero a praefidibus provinciarum ex lege Iulia et Titia. In the official signature below (l. 14) the more usual and probably more correct form Iulia et Titia is used. The et has sometimes been regarded as a reason for supposing that there were two leges, a Julia and a Titia, but the conclusion is by no means necessary.

Of the mutilated word at the end of the line the first letter may be a, e, i, s, or t, and the second a, r, m, n, or x.

(d) CONTRACTS.

721. SALE OF CROWN LAND.

15 x 16.5 cm. A.D. 13-14.

An offer addressed by two persons to Gaius Seppius Rufus, perhaps idiologus, for the purchase of 19 arourae of land which had reverted to the State and was at the time uncultivated, at the price of 12 drachmae per aroura. The document follows, so far as it goes, the same formula as P. Amh. 68. 17-24, which Mitteis is no doubt right in explaining, not as a sale in the strict sense, but as an example of emphyteusis or hereditary lease (Zeitschr. Savigny-St. 1901, pp. 151 sqq.)—a custom for which we now have evidence in Egypt as early as the second century B.C. (cf. P. Tebt. I. 5. 12). That this is the true nature of the transaction, in spite of the use of the term ὀφθαλμὸς, is shown both by the lowness of the price—in P. Amh. 68. 21, 20 drachmae, here only 12—and by the provision in the Amherst papyrus for an annual rent. Cf. 835, which is a similar offer for the 'purchase' of land addressed to the same official as 721, and P. Amh. 97. The document was never completed, blank spaces being left for some of the dates.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Γαῖων Ξεππίρ Ἦσσιφον

παρὰ Πολέμωνος τοῦ Τρόφωνος καὶ Ἀρχελάου . . . . . . .

βουλήμεθα ὄνησασθαι ἐν τοῖς Ὁμορηγητη . . . . . . . . . . . . αὖ̄

ὡπολόγους βοσιλικῆς ἐώς τοῦ (έτους) Καῖσαρος κλῆρων ἐ-

5 πί τοῦ (έτους) Καῖσαρος ἀνειλημένων καὶ ἀφόρων γεγονότων καὶ κλήρων τῶν ἐως τοῦ ἀνειλημένων καὶ αὐτοῦ (έτους) Καῖσαρος ἀνειλημένων πλὴν ἱερᾶς εἰς καὶ ῥοποῦς (?)

τοῦ ἵσιώτος τεταρτοῦ καὶ τεσσαρακόστου ἐτῶν Καῖσαρος, [ὁ μὲν Πολέμων περὶ Θεόβιτι καὶ Τετοῦν τῇ(7)] ἄνω τοπ(α)ρχ(ας

10 ἀροῦρια) δεκάπεντε, / ἀρουρ(αι) 1ε, ὅ δὲ Ἀρχελάος περὶ . . . . . . . τῆς Θεοισεφὸς τοπαρχ(ας) ἀροῦρ(ας) τέσσαρες, / ἀρουρ(αι) 1[δ, / ἀρουρ(αι) ιθ, ἐφ' ὁ παραδείχθεντες ταῦτα διαγράφουσθε εἰς τὴν ἑπτά τῶν τό-

πων [δὴ] μοιοί τράπεζαν τὴν κεκελευσμένην τιμὴν ἐκάστην ἀροῦρια) [ἀρουρ(αί) (δραχμάς)] δεκάδου, ἔξομεν δὲ εἰς τὴν τοβ(ε)τοῦ ἀνα-

γωγὴν καὶ κα-

15 [τεργάσασαν ἄτελειαν] ἐτῆς τρία ἀπό τοῦ [εἰσίωτος μῦ (έτους) Καῖσαρος . . . . . . . . . . . . .

5. 1. ἀνειλημένων; so in l. 7.

'To Gaius Seppius Rufus from Polemon son of Tryphon and Archelaus son of . . .

We wish to purchase in the Oxyrhynchite nome of the Crown land returned as unproductive up to the . . . year of Caesar, from the holdings which were confiscated in the . . . year of Caesar and became unfruitful and the holdings confiscated up to and including the . . . year of Caesar—namely Polemon at Thosbis and Tepouis in the upper toparchy fifteen arourae, total 15 arourae, and Archelaus at . . . in the toparchy of Thmoisepho, four arourae, total 4 arourae, total 19 arourae, with the understanding that on these being assigned to us we shall pay into the local State-bank the price ordered for each aroura, 12 drachmai of silver, and shall have for their reclamation and cultivation immunity from taxation for three years from the coming 44th year of Caesar . . .'
The saleable land ἵππος ᾑστικῆς is regarded as including both the confiscated κλῆρος and certain ιερά γῆ which must also have reverted to the government.

12. παραδείγματα ταύτας: cf. P. Amh. 68. 20, where παραδείγματα ταύτας is no doubt to be read, P. Teb. 79. 16, &c.


14-5. The supplements are taken from P. Amh. 68. 21. Other conditions on the lines of P. Amh. 68 presumably followed. 835 concludes ἄξιον ἐπιστεύει; οὐκ ὁτι γραμματεύσας ἐκδόθη μοι τούς... ἀνθρώπους, and something of this kind apparently underlies P. Amh. 68. 23-4.

722. Emancipation of a Slave.

24·3 x 10 cm. A.D. 91 or 107.

This document, which contains a formal emancipation of a female slave, drawn up before the agoranomos and concluding with an acknowledgement of the ransom, is of great interest as being the first specimen of its class from Egypt which is prior to the introduction of the constitutio Antonina, and illustrating the differences between Graeco-Egyptian and Roman law on the subject of manumission. Of the two previously known parallels, B. G. U. 96, which is a mere fragment, belongs to the third century and the Papyrus Edmondstone (facsimile in Young’s Hieroglyphics, ii, Plate 46; text in Curtius, Anec. Delph. App. i, Wessely, Jahresber. des k. k. Staatsgym. in Hernaln, xiii, pp. 47-8) to A.D. 354. Since the publications of the latter papyrus are somewhat inaccessible, we append the text of it on p. 202. Other papyri concerning the emancipation of slaves are 716, 723, a similar but much shorter example of a second century manumission, 48-9 and 349, which are letters to the agoranomos authorising them to liberate slaves. The ends of lines are lost throughout 722, but can in part be restored either from the context or from a comparison with another and quite complete specimen of an emancipation, written in the reign of Commodus, which we opportunely found in January, 1904. The most striking feature of 722 is the circumstance that it is concerned, not with the emancipation of an individual whose status was entirely that of a slave, but with a joint manumission by two brothers of the third part of a slave who, as regards the other two-thirds had already been made free; cf. the parallel case in 716 and, as it now appears, in P. Edmondstone 6. That the previous owner of the ⅔ was a different person from the two owners of the ⅓ is also not stated directly but is in the light of 716 likely enough. It is also noticeable that the
ransom is paid, not by the slave herself or by a banker, but by a private individual, perhaps her prospective husband, and that a distinction is drawn between the λότρα paid to the owner and a small sum in silver which probably went to the State; cf. note on l. 19.

*Ετος δεκάτου Αὐτοκράτορ' ὁς Καίσαρος Δομιτιανὸς
Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ 'Τη[ρ]βερτείον
ἐπαγο(μένων) (2nd hand) ἤ Σεβα(στὴ) (1st hand) μη(ν ὅς) Καίσαρείον
ἐ[παγο(μένων) (2nd hand) ἤ Σεβα(στὴ) (1st hand) ἐν 'Ο-
ξυρόγχων πόλει τής Θηβαίδος ἐφ' ἀγορανό.

μον Ἀρμιᾶς τρίων [5
αφείκαν ἐ{υ}']λευθέραν ὑπὸ Δία Γ' Ἦλιον Ἀχίλλευδ ὡς (ἐτῶν) κ ἰμέσοι μελίχρως μ[ακρο프ρόσωπος
[ούλης] μ]ετάπφρ μέσῳ καὶ Σαραπάς ὁς (ἐτῶν) . μέσος
[μ[ε]]λίχρως μακροπρόσωπος οὔ(λης) ...........

10 [. . ἄ]ρμιστερ', ἀμφότεροι ............ τοῦ
[Ἀμ]μούνιοι σήμεροι Σαραποῦτος [.............
[τῶν ἄπ' Ὀξυρόγχων πόλεως [ἐν ἁγιᾶ] τὸ ὄ-
[πάρ]χον αὐτότις ἐξ ἵσον τρίτων μέρος τῆς ἐξαπη-
[λευθερωμένης κατὰ τὸ ἅλλο ἐ]μοίραν δου-

15 λης Ἀπολλωνοῦτος ὡς (ἐτῶν) κς μέσῆς μελίχρωτος
[μακροπροσώπου οὐ]λή ποιῆ ἰε[iδ] ...........
ἐξαπήλθερωμένης (ταλάντων) .... .
[. . .]ν τῶν τοῦ ἀπελευθερωμένου .... τρίτων
[μέρους] ἀργυρίου ἐπισήμου δραχμῶν ........

20 [πε]ρῳβόλακα καὶ δῶν τέτακται [. . . Ἀχίλλει
καὶ Σαραπᾶ Ἡρακλῆς Μύρφωνάς τοῦ ...........
μητρὸς Ταυνώφριος Πάρεσι]. . . . ἀπὸ τῆς
[α]πτῆς πόλεως ὡς (ἐτῶν) λα μέσος μελίχρως
μακροπρόσωπος οὔ(λης) ὑπὲρ γύναι δεξιῶν λότρων

25 ἀργυρίου Σεβαστοῦ νομίσματος δραχμῶν
dιακοσίων χαλκοῦ ταλαντῶν ........
χιλιῶν, οὐκ ἔξως τῷ Ἀχ[ί]λλεῖ οὔθ ἄλλο
[ὑ]πὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀπαίτησιν ποιεῖσθαι παρὰ τῆς Ἀπολ-
[λ]ινοῦτος οὔθε τῶν π[αρ]ὰ αὐτῆς τῶν προκει-
30 [μ]ένων λύτρων οὐδ’ ἔπιε. ................. 
γνωστήρ τῆς ἐλευθερώ[σεως] .................
τῷ Πετεήσιος μητρὸς [........ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς
πόλεως ὁς (ἐτών) μ [έσος μελίχρως μακρο-
35 τῇ αὐτῆ[], (2nd hand) Ἀχιλλ[έ]ως ........
πεπύμη σ'[ν] τῷ ἀδελφ[ῷ]
Σεραπάτι τῇ[ν] ἐλευθέρω[ν]
τῷ τρίτον [μέρους δούλης
Ἀπολλωνιτ[ό]ς καὶ ἀπέκῳ
40 τὰ λύτρα δ’[ρυμπόν δραχ(μάς)
διακοσία[ς] χαλκοῦ
[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]

On the verso
ἐπαγω[μένων] τ [ ]


'The 10th year of the Emperor Caesar Domitianus Augustus Germanicus, on the 6th intercalary day of Hyperberetaeus, dies Augustus, which is the 6th intercalary day of the month Caesarius, dies Augustus, at Oxyrhynchus in the Thebaid, before three agoranomi called Psammis, Achilleus, aged about 20 years, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar on the middle of his forehead, and Sarapas, aged about . . years, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar on his left . . , both sons of . . son of Ammonius, their mother being Sarapous daughter of . . , all of Oxyrhynchus, have set free under sanction of Zeus, Earth, and Sun (the deed being drawn up in the street) the third part which they jointly own of the slave who has been freed as regards the other two-thirds, Apollonius, aged about 26, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar on the right foot, . . for . . drachmai 4 obols of coined silver and the ransom paid to Achilleus and Sarapas by Heraclas son of Tryphon son of . . , his mother being Taonnophris daughter of . . of the said city, aged about 31, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar above his right knee, namely 200 drachmai of Imperial silver coin and . . talents 1000 drachmai of copper; Achilleus or any one else on his behalf being forbidden to make any demand of the aforesaid ransom from Apollonous or her assigns, or to . . The certifier of the manumission is . . son of Peteeis, his mother being . . , of the said city, aged about 40, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar upon his . . shin, in the same street.

'I, Achilleus, have with my brother Sarapas effected the emancipation of the third part of the slave Apollonous, and I have received the ransom, two hundred drachmai of silver . . .'
1. Since the papyrus must on palaeographical grounds be assigned to the end of the first or the early part of the second century, the coincidence of a 6th intercalary day with the 10th year of an emperor called Germanicus fixes the reign as that of either Domitian or Trajan. The supplement at the end of l. 1 is in any case long compared with the 10 letters which are missing in l. 2, and Domitian is therefore preferable.

6. Cf. the similar beginning of P. Edmondst. 6 sqq. For Δια Γερμανίκου, cf. 48, 6, &c.

12. ἐν ἄγωνι is supplied from the newly found emancipation (cf. introd.); cf. ἐν ὑμῖν 

tif. We are inclined to think that this formula, which so far is only known at Oxyrhynchus, regularly implies the execution of the document before the agoranomi, who are mentioned much less frequently in Oxyrhynchus contracts than elsewhere.

16—9. The newly found emancipation proceeds straight from the description of the slave to the mention of the ἀγωνίων ἐπίσημων corresponding to l. 19, and owing to the lacunae it is not clear whether the sum mentioned in l. 17 is the ransom of the whole slave or of the ½ previously set free. On the whole we think the latter hypothesis is more likely. The talents are in either case probably copper.

19. ἀγωνίων ἐπίσημων: the newly found emancipation has ἀγω. ἐπισ. δραχμῶν δέκα καὶ ὧν τέκτοι ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ (sc. the slave) τῷ Θεωρίῳ (the owner). . . δραχμῶν ἀγω. δραχ. πεντακοσιων, on the analogy of which we have supplied δραχμῶν in l. 24. It is clear from that papyrus that a distinction was drawn between the payment in ἀγωνίων ἐπίσημων and the ransom paid to the owner, and from 48 and 49 in which the same amount of ἀγωνίων ἐπίσημων, 10 drachmae, is coupled with different sums expressed in copper, there would seem to have been a normal charge of 10 drachmae in addition to the ransom, in spite of 722. 19—20, where the amount of ἀγω. ἐπισ. cannot be 10 drachmae. The divergence of 722 at this point may be due to the fact that it is concerned with the emancipation of only part of a slave. To whom these 10 drachmae were paid is not made clear, but it is probable that the State in some form was the recipient. Nowhere in connexion with these emancipations under Graeco-Egyptian law is there a mention of the vicesima libertatis levied under Roman law, which appears in B. G. U. 96. 8 (τὴν εἰσveis εἰκοσ𝛁ήν); but if, as we are now disposed to think, the status of the persons who wrote 48—9 was that of farmers of the εὔκλειδον and 48—9 stand towards such documents as 722 in the same kind of relation as 241—3 towards contracts for sale or mortgage, there must have been a tax upon the emancipation of slaves apart from the 10 drachmae ἀγωνίων ἐπίσημων.

Papyrus Edmondstone. A.D. 354.

εἰπώ( ) ὑπατείας τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Καυσατιάνιον Αἰγύπτου τοῦ ξ καὶ Κωστατίνον τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου Καῖσαρος τὸ γ

Τοῦ Τίντι τῆς εἰκαστικῆς, ἐν Ἐλεφαντίνη[ε] πάλαι τῆς ἀνω ᾿Εθαίδος.

Ἀυραμίλη Τερανθίυνον Πασαρίτος μητρὸς Τεραπαχανοῦμεοι ἀπὸ Ἐλεφαντίνης πόλεως μετὰ συνεστῶνος ἐκ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτῆς ἀνδρὸς Ἀυραμίληον Διορθέου Σερίνου ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως Ἀυραμίληον Σαραπάμμωι

5 μητρὸς Τεσαρίων καὶ Τζαλίζη ἐκ μητρὸς Θαῖσιος καὶ τῆς ταύτης τοῦ Ἄμιντρις Λουσίας γενομένου.

μοι διδόμετε ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντος μέρους χαρίν. ὁμολογοῦ ἐκείνου καὶ ἄπαθετώς καὶ ἀμέτρατώς ἀπεκάθισεν ἡμᾶς ἔλευθερον τοῦ ἐπιβάλλουσιν μοι μέρους ὑπὸ Γην καὶ ᾿Ορανόν καὶ ἐπεξετάζαν

τοῦ πανελθέμους θεοῦ ἐλθόσον εἰς ἐμὲ ἀπὸ κληρονομίας τῆς μητρὸς μου ὑπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπαντα χρόνων.
This document, recording the formal emancipation of a female slave, follows the same formula as 722, but is simpler and more compressed. A good deal is lost at the beginnings of the lines, including, unfortunately, the details concerning the lútra; but a comparison with 722 renders the general sense clear enough. Cf. the introd. to that papyrus.
2 ἐπὶ ἀγορανόμων ἀφείκεν ἑλευθέραν ὑπὸ Δία Γῆν Ἡλιον [Διο-
δώρου τοῦ Αγαθείνου μητρὸς Τσεεί Θεόνος Ἡρακλείδου
3 30 letters ἀπ’ Ἀγυρύγχων πόλεως ἐν ἀγνιᾷ τῇ ἕν υπάρχ[ου]σαν αὐτῷ
οἰκογενή ἐκ δούλης Δημητριώτου
4 δούλην 50 letters [ὅ] . . [ γνωστὴρ τῆς ἑλευθερώσεως Σαραπίων
Ἀσκληπιάδου
5 55 letters (2nd hand) ὅς] (ἐτῶν) ν ὀ[ὐλή] ποθῇ ἀριστ(ερῷ) (1st hand)
ἐν ἀγνιᾷ τῇ αὐτῇ (2nd hand) διὰ Χαρῆμ(ονος) τοῦ σύν ἀλ(λοις)
6 50 letters ]

1. θηβαίδος Pap. 3. υπάρχουσαν Pap. 5. αγνία Pap.

2. τοῦ seems to have been omitted before Ἡρακλείδου. The name Τσεεί occurs also in
76. 5 μητρὸς Τσεεί Κυλλιὸν.
4. The vestiges following ὅς possibly represent the γνωστὴ τῆς, the intervening space
being accounted for by the junction at this point of two selides. Shorter blank spaces
have been left in the corresponding part of the two preceding lines. In that case ἐτῶν] ὅς
γνωστὴ should be read; but the traces do not suit γνωστὴ particularly well, and there is no ἐτῶν
ὅς in 496. 16 where a γνωστὴ is mentioned at the end of a contract. A description of the
slave and perhaps the amount of the λέτρα were given at the beginning of this line (cf. 722.
15 sqq.); but ὅς is not a possible reading.
5. After σύν ἀλ(λοις) the papyrus not improbably proceeded ἐπὶ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου; cf. 96. 2
(corr. by Wilcken) ὅ σύν ἀλ(λοις) ἐπὶ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου. This restoration would accord very
well with our present explanation of the position occupied by the writers of 48 and 49
(cf. 722. 19, note); but what exactly ἐπὶ implies here is uncertain.

724. APPRENTICESHIP TO A SHORTHAND-WRITER.

18.3 x 21.3 cm.  A.D. 155.

Contract whereby an ex-cosmetes of Oxyrhynchus apprenticed his slave
to a shorthand-writer for two years to be taught to read and write shorthand,
the teacher receiving 120 drachmae in all. The contract was drawn up by an
unprofessional scribe, and the language is often confused.

Πα[ν]εχώτης ὁ καὶ Παναρὴς τῶν κεκοσμητευκτῶν τῆς Ἀγυρύγχειτῶν
πόλεως διὰ Γεμέλλου φίλου Ἀπολλωνίῳ σημιογράφῳ χαίρειν. συνεστησά σοι
Χαιράμμωνα δούλου πρὸς μάθησιν σημείων ἐν ἐπιστάται ὁ υἱὸς σου
Δι[ο]νύσιος ἐπὶ χρόνων ἐτη δύο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνεστῶτος μηνὸς Φαμενῶθ τοῦ
5 δικτοκαδεκατού ἕτους ΄Αντωνίου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου μισθοῦ τοῦ συμπεφω
νημένου πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἄργυριον δραχμῶν ἐκατὸν εἴκοσι χωρίς ἐφρικ
κῶν, ἐξ ὧν ἔσχες τὴν πρώτην δόσιν ἐν δραχμαῖς τεσσαράκοντα, τὴν δὲ
δευτέραν λήψῃ τοῦ παιδός ἀνειληφότος τὸ κομμεντάριον ὅλον ἐν δρα.
χίλιας ἒπεσαράκοντα, τὴν δὲ τρίτην λήψομαι ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ
παιδός ἐκ παντὸς λόγου πεζοῦ γράφοντος καὶ ἀναγεννώσκοντος ἀμέμπτως
τὰς [δὲ] λοιπὰς δραχμὰς τεσσαράκοντα. ἔδω δὲ ἐντὸς τοῦ χρόνιον αὐτῶν
ἀπαρτίσῃς οὐκ ἐκδέχομαι τὴν προκειμένην προθεσμίαν, οὐκ ἐξόντος
μοι ἐντὸς τοῦ χρόνου τὸν παιδὰ ἀποσπάν, παραμενεῖ δὲ σὲ μετὰ τὸν χρόνον
ὄςας
ἔδω ἀργήηη ἠμέρας ἢ μήνας. (ἕτους) ἐν Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτου
Αἰλίου Ἀδριανοῦ
15 Ὁ Ἃντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσέβους Φαμενῶθε ε.

3. σ of σου corr. from μ. 7. χ of δραχμῶν corr. from γ. 9. λήψῃ.
6 of εκδέχομαι corr. from χ. 14. η of ἠμέρας rewritten.

’Panechotes also called Panares, ex-cosmetes of Oxyrhynchus, through his friend
Gemellus, to Apollonius, writer of shorthand, greeting. I have placed with you my slave
Charammon to be taught the signs which your son Dionysius knows, for a period of two
years dating from the present month Phamenoth of the 18th year of Antoninus Caesar the
lord at the salary agreed upon between us, 120 silver drachmae, not including feast-days;
of which sum you have received the first instalment amounting to 40 drachmae, and
you will receive the second instalment consisting of 40 drachmae when the boy has learnt
the whole system, and the third you will receive at the end of the period when the boy
writes fluently in every respect and reads faultlessly, viz. the remaining 40 drachmae.
If you make him perfect within the period, I will not wait for the aforesaid limit; but it is
not lawful for me to take the boy away before the end of the period, and he shall remain
with you after the expiration of it for as many days or months as he may have done
no work. The 18th year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus
Pius, Phamenoth 5.'

6. χωρίς ἐφρίκων: sc. ἠμέραν (cf. 725. 36-7), though the phrase is out of place.
8. κομμεντάριον: a Graecized form of commentarium seems to be intended, though the
doubtful μ is more like λο.
11-3. The clause οὐκ ἐξόντος κ.τ.λ., which is regularly found in contracts of apprentice-
ship (cf. e. g. 725. 53-6), comes in somewhat awkwardly here after the clause ἐδω δὲ ἐντὸς κ.τ.λ.
The meaning is that if the boy was perfect in less than two years, his owner would not
insist on his staying with the teacher unless the teacher wished to keep him, but the boy's
owner was prevented from taking him away before the boy was perfect and so evading the
payment of the second and third instalments.
725. Apprenticeship to a Weaver.

A.D. 183.

A contract between Ischyrion and Heraclas, in which the former apprentices to the latter a boy called Thonis, probably the ward of Ischyrion, for five years, to be taught the trade of weaving. Arrangements are made for the provision of wages (after two years and seven months) and clothes for Thonis by Heraclas on an ascending scale, and for the case of Thonis' absence from his work for more than the 20 days allowed for holidays. Cf. 275, a similar contract with a weaver written 120 years previously, upon which the supplements in II. 1–5 are based.

[Ὁμολογοῦσιν ἀλλήλους Ἰσχυρίων Ἡραδίωνος
[μητρὸς . . . . . . . . ἀπ' Ὀξυράγχων πῶλεως καὶ
[Ἡρακλᾶς Σαμαπίων τῷ καὶ Λέοντος Ἡρακλεί-
[δ[.]υ μητρὸς . . . . . . ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πῶλεως
5 γέρβιος ὁ μὲν Ἰσχυρίων ἐγιθεδόσθαι τῷ Ἡρα-
[κλῆς τὸν τῷ ἀ . . . . . . . . . . ο[.] ἀδελφόν
. . . ο[.] ὁ Ὁ[.][' άφηλί[.]ικα π]ρὸς [μ]άθησιν τῆς ὅ-
[λομένης [τέχνης ἀπὸ νεομηνίας τοῦ] ἐξῆς
[μ[.]υνός Φαυφί[.] τῷ ἡρών ἐτη πεῖντε, καὶ παρ-
10 ἐξει αὐτὸν προεσφεύοντα τῷ διδασκάλῳ
ἐπὶ τὸν δηλο[.]μενον χρό̣νον καθ' ἐκάτον
[ἡμέραν ἀπὸ ἀν[.]ατολῆς] ἥ[λιον] μέχρι δόσεως,
ποιούμενα πάντα τὰ ἐπίταχθησόμενα [α]ὐτ[.]ο[.]
ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δ[.]ιδασκάλου ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοι-
15 ὠν μαθητῶν, [πρεφόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰσχυ-
[ρίων. κ[.]αὶ τὰ μὲν] πρῶτα ἑτη δύο
καὶ μήνας ἐπὶ τοῦ τρίτου ἐνιαυτοῦ
οὐδὲν δόσει ὑπὲρ μισθοῦ τοῦ παιδὸς ὁ Ἡρα-
κλᾶς, τοῖς δὲ λουποῖς μηιὶ πέντε τοῦ αὐ-
20 τοῦ τρίτου ἐνιαυτοῦ Χορηγήσει ὁ Ἡρα-
κλᾶς ὑπὲρ μισθῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαθητοῦ
κατὰ μήνα δραχμᾶς δεκάδον κ[.]αὶ τῷ τε-
τάρτων ἐνιαυτῷ ὁμοίως κατὰ 'μῆνα

25 πέμπτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ ὁμοίως κατὰ μῆνα ὑπὲρ μισθῶν δραχμῶν δεκαεξής καὶ τῷ

Χἰτῶνα ἄξιον δραχμῶν δεκάεξ, τῷ [δὲ]

30 ίσιωτεί κε (ἔτει) ἔτερον χιτῶνα ἄξιον δραχμῶν εἰκοσὶ, καὶ [τῷ] κ’ (ἔτει) ὅμοιοὶ ἀλλο[ν] χιτῶν’ α ἄξιον δραχμῶν εἰ[κοσὶ] τεὸς[πάρον], κ[α]ί τῷ κ’ (ἔτει) ἀλλὸν χιτῶνα [ἄξιον δραχμῶν εἰκοσὶ ὁκτῶ, καὶ τῷ κ’ (ἔτει) ὅμοιοι ἄλλοι] χιτῶν

35 χαί ήρας εἰς ὅρθων κατ’ ἐτῶς ἡμέρας εἰκοσὶ, οὐδενὸς ἐκκρονομένου τῷ[ώ] μισθῶν τρύτων ἄψ’ οὔ χρόνου ἐὰν χρησιθηναὶ μισθῶς, ἐὰν δὲ πλείονας τοῦ·


45 χωρὶς μισθοῦ, πρεβόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰσχυρόνους, διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦτοις ἐστάσθαι. ὁ [ὅ] Ἰσχυρός εὐδοκόων τοῦτοις πᾶσι καὶ ἐκ δειδάξειν τῶν μαθητῶν τὴν ἀποκλημένην τὴν ἐπίκες ἐν τῷ πενταετὶ χρόνῳ

50 καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιστατεῖ καὶ χρησίμοις τοὺς μνημόνους μισθοὺς καθὼς πρόκειται[α] ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁγιῶν μισθοῦ τοῦ τρίτου ἐνιαυτοῦ. καὶ μὴ ἔξειναι μηδενὶ αὐτῶν παραβαίνων τι τῶν προκειμένων ἢ ἡ παραβὰς

55 ἐκτείνει τῷ ἐνεμένοντι ἐπίτειμον δραχμᾶς ἐκατόν καὶ εἰς τὸ δημόσιον τὰς ἱσας. κύριοι τὸ ὁμολόγημα. (ἔτους) κά Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Μάρκου Αδρηλίου Κομμώδου Ἀντωνίνου
Σεβαστοῦ Ἀρμενιακοῦ Μηδικοῦ Παρθικοῦ
60 Σαρματικοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Μεγίστου Θωδ κε.

2nd hand Ἡρακλᾶς Σαραπι(ῶνος) τοῦ κ(αί) Δέοντος τέθειμαι τὸ ὀμολογημα καὶ εὐθοκῷ πᾶσι τοῖς προκ(ειμένοις).

Θῶνις ὁ κ(αὶ) Μωροῦς Ἀρθάνιος ἔγραψά
ὑπὲρ αἰ(τοῦ) μὴ εἰδ(ότος) γράμμ(ατα).

16. τ of εττ' corr. from ξ. 30. ἱσωντι Παπ. 34. αλλ' ου above the line. 35. 
εξ of αἰῶν corr. from δο. 52. οὐδοῦ corr 56. ἱσας Παπ. 63. ἵ of μῶρους
rewritten (?)

'Ischyron son of Heradion and . . ., of Oxyrhynchus, and Heraclas son of Sarapion also called Leon, son of Heralclides, his mother being . . ., of the said city, weaver, agree with each other as follows:—Ischyron on the one part that he has apprenticed to Heraclas . . . Thonis, a minor, to be taught the art of weaving for a period of five years starting from the 1st of next month, Phaophi, and will produce him to attend the teacher for the stipulated period every day from sunrise to sunset, performing all the orders that may be given to him by the said teacher on the same terms as the other apprentices, and being fed by Ischyron. For the first 2 years and 7 months of the 3rd year Heraclas shall pay nothing for the boy's wages, but in the remaining 5 months of the said 3rd year Heraclas shall pay for the wages of the said apprentice 12 drachmae a month, and in the 4th year likewise for wages 16 drachmae a month, and in the 5th year likewise 24 drachmae a month; and Heraclas shall furnish for the said apprentice in the present 24th year a tunic worth 16 drachmae, and in the coming 25th year a second tunic worth 20 drachmae, and likewise in the 26th year another tunic worth 24 drachmae, and in the 27th year another tunic worth 28 drachmae, and likewise in the 28th year another tunic worth 32 drachmae. The boy shall have 20 holidays in the year on account of festivals without any deduction from his wages after the payment of wages begins; but if he exceeds this number of days from idleness or ill-health or disobedience or any other reason, Ischyron must produce him for the teacher during an equivalent number of days, during which he shall remain and perform all his duties, as aforesaid, without wages, being fed by the said Ischyron, because the contract has been made on these terms. Heraclas on the other part consents to all these provisions, and agrees to instruct the apprentice in the aforesaid art within the period of 5 years as thoroughly as he knows it himself, and to pay the monthly wages as above, beginning with the 8th month of the 3rd year. Neither party is permitted to violate any of the aforesaid provisions, the penalty for such violation being a fine of 100 drachmae to the party abiding by the contract and to the Treasury an equal sum. This agreement is valid. The 24th year of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Augustus Armeniacus Medicus Parthicus Sarmaticus Germanicus Maximus, Thoth 25. I, Heraclas son of Sarapion also called Leon, have made this contract and consent to all the aforesaid provisions. I, Thonis also called Morous, son of Harthonis, wrote for him as he was illiterate.'
This is an agreement by which Apollonius authorizes another person to appear for him in some legal proceedings in which he was concerned, being prevented by illness from attending in person; cf. 97 and 261, which are contracts of the same kind. The document is incomplete, the name of the representative and the date not having been filled in.

"Ετους ἐννεακαideκάτου Αὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Τρα[i]ανοῦ 'Αδριανοῦ
Σεβαστοῦ Τύβι[ ] ἐν 'Ὀξυρύνχον πόλει τῆς Θηβαίδος. ὁμογενεῖ' Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλώνιον τοῦ Δι[ο]γένους μητρὸς Τανεχωταρίου τῆς [καὶ] Εὐτέρπης Διογενοῦς ἀπʼ 'Ὀξυρύνχων πόλεως

ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως, ἐν ἀγνική,

οὐ δυνάμενος διʼ α[σθένειαν]

πλεύσας ἐπὶ [Γ]υν τοῦ νομοῦ

dialegism[ ]ον, αὐτόθεν συν-εστακέναι τὸν

τὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ λόγον ποιησο-νεν περὶ τῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν

κρατίστον ἡγεμ[ ]ὸν Πετρωνίου

[Μαμ[ ]ερτενου καὶ τοῦ ἐπιστρατη-

[γο]ν Γελλίου Βα[σί]ου ἡ κ[α] ἐφʼ ἐτέ-

ρων κριτῶν κ[α] πάντα ἐπιτελέ-

σοντα περὶ τῶν [κα] ὑστασιν,

εὐθοκεί γὰρ ἐπὶ τούτοις.

[kυρία ἡ ὄρμολογία.

"The 19th year of the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus, Tubi, at Oxyrhynchus in the Thebaid. Apollonius son of Apollonius son of Diogenes, his mother being Tanechetarian also called Euterpe, daughter of Diogenes, of Oxyrhynchus, acknowledges to [of the said city (the contract taking place in the street), since he is unable through sickness to make the voyage to the assize of the nome, that he has forthwith appointed to represent him in the inquiry to be held against him before his highness the praefect Petronius Mamertinus or the epistrategus Gellius Bassus or other judges, and to carry out everything concerned with the trial; for he gives his consent on these terms. The agreement is valid.'

10. διʼ α[σθένειαν: cf. 261. 12 ἄδια γεναικεῖαν ἀσθενεῖαν.

14. τὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ: so no doubt in 97. 3; the word after Νικάνωρ there is perhaps a patronymic.

19. Γελλίου Βα[σί]ου: Bassus is mentioned as epistrategus seven years earlier in 237. vii. 22.

33.3 x 15 cm. A.D. 154.

This is a deed drawn up by two brothers, who were Roman citizens and owned property at Oxyrhynchus, authorizing an agent to act in their absence from Egypt for a nephew and niece whose guardians they were. The document, which is called a συνχάρησις, is addressed to the archidicas, whose official cognizance of the transaction was desired. Other instances of private contracts being sent to the archidicas are 288, B.G. U. 729 and 741, the juristic significance of which is discussed by Gradewitz, Einführung, pp. 91–2, and Mittels, Archiv, I. p. 350. It is noticeable that, with the exception of 288, the persons concerned in all these cases are Roman citizens, and that the documents usually take the form of a συνχάρησις. The procedure here is apparently to be distinguished from that exemplified in 719; cf. introd. to that papyrus.

[I.3][8.3]μ. .]ει Ἐσ[ήκ]φόρου γενομένου ἐξηγητοῦ υἱὸ
γενομένῳ στρατηγῷ τῆς πόλεως ἱερεὶ ἄρχιδικαστῇ
καὶ πρὸς τῇ ἐπιμ[ε]λᾷ τῶν χρηματιστῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων
κριτηρίων δίὰ [Ἀ]ημητρίου Ἡρακλείδου γενομένου
5 ἐξηγητ[οῦ] υἱὸ διέποντ[ι] τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἄρχιδικαστείαν
παρὰ Ταῖων Μαρκίων Ἀπίανος τοῦ καὶ Διο-
γένους καὶ Ἀπολλονάριον τοῦ καὶ Ἰουλιανὸν καὶ ἠς
χρηματίζομεν καὶ παρὰ Ὁμήρα τοῦ Ὁμήρατος τῶν
ἀπ’ [Ὀ]ἴ[ου]ρων πόλεως. συνχωροῦσι οἱ Ταῖοι Μάρκι-
10 οἱ Ἀπίανος ὁ καὶ Διογένης καὶ Ἀπολλονάριος ὁ καὶ Ἰουλιανὸς
οὐ δυνάμενοι κατὰ τὸ παρόν τὸν ἦς Ἀγνυτὸν πλοῦν ποι-
ήσασθαι]ι συνεπάκειν τὸν προγεγραμμένον Ὁμηλόν
ὅτα καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ Ὁρυκει-
τῇ νομῷ φροντισθήν καὶ κατὰ τῆς ἡμίν συνχώρησιν
15 φροντισθείτω καὶ ἐπιμελησόμενον ἀν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπι-
τροπεῖσθαι ἀφηλίκων ἑαυτῶν ἀδελφιῶν Ὀδαλερί-
ων Θεοδότου τοῦ καὶ Πωλίωνος καὶ Ἀπολλοναρίου
τῆς καὶ Νεικαρέτης ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἀπαιτήσοντα φόρους
καὶ ἐγμ[ε]θώσοντα ἐὰν [θ]έον ἢ καὶ καταστησόμενον
20 ἐν δὲ καὶ γένη διαπωλήσοντα ἢ ἐν δέον
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25 θὰ καὶ αὐτοῖς παροῦσι ἐξῆν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ συνιστανόμενος

19. καταστροφόμενον: for καθόστασθαι in the sense of appearing at legal proceedings cf. e.g. B. G. U. 613. 14 κατέστημεν ἐπὶ θεοῦ δόρου, and the frequent instances of καθόστασις.

21. The construction is here somewhat awkward, the series of future participles which depend upon συνεσταθώμεν in l. 12 being interrupted by the parenthetical sentence διὸ τοὺς ἀνεξήγητος, which would better have been kept till the end.

29. ἄξοιδὲ(μεν): cf. 268. 19 ἄξοιδὲν ὡς καθήκει, and B. G. U. 729. 19 where ἄξοιδὲ(μεν)
stands by itself, as here. Wilcken (Archiv, I. p. 176) and Mitteis (ibid. p. 350) both consider that the object to be supplied after ἀξωικέν is σωματισμός, on the strength of 268, where the preceding sentence is ἐν δὲ τοῖς προκείμενοι οὐκ ἐννοεῖ σωματισμός. This was also our own view when editing that papyrus; but in consideration of the uncertainty concerning the meaning of the word σωματισμός, and the fact that here as well as in B. G. U. 729 ἀξωικέν is found by itself, we retain the doubts expressed in the note upon P. Fay. Towns 33. 18–9 as to whether in 268 ἀξωικέν is to be connected with the clause immediately preceding. We should therefore prefer to understand some more general term.

728. Sale of a Crop.

27 × 11.9 cm. A.D. 142.

A contract of a somewhat novel character, called a καρπωνεία, by which two tenants sell part of their crops standing, the money to be paid by the purchaser within a given time direct to the landlord, who has the same rights of execution as in the case of a loan. At the end is an acknowledgement from the landlord of the receipt of the money.

μὴ ἀποδοῖ τῇ ώρισμένῃ προθεσμίᾳ
ἐκτίσει τὰς τοῦ ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς διακο-
20 σίας ἐβδομήκοντα ἐξ σὸν ἡμιωλία καὶ τὸ-
κον δραχμαίοιν ἐκάστης μνᾶς κατὰ μήνα
ἐκαστὸν, τῆς πράξεως οὐσίας τῷ Ἀπίωνι
ἐκ τοῦ Διογένους καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόν-
[τ]ῶν αὐτῷ πάντων καθάπερ ἐν δίκης.
25 [Κύρια] ἡ καρπονεία. ἔτους πέμπτους Αὐτοκράτορος
[Kaí]σαρος Τίτου Ἀλίου Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνέινου
[Σε]βαστοῦ Ἔυστεβους Φαρμοῦθι κυ. (2nd hand) Παθώ-
[τ]ῆς καὶ Δάβιος ἀμφότεροι ἐκ μητρὸς
Ἀρσεῖτος (κ')εκαρπονήκαμεν τῷ Διόγενει
30 τὰς τοῦ χόρτου ἀροῦρας τρεῖς ἐκ γεωμε-
τρίας φόρου ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν δια-
κοσίων ὀδομῆκοντα ἐὰν ὅσ πρόκει-
ται. Διονύσιος Διονύσιος ἐγραφά
ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν μὴ εἰτέσσων γράμματα.
35 χρόνον ὁ αὐτὸς.

3rd hand Ἀπίων Ὁμείωνος Διογένει Ἀμβίτος
χαίρειν. ἔσχον παρὰ σοῦ τὰς συντε-
φωνιμένας ὑπὲρ τιμῆς χόρτου ἀργυρί-
[ο]ν δραχμὰς διακοσίας ἐβδομήκοντα
40 [ἐξ] καὶ οὐδὲν σοι ἐκαλῶ ὅσ πρόκειται.
[ἐς]τοὺς ε Ἀμφωνείνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
[Ἐπ]εὶ β.

20. l. ἡμιωλία. 32. l. ἐβδομήκοντα. 33. l. Διονύσιος Διονυσίου. 34. l. εἰδοτῶν.

'Pathotes and Livius, both styled as having Harsei as their mother, from the village of Thosbis, have sold to Diogenes son of Amois and Abeis, from the said Thosbis, out of the land belonging to Apion son of Horion, of Oxyrhynchus, which they cultivate at Thosbis in the holding of Charixinus, consisting of 20 arourae, the crop of hay upon three arourae as fixed by a survey in the eastern part for 276 drachmæ of silver, on condition that Diogenes may cut the crop bought by him and transport it to any place that he may choose, and shall hand over to the aforesaid Apion who is the owner of the land the 276 drachmæ of silver before Epeiph 10 of the present 5th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord. If he fails to pay it within the stipulated date he shall forfeit the 276 drachmæ of silver increased by one half, with interest at the rate of a drachma a month for each mina, Apion
having the right of execution upon both Diogenes and all his property as if in accordance with a legal decision. This sale of a crop is valid. The 5th year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Pharnouthi 23. We, Pathotes and Livius, our mother being Harseis, have sold to Diogenes the crop of 3 arourae of hay as fixed by a survey for the payment of 276 drachmae of silver, as aforesaid. I, Dionysius son of Dionysius, wrote for them as they were illiterate. The same date.

Apion son of Horion to Diogenes son of Amois, greeting. I have received from you the 276 drachmae which were agreed upon for the price of the hay and I make no complaint against you, as aforesaid. The 5th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, Epeiph 2.'

729. *Lease of a Vineyard.*

21 x 29.7 cm. A.D. 137.

A contract for the sub-lease of a vineyard for four years from Sarapion, who was himself a lessee (cf. l. 14), to Ammonius and Ptollas. The body of the document (ll. 1–35) is written in a very small hand in lines of exceptional length, of which the first 35–40 letters on the average are lost, while a few lines at the beginning are also wanting, being represented only by a detached fragment which is illegible and half decayed.

No extant lease of the Roman period has been drawn up with such elaboration of detail as the present document, and though P. Tebt. I. 105, of the second century B.C., is equally long its formula is quite different. Of the known leases of vineyards C. P. R. 244 is a mere fragment, and P. Brit. Mus. 163 is incomplete in the most important part. Hence the restoration of the lacunae in 729, which was moreover written by a somewhat careless scribe, is far from easy, and the sense of some of the provisions is obscure, though the general construction and meaning are usually intelligible.

The rent paid for the ἄμπελον, the extent of which does not appear, was (ll. 36–7) half the vine produce in addition to 50 jars of wine and perhaps a sum of money or corn; but that does not seem to include the rent of a piece of dry land which had once been a vineyard (χερσάμπελος, l. 30). This is leased (ll. 30–32) for three years, starting from a year after the date of the contract itself, and was to be cultivated as the lessees chose with the usual exceptions of the more exhausting crops, the rent being 60 drachmae and perhaps half the produce. The ἄμπελων is subdivided in l. 22 into a κτήμα and a καλαμεία. The former term refers mainly to the vines (though including a rose garden, ν. ἱντ), the latter apparently to a crop of some kind of reeds; but the passages dealing with the καλαμεία (ll. 3–4 and 25–7) are unfortunately very imperfect,
and the connexion between the vines and the κάλαμος is not made clear; cf. l. 3, note. Lines 5–10 deal with the embankments (χωματισμός), ll. 10–11 with the manuring (κοπρωμός), l. 11 with the watching of the fruit (ὀπωροφυλακία), ll. 12–8 with the irrigation, for which the lessees were to receive a loan of both money and cattle, ll. 18–22 with the payment of the rent and penalties for failure to carry out the terms of the contract. Lines 22–7 regulate the condition in which the vineyard was to be delivered up at the end of the lease, while ll. 27–30 are concerned with the apportionment of the various έργα. After a section dealing with the lease of the χερσάμπελος (ll. 30–2) follows one concerning a rose garden in the κτήμα (ll. 32–3), and the lease concludes with the usual clause assigning the taxes to the lessor (ll. 33–4), and another by which two rooms in a farmhouse are secured to the lessees (l. 34). Lines 35–8 contain the signature of the lessees, written for them in a large uncultivated hand by Ptolemaeus, while in ll. 38–46 is a supplementary agreement in a third hand, drawn up a year after the original contract, and acknowledging firstly (ll. 38–44) the loan of the cattle mentioned in l. 16, and secondly (ll. 44–5) another loan of which the previous mention is lost.
7 [ 36 letters ] δ]ραξμῶν τριακοσίων, τὴν ἰὲ ἄν[α]βολὴν ποιήσονται ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθίμων ἀναβολῶν. τὴν ἰὲ τοῦ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ τοῦ ἀρχαίου κτήματος χώματος ύδροφυλακίαν μέχρι τοῦ ὄρους
8 [ 37 letters ] τῷ τοῦ ἀρχαίου κτήματος μισθωτῇ, τῆς καὶ ἐτος ἀπεργασίας τοῦ αὐτοῦ χώματος ἐάνπερ χρεία ἦν ἐσται πρὸς μόνον τοῦ μεμισθωκότα, τῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ νεωφύτου ὥ- 
9 [μάτων 32 letters ] πρὸ{s}s μόνον τοῦ μεμισθωμένου, ὀρμόιος καὶ τοῦ νοτίου χώματος μέχρι τοῦ ὄρους, τοῦ μεμισθωκότος Σαραπίων παρέχοντος αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐτος ἄμισθει ὄνος δεκάπεντε
10 [..........], ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ εἰσήγοντος τρίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους ἐπὶ τὴν λοιπὴν τριετίαν δόθησιν τῷ μεμισθωκότι καὶ ἐτος τυρώς ὀβολιαίοις ἐκατόν. τὴν δὲ αὐταρκίαν κόπρων περιστερῶν πρὸς κοπρισμὸν τοῦ κτῆ-
11 [ματός δόθουσιν οἱ μεμισθωμένοι κατὰ τὸ ἥμισυ] καὶ ὁ μεμισθωκός κατὰ τὸ ἐπ[ερον] ἥμισυ. ὃν δὲ ἔλαυνθησα ὁ Σαραπίων ὅπωροφυλακα φυλάσσου(γ) δὲ τῆς ὑπόρας καιρῷ φύλακα πέμψε, τοῦ ὄψουν ὄντος πρὸς αὐτόν
12 [ 37 letters ] μηχανής καὶ τῆς ταύτης κ[..]ας ἐσται τὰ μὲν ἐφισα πρὸς τῶν Σαραπίων, οἱ δὲ τεκτονικοὶ μισθοὶ καὶ ἡ τοῦ τέκτωνσ σύνταξις ἐσται πρὸς τῶν μεμισθωμένους. ἐὰν δὲ καίνοι
13 [τροχοῦ 31 letters ] καὶ δόσει τοῖς αὐτοῖς μεμισθωμένοις εἰς λόγον προχείρας ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς τρισχείλιας, εἰς ὁπολοχυ(ς)θήσονται αἱ διδομέναι τοῖς ύδροπαρόχοις ὑπὲρ ποτισμῶν τοῦ αὐ-
14 [τοῦ κτήματος ἀπὸ Φαώφι] εἰκάδος τῶν ἐνεστώτως δευτέρου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους ἐνος Φαώφι εἰκάδος τοῦ εἰσίντων τρίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους ἀκολούθως ἦ ἔχει οἱ Σαραπίων μισθώσει ἥν καὶ εἶναι κυρίαν δραχμὰς δισχελιᾶς
15 [ 36 letters ] ὡς ἀποδώσοι αὐτοῖς τῷ μὲν Ἀθήρ μην δραχμᾶς διακοσίας Τῦβι (διακοσίας) καὶ Μεχεῖρ τὰς λοιπὰς δραχμὰς ἐξακοσίας, τᾶς δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δραχμᾶς τρισχείλιας ἀποδώσουσι ἐξενιάν-
16 [τὰ 35 letters ] πουσὶν ὀινὸν ἀτόκους. τὰ (δὲ) (δέοντα) κτήσή παρὰ τῷ ύδροπαρόχῳ βόθεις πέντε καὶ μόσχους τρεῖς παραλήψονται αἱ αὐτοὶ μεμισθωμένοι εν συντιμήσει τῇ εἰκάδι τοῦ
17 [Φαώφι τοῦ τρίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους, καὶ συγγράφονται τῆς συντιμήσεως
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απόδοσιν του λήγοντος χρόνου. εάν δὲ χρεία γένητε ἑτέρας προ-
χρήσεως δώσει αὐτοῖς ὁ μεμισθωκός, λαβὸντες καὶ τάξονται δρα-
18 [χμ 31 letters ἐπάν]αγκον οὖν οἱ αὐτοὶ με[μ]ισθωμένοι ἐκαστα ἐπιτελεῖ-
tοσαν ὁς πρόκιται ἀμέμπτος μηδὲν ἐκκαιρον ἐώντος γείνεσθαι πρὸς
tὸ μὴ καταβάσπεσθαι τὴν ἀμπελοὺ μηδὲ
19 [ 35 letters ἀποδότωσαν τῷ μεμισθωκότι τὸν μὲν οἶνον παρὰ ληνὸν
νέον ἄδολον ἐκατέρω μέρους παρέχοντος παρὰ ληνὸν τὸν αὐτάρκη
kέραμον, οὐ δὲ ἦν μὴ κατὰ καιρὸν ἔρ-
20 [γάζουντα 29 letters ]ομένου φωτὸ τὸ βλάβοι διπλοῦν, τοῦ δὲ κατα-
lιστεῖν τὴν μίσθωσιν ἐντὸς του χρόνου ἐπιτίμου ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς
πεντακοσίας καὶ εἰς τὸ δημοσίουν τὰς ἵσσας χωρίς
21 [τοῦ τὴν μίσθωσιν μένειν κυρίαν . . . . . . . . . . ν]ι, καὶ ἡ πραξ[ης] ἐστὸ [τ]ί
c[μ][εμισθωκότι] ἐκ τῶν μεμισθωμείων ἀλληλεγγυῶν ὄντων εἰς
ἐκτισιν καὶ ἐξ οὐ ἦν αὐτῶν αἰρῆται καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς πάν-
22 [των καθέπερ ἐγ δίκης. καὶ μετὰ τὸν χρόνων παραδότωσαν οἱ μεμισθω-
mένοι τῷ κτήμα καὶ τὴν καλαμείαν σύνφυτα καὶ ἐπιμεμελημένα
καὶ καθαρὰ ἀπό τε θρόνον καὶ βοτάνης καὶ δείσης πάσης καὶ τὰ
φυτὰ εὐθαλοῦτα καὶ
23 [ 37 letters ]τι κεχαρακομένας καὶ τά [τοῦ] κτήματος χώματα ἐστε-
γαμένα καὶ ὑδροπεφυλακμένα καὶ ὃς ἄν παραλάβωσι θύρας καὶ
κλεῖσι καὶ τὴν μηχανὴν ὅ(γ)υ(ή) πλῆν
24 [ 34 letters ποιο]ήσουντα τοῖς ποισμοῖς τοῦ [κτή]ματος καὶ τῆς καλα-
μείειας] πεμπταῖος πρὸς ἀρεσκ[η]ν] τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ τὴν τοῦ
κατὰ τὸν Σαραπίωνα οἰνοῦ μεταφορὰν ἀπὸ τῆς
25 [ 40 letters ]εινησιν κ[. . . . . . . ] ἐφ' ὅσον ἐννη . . . [. . . . . ]ται,
ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ μ[εμ][εμισθωμένοι] ὑπολείψουσι μ[ετά] τὸν χρόνον
τῶν τότε τῆς καλαμείας κάλαμον
26 [ 40 letters ]υ τὸν ἐξή[β. . . . . . . . . . ]τι διὰ τὸ καὶ [. . . . . . . . ]νων
ἐτέρφῳ μισ[θ] . . . . . . . . ] οἱ ἐπικείμενοι τῆς κ[α]λαμείας κάλαμον
τῶν π[ρ.][π.] φο[ς] διελθόντος έκτος
οἶνος [ 15 letters ]ον φ. . . . . μέτρῳ π[. . . ] . . . . . . . . . . . . οἰκείον
τοῦ Σαραπίωνος
28 [ 36 letters τ]ό μέσο τοῦ κτήματος τήν δὲ μιμήχανην ἀναβαλεῖ ὁ μεμισθοθεκώς Ἰδαίς δαπάναις ἀπὸ μηνὸς Παχών, τὴν δὲ σκαφήν τῆς πλακάδος τοῦ ὑποδοχύου ἔσται ὑπὸ
29 [τ]ὲ τῶν μεμισθομένων κατὰ τὸ ἡμίου καὶ] ὑπὸ τοῦ μεμισθωκότος κατὰ τὸ ἐτερον ἡμίου. τὴν δὲ κατ' ἐτος ἐυλοτομίαν καὶ ἐκαστον τῶν κατὰ καὶρ[ῶν ἔργων ποιήσουσι οἱ μεμισθομένοι ἑπακολουθοῦν.
30 [το]ὸ τοῦ Σαραπίωνος 20 letters ]ως αὐτῷ πάντα γενέσθαι. μισθώσει δὲ ὁ μεμισθωκὸς τοῖς μεμισθομένοις ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰσιόντος τρύτων καὶ εἰκ[ό]στοι ἐτοὺς ἐπὶ χρόνον ἐτη τρία τὴν ἑντὸς πλαστῶν χερσάμπη-
31 [Λο]ν 33 letters ἀ]ρουρηθοῦ ἄστε κατ' ἐτος σπείραι καὶ ἐυλαμῆσαι ὡς ἐὰν αἵρονται γένεις χωρίς εἰσάτεος καὶ ἐχομενίον φόρον ἀποτάκτου κατ' ἐτος δραχμῶν ἔξηκοντα καὶ ἡμῖν μέρος τῶν
32 [ 37 letters ] , ἐν αἷς ἦστιν τροχὸς ὡς ἐὰν κατ' ἐτος κοινότερον συν-
φονῆσωσι τῶν φόρων. τῶν δὲ ἐν τῷ κτήματι μοδώνα κατ' ἐτος ὑντος τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ Σαραπίωνος τῶν μεμ-
33 [σθωμένων 29 letters ]τα[.] παρέξ τῆς ἐυλογογείας, τῶν κατ' ἐτος πάντων τῶν αὐτῶν ἀροῦρων καὶ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ὑντῶν πρὸς τὸν Σαραπίωνα δημοσίων, δι καὶ ἔξει ὁ αὐτὸς Σαραπίων
34 [ 28 letters καὶ παρέξει] δ' ἐν αὐτῶν Σαραπίων τοῖς μεμισθομένοις πρὸς ἐνοίκησιν χωρὶς ἐνοικίου ἐν τῷ ἐποικίῳ καμάρας δόο, κυρία ἡ μισθωσις. (ἤτους) δευτέρου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ Δυτικάρτατος
35 [Καὶσαρος Τραιανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Φαι]βι ε. (2nd hand) Ἀμμώνις Ἀπολλωνίων καὶ Πτολλᾶς Δουκίων μεμισθομένη τῶν ἀντέλονα ἐπὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ἐτη
36 [φόρον τῆς ἡμίους τοῦ ἐκ]βησομένου οἰκίκου γενήματος καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμίου(ν) ἡμισιὰς ἄλλα ὠν κεράμια πεντήκον-
37 [τα 20 letters ]α καὶ ἐκα(σ)τα ποιήσομεν ὡς πρόκειται. Πτολεμαῖς Ζωῖλου ἐγγάζα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν μη εἰδότον
38 [γράμματα. ἕτοὺς δευτέρου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ Δυτικάρτατος Καίσαρος Τραει-
39 [Ἀπολλωνίου καὶ Πτολλᾶς Δουκίου ἐσ]χομεν παρὰ τοῦ αὐ(τοῦ) Σαρα-
πίωνος καὶ τῇ κ τοῦ Φαϊβι τοῦ δευτέρου ἐτους Τίτου Διλίου Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνείνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου βοεικά κτήμη μόσχους μὲν τελείους
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40 [ 22 letters βόας dė tε]λειας τρείς πάντα ἐν συντειμήσει ἄργυριῳ δραχμῶν δισεκατοστίων πεντακοσίων, ἀπερ κτήνη ἐπάναγκον θρέψομεν τῆς κατ' ἐτος γο.

41 [νής 27 letters ᾧν, μετὰ dė τὸν χρόνον τῆς μισθώσεως αἵρέσεως καὶ ἐγγυότης οὐσίας σοι τῷ Σαραπίων ἐὰν μὲν αἱρῇ τὴν συντείμησιν τῶν κτηνῶν λαβείν

42 [ 31 letters ]υ τῆς τότε ἐσομμένης αὐτῶν συντειμήσεως, κὰν μὲν ἐλάσσονες συντειμήσῃ ἀποδώσωμεν τὸν ἵσυ συνπληρώσων τῆς προκει-

43 [μένης συντειμήσεως, ἐὰν dė καὶ μείζονος ἀποδώσεις ἥμειν σḏ q] Σαραπίῶν τὸν ... y [ยายσον, ἐὰν dė αἱρόμεθα ἀλλάσσειν κτήνη ἡ πωλεῖν ἔξεσται ἥμειν μετὰ γνώμης

44 [ 30 letters τά ἦγα. ἐτῇ dὲ καὶ ἔσχων ἐνεχυροῦμεν ἀλ[............]μενα ἐκατόν ... ]κοντα d μετὰ τῶν χρόνων παραδόσωμεν τὰ ἵσα σει-

45 [ 35 letters [άτι...] [.........] .........] [ ......] [ ......] ἐτοὺς ἐντερ' Ἀυτοκράτ]τορος Καλπάρας Τίτον Ἀλ[ην]άνου Ἀδριανοῦ [Ἀντ]α-

46 [Εὐσεβίου Φαώφι κ. ]

8. 1. οὔσις for ἦταν. 9. 5 μονοὶ above the line. 10. of τοὺς corr. from ν. 11. μεν of μεμεθαθεμένων corr. from κοτα. 12. 1. κάποιον. 13. of ἀδοκιμαν cor. from α. 14. πο of νῦν cor. from σ. 15. 1. ραχαίμα διαχλιαί. 16. πο of νῦν cor. from φυ. 17. γ of γενετής cor. from ν. 18. 1. γένεται. 19. ἐφσχίσῃς. 20. of δως cor. from α. 21. 1. ἐφότες. 22. 1. καὶ before καθαρα. 23. καὶ before νῦν cor. 24. αλατι of καλύμ cor. 25. 1. καὶ before νῦν cor. from εαυ. 26. 1. ἁματυς καὶ ἀχμενίων. 27. 1. μεμθαθεμένα τὸν ἀμπελώνα. 28. 1. ἡματιάς. 29. 1. καὶ before κάθεται. 30. 1. αἰδώσων. 31. 1. τίτων ζυγῶν ἀπε ἡ Παπ. 32. 1. ἐδόσων. 33. 1. καὶ before κάθεται. 34. 1. παραδόσασθεν. 35. 1. οὐσίας. 36. 1. Φαώφι. 37. 1. Παρ. 38. 1. Παραδόσασθεν. 39. 1. καὶ before κάθεται. 40. 1. Παρ. 41. 1. ἀλάσσων. 42. 1. παραδόσασθεν. 43. 1. Παρ. 44. 1. ἀλάσσων. 45. 1. καὶ before κάθεται. 46. 1. αἰδώσων. 47. 1. τιτῶν ζυγῶν ἀπε ἡ Παπ.

3. καλαμείαν: that a special connexion exists between the cultivation of καλάμος and vine-growing is apparent not only from the present document (cf. especially II. 22 and 24, where the κτήμα is coupled with the καλμαία), but from other leases of ἀμπελώνες; cf. C. P. R. 224. 11−2 ἦν καλαμομυργίαν ἐκ καλῶς ... τῷ αὐτάρκει καλαμὸν καὶ σχονία, P. Brit. Mus. 163. 22−5, where read καί τὴν οὔσαν καλαμὰν ἀναχώσομεν κατ' ἐκατόν καὶ τὸν ἀρπηγεῖλόν καὶ ... καὶ ἀμπελώνα καὶ ἀμπελώνα. 36. 1. Παρ. 37. 1. καὶ before κάθεται. 38. 1. Παρ. 39. 1. Παρ. 40. 1. Παρ. 41. 1. καὶ before κάθεται. A new hand καλαμεία was sometimes cultivated by itself, as is shown by B. G. U. 558. 13, where a καλαμία corresponds to an ἔλαιον; cf. P. Brit. Mus. 195 (8). 11 and B. G. U. 619. ii. 19 and 776. 10, which mention κάλαμος ἀμπελών, contrasted apparently with καλαμαίαν (P. Brit. Mus. 191. 11; cf. Wilcken, Archiv, I. p. 150). In P. Tebt. 5. 199 καλαμεία is mentioned as being required for
embankments (cf. note ad loc.); but though this section dealing with καλαμία in 729 is immediately followed by one dealing with embankments (cf. P. Brit. Mus. 163. 22) the καλαμία in an ἀμφελον would seem to be a crop of reeds planted between or under the vines. According to l. 22 the καλαμία equally with the κτήμα had to be handed over σύνθετα καὶ ἐπιμελημένα κ.τ.λ.

5. χῶν is to be supplied as the object of ἐσθειον; cf. l. 6. In the first year of the lease the responsibility for the χωματισμὸς was shared equally by the lessor and lessees. In the succeeding three years (ll. 6-7) the responsibility continues to be equally divided, but a payment of 300 drachmae comes in, the nature of which is obscure.

7-9. Apparently the contract is concerned with the lease of the newly reclaimed κτήμα, and the adjoining ἀρχιν κτήμα was leased to some one else, the μοιχωτής of l. 8. The embankment which is the subject of ll. 7-8 probably divided the two κτήματα, and the arrangement is that for the ὑδραφάλακτα Sarapion and the other μοιχωτὴς are jointly responsible, but for the ἀγερμαί Sarapion alone. For certain embankments of the νεφρόντων κτήμα on the other hand the lessees were responsible, as well as for the 'southern embankment' (ll. 8-9), Sarapion supplying them with 15 donkeys annually, in return for which they were to pay him in each of the last three years of the lease 100 cheeses worth an obol apiece (ll. 9-10).

10-11. 'The necessary amount of pigeon's dung for manuring the vineyard shall be provided half by the lessees and the other half by the lessor. Sarapion shall send any guard whom he chooses in order to protect the fruit at the time of bearing, being himself responsible for the payment of him.'

12. A new waterwheel (sakīyēh) was required, Sarapion paying for the wood, the lessees for the construction.

13-6. A loan of 3000 drachmae is to be advanced by Sarapion to the lessees, but from this is to be deducted 2000 dr. paid to the persons who supplied the water for the current year in accordance with Sarapion's lease of the land from them. The remaining 1000 dr. to be paid in three instalments in the earlier half of the year. In l. 15 only 800 dr. are accounted for, but it is more likely that διακοσίας has been omitted after τοῦ that it is to be supplied at the beginning of l. 15. The whole 3000 dr. to be repaid to Sarapion without interest at the time of the vintage towards the end of the first year of the lease. The large amount paid for water makes it probable that this came not from a well but from a newly-made channel. For ἐξενίατα in l. 15 cf. P. Amh. 85. 14, 86. 11, and P. Par. 25. 12. The second of these instances, in which ἐξενίατα follows κατ' ἐτος, shows that it must have meant something different; and the sense 'annually' would not suit the present passage, for it is clear that the loan which is the subject of ll. 13-6 refers to a single occasion; cf. l. 17, where it is contrasted with the ἔτη πρᾶξιν. The most suitable meaning for ἐξενίατα in all these contexts is 'within (or 'for') the whole year.' In B. G. U. 920. 18 the editor reads ἐνενίατα κατ' ἐτος, where too ἐξενίατα was probably intended if not the actual reading.

16-7. With this passage cf. ll. 39-44, which refer to the carrying out of this stipulation. The oxen were required for working the waterwheel, and according to l. 39 were actually supplied a year after the date of the lease by Sarapion, but from the present passage they would seem to have been deposited with the persons who supplied the water. They were to be received 'at a valuation' and an agreement was at the same time to be made about the return of this valuation at the expiration of the lease. The details of the repayment are specified in ll. 41-4.

17-8. The 2000 drachmae for water (l. 14) were probably an annual charge, and hence a second loan from the lessor might be required. For this the lessees paid interest, if we restore δραχμιων τόκων.
18-24. ‘The said lessees are therefore required to perform all the aforesaid duties blamelessly, leaving nothing undone at the right season, so that no damage may accrue to
the vineyard . . . and they shall pay to the lessor the wine at the vat, new and unadulterated,
each party providing at the vat a sufficient number of jars, and for every failure to perform
work at the proper time...twice the amount of the damage, and for giving up the lease before
the end of the period a fine of 500 silver drachmæ and to the Treasury an equal sum
without affecting the validity of the lease, and the lessor shall have the right of execution
both upon the lessees who are each other’s sureties for payment, and upon whichever of
them he chooses and upon all their property, as if in accordance with a legal decision. And
at the end of the period the lessees shall deliver the vine-land and reed-land planted, well
cared for, free from rushes, grass and weeds of all kinds, and the plants healthy . . ., and
the ... palisaded, the embankments of the vineyard firm and watertight, and also any doors
and keys they may have received, and the waterwheel in good repair except . . .; and they
shall irrigate the vine-land and reed-land every fifth day to the satisfaction of Sarapion, and
shall transfer Sarapion’s share of the wine from the . . .’

28. The μηχανή is presumably that mentioned in l. 12, but the technical meaning of
ἀναβίδλαψις here is obscure. παλαξία is a new word meaning the lower part of the wine
receptacle, which was below the ground level.

50. The lacuna at the beginning may be filled up ὀστε πάντα ἄρεσκοντ’ως; cf. l. 24.
50–2. This χρυσόμελος is distinct from the ἀμπελών which is the subject of the main
contract; cf. introd. ἐνός πλαστῶν in l. 30 seems to mean ‘enclosed by a mud wall.’

32. ῥοδώνα: this is the first mention in a papyrus of the cultivation of roses. In
P. Brit. Mus. 163. 17, where for the editor’s ἄφροδιτος σιωπ Ἀλίκιν (Archiv, I. p. 150)
suggested ἄργυρος ἀφροδίτης, the correct reading is ἄργυρος ἀφροδίτως, i.e. ἀργυρόδιτως.

40–4. The total number of calves to be provided according to l. 16 was 3, and of
βῆες 5. Here however the calves were probably 5, for the βῆες are 3. The cattle were
valued at 2500 dr. altogether, and at the end of the lease Sarapion had the choice of
receiving this sum or the animals at a new valuation. If this was less than the former one,
the lessees had to make up the difference to Sarapion. If the fresh valuation was higher,
apparently Sarapion paid them the difference. If the lessees wished to change or sell the
cattle, they might do so with Sarapion’s consent.

44–5. These lines clearly refer to something contained in the main contract, but
though we should expect a mention here of the χρυσόμελος (ll. 30–2) which was to be
leased after one year, the remains of l. 44 suggest something quite different, which must have
occurred in one of the lost provisions.

730. Lease of Domain Land.

19.5 x 7.3 cm.
A.D. 130.

A sub-lease of 5 aourae of domain land at Senepta for one year, at the
rent of 24 drachmae per aoura, with an extra payment of 4 drachmae. The
crop specified is grass, while the other provisions follow the usual formulæ; cf.
e.g. 490.
On the verso

2. Ουαλερίω. 20. o of τον corr. from ο. 21. ε of of δε corr. from i (?). 39. σενεπ(τα) above [.].

1 Sarapion son of Herodes, of Oxyrhynchus, has leased to Valerius son of Apollonius, of the village of Senepta, a Persian of the Epigone, for the current 15th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord, out of the domain land standing in his name 5 arourae in the holding of Damon, to be cultivated with grass for cutting and grazing at a fixed rent of 120 silver drachmata and 4 drachmata for the slaves for a libation on account of all the land, the rent being secured against every risk, and the taxes on the land being paid by the lessor, who shall also be the owner of the crop until he receives the rent. If this lease is guaranteed, the lessee shall pay the rent in the month Pauni of the said year, and the lessee shall forfeit any arrears increased by one half; and the lessor shall have the right of execution upon the lessee and upon all his property. This lease is valid. The 15th
731. **CONTRACTS**

year of the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus, Athur 19. (Signed) I, Valerius son of Apollonius, have leased the land at a rent of 120 silver drachmae.

8–9. βασιλεύς... ἵκ τοῦ Δάμωνος κλήρου: i.e. the land was part of a confiscated κλήρος; cf. 721. 4–6.

10. ἔλαμψαντα χόρτα: cf. 101. 11, 280. 12, 15, and 409. 15 where χόρτα is to be read for χόρτον.

13. στουδῆς... παιδιώς: for the payment on account of στουδη in leases cf. 101. 19 and 610, and note on 525. 7. In the present case it was for the benefit of the slaves employed in the cultivation of the land.

35. The paragraphus below this line marks the conclusion of the lease, and the signature was intended to begin below it.

36–7. [φορου [ἀποσταθρου')] is perhaps to be read, but does not very well suit the remaining vestiges of letters.

---

731. **Engagement of Services.**

**II.7 x I3.4.**

A contract for services to be rendered on certain specified occasions, among which are the festivals of Isis and Hera, at a salary of 40 drachmae a year, besides an ὑψώμων of 13 drachmae 2 obols. The commencement of the contract is lost, and the nature of the services to be performed is uncertain; but it may be conjectured on the analogy of e.g. 475, P. Grenf. II. 67, and P. Brit. Mus. 331 (cf. Archiv, I. p. 153), that the person engaged was an *artiste* of some kind, though to judge from the scale of remuneration, not of a very high class. The document was drawn up by a careless scribe, who makes a number of mistakes.
... of the 39th year of Caesar to Thoth of the 40th year of Caesar, on condition that I give you my services on the 9th and 10th of each month and for two days at the festival of Isis and three days at the time of the stars of Hera; and if you require me you shall pay me 1 drachma 2 obols of silver daily, or a fixed yearly salary of 40 drachmae of silver, and a present of 13 drachmae 2 obols of silver; and for every day that I am unemployed I will forfeit 1 drachma 2 obols of silver. This contract of engagement shall be valid as if publicly registered. The 38th year of Caesar ...

5–6. For the feast of Isis cf. P. Fay. Towns 118. 13. The star of Hera was another name for the planet Venus (cf. Arist. de Mundo, p. 392 a 27 ὅ τοῦ Ἀφροδίτης ὧν Ἰεραπετής ὁ Ἡρας προσαγορεύοντας, Pliny, H. N. 2. 8, &c.); but why the plural ἀστραπεῖς is here used is not clear. References to the cult of Hera in Egypt are rare; cf. 483. 3, note.

8–9. The 29 days in the year specified in ll. 4–6 seem to be treated as 30, which at 1 dr. 2 obols a day make the 40 dr.

11–12. ἕξ ἡμέρας ὅτι ἕν would be expected, but this was certainly not written. The e after the lacuna is nearly sure and this may represent ἐν; but the letter after ἡμέρας if not η must be v and is certainly neither δ nor ε.

14. There is not room for ἐν δημοσίῳ.

---

(e) RECEIPTS.

732. RECEIPT FOR THE TAX ON FERRY-BOATS.

18-2 X 23 cm. A.D. 150.

A receipt issued by two farmers of the ἦς ἀνθρώπων at Oxyrhynchus and certain villages to two persons who apparently were ferrymen at one of these villages, acknowledging the payment first of 200 and subsequently of 100 drachmae for φόρος πόρθμευς, the total, 300 drachmae, being probably the whole sum due from them for a year. This impost, the title of which is new, seems
to be a tax upon the profits of privately owned ferry-boats rather than a revenue derived from a State monopoly, though the latter interpretation is also possible.


Ἀντωνίνου Καῖσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Ἀχιλλάτη Θεόφιος [καί] Ἀπιτᾶς Ἀπιτᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς αὐ(τῆς)

πόλεως χαῖρειν. ἔσχομεν παρ' ὑμῶν ἀφ' ὑμών [ὁ] φίλητε ἡμίν ὑπ' ὑ[περ] φόρου προ-5 θείου Πανκύλου ἐπὶ λόγου δραχμᾶς διακόσιας, γίν(ονταί) (δραχμαί) σ. (ἐτος)

Ἀντοκράτορος Καῖσαρος Τίτου Αἰλίου Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνίνου Ξεβαστοῦ Ὑσαβεθοῦς Ὀξυρρυγχοῦ τοῦ κ. (2nd hand) Ἡλιόδωρος ὁ προγεγραμμένες ἔσ-χον σὺν τῷ Λεοντᾶτι τὰς προ[γε]κμένας δραχμᾶς διακόσιας, γίν(ονταί) (δραχμαί) σ. (3rd hand) Λεοντᾶς Πεκύριος

ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἔσχον σὺν τῷ Ἡλιόδωρῳ (τῷ) προκυμένας δραχμᾶς δι(α)κοσίας. Χρόνος

ὁ αὐτοῦ. (2nd hand) Ἡλιόδωρος ἔσχον σὺν τῷ Λεοντᾶτι τὰς λυπάσ(ι) δραχμᾶς ἑκατόμην. (3rd hand) Λεοντᾶς ἔσχον σὺν τῷ Ἡλιόδωρῳ (ρφ) ὁ πρὸκεκτᾳ.

2. 1. πορθμίδων. ἱσίου Παπ. 4. 1. πορθμείου. 7. 1. προγεγραμμένος. 8. κ[ι]μένος 

Heliodorus son of Heliodorus and Leontas son of Pekuris, of Oxyrhynchus, farmers of the contract for the tax on ferry-boats at the city, Ision A...., and other (villages) for the present 13th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, to Achillas son of Thodnis and Apeis son of Apeis, of the said city, greeting. We have received from you on account out of the sum which you owe us for the revenue from ferry-boats at Pankulis two hundred drachmae, total 200 dr.' Date and signatures of Heliodorus and Leontas, followed by their further acknowledgements of the remaining hundred drachmae.

733. Tax-Receipt.

A receipt for the tax on pigs (cf. 288, introd.) and poll-tax paid by an inhabitant of Oxyrhynchus and his son. The payments are no doubt installments of the whole amount due for a year.
I (ἔτους) Ἀντωνινοῦ[ν] Καίσαρος τῶν κυρίων
Παχῶν δ. [δ]έγρα(ψε) Διογ(ένει) πρά(κτορι) ἄργυ(ρικὸν)
Μ. [... ] πλατ(είας) ᾿Αμβίς ὁ κ(αί) Παπο(ντῶς) Διοδό(ρου)

υις(ῆς) [τοῦ] αἰ(τοῦ) ι (ἔτους) (δραχμῆν) μίαν (πεντάβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον), /

(δραχμῆ) a (πεντάβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιοι).
5 T. β[. .]. ο[. .]. ὑιὸς μη(τρὸς) Ταποντῶτος λαογρα(φίας)
tοῦ αἴ(τοῦ) ι (ἔτους) (δραχμᾶς) τ(ν)σαρας, υις(ῆς) a (πεντάβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιοι).

2. π of παχῶν corr. from δ. The following δ is corrected.

'The 10th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, Pachon 4. Amois also called Papontos, son of Diodorus, has paid to Diogenes, collector of money taxes of M... street, for the pig-tax of the said 10th year 1 drachma 5½ obols, total 1 dr. 5½ ob. T... his son, his mother being Tapontos, has paid for the poll-tax of the said 10th year 4 drachmae, for the pig-tax 1 drachma 5½ obols.'

734. TAX-RECEIPT.

I0.4 × 9.7 cm. Α.Δ. 165.

A receipt for the payment of 1 drachma 4 obols by Cleon to an agent of the tax-collectors of a subdivision of the middle toparchy. The names of the taxes, which are abbreviated γλ- and σ-, are uncertain, being probably both new.

Ε (ἔτους) Ἀμμαχίου Αντωνίνου καὶ Οὐήρου τῶν
κυρίων Σεβαστῶν Φαμε(νοῦ) Κλάρω
χι(ριστῆ) πρα(κτόρων) ἄργυ(ρικῶν) μέ(σης) τοπ(αρχίας) Πέτυν Τακολ( )
τοπ(ων) διὰ(δ)

Ἀμμαχίου βοη(θοῦ) γλυ( ) καὶ σι( ) ε (ἔτους) Κλέων
5 [... ]τού Τακολ( ) δραχ(μῆν) μία(ν) τετράβολον(ον),

(δραχμῆ) a (τετράβολον).

3. The Πέτυν τόπου are known from 595, but the addition of Τακολ( ), which recurs in l. 5, is new.
This is a fragment of a Graeco-Latin register or account, concerning a detachment of troops (cf. 43 recto). Lines 5-11 contain a copy of a receipt in Greek from an optio, or adjutant, to an imperial deputy-procurator for 50 artabae of wheat paid to a number of cavalrymen, whose names in Latin precede. A list of six footsoldiers follows, which was presumably succeeded by another receipt in Greek recording a payment to them. There are a few Latin letters (apparently belonging to names) from the ends of lines of the previous column, and what remains of Col. iii is occupied with more names in Latin. One or two of these soldiers’ names indicate Hebrew extraction.

The receipt is dated in the 14th year of a joint reign, which on palaeographical grounds is probably that of Septimius Severus and Caracalla.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. ii</th>
<th>Col. iii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Μαλωχός Μ[.].μαidian όπτιών Οδύτω-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μι Κωμαρίνω Κασάρων οίκονόμου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐκαρίον χαίρειν. ἐμετρήθησαν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ προκλήμενι ἐπηεῖς πραίτων ἄριθμῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπ᾽ ἐκείνης Θοῦθ πυρὸν ἀρτάβας ΠΕΝ-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 τῆκοντα. (ἐτος) ἐτῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θώθ ζ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item pedites vi Belei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beleus</td>
<td>Zabdius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad cognlega Claudius</td>
<td>Sabinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ierraeus</td>
<td>Macchana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradius</td>
<td>Avidus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Malichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6-7. Ἰωμαρίνον... ὀλεονόμοι οὐκαρίη.

7. First ἐ of ἐμετρήθησαν corr. from 0 (?) (

8. ἄριτον.

3-4. The pairs of names here and in ll. 13-7 are placed rather far apart and look at first sight as if they were independent; but with one exception either the second name has a genitive termination or the first may be a gentile name, while unless the names are connected the number vi in l. 10 is wrong. The only case in which any difficulty arises is in l. 13, where Belus and Zabdius certainly seem to be separate names; but the distance between them is greater than in any of the other cases. Possibly Gradius and Avitus in l. 16, where again the space is very wide, should also be separated, thus making the number 6. In l. 3 the second name is perhaps Comarini; cf. l. 6.

5. Μαλαχών: hardly Μαλαχᾶς, though that name occurs in a Palmyra inscription, C. I. G. 4497.

6. Κανάρων ὀλεονόμοι οὐκαρίη: cf. B. G. U. 156. 3 and 102. 1, where ὀλεονόμος is probably to be read between Κανάρως and οὐκαρίης.

14. The marginal additions here and in l. 19 are obscure; cognlega is perhaps collega, but what is riesz? The first letter may be a but the second does not at all resemble ρ, nor would apex be a very likely word here.

736. PRIVATE ACCOUNT.

17'3 × 54'3 cm. About a.D. 1.

Of this lengthy account of private expenses parts of seven columns in all remain, five on the recto and two on the verso; the first column of the recto, however, which is separated from those following by a broad blank space, is too fragmentary to be worth reproducing, and the same may be said of a narrow half-effaced column corresponding to this one but written in the reverse direction on the back. The remainder is in fairly good condition, but the papyrus is broken at the top and bottom, and the short column on the verso is sometimes difficult to decipher owing to discolouration. The various payments are arranged according to the days of the month, and some interesting items and prices occur.

Col. ii.

κα. φα[ ]

eis [ 15 letters ]... (δραχμαί) δ,

βα. [ ... ]... [ ... ]αφι... διᾶ

Ζμ[ ... ]... δανίλος ὇ραζον (δραχμαί) ι,

γο[ ... ]... ταριχείαν (δραχμή) α (ὄβολοι δύο),
χαλκίου μισθοῦ εἰς βάψαι (δομολο δύο ?)
αλός (δομολος ?),
dλεστρα (πυρού) (ἀρτάβης) α ἐπὶ τῆς η (τριώβολον?),
θρόνων εἰς τοὺς άρτους (δομολο δύο),
ηπητρα εἰς φαινόλην Κοράζου (δομολοδος) (ημιωβέλιον),
eἰς κατανθρώπισμον γυναικάς
 Gammałów (τετράβολον ?),
μύρου εἰς ἀποστολήν ταφῆς
θυγατρός Φνᾶς (τετράβολον).
κβ. ἐλαιῦν χαδος α (δραχμαί) δ (τετράβολον),
κηροῦ καὶ γραφέλου παίδων (δομολος),
ἀρτου καθαροῦ Πρίμας) (ημιωβέλιον),
eἰς κατανθρώπισμον Τύχης (τριώβολον).
Μεχ(ερ Ὁ [ 20 letters ] (δραχμη) α (τριώβολον)

3. φ of Ἰψι rewritten (?)

Col. iii.

Ends of 3 lines.

1. οι[ ... ]κρ [ ... ] ἀρίστρο γερδίου (δομολος),
κρ[ ... ] ν ... (ημιωβελιον),
eἰς τὸ Σαραπίων (δομολο δύο),
ἀρτου καθαροῦ παιδῶν (ημιωβέλιον),
ζότου γ(ε)ρδίου (δομολο δύο),
πράσων ἀρίστο γερδίου (δομολος),
περιστεράς (δομολος),

20 Ἀντατί (δραχμαί) β (δομολο δύο),
ἀνω ἐν τῇ πόλι(ε) ἀλεστρα ἀρτων
(πυροῦ) (ἀρταβῶν) β διὰ [Ἰ]σνας (δραχμή) α (δομολο δύο).

25 η. ἐν παραμβαλή διὰ Θεοδώρου
ἀλεστρα [ἀρτοί(υ) (πυροῦ) (ἀρταβης) α (τετράβολον),
ἀρίστω [γε]ρ(δίου)] (δομολος),
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ἀσπαράγῳν [ὅπ’ ὑπ’ Ἀντ(άτος) ὀτ’ εἰς
tὸ περὶ[δ’ ὑπ’ ὑπ’ Ἀθη(ὸς) γναφέως (ἡμωβέλιον),
kai παιδαρ[ὶ(ς) δίπυφ κράμβης (ἡμωβέλιον),
π...[.]...παιδ之声 (ἡμωβέλιον)
Parts of 2 lines.

25. Second of σαραπίον corr. from ο (?) 36. First α of ἀσπαραγω(ν) corr. from δ.

Col. iv.

Parts of 4 lines.

46 ἵ. προ[ἱ’ παχ]νου (ἡμωβέλιον),
θρύ[ων ε][I] [ἄρτου (δ]βολοί δύο) (ἡμωβέλιον).
ἵ. γάλακτος παιδ[יוν] (ἡμωβέλιον),
ἄρτου καθαροῦ (ἡμωβέλιον).

50 Ἐκεύντα παιδ[ίων] ἵτριου (ἡμωβέλιον).
ἰθ. τισάνης ὄρ(ιως) (ἡμωβέλιον).
κ. ὀψαρίου (δ]βολός),
ἄρτου καθαροῦ (ἡμωβέλιον),
eἰς κατανθρωπ[ισμὸν] Ἀντ(άτος?) (δ]βολοί δύο),
καὶ εἰς Τριπτολοῦτος Καῖκιλ(ίου?) (τριάβολον),
γενετός Τριφήτως στεφάνιον (δ]βολοὶ δύο),
γε[νε]τίοις [...] [...] ω[...] στεφάνιον (δ]βολοὶ δύο).
κα. βράς παιδ[ίων]** [ ] (δ]βολός),
παγινίω(ν) καὶ επουρι(α) παιδ[ίων] (ἡμωβέλιον),

50. 1. Σεκούντω (cf. l. 81). 54. as of αντ(ο) rewritten.
736. ACCOUNTS

Col. v.

Parts of 4 lines.

Θαῆσις [ ... ἧμερα] β [τετράμβολον],

μήτηρ [Ἀμα]μωνάτος ώμερον]

Ταρπαῖσις ὤμερον [Β] τετράμβολον,

Βεροῦς ὄμ(οίως) ἡμερ(οι) τ (δραχμᾶς) ὀ (δολοῦ).

κδ. ἀλεστρα (πυροῦ) ἀρτάβης α (τετράμβολον),

ἀλμυρίδος μα( ) β (δολοὶ δύο),

ἀλὸς (δολοῦ),

λίνου καὶ ῥαψίδος (δολοῦ),

ἀλεστρα (πυροῦ) ἀρτάβης α διὰ Θεοδώρου (τετράμβολον),

κέρκιον [τα] φα[λλ]ο[ῦ] (δραχμῆ) α (δολοὶ δύο),

ἀρταυ(ν) καθαροῦ(ν) Φα[ ... ]ω( ) (δραχμῆ) α,

περιστερᾶς [πα]δὼ(ν) (δολοῦ),

ἀρτου καθαροῦ ὄμ(οίως) (ἡμιώβελιον),

Σκευοῦντο στήρ(ῶ) ἑτρ(ῶ) (ἡμιώβελιον)

καὶ σεμιδάρεως [ἡμιώβελιον],

γάλακτος (ἡμιώβελιον),

μύρου ε[λ]ταφής θυγατρῶς

[Π]άτητ[ός] (δραχμῆ) α.

82. 1. σεμιδάρεως.

On the verso opposite Col. v.

Parts of 2 lines.

ι. αμ[ ... ]γ( ) γυ[ν]αγέι συνά[ ... ] (δραχμαί) β (τριώβολον),

προ[φαγά]υ(ων) ταῖς γυναικῖς

ήμερα(ρων) β (δολοὶ δύο) (ἡμιώβελιον),

κόλλητα λυχνίας (δολοὶ δύο) (ἡμιώβελιον),

ἐφεβίνθων [ὅ]πε δόε

ἐδείπνει [ ... ] [ο]ς (δολοῦ) (ἡμιώβελιον),
eis κατανθρωπισμόν

Δανθρωπισμον (δβολοι δύο ?),

[.] eis τὰ αρτ. [. . . .] (δβολοι δύο).

Στράτου eis τὴν . ε. απ. s εἰσβολήν (δραχμαί ?) ε,

[. . . . ] διπανή . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . [ .

Ηρωμεναι eis τ . . . ρ . . κιθώνα (δραχμαί ?) [ . ],

κόλλητρα χάλκι[ο]ν (ημιοβέλιον).

II. 1-95. The 21st: ... through Zm ... for the cloak of Coraxus, 10 drachmae; turnips for pickling 1 dr. 2 obols; for the kettle, payment for enamelling 2 ob.; salt 1 ob.; cost of grinding 1 artaba of wheat on the 18th 3 ob.; omelette for the bread 2 ob.; cost of mending the cloak of Coraxus 1½ ob.; for treating (?) the wife of Gemellus 4 ob.; perfume for the dispatch of the mummy of the daughter of Phna 4 ob. The 22nd: a chous of oil 4 dr. 4 ob.; wax and stilus for the children 1 ob.; pure bread for Prima ½ ob.; for treating Tyche 3 ob.; 9th Mecheir ... the 10th: ... for the weaver's breakfast 1 ob.; ... for the Sarapeum 2 ob.; pure bread for the children ½ ob.; beer for the weaver 1 ob.; leeks for the weaver's breakfast 1 ob.; a pigeon 1 ob.; to Antas 2 dr. 2 ob.; up at the city for the bread, cost of grinding 2 artabae of wheat, through Isas, 1 dr. 2 ob. The 11th: at the camp, through Theodorus, for the bread, cost of grinding 1 artaba of wheat 4 ob.; for the weaver's breakfast 1 ob.; asparagus for the dinner of Antas when (he went) to the funeral feast of Atha ... the fuller ¾ ob.; and to the slaves (?), for a cabbage for dinner ¼ ob.; to the child ½ ob.; ... the 16th: a relish ¼ ob.; omelettes for the bread 2½ ob. The 17th: milk for the children ½ ob.; pure bread ½ ob. The 18th: to Secundas, a cake for the children ½ ob. The 19th: barley water for the same ½ ob. The 20th: sauce 1 ob.; pure bread ½ ob.; for treating Antonia 2 ob.; and for Taptollous daughter of Caecilius 3 ob.; on the birthday of Tryphasis, for garlands 2 ob.; on the birthday of ... for garlands 2 ob. The 21st: pomegranates for the children 1 ob.; playthings and ... for the children 1 ob.; beer 3 ob.; sauce 1 ob. The 22nd: sauce 1 ob.; Thaësis ... for 2 days 5 ob.; the mother of Ammonas for ... days ...; Taarpaësis for 2 days 5 ob.; Berus similarly for 10 days 4 dr. 1 ob. The 24th: cost of grinding 1 artaba of wheat 4 ob.; 2 ... of pickle 2 ob.; salt 1 ob.; a needle and thread 1 ob.; cost of grinding 1 artaba of wheat, through Theodorus, 4 ob.; cost of weaving a cloak 1 dr. 2 ob.; pure bread for Ph ... 1 dr.; a pigeon for the children 1 ob.; pure bread for the same ½ ob.; to Secundus for a cake for the children ½ ob., and for dry meal ½ ob.; milk ½ ob.; perfume for the mummy of the daughter of Pasis 1 dr. ... The 10th: ... for the women 2 dr. 3 ob.; relishes for the women on 2 days 2½ ob.; cost of tinkering a lamp 2½ ob.; pulse when ... was dining here 1½ ob.; for treating Laodice 2½ ob.'

7. δεσποτα: cf. I. 10 ἠπητα, I. 77 κέρκωντα, I. 91 κόλλητα, 739. 4 στοιχυρα. ἦπητα had already occurred in P. Tebt. 120 introd., where it should be regarded as a neuter plural, as should also ἠφαντα in P. Tebt. 117, 37, &c.

11. εἰς κατανθρωπισμόν: cf. II. 17, 53, and 92, where the expression recurs, the object being apparently always a woman. Neither κατανθρωπισμός nor κατανθρωπίζειν appears to be otherwise attested.

28. The ω of ἀβαστή here and elsewhere is written above the line (so too διπνο in
An account of wages paid on different days to 'weavers,' 'hired persons,' and a 'master' or 'foreman.' The wages, which are reckoned in asses, are at the rate of 3½ for a weaver, 4 for a 'hired man,' and 6 for the foreman. We give the text of two columns, which are contained on separate pieces of papyrus but seem to be consecutive; there is a large blank space after Col. ii, which was the end of the roll. A few small fragments of some other columns also remain. The account is written in a clear cursive hand which is probably of the reign of Augustus, the papyrus being one of a large find belonging practically entirely to that period. Points are commonly used after abbreviations (but not with a for assēs) and the numerals of the days of the month, and are not infrequently added after words which are not abbreviated.

Col. i.

\[[\text{ante}] \, \text{d(iem)} \, \text{Nonas} \, \text{Iulias} \]

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{[condu]ctei} & \text{iv} & \text{a(asses) xvi} \\
\text{[ii] textor(es)} & \text{ii} & \text{[a(asses)] vii} \\
\text{conductei} & \text{ii} & \text{[a(asses)] viii} \\
\text{5 [i]x Idus textor(es)} & \text{ii} & \text{a(asses) vii} \\
\text{conductei} & \text{ii} & \text{a(asses) viii} \\
\text{vii Idus textor(es)} & \text{ii} & \text{a(asses) vii} \\
\text{conductei} & \text{ii} & \text{a(asses) viii} \\
\text{vi] Idus textor(es)} & \text{ii} & \text{a(asses) vii} \\
\text{condu}ctei & \text{ii} & \text{a(asses) viii} \\
\end{array}\]
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\[\begin{align*}
&i\text{ Idus textor(es) iii} & a(\text{asses}) & x \text{(emis)} \\
&\text{magister} & a(\text{asses}) & vi \\
&i\text{ Idus textor(es) iii} & a(\text{asses}) & x \text{(emis)} \\
&\text{magister} & a(\text{asses}) & vi \\
i\text{Idus} & a(\text{asses}) & x \text{(emis)} \\
&\text{magister} & a(\text{asses}) & vi \\
\end{align*}\]

Col. ii.

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{Idus textor(es) iii} & a(\text{asses}) & x \text{(emis)} \\
&\text{magister} & a(\text{asses}) & vi \\
&\text{Idus textor(es) iii} & a(\text{asses}) & x \text{(emis)} \\
&\text{magister} & a(\text{asses}) & vi \\
&\text{ante} & d(\text{iem}) & \text{xiix} \text{(calendas) Sextilias} \\
&\text{textor(es)} & a(\text{asses}) & x \text{(emis)} \\
&\text{magister} & a(\text{asses}) & vi \\
\end{align*}\]

21. a of sextilias corr. from l(?)

2. a(\text{asses}): this abbreviation is common in the Pompeian inscriptions; cf. C. I. L. IV, index. The occurrence of asses in an account of this kind is however very singular. Presumably the money though reckoned in asses was paid in obols, three of which would be the equivalent of 2 asses.

5. \textit{i}i: cf. l. 21, where \textit{xiix} is written for \textit{xviii}; for the sums of asses, on the other hand, \textit{viii} is regularly used.

17–9. If this column immediately follows Col. i, which from the dates seems most probable, there is nothing lost at the beginnings of these lines and \textit{i} in l. 19 stands for pridie.

21. \textit{Sextilias} is a curious form; the \textit{a} has been corrected, but was apparently altered from another letter, not itself deleted. For the numeral \textit{xiix} cf. note on l. 5.

738. Account of Food.

13.5 \times 10.3 cm.

About A.D. 1.

A fragment of an account of articles of food consumed on different days; cf. 108. The ends of lines of a preceding column are preserved.

δίπων ε'  δίπων υ'
739. ACCOUNTS

Κανωπικών ἡμαρ. δίπυρο 5.

5 δοστρεα ἵνα τεργαζαί.

For dinner on the 5th a Canopic liver; for dinner on the 6th 10 oysters, 1 lettuce; for dinner on the 7th 2 small loaves, 1 bird . . . from the water, 2 snipe (?).

9. σιδυτή is a new word. The πτέρυγες were probably smaller than the ὀρνη.

739. PRIVATE ACCOUNT.

32 x 10 cm. About A.D. 1.

A private account for a month, reckoned in silver drachmae and copper obols. Lines 1–2 mention a receipt, ll. 3–22 give an account of expenditure for various purposes. The account is written on the verso, the recto being blank.

€Εχεί Ἰσάς παρά Ἀπολλωνίου
ἀπὸ Κύνου (δραχμᾶς) μ. [.

ζ. δα(πάνης) τι(μῆς) χι( ) [Ν]εχθετὶ (δραχμαὶ) κῆ, σειτσκοπήτρων (δραχμῆ) α (τετράβολον),
5 [ἐλαιοῦ (δραχμαί) δ (ὀβολοὶ δύο).]

δ. ἄλεστρα (πεντάβολον),
κόνιον εἰς πρ[ο]σφαγίον (ὀβολός).

ε. κοφίνων γ (τετράβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον).

ζ. βατανίων (ὀβολοὶ δύο),

προσφαγίου οἰκοδ(όμου) (ὀβολός),
6 ἑλαιοῦ χοῦς (δραχμαί) δ (ὀβολοὶ δύο). μ (τριάβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον).

ζ. προσφαγίου οἰκοδ(όμου) (ὀβολός).

θ. ἐργάτου (τετράβολον ?),
οἰκοδ(όμου) προσφαγίου (ὀβολός),
15 τέκτονίσος .

ι. τι(μῆς) ἑλαίου (δραχμαί) δ (τριάβολον ?),
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πορφύρας (δραχμαί) κ.,
στήμωνος εἰς γυναῖκαί ηπίου
ιμάτειον

20 Φιλοπαρέω [. .] [. .] [. .] . β . [κβ. τι(μής) ἐλαιον (δραχμαί) δ] (δβολοί δβο).

5. This line enclosed in round brackets. 7. l. πρ[ο]φύρανον.

'Isas has received from Apollonius, an inhabitant of Cynus, 4[,] drachmae. Deduct on account of expenses: price of ... paid to Nechtheus 28 dr., for making bread 1 dr. 4 ob., (for oil 4 dr. 2 ob., erased). On the 4th, for grinding 5 ob., powder (?) for a relish 1 ob. 5th, 3 baskets 4 1/2 ob. 6th, plates 2 ob., a relish for the builder 1 ob., a chous of oil 4 dr. 2 ob. Total 40 dr. 3 3/4 ob. 7th, a relish for the builder 1 ob. 9th, for the workman 4 ob., a relish for the builder 1 ob., the carpenter ... 13th, price of oil 4 dr. 3 ob., purple 20 dr., thread for a woman's robe ... to Philoutarion ... 22nd, price of oil 4 dr. 2 ob. Total ...

2. Κῶνοι, if correct, is the name of a village, but the writer is careless about his cases (cf. l. 7), and he may mean Κινων, i.e. Cynopolis.

4. σειτοπαρέων: cf. the similar forms ἄλεστρα (l. 6), ἀλεστρα, &c. (736. 10 and note on 736. 7).

5. The amount of oil which is not stated here and in l. 21 was no doubt 1 χῦν: cf. l. 11.

740. ACCOUNT OF CORN.

21·2 X 46 cm. About A.D. 200.

An account of corn, arranged according to different villages, apparently from the day-book of a private individual rather than an official. Of Col. i only the ends of lines are preserved, but Col. ii is practically complete, and Col. iii has lost only a few letters at the ends of lines. There is also a detached fragment (not printed) belonging to another column.

Cols. i and ii are apparently concerned with corn paid out, and the sum given in ll. 28–9, added to the 30 artabae accounted for in ll. 30–1, is subtracted from a previously mentioned total, leaving the remainder stated in l. 32. The rest of Col. iii deals with receipts from rents. The papyrus provides some interesting new information about the names and character of different measures of corn, and a curious conversion occurs in l. 29. On the verso are copies of
petitions to Septimius Severus and Caracalla (705), and the 9th year mentioned in 1. 36 of the recto no doubt refers to these emperors.

Col. i.

Ends of 13 lines.

14 [Μερμέρθων] γυνήσων δη-
15 [μοσίων] ίσος διδομέ-
16 [υ] διὰ γεωργ(αυ) Μερμ(έρθων)

Col. ii.

17 μιᾶς ἀντὶ μιᾶς μέτρῳ σιτολ(ογικῷ ?) 'Ἡρωίς . . . ] . ν (ἀρτάβαι) [. .
18 Σερύφεως· μέτ(ρω) δημοσίῳ μιᾶς] ἀντὶ μιᾶς ἐμβ( ) (ἀρτάβαι) κβ Χ(οίνικες) ζ,
19 καὶ ἐδόθησαν ὑπὲρ φορέτρου ὄνημ(ατών) (ἀρτάβαι) . Χ(οίνικες) γ.
20 Πέλα· ἰδιωτικῶς μέτ(ρω) δη(μοσίῳ) διὰ Πασαλόμιος
21 γεωργ(αυ) Πέλα θέμ(ατος) ἀπὸ (ἀρταβῶν) κς τὸ γ' (ἀρτάβαι) η (ἡμισυ)
22 καὶ ἐδόθη(ν) ὑπὲρ φορέτ(ρου) ὄνημ(ατών) καὶ σιτολ(ογικῷ) καὶ
23 σιτομετρικοῦ τῶν προκ(ειμένων) (ἀρταβῶν) η (ἡμισυς) Χ(οίνικων) ζ
(ἀρτάβης) (ἡμισυ τέταρτον) Χ(οίνικες) β.
24 Παώμεως· ἐμετρήθη(σαν) σιτολ(ογίου) [ . . . . ] (ἀρτάβαι) ιε,
25 καὶ ἐδόθη(σαν) ὑπ(ερ) φορέτ(ρου) ὄνημ(ατών) καὶ σιτομετρή(κικό) τῶν
προκ(ειμένων) (ἀρταβῶν) ιε (ἀρτάβαι ). Χ(οίνικες) γ.
26 Σενεκελεύ· ἐμετρήθη(σαν) σιτολ(ογίου) θέμα(τος) . . . . . (ἀρτάβαι) ι,
27 καὶ ἐδόθη(σαν) ὑπ(ερ) σιτολογ(ικοῦ) καὶ φορέτ(ρου) Χ(οίνικες) .]
28 / ἀναλόμ(άτος) ἰδιωτικῶς (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι) νβ δ' Χ(οίνικες) β,
29 αἱ θέματος δημοσίου καθαροῦ (ἀρτάβαι) μθ (ἡμισυ τέταρτον) Χ(οίνικες) θ.
30 καὶ ἐπράθησαν ὡς ἐπάνω [διὰ τοῦ] γ λογοῦ δεδηλωται
31 ἐπὶ μηνὸς Μεσορῆ [[(ἀρτάβαι) λ]] (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι) λ.

Col. iii.

32 λοιπαί [ί]διωτικῶς πυρ(οῦ) ἀρτάβαι .
33 καὶ ἐν θέματι ὁμοίως διδομένου ὑπὸ γεωργ(αυ) . . . .
34 κατὰ μίσθωσιν [(ἀρτάβαι) . .]
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35 Θώλθεως: ἐμετ(ρήθησαν) διὰ Ἡράτος γεωργ(οῦ) Θεω[... (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι)...] 36 ὁ αἰ(τὸς) ἀπὸ σπερμ(άτων) θ (ἔτους) (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι) γ, / [(πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι)].

37 Πέλα: ἐν πεδίοις Σενοκω[... ] παρὰ [...].

38 Διογένους τοῦ Σαραπ(ίωνος) γεωργ(οῦντος)]... ( ) περὶ Πέλα [...].

39 καὶ Σενοκω[... ] ἀπὸ (ἀρτάβων) λ ἡ π[...].

40 Κεσμοῦχεως: παρὰ Παθότου Μοιμε[... ] γεωργ(οῦντος) [...].

41 (ἀροῦρας) ἡ (ἡμιοῦν τέταρτον) ἀπὸ (ἀρτάβων) κὴ τὸ γ´ [(ἀρτάβαι) θ].

42 παρὰ Ἦρακλείδου ἐπιτρέπουν Ἡρα[κλείδους,] φ[...]. ἡ ἡ.-

43 στόρησεν ἐπὶ Μαγδόλων κοιν(ῆς) πρὸς Ἡρακλείδην κατὰ τὸ (ἡμιοῦν) γ´

44 καὶ πρὸς τὴν μητέρας τῶν ἄφηλ(ίκων) κ[α]τὰ τὸ ἥ κα[ὶ] πρὸς τοὺς.

45 ἄφηλίκας κατὰ τὸ κ´, ἀβρόχ(ου) ἀροῦραι κὸ[...]. Λ[...].


47 τοῦ αἰ(τοῦ) [μ]έρο(νς) τῶν ἄφηλ[ίκων] ἁροῦρα α (ἡμιοῦν). Λ[...]. επη( ) γ´

α [...].

48 [...] [...] ( ) ε[.] [...]. ο[...] δ̄列为[...] ἐ[...]. [...]. ( ) ἁρτάβαι] Γ[...].

49 / θήμα(το) ἁρτάβαι [...]. γ´ (ἡμιοῦν).

14. Μεριμέοιν (cf. 823) is restored from l. 16; cf. the position of Πέλα in ll. 20–1. The genitive Μεριμέοιν occurs in a papyrus found last winter.

γηροίνων δημοσίων: cf. P. Amh. 86. 10 and note. ἁρταβίαν and ναῖβιον are meant, though perhaps not exclusively.

17. μιάς...μιάς: cf. I. 18, and P. Amh. 87. 21–2, note. The meaning here is that half the artabae were paid on one measure (the name of which is lost in ll. 14–6), half on the measure στολ(´), which is new and which we have supposed to be στολ(ομικός) on the analogy of μέτρῳ ἄγορανομικό in 830.

18. ἐμβ(´): this measure is also new. Perhaps ἐμβ(ολικός), i.e. the measure generally used in corn sent by boat to Alexandria. It was no doubt smaller than the δημόσιων μέτρων; cf. I. 21, note.

20. ἡδωτικός: the point of this remark (cf. ll. 28 and 32) is not quite clear. We might suppose that the writer was contrasting the present private payment with other official ones in the same account, but from l. 28 it appears that all the items in Col. ii concern his private account, and to assume that he failed to keep official and private accounts distinct is not satisfactory. An alternative explanation is to suppose that ἡδωτικός refers not to the nature of the account but to the character of the corn; cf. ll. 28–9, where an amount of corn which is apparently ἡδωτικός is converted into a slightly smaller sum δημοσίων καθαροῦ, and note ad loc. But since the payment in l. 19, although ἡδωτικός, is μετ(ρῆ)/δημοσίως, ἡδωτικός cannot refer to a private measure, and would be a curious expression to imply that the corn in question was not καθαρὸς.

21. ⅓ of 26 artabae is ⅔ art., a sum which the writer expresses by 8½ art. 7 choenices.
This implies, if his arithmetic is correct, the artaba of 42 choenices, the largest of the different artabae in use in Egypt, and in the fourth century called the artaba φορικός (μέτρον) (P. Brit. Mus. 125; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 232–3). The fact that it is the artaba of 42 choenices which is here μέτρον δημοσίου is important, for the official artaba in Roman times has been often supposed to be much smaller, though, as we pointed out (P. Tebt. *ibid.*), on insufficient grounds. But it would not be safe to infer from the present passage alone that the mention of μέτρον δημοσίου in Roman times always implied an artaba of 42 choenices.

22–3. These charges for donkey transport, with the στυλογικά (a new term, probably meaning a bakhshish for the στυλόγος) and στυλομετρικά (also new as an impost for measuring the corn), all of which are supplementary of the main payment (cf. ll. 19, 25, and 27), are probably included in the προσμετρούμενα which occur in the official receipts of this period; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 411–2.

24. στυλο(γίας): this does not necessarily imply that the payment was for taxation purposes; cf. P. Oxy. III. p. 251.

28–9. The sum of the foregoing items, 52½ artabae 2 choenices, is here converted into 49½ art. 8 choen. θέματος δημοσίου καθαρού, whatever that precisely means. The reduction is probably due to two causes at least, (1) the fact that in the preceding items artabae of different sizes were employed, and that some of them were smaller than the artaba meant in l. 29, which very likely contained 42 choenices (cf. l. 21, note); (2) the fact that these artabae ἄδορ(μοῦς) were partially or even wholly not καθαραί; cf. P. Tebt. I. 92. 9–11.

30. The doubtful γ has a horizontal stroke over it and seems to mean '3rd'. αὐ(τοῖ) cannot be read.

35. θεω[...]: θάλαθος (cf. l. 14, note) or at least a place name would be expected.

41. Since we do not know which artaba was being employed, it is uncertain how the writer expressed ½ art. at the end of the line.

44. The μέτρο τῶν ἀφηλίκων, if 'Ἡρακλεί(δον)' is right in l. 43, is the 'Ἡρακλεία' mentioned in l. 42.

741. LIST OF ARTICLES.

16.5 × 9.5 cm. Second century.

A list of miscellaneous articles, containing, as such lists commonly do, a number of rare or unknown words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δύγ(ος) ἐντολικόν Ἐὐγενέτο-</td>
<td>ἰππικόν</td>
<td>α,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ροῖς] ἐν δισακιδίῳ</td>
<td>κελλάριον τριλάγγυνον</td>
<td>α,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σφυρίς διπλὴν καρδόν</td>
<td>βί. [γ]υν ἀναβολή</td>
<td>α,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄλλα μεικρά</td>
<td>προχείρια</td>
<td>β,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 γεργάθος</td>
<td>15 ἐν οῖς ἕλα(τ) ἡμισυν-</td>
<td></td>
<td>θέσεις</td>
<td>γ,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρνακίς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Account of articles at order of Eugenetor in a double sack:—1 double basket of nuts, 5 other small ones, 1 wicker crate, 1 sheepskin, 1 scraper, 8 pairs of men’s..., 6 pairs of women’s ditto, 2 donkey straps (?), 1 horse’s ditto, 1 three-flagon jar, 1 bag (?) of..., 2 hold-alls containing 3 half-sets of glass, 4... cups and 1..., 4 plates, 2 bowls, 1 saucer.

4. ἀλλα(?) μικρο(?) should perhaps be read, as the writer seems to have a tendency to omit final i (cf. 1. 15) and five baskets must be meant; but the neuter may refer to κάρυνα.

5. γεργάβος is probably for γεργάβος, meaning a wicker basket.

8. σέλια: or perhaps σέλια, which however is still more difficult. σέλιων might be a diminutive of σέλιον or an adjective from σέλοι, but neither is very suitable. It is hardly likely that the word is connected with στόλη, for which στολή was a late Attic form (cf. Du Cange s.v.), though some article of attire is evidently meant. Mr. Smyly suggests a connexion with the Latin soliar.

10. σανδάλια may mean ‘bands’ of some kind, the word being used for a medical bandage by Oribasius. But the reading is extremely doubtful; the second letter could be ε and of the first only the smallest vestiges remain.


13. ἀναβολή, since it governs a genitive plural, looks like a receptacle of some kind, a sense in which ἀναβολίδιον is found in Macarius, Apophth. Patr. 33 ἀναβολίδιον μεστόν φυσίων. In the preceding word the vestiges before the lacuna suit only a round letter such as β, θ, φ, or σ; possibly βίζ[λ]ιον. There are two dots like a diaeresis above the i, but they are perhaps accidental.

14. προχείρα are cases or boxes, since they contained glass; but the word is apparently new.

15. Mr. Smyly compares Martial iv. 46. 15 septenaria synthesis.

17. The cups are divided into two kinds, but what these are is obscure.

18. βάτελλαι: probably the Latin patella.

PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE.

742. LETTER OF ANTAS.

26.5 x 13.7 cm. B.C. 2.

A letter from Antas to Faustus, chiefly concerning reeds (καλάμοι), written like many other letters of this period in vulgar Greek.

'Αντάς Φ[αύσ]τωι πλείστα χαίρειν. παράλαβε παρὰ Πόθου τὸν κάλαμον μὴν παναρθομόλω καὶ ἀπόστειλον μὴν πόλεμος δέσμαις παρείληψε.

καὶ θ[εῖς] αὐτὰς εἰς τόπον ἀσφαλῶς ἤνα τῇ ἀναβάσει αὐτὰς ἀξιωμένα. παράδοσι δὲ τινὶ τὸν φίλων ἀριθμὸν αὐτὸς ἤνα πάλιν φίλος ἢ μὲν παραδόῃ.

ἀσφαλῶς] καὶ εἰς τὸ δύνη

σὺ δὲ [. . . .]ναί μοι δός ἑργασίαν ἀν [. . . . .]σα ἐμὲ ἡγορακέναι παρὰ [. . . .]ν τὴν χιλιάν δέσμην (δραχμῶν) δ(εκαπ)ταῖε. μὴ ἀμελήσῃς.

ἐρρωσο.

(ἔτους) κη [Κα]ίσαρος Παύνι α.

On the verso

Φαυστῶι [. . . . .]ετενν. ( ) εἰς Νέκλη.

'Antas to Faustus, many greetings. Take over from Pothus the reeds all together, and send me word how many bundles you have received, and put them in a safe place in order that we may take them on the journey up. Deliver a certain number of them to one of our friends in order that a friend may deliver them to me safely, and if you can give your attention to it ... I have bought from (Pothus?) the 1000 bundles for 15 drachmae. Don’t forget. Good-bye. The 28th year of Caesar, Pauni 1. (Addressed) To Faustus ... at Nekle.'
743. Letter to a Friend.

A letter in two columns, of which the first is much broken. The greater part is concerned with the explanation of the writer's reasons for sending Damas, whom he recommends to his friend's good offices.

Col. i.
Parts of 16 lines.

17] θέλω δὲ σε καὶ τὸν Καλσάρος
] ἀναγνώναι, δεῖ γὰρ σε

Col. ii.

ei καὶ π[ρ]ὸς ἄλλους εἶχον πράγμα
20 βοηθὸν αὐτοῦ γ[ε]νέσθαι διὰ ἥν
ἐχομὲν(ν) πρὸς ἑαυτὸς φιλιαν. καὶ
γὰρ ἐγὼ ὅλος διαιηθον[ν]'ήμαι ei "Ἐλε-

νος χαλκὸς ἀπὸλε[σ]έν, παραγενομ(ένοι)
γὰρ Δαμάτος εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἥλ-

θαμεν ἐπὶ Ἑσαφρόδειτον καὶ εὑρέ-

 θη μήτε εἰληφὼς μήτε δεδωκώς).

ὡστ' ἀν τοῦτο σε θέλω γεινώσκειν
διὶ ἐγὼ αὐτῷ διαστολᾶς δεδώκειν
τὸ βαδίσαι εἰς Τακώνα χάριν τῶν ἐκ-

30 φορίων καὶ τὰ νῦν ἑπειπέπομφα
αὐτὸν πάντα συνιλέξαι καὶ περὶ πάν-

των αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν δέδωκα.

ἐν οἷς ἔδω σοῦ προσδεήται συντροσ-

γενέσθαι αὐτῷ ὡς ἀνθομολογή(σομένω)

35 ύπέρ σου οὕτως ὡς ὑπ(έρ) μου. ἐν τῷ δὲ
μὲ περιπτάοσθαι οὐκ ἥδυνάσθην

συντυχεῖν Ἀπολλωνίῳ τῷ Διβικῷ ἕνα
αὐτῷ αὐτὰ ταῦτα ὑποδίξε. καὶ σῦ
744. **PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE**  

20. ν of ην corr. 22. l. ἀλως. 23. l. ἀπώλε[σ]ιν. 43. l. πάντα(ε).  

'...I wish you and the...of Caesar to read this (?), for although I (?) have had trouble with others you must assist him for the sake of our friendship. I am quite upset at Helenos' loss of the money; for when Damas arrived at Alexandria we came to Epaphroditus, and it was discovered that he had neither received nor paid anything. I wish you therefore to know this that I had given him orders to go to Takona for the rents, and now I have dispatched him to collect them all and have entrusted to him the care of the whole matter. Whatever service he may require from you, stand by him, as he will agree in everything for you just as for me. Owing to my worries I was unable to meet Apollonius the Libyan in order to inform him of this. Write to me yourself about anything you want, and I will do it without hesitation; for Damas has agreed in everything with me. It is well for him to come quickly, for he will instruct you. Take care of yourself so that you may remain in good health. Look after all your household. Good-bye. The 29th year of Caesar, Phaophi 6.'

18. Some word like ὀικονύμον is probably to be supplied at the beginning.  
19. εἰςον whether first singular or third plural is difficult; εἰςες would be expected.  
34. ἀνθομολογη[πομίν]: cf. P. Tebt. 21. 6, P. Par. 42. 7.

### 744. LETTER OF ILARION.

25 × 14.7 cm. B.C. 1.

A letter from a man who had gone to Alexandria, addressed to his sister (who was no doubt his wife), and to two other women, regarding certain domestic matters. A curious injunction occurs in ll. 9–10.

'Ἰλαρίων{α} Ἀλιτι τῇ ἄδελφηι πλεύστα καὶ ἐπειδῆ τῇ Βερούτῃ τῇ κυρίᾳ μοῦ καὶ Ἀπολλωνάριν. γίνοσκε ὡς ἐτι καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἔστε. ἐτι νῦν ἔστε. ἀπολλωνάριν. τῇ κυρίᾳ μοῦ καὶ Ἀπολλωνάριν. γίνοσκε ὡς ἐτι καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἔστε. ἐτι νῦν ἔστε. ἀπολλωνάριν. τῇ κυρίᾳ μοῦ καὶ Ἀπολλωνάριν. γίνοσκε ὡς ἐτι καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἔστε. ἐτι νῦν ἔστε. ἀπολλωνάριν. τῇ κυρίᾳ μοῦ καὶ Ἀπολλωνάριν. γίνοσκε ὡς ἐτι καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἔστε. ἐτι νῦν ἔστε. ἀπολλωνάριν. τῇ κυρίᾳ μοῦ καὶ Ἀπολλωνάριν. γίνοσκε ὡς ἐτι καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἔστε. ἐτι νῦν ἔστε. ἀπολλωνάριν. τῇ κυρίᾳ μοῦ καὶ Ἀπολλωνάριν. γί

R 2
On the verso

'Ilarion Ἀλίτι ἀπόδος.

2. Ἀπολλωνιά.  8. l. σο.  11. δὲ above the line.

'Ilarion to Alis his sister, many greetings, and to my dear Berous and Apollonarion. Know that I am still even now at Alexandria; and do not worry if they come back altogether (?), but I remain at Alexandria. I urge and entreat you to be careful of the child, and if I receive a present soon I will send it up to you. If (Apollonarion?) bears offspring, if it is a male let it be, if a female expose it. You told Aphrodisias "Don't forget me." How can I forget you? I urge you therefore not to worry. The 29th year of Caesar, Pauni 23. (Addressed.) Deliver from Ilarion to Alis.'

8–10. εἶν τολαπολλαὶ τέκνα is very obscure. If the second person τέκνα is right, this passage must refer to the exposure of a female infant. But τολά would be most extraordinary, apart from the difficulty of constructing τολλών. If τέκνα is altered to τέκνον we might suppose that an animal was the subject and divide τολλ(α) Ἀπόλλων; but Ἀπόλλων is not a likely name for an animal. Perhaps τολαπολλαὶ conceals Ἀπολλωνιά (cf. l. 2); for the use of the second person cf. e.g. 295. 7.

745. Letter to Gaius Rustius.

11·1 x 18·8 cm.  About A.D. 1.

Conclusion of a letter, chiefly concerned with money matters. The writer had evidently been in financial difficulties, and was afraid of their recurrence; but the loss of the beginning of the letter makes the transactions under discussion rather obscure. The addressee has a Roman name.
745. PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE


μου περὶ τοῦ αὐτὸν τῶν Ἀντάν ἀποστήσειν διὰ τὸ κ. [. . . . . . . ] κεναι ὡς καὶ ἔπεσχοι διὰ τοῦ πολειτάρχου Θεοφίλου, μ[η]. [. . . . . . . ] μα ἀνω-5 θεν γείνηται πάντα καὶ πάλιν ἑαυτοῖς ἀνασκευάζωμε[ν] μὴ ὀδησὶς χρήσας. οὐκ οίδας γάρ πῶς μοι ἔχρησατο ἐν 'Οξυρύγχωσ οὐχ ὡς λύσα(ν)τι ἀλλ' ὡς τινὶ ποτε ἀποστερητὴν μὴ ἀποδεδωκότη. ἐρωτῶ ὅνι σε μὴ ἄλλως ποῆσαι, οίδα δὲ δοὶ πάντα καλῶς ποῆσεις; οὐθε δὲλω γὰρ ἀμφιβαθήσῃ πρὸς σε ἐχειν φίλου μου δ[ν]τα. ᾧ[σ]πάζον πάντας 1ο τοὺς σοὺς καὶ σεαυτόν ἐπιμέλειν ἤν υγιαίνης. ἔρρωσο.

On the verso

Ταύτω Ποντιώι [ ]

6. v of οὐκ corr. from ἦν.

... from my sister 65 jars of wine and 10 drachmae, and you bought the wine at 6 drachmae, for which you drew me up a bond through Artemas that the said Antas would make the repayment because you had ... as you promised through the politarch Theophilus, in order that everything may not be completely ... and we go bankrupt again without any necessity. You don’t know how he treated me at Oxyrhynchus(?) not like a man who had paid but like a defrauder and a debtor. I ask you therefore not to do otherwise; but I know that you will do everything well. I do not want to have any dispute with you, as you are my friend. Salute all your household, and take care of your health. Good-bye. (Addressed) To Gaius Rustius ...'

4. πολειτάρχον: πολειτάρχοι are known at Thessalonica from Acts xvii. 6 and C. I. G. 1967, but the title is new in Egyptian papyri.

The mutilated word before ἀνωθεν is most likely a perfect participle; the letter before ἦ seems to be λ, σ, or τ.

6. ἐν 'Οξυρύγχωσ: a village 'Οξυρύγχα is known in the Fayûm but not in the Oxyrhynchite nome, and it is difficult to believe that the metropolis is not here meant, though 'Οξυρύγχων or 'Οξυρύγχεων πόλεις is the normal form. The sentence οὐκ οίδας ... ἀποδεδωκότι may be interrogative.
746. LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

23.2 x 13.5 cm. A.D. 16.

A letter from Theon to his brother Heraclides, a basilicogrammateus, introducing the bearer, Hermophilus. Theon is perhaps the same as the writer of 292, a similar letter of recommendation addressed to the dioecetes on behalf of a brother named Heraclides. Cf. also 787.

Theon Ἡρακλείδη τοῦ ἄδελφοι
πλεύστα χαῖρειν καὶ υγιαίνειν.
Ἐρμόφιλος (ὁ) ἀποδίδοις σοι τὴν
ἐπιστολὴν [ἐςτὶ [. . .] κ. .] μ. φι.].
5 ἤρεῖον, καὶ ἡρώτησέν με γράψαι σοι.
[π]ροφέρεται ἥχειν πραγμάτιον
[ἐν τῇ] Κερκεμοῦν. τοῦτο οὖν ἐὰν
σοι φα[λ]νησί σπουδάσεις κατὰ τὸ
δίκαιον. τὰ δ’ ἄλλα σεαυτοῦ ἐπιμελῆν
10 ἐν ὑγιαίνῃς.

έρρωσο.

(ἐτοὺς) γ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Φαώφι γ.

On the verso
Ἡρακλείδη βασιλεύων γραμματέων Ὀξυρίχιτος Κυνοπολίτου.

'Theon to Heraclides his brother, many greetings and wishes for good health. Hermophilus the bearer of this letter is (the friend or relative) of . . . eurus, and asked me to write to you. Hermophilus declares that he has business at Kerkemounis. Please therefore further him in this matter, as is just. For the rest take care of yourself that you may remain in good health. Good-bye. The 3rd year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, Phaophi 3. (Addressed) To Heraclides, basilicogrammateus of the Oxyrhynchite and Cynopolite nomes.'

4. The letters ἐςτὶ are on a separate fragment, the position of which is doubtful.
13. There seems to be an ellipse of καὶ after Ὀξυρίχιτον, though the fact that a basilicogrammateus should have more than one nome under his jurisdiction is remarkable.
747. INVITATION TO A FEAST.

5.1 x 7.3 cm. Late second or third century.

An invitation to a feast given by a cavalry officer; cf. 110 and 523.

Kalēi σε ὀ ἄκαθαρτια εἰς τὴν ἑσύ-
αν ἑαυτοῦ τῇ ἐκ Καλάν-
δαις ἀπὸ ὁπ(ας) η.

2. οτ of ἑαυτοῦ corr. from ο.

"The decurion invites you to his party on the sixth day before the Calends at eight o'clock."
V. COLLATIONS OF HOMERIC FRAGMENTS

(The collations of Η. i-xii and the Odyssey are with the text of Ludwich, those of Η. xiii-xxiv with that of La Roche.)

(a) Iliad.

748. 16.1 x 6.6 cm. Ends of i. 107-116, with occasional stops and elision-marks. 108 οδός τελεσται. 113 Κ[λυται]μηστρης. Third century, written in sloping oval uncials of good size.

749. 10.3 x 10 cm. Ends of i. 160-176 from the bottom of a column. Second century, written in heavy round uncials.

750. 8 x 6.3 cm. Parts of ii. 57-73. 62 τριώσσω[α. 63 εμεθέ]σε. 65 ε]κελευ. Third century, written in sloping oval uncials.

751. 19.6 x 9.2 cm. Part of a column containing iii. 30-55, with numerous stops and accents, and several corrections (probably by a second hand). 37 νως. 40 οφε]λος. First ο of άγονος above an α crossed out. 47 αγειρε[ς corrected from άγειρε[ς. 48 γ of ανήρε above the line. 50 πολι]νι corr. from πολι]ν. 51 κατη[φεί]ν. 53 ψιφ[ωτο. s of ε]χεις above the line. 54 οι of χράισμοι above η crossed out. Late second or third century, written in a neat uncial hand of the oval type.

752. 11 x 8 cm. Beginnings of iv. 87-96, with numerous stops, breathings and accents. 93 The first hand had η ρ α]ν μοι; a second hand seems to have corrected υ and has added δι above μοι. Third century, written in sloping oval uncials.

753. 19.2 x 6.4 cm. On the recto part of a second or third century account. On the verso parts of iv. 364-398, with numerous stops, breathings and accents. 369 is omitted, as in A. 378 εστρατοων]β[τ. 381 παρ ᾧ[σια. 382 ω]χοντο δι[ε corr. to ω]χοντι ς[ε(?). 387 ε of εων above the line. Third century, written in sloping oval uncials.

754. 5.5 x 2.5 cm. On the recto ends of 7 lines of a document mentioning a έμοσονγ[ός]. First century. On the verso a few letters from iv. 532-539. 535 πε[δε]μιχθη. First century, written in a good-sized irregular uncial hand.

755. 19 x 6 cm. On the recto part of a document in a cursive hand of the early part of the third century. On the verso a few letters from the ends
V. COLLATIONS OF HOMERIC FRAGMENTS


756. 6.8 x 8.2 cm. Fragment of the bottom of a leaf from a book, containing on the recto the ends of v. 324-334, and on the verso parts of 379-390, with elision-marks. 332 κυρανέωσαν. 382 τε[τ]ατι. 384 λγ of αλγε[ ] corr. 388 η of ε[ε]ξηγγελεν above α, which is crossed through, ε having been also corrected. Late third or fourth century, written in a semi-uncial hand.

757. 4.2 x 3 cm. Parts of v. 578-586. 582 εγ δ. First century, written in round uncial.

758. 9.6 x 11.4 cm. v. 583-596, the lines being nearly complete, from the top of a column, with stops, breathings, accents and elision-marks. 583 ελεφ[α]ρα. 586 δε καλι. 587 εισετηκεν. 588 επτω...πεσαι ευ. Late second or third century, written in a neat uncial hand of the oval type.

759. 12.7 x 2.9 cm. A few letters from the ends of v. 662-682, from the end of a column, with stops (high and low point) and accents. 667 αμ[φ]ις επουτ[ες], confirming the conjecture of Brandreth. Third century, written in a neat upright uncial hand of the oval type.

760. Fr. (b) 7.3 x 4.9 cm. Two fragments, the first containing a few letters from the beginnings of v. 715-718, the second parts of 720-729. 724 ε of χρυσηι above the line. First century, written in round upright uncial.

761. 21 x 11 cm. On the recto part of an effaced document. On the verso vi. 147 and 148, and, after a lacuna which may have contained 2 lines, parts of ll. 147 and 149 and another line, the whole being a writing exercise. 148 τηλεθώσα. Late first century B.C., written in a large semi-uncial hand.

762. 19.8 x 8.5 cm. On the recto ends of lines of a list of persons, written in a cursive hand in the late second or early third century. On the verso the latter parts of vii. 1-35, forming a complete column. 5 ελατησιν. 16 δυντο. 30 μαχησομεθ. 31 omitted. Third century, written in small upright uncial.

763. 24.4 x 10 cm. Part of a leaf from a book, containing on the recto the latter portions of vii. 68-101, and on the verso the earlier portions of 69-134, with stops, breathings and accents. 72 ν of ποντοποροσιω added by a second hand. 73 Παναχαιων. 77 τι of ελη added above the line by a second hand. 112 Final τ of Παιμιδη added above the line by a second hand. τον τε τρομ[εῳ](a new reading; cf. υποτρομέουσι in Vindob. 61). 113 Αχιλλειν.
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133 i of \(\omegaκυρων\) added above the line by a second hand. Third century, written in good-sized oval uncial.

764. 9.6 x 2.8 cm. A few letters from the beginnings of viii. 109-122, with stops, breathings and accents. Third century, written in oval uncial.

765. 8.1 x 5.4 cm. Ends of ix. 320-333, with stops, breathings and accents (oxytones having a grave accent on the final syllable). 323 First i of \(\piροφερμαι\) added above the line. 324 δέ τέ. 325 ν of \(ιανον\) above \(\lambda\lambda\) crossed out. Third century, written in oval uncial.

766. 5.8 x 5.8 cm. A few letters from the ends of x. 542-547, from the bottom of a column, with occasional accents. Third century, written in sloping oval uncial.

767. 6.6 x 4.3 cm. A few letters from the ends of xi. 555-561, with stops. Second century, written in good-sized round uncial.

768. 14 x 10.9 cm. Fragment from the top of a column, containing parts of xi. 736-764. 739 \(\Lambda\nu\gamma\rho\varepsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\). 740 \(\varepsilon\iota\alpha\nu\delta\iota\mu\nu\). 750 \(\alpha\pi\alpha\lambda\varepsilon\alpha\). 755 \(\alpha\iota\nu\rho\varepsilon\sigma\). 756 \(\beta\nu\beta\beta\rho\alpha\varepsilon\sigma\). 757 \(\alpha\lambda\varepsilon\alpha\varepsilon\). 758 \(\Pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\varepsilon\sigma\). 760 \(\beta\nu\beta\beta\rho\rho\alpha\varepsilon\sigma\). Third century, written in sloping oval uncial.

769. Fr. (a) 4.5 x 3.1 cm. Two fragments containing a few letters from xiii. 308-317 and 342-347, with accents. 316 omitted. 344 \(\gamma\theta\eta\sigma\) \(\varepsilon\varepsilon\). with ν \(\varepsilon\varepsilon\) above \(\lambda\). Late second or third century, written in a neat uncial hand of the oval type.

770. 4.7 x 7.9 cm. A few letters from the ends of xiii. 372-377 and the beginnings of 405-413, with stops, breathings and accents. 372 \(\pi\eta\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\). 374 In the margin \(\epsilon\pi\omega\iota\varepsilon\omega\sigma\omega\alpha\) and below it \(\alpha\nu\varepsilon\iota\theta\omega\alpha\), referring to the variants \(\alpha\nu\iota\zeta\omega\sigma\mu\alpha\) and \(\alpha\nu\iota\varepsilon\omega\sigma\mu\). Cf. Schol. A \(\alpha\nu\iota\zeta\omega\sigma\mu\) \(\phi\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\sigma\alpha\) καὶ διὰ τοῦ \(\varepsilon\) \(\alpha\nu\iota\zeta\omega\sigma\mu\) ἀντὶ τοῦ \(\epsilon\pi\omega\iota\varepsilon\omega\sigma\omega\alpha\). \(\Sigma\nu\rho\delta\sigma\tau\alpha\) \(\alpha\nu\iota\varepsilon\omega\sigma\omega\). 410 In the margin between this and l. 411 is a critical sign shaped like \(\phi\). Second century, written in round upright uncial.

771. 14 x 7.8 cm. On the recto beginnings of xv. 736-746, with occasional breathings and accents. 740 \(\kappa\alpha\iota\lambda\mu\iota\varepsilon\nu\iota\). 742 \(\alpha\iota\) and first \(\omega\) of \(\mu\alpha\mu\omega\omega\varepsilon\) above \(\epsilon\) and \(\circ\). 744 i of \(\kappa\pi\lambda\varepsilon\omega\) added later (by a second hand?). At the end a coronis and the title in large letters \(\Lambda\nu\delta\alpha\iota\sigma\). Late second or early third century, written in handsome good-sized uncial of the oval type. On the verso 12 nearly complete lines of a money-account in third century cursive.

772. 10.2 x 5.9 cm. Ends of xvii. 353-373, with stops, breathings and accents. 361 \(\alpha\gamma\chi\psi\sigma\tau\iota\nu\iota\). 363 \(\alpha\nu\varepsilon\sigma\omega\tau\iota\). 369 Final i of \(\mu\varepsilon\nu\iota\tau\alpha\delta\rho\iota\varepsilon\) added above the line. 371 a of \(\alpha\tau\varepsilon\rho\iota\) corr. from \(\epsilon\). Second or third century, written in a rather small uncial hand.
V. COLLATIONS OF HOMERIC FRAGMENTS

773. Height of roll 24.4 cm. Seven fragments from four columns of a MS. of ii, containing a few letters from 304–312, 339–357 (top of a column), ends of 362–374 (top of a column), and parts of 386–410 (a whole column), with stops (high and middle point) and occasional accents. 341 above εξονύτες is δι... δ. 368 δασδωκται. 369 ν of ουδε corr. 372 (end of the line) [πη or ] η. 401 [είδομεν θυμί]. 407 omitted. 408 ε of θεων added above the line by a second hand. ΑΧΛΙΓΙΟΣ. Second century, written in very large heavy uncialis (cf. 081), the letters measuring 5 mm. in height.

774. 4.5 x 7.5 cm. Parts of iii. 226–231. 227 ειςεσε, the ε being added by a second hand above a crossed through. 228 θεωσ ει, the s being corrected from τ (?). Third century, written in good-sized sloping oval uncialis.

775. 8.4 x 4.1 cm. Parts of iv. 388–400 from the bottom of a column, with occasional breathings and accents. 396 a of αλεπται above η crossed through. 399 omitted. Third century, written in sloping oval uncialis.

776. 6.2 x 2.4 cm. A few letters from iv. 520–529 from the bottom of a column, with occasional accents. First or early second century, written in round uncialis.

777. 12.2 x 8.8 cm. Part of the lower portion of a leaf of a book, containing on the recto the beginnings of v. 7–17 and on the verso the ends of 34–44, with stops, breathings and accents. Fourth century, written in good-sized sloping oval uncialis, in brown ink.

778. 20.6 x 17.2 cm. On the recto a nearly complete column containing x. 26–50, with stops (high, middle and low point). 27 Second ι of αφραδιμησεων added above the line; similarly final ι of δεκατηι in 29, τωι and αλλοι in 32. 31 επελλαδε. 34 επεσσι. 38 εσσι. 42 νεισομεθα. 46 βουλη τε. Late second or third century, written in handsome round upright uncialis. On the verso parts of the last 7 lines of a letter in a cursive hand of the late third century.

779. 6.2 x 9.6 cm. x. 124–130 from the top of a column, the lines being nearly complete, with breathings and accents. Late second or third century, written in a clear cursive hand.

780. 17.7 x 8.5 cm. A few letters from the ends of xi. 471–493, and the earlier portions of 523–545, from the bottoms of columns, with stops and occasional accents. 533 δη Τρωσσι with οτ (in a second hand) above εσσι. 539 βιβδόνα. 544 φ of νοσφιν above τ crossed out. αφειστηκεί. 545 μιν with ε above ι added by a second hand. Second century (?), written in an uncial hand of the oval type and archaic appearance, Ξ being formed Ξ.
781. 6 x 3.8 cm. Fragment of a leaf from a book, containing on the recto parts of xvi. 243–256, and on the verso the ends of 288–301, with stops, breathings and accents (in lighter ink). 293 δε δαιρα. 295 δ of δουρε corr. Third century, written in rather small sloping oval uncial.

782. 7.3 x 5.3 cm. Fragment of the bottom of a leaf of a book containing on the verso parts of xvii. 137–148, and on the recto ends of 182–193, with stops and accents (in lighter ink). 187 γενέσθαι. Third century, written in rather small sloping oval uncial.

783. 11.7 x 4.4 cm. Ends of xvii. 410–428, with stops. 417 αλλωι. Late first century B.C., written in good sized irregular uncial.
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784. Fourteen fragments of a document containing on both sides several columns, the recto consisting for the most part of lists of persons, the verso of a private account (continued on the recto), which mentions καὶ προσφοράν (ν. e. προσγίγοντας τιμήσεις ἃμελευμονών Διδύμῳ Ἀρ (i.e. 1100 copper drachmae), [Λύτρα ἐρώτων ἰγ Μούχεω(ς) φ, ἱερείδιον κ, ἄτινες i, φῶν β κε, ἐλαιὸν κο(τήλης) α πτ, οἶνον (καραμέλων) β (τάλαντων) α, and payments for Τ'Ελληνικών. A conversion of silver into copper drachmae occurs, τιμή(ς) ἄργυρο(ν) (δραχ-μων) η ὑπ(ερ) τοῦ πατρώ(ς) Βψ (a ratio of 337/2 : 1, which is unusually low; cf. P. Tebt. I. p. 580-1). First century B.C.

785. 14.7 x 9 cm. An undertaking by a surety to produce a certain individual who had been committed to his charge; cf. 259. After the first 5 lines, which seem to have contained the address but are much broken, the papyrus concludes ἡμιληθείσα Ξένων 'Ηρακλέους παρὰ σοῦ ὄν καὶ παρέξουμεν ἐν τῷ ἐμφανεί ἐκτὸς ἐρωτο βωμοῦ τεμένουσα πάσης σκέφτης. About A.D. 1. 12 lines in all.

786. 14.3 x 8.4 cm. Conclusion of a census-return on oath, written by Aristion and Didymus on Tubi 30 of the third year of Hadrian (A.D. 119), the portion preserved corresponding to 480. 7 sqq. προγεγραμμένων (cf. 480. 15) is apparently written ἀγεν. Below the signatures in two different hands are official docket κατεχ(ωρίσθη) λαογρ(άφως) Νό(του) Δρ(όμου) χρ(ονος) δ αὐ(τός), and καταδρ(μύσθη) λαογρ(άφως) Παρε(μβολῆς) χρ(ονος) δ αὐ(τός). 20 lines, which are complete except the first.

787. 19.9 x 13.3 cm. Concluding part of a letter of recommendation (cf. 746). The first 5 lines are ὅς ἦσσιν ἡμέτερος. ἐρωτῶ σε οὖν ἐχειν αὐτῶν συνεσταμένων καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκ προσέρχεσαι [tó] ἐκ δικαίου ἐς τῆν ἐρυθράν καταλογήν ποιήσεις αὐτῶι. [σῇ ὡς ὑπὲρ δῶν ἐκαὶ αἰρή γράφει. Dated in the second year of Tiberius, Pharmouthi 11 (A.D. 10). 9 lines.

1 The problems of Ptolemaic copper coinage have recently been discussed by Hultsch in Abhandk. d. Königl. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., 1903. We regret to be compelled to observe that owing to the adoption of Revillon's long exploded theories based on demotic, and the failure to appreciate the evidence of the Tebtunis papyri with the arguments brought against the 120 : 1 ratio in our App. ii to that volume, the article seems to us a step backwards rather than forwards.
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788. 11.7 x 10 cm. On both recto and verso parts of two columns of a private account in copper drachmae. A conversion of silver into copper (δραχμαί) δ 'Αττικά (a ratio of 4:5:1) occurs; among the other items are ἀργυρὸν παρηγορήθη. Early by iv. Incomplete, avibs {sic). Early first century B.C. In Col. i of the recto the first 8 lines are complete, the rest being imperfect throughout.

789. 9.7 x 13 cm. Part of a letter. Lines 2-9 ἔδωκά σοι ἐν Οἰκυρίῳ τοῖς μηνιάθεν. Διονύσιος Φανίων ἐπιστολείδον κεχαραγμένον εἰς τῷ μηνίῳ τοῦ δισεκατοστοῦ (έτος) περί τοῦ σε δοναί μοι ἵσας δώ καὶ ἀργυρὸν τοῦ Διονύσιος ἐσχέν παρ’ ἐμοῦ (πυρῷ) ἐτέραβα ὁ δὲ καὶ ὁ Χριστένας 7. The tenth year probably refers to Tiberius or Claudius. 11 lines.

790. 8.7 x 12.8 cm. Beginnings of 8 lines of an official letter from Dionysius to Ptolemaeus enclosing a copy of another letter. ἐπιστάται τῶν ἰππόρχων are mentioned. Late second century B.C. Written across the fibres. On the verso beginnings of 6 more lines in a different hand.

791. 14.7 x 6 cm. Letter from Didymus to his brother Apollonius, beginning ἐπιμέμψαται Ἀμμιλόπολδος τῷ ἀδελφῷ περὶ ἀργυρίου (δραχμῶν) τεσσαράκοντα ὅκτω εἰς συναγοράσματον ἐρώτω. Addressed on the verso Ἀπολλοςώνω. About A.D. 1. Incomplete, the end being lost. 12 lines.

792. 8.4 x 27.2 cm. On the recto an incomplete account of payments of wheat to various persons, containing 19 lines. On the verso another practically complete account of receipts and payments, mentioning λητο[ψ]ργο(ίς) ῥμ, Φωσφόρῳ καὶ τῷ ἀλλῷ καὶ ναύ(λων) πορε(ίων) δὲ ἦ, Φωσφόρῳ καὶ αὐτῷ... ψ( ) εἰς ἐφόδῳ(α) ἐκ τοῦ ἱππόρχου. About A.D. 100. 13 lines. The writing on the recto is across the fibres, that on the verso along them. First century B.C.

793. 24 x 11.5 cm. Acknowledgement of payments of wheat εἰς τὸ δημόσιον by various persons ἀπὸ διαστολῆς of other persons. Dated in the seventh year of Domitian, Caesarius 16 (A.D. 88). Nearly complete. 18 lines.

794. 21.2 x 15.6 cm. Conclusion of a contract for the sale of 14/2 arourae of catoeic land, with the signatures, which are nearly complete, and following the same formula as 504. The seller was Asclepiades, the buyer a woman called Σωτότες (?) or Σωτότειν, and the price 500 drachmae of silver. The land was περὶ Θ. θανίν εἰς τοῦ ἑβρονος ἀλα κλήρου (sic). Written in the fifth year of Domitian (A.D. 85-6). 36 lines.

795. Fr. (a) 4.5 x 13.3 cm. Two fragments of a marriage-contract dated in the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96). The husband is called Heraclides, the wife (?) Sarapous. Line 4 γράμματον φερεῖν προσφερομένην δακτύλων χρυσοῦν τεταρτάων (cf. 496. 6, note), and lower down τεταρτάων κατὰ τοῦ τῆς χώρας νόμον occurs. Written across the fibres. Parts of 12 lines in all.
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796. 3 x 8.3 cm. Parts of 7 lines from the beginning of a marriage-contract written in the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98–117), mentioning ἐν παραφέρων κλαλίων ἄργυρων ζεύγος (?). For κλαλίων = κλανίων (‘bracelet’) cf. 114. 11. Written across the fibres.

797. 5.5 x 10 cm. On the recto an entry concerning the measurement of the land of Thotsutaios, διάφορον σχοινισμόν) Θουσταίος τοῦ Ὄμοι τῶν ἐν τῇ συν( ) τῶν πα( ) ἀπὸ τοῦ ιε τοῦ καὶ 13 (έτου) περὶ κόλ(μην) . . . For διάφορον σχοινισμόν cf. P. Tebt. I. p. 219. The reign is that of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy Alexander (B.C. 103–2). 4 lines. On the verso 2 lines from the beginning of a document mentioning Νεμέα κω(μο)γ(αμματεύς).

798. 7.8 x 9.2 cm. Conclusion of a letter, ending ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τῶν ἀγοραστῶν πρὸς ταῦτα ἀποδοῦναι, ὡς δ' ἀν παραγένωσαι οἱ σιγολόγοι ἐπὶ τὴν παράληψιν τῶν σιτίκων ἀπομείρησομεν ἄμα καὶ τάστα. ἐρρασο. (έτους) κυ Φάωφι. The twenty-third year probably refers to Epiphanes (B.C. 183). 8 lines.

799. 30.5 x 25 cm. One complete and one incomplete column of an account of sums owed and interest upon them, beginning τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίας ασφάχτης (? 1. ἐν δεκαχηκε) χειροθέων Θεοπο(τ) ἐν πλοίοι. Then follows a list of names and amounts, e.g. Ταυρείου καὶ Σαραπιδος (δράχμαι) τό τόκου ἕως Μεσορῆ (δράχμαι) οίο. The second column is also concerned with loans; εἰς δανισμών occurs. About A.D. 1. 34 lines.

800. 18.7 x 12.5 cm. Beginnings of 19 lines of an official document enclosing a letter of Valerius Athenodorus. Lines 4–10 (which begin a new section, as is indicated by the size of the initial letter) Καὶ διὰ λόγον (δωδεκαμήνου [, ἐδηλώθη διαγεγράφθαι [, νομοῦ τούτου τὸν τρόπον τούτου [, ποταμοῦ τῷ ἤς (ἐτεί) Ἀρσινόου Καλάροσ τοῦ κυρίου, Φίλλακο τοῦ ἡγεμονεύσατος ἐργατεία ἐκ τῶν [, αἰρεθέντων ἐξ ἐνοχημόνων ὑπὸ Ἰρακ[λ ... ἐφορεῖος ἐκ τοῦ κυριακοῦ λόγου εἰς τὴν [. Written about A.D. 153.

801. 19.2 x 12.3 cm. Fragment of a notification addressed to Euangelius also called Sarapion, strategus, by Diogenes, enclosing an authorization to the strategus from the archidacias in answer to a petition by Diogenes. Cf. 485 and 719. In the upper margin is a short note from the strategus (cf. B. G. U. 578, 1) dated in the second year of Gaius Pescennius Niger (A.D. 193). The letter of the archidacies to the strategus is dated Thoth 18 (probably of the same year). 35 lines, of which the ends are lost.

802. 7 x 7 cm. Parts of 11 lines from the beginning of a contract, one of the parties being called Συμφώντος. Dated in the 11th year of Ptolemy (Alexander the god) Philometor and Berenice, i.e. B.C. 101–95. On the verso a docket.

803. 15 x 5 cm. Fragment of an official letter or petition, containing 3 com-
complete and 3 incomplete lines, with traces of a preceding column. Lines 2–5 καὶ ἀπὸ ἑπτατέλειας φίλακτῶν ἀντὶ τῶν κατ’ έτος εἰς τὸ δημόσιον ὁμολογημένων διαγράφεσθαι (δραχμῶν) 'Τ άπητήσσαι βιαστήρεν τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ νομοῦ φύλακας ὑπὸ τε τοῦ . . . . καὶ Πτολεμαῖον τοῦ στρατηγοῦ . . . Late first century B.C. On the verso parts of two columns of an account.

804. Width 9-9 cm. Horoscope dated in the twenty-seventh year of Augustus, Phaophi 5 περὶ ὀφα(ν) γ τὴς ἡμέρας (Oct. 2 (?) A.D. 4). The sun was in Libra, the moon in Pisces, Saturn in Taurus, Jupiter in Cancer, Mars in Virgo. Taurus was setting, and Aquarius at the nadir. After the astronomical details the papyrus concludes ἔχει κυδώνου φυλάσσον ἔως ἡμέραν(ν) μ χάριν τοῦ Ἀρεώς. Incomplete, being broken in the middle. 15 lines in all.

805. 6-6 × 7-6 cm. Conclusion of a letter written on Epeiph 20 of the fifth year of Augustus (B.C. 25). Lines 2 sqq. ὑπὸ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐφαρμόσεις πλούσιοι καλαὶ φάσεις ἑλεύσονται παρ’ [ἐ]µοῦ, ἀξίω δὲ ἀντιφωνεῖν [μ]ου πυκνότερον. ἀπάξον πάντας τοὺς παρ’ ἡμῶν καὶ σεαυτής ἐπιμελοῦ ἵν’ ἴμαινης εὕτυχος. ἔρω(s). 9 lines.

806. 15-9 × 35-4 cm. Account, in two columns, of expenditure of copper money for various purposes in the tenth year (of Augustus, i.e. B.C. 21–0). Among the items are ἰερεύνου Θωρίου 'Δ, Κεφαλῆς χρυσοχόφ Το, Σαραπίων εἰς πραγματήν Ἀφ, διὰ τῆς Ἀσκληπιάδου τραπέζης λόγοις (τάλαντον) α. Complete. 21 lines.

807. 16-8 × 21-1 cm. Fragment of an official list of sheep and goats belonging to different persons at a village. Col. i contains the ends of 5 lines. Col. ii has ὅν αὐτῶν ἱδια π, αἰγ(ε)ι δ, καὶ Ἀρσινόης φορικά μ, Ἀχρινίου ἱδια μ αἰγες γ. / ρεξ αἰγες ζ. γίνεται τῆς κόμης πρό(βατο) δ' Ἀσμα αἰγες ττζ, ὅν Ἀρσινόης φορικ(ά) σµ. The sheep which were Ἀρσινόης φορικά as contrasted with those that were private property seem to have been subject to a special impost (φόρος), payable nominally to Arsinoë (i.e. Arsinoë Philadelphus probably), but really of course to the State; cf. the ἀπώμαιρα in the Revenue Papyrus. About A.D. 1. On the verso part of an account.

808. Height 36 cm. A list of abstracts (διαστρήματα) of contracts for loan; cf. 274 and P. Oxy. II. p. 176. One column, numbered at the top ῥει, is practically complete, and there are parts of another in three separate fragments. The first entry is [ἐ]πὶ Παλώσει όµολ(ογε) ὁ Ἀρπαλὸς ὁ Ἐρμωρ[ο]ς τοῦ . . . . . . . οὐς ἀν’ Ὀξφ(ώγχων) πόλεως Πανούρεις Πετσήριος ἀπό τῆς αἰ(της) κόμης Παλώσεως Θωρίου(τεφω) τοῦ(ἀρχ[ις]) ἀπό(χει) ἐν(ω) παρ’ αὐτὸν ἀργ(υ)ρό(ν) (δραχμάς) σι κεφαλ(αν) δι εἶδα(νεον) αὐτῶ δια τοῦ ἐν τῇ αἰ(της) κόμης γραφίνων τῶ ἔνεσ(τω)τε (ἐτε) μην Νερωνείων Σεβαστοῦ. (Second hand) ἤθε(πισταὶ) μη[ν] Νερωνείων Σεβαστῶν ἵδι, ἄποδ(οσίς) λ [μ]η(νός) Νερωνείων τοῦ ἴα (ἐτους), εὐ( ) λευ(μένη?).
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A marginal note (probably by the second hand) has ] 7ox( ) ev ἀπο(γραφή) i (ἐρωσ). The other entries refer to loans ἐν Σεφώ, ἐν Κεσμούχ(ei) or ἐν Τής, and follow the same formula with similar later additions. The month after ἱδή(τιμαται), (which is once written ἤθεται(ται)), is uniformly that in which the contract was drawn up. θέως Κλαύδιος is mentioned, and the papyrus was probably written in the reign of Nero (A.D. 54–68). 43 lines in Col. i, besides the marginal notes.

809. 16.7 x 6.4 cm. Ends of 22 lines from the beginning of a contract drawn up before the agoranomi for the sale (?) of a female slave called Τεχωσών. Dated in the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98–117).

810. 14.6 x 10 cm. Proposal (ἐπιδέχομαι μισθωσάθαι) addressed to Claudia Ptolema by Dioscorus for the lease of 3 arourae of βασιλική γῆ near Sinaru in the κλήρος of Xenon for the nineteenth year of Hadrian (A.D. 134–5). The land, being ἐκ μέσου ἐν ἄφρού (1. -χφ), was to be irrigated by the lessee at his own expense and cultivated χόρτῳ εἰς κοπῆν καὶ θερμῆν ἐπινομην at the total rent of 120 drachmae, the δημόσια being paid by the lessor. Cf. 730, the formula of which is almost identical. Nearly complete, but broken at the bottom. Title on the verso. 27 lines.

811. 7.7 x 9.4 cm. 8 lines from the beginning of a letter from Πέλλιος to Αντ[ας?] beginning καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἐγρ[αφά] σοι εὐχαριστῶν Ερμίππου (1. -πφ) δὲν πάντα μοι ποιείς τὴν σήμερα καταλογήν (cf. 787), καὶ τὰ νῦν εἰς σοι φα[-πρε]ται γράφων αὐτῷ... Address on the verso. About A.D. 1.

812. 10.2 x 8.3 cm. Fragment of a letter containing in a postscript (l. 5) πεπλωσταὶ Λοκρίων [, (l. 6) πικαρίς ὑπὸ Λουκίου (ὑπ. Λ. above the line) ἠκοννά γὰρ δῆτι] [, (l. 7) τὴν λορίκαν αὐτοῦ [. Dated in the twenty-fifth year of Augustus, Athur (B.C. 5). 8 lines.

813. 15 x 11.7 cm. Conclusion of a letter in which the writer requests that a cargo of barley may be sent to him. About A.D. 1. 7 lines.

814. 21.5 x 11.6 cm. Fragment of an account in two columns. Among the entries are πακτωνίταις... ἀπὸ Θελβῶι... Κόνος Πτολεμαίου τῶν ἀπὸ Εὔαργηθ[ίδος...] Written in the fourth year (probably of Tiberius, i.e. A.D. 17–8). 15 incomplete lines in Col. ii.

815. 27.9 x 11.3 cm. Fragment of an account containing names and sums of money arranged under different dates, the beginnings of lines being lost. The proper name Όνθονόβετι (dative) occurs. About A.D. 1. 19 lines.

816. Fr. (a) 14.3 x 13.1 cm. Three fragments of an account containing names and sums of money. ἦς Ἰσιδόρου καὶ Ιησοῦς occurs. 10 incomplete lines in Fr. (a). On the verso part of another account mentioning the twenty-fifth year (of Augustus, i.e. B.C. 6–5).
817. 9.7 x 20 cm. 5 nearly complete lines from the top of a column containing a list of names and sums of money, a larger and a smaller, the second being probably interest, e.g. δ( ) διὰ Ἀντέρωτος Λοκρητίου Παχών β (δραχμαι) ρν (δραχμαι) η. The twenty-first year of Augustus, i.e. B.C. 10-9) is mentioned. On the verso part of another account.

818. 6.8 x 9 cm. Ends of the first 7 lines of a contract dated in the thirty-fourth year of Augustus (A.D. 4-5), written in a semi-uncial hand.

819. 8.6 x 10.6 cm. Conclusion of a letter concerning the sale of wine or oil, ending τὰ δὲ προκείμενα χ(οσ) δεπρᾶσαι {σ'θαί} δι᾽ ἐμῶν ἀνὰ δραχ(μὰς) πέντε, τὰ κόρι(α?)] ἐκ δραχ(μῶν)] ἔξ (τριμβόλοι). About A.D. 1. 6 lines.

820. 10.2 x 17.9 cm. End of a letter containing the date (twenty-seventh year of Augustus, Tubi 1[,] i.e. B.C. 3) and a postscript of 7 lines, giving various directions.

821. 11.5 x 6.2 cm. Ends of the first 9 lines of a letter to a daughter. About A.D. 1.

822. 5.4 x 13 cm. Beginning of a letter from Lysimachus to his brother, εὑ πράσσειν takes the place of χαρέων. About A.D. 1. 4 lines.

823. 24 x 10-2 cm. Fragment of the conclusion of a lease of land near Μεριφερ[α]. Cf. 277. Dated in the twenty-fifth year of Augustus, Phaophi (B.C. 6). Written on the verso, the recto being blank. 13 incomplete lines.

824. 4.8 x 2.5 cm. Fragment containing parts of the first 10 lines of a contract dated in the sole reign of Ptolemy (Alexander the god) Philometor (B.C. 101-88).

825. 7.8 x 15.9 cm. Beginning of an account of which the heading is Δημητρίῳ καὶ Ἀμιμωνὶ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτοῖς μισθωταῖς Εὐκνῆ ἑπτορείας παρὰ Σαρπιλίωνος[] πραγκατευτοῦ Μέμφεως Μ(ε)[ιμφ][ε]τοῦ. λόγος λήμματος καὶ ἀναλώμα[α] ἡμῶν τριῶν ἀπ[α] Ἀφροκόπη ἔως Πατίνα τοῦ [έτους]... The beginnings of lines of a second column are preserved, containing a list of entries each commencing with π(αρά). On the importance of this papyrus for the Εὐκνῆ ἑπτορεία see 712. introd. Second century. On the verso in a different hand (?) parts of the first 6 lines of a document mentioning the ἑγκτήσεων βιβλιοφυλάκιον, perhaps the draft of a declaration.

826. 9.5 x 11.9 cm. Fragment of the conclusion of a notice sent to some official, apparently an announcement of a death. Lines 1 sqq. Δίδυμος[] Χαρτι. ( ) γέρδιος [μετήλλαξε; τὸν] βίον τῶι ἔνεστωτι μηνι Τύβι τοῦ δευτέρου[ν] (καὶ) τριακό[σιον] ἔτους Καίσαρος. διὸ δεξίῳ δῶν φαινέται καταχωρισθῆναι τούτο [.........ἐν] τοῖς παρὰ σοι βιβλίοις... A.D. 3. 9 lines. On the verso the beginning of an account.

827. 13.5 x 6.8 cm. Part of a list of names. About A.D. 1. 18 lines.
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828. 5.8 x 10 cm. Parts of 6 lines of a petition concerning the measurements of a piece of land. Early first century B.C. On the verso parts of 6 much effaced lines of another document.

829. 12.3 x 9.3 cm. Part of a letter from Σωγένης to his sister. About A.D. 1. 13 lines.

830. 15.3 x 5.6 cm. End of 17 lines of an official letter, enclosing other documents. Phaophi 28 of the twenty-first year, (of Philometor probably, i.e. B.C. 155) is mentioned. Written across the fibres. On the verso part of a line.

831. Fr. (a) 6.1 x 9.2 cm. Two fragments of a contract beginning ἐτοὺς § [. . . ἐν] 'Οξ(υφύγχων) πό(λει) τῆς Θηβαί(δος). ὀμο'λουεῖ Λεπτίνη[η]ς . . . Ῥωκάντος Μακεδῶν τῶν Σωγγυμάριος πεζῶν Ἡρακλείδη[ι] . . . The sovereign is Ptolemy Soter II, and the date therefore B.C. 111-0. 8 lines.

832. Fr. (b) 6 x 9 cm. Conclusion of a letter dated in the twenty-sixth year of Augustus, Mesore (B.C. 4), mentioning a voyage εἰς Ομβροὺς. 6 lines.


834. 4.5 x 9.8 cm. Conclusion of a letter dated in the twenty-sixth year of Augustus, Mesore (B.C. 4), mentioning a voyage εἰς Ομβροὺς. 6 lines.

835. 4.8 x 12.8 cm. An offer to purchase confiscated land at Pela, addressed to Gaius Sep[il]ius Rufus; cf. 721, which has the same formula. The purchase price, which was to be paid ἐπὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ Σ[α]ρ[α]πε[ί]ῳ ὀ[μ][βο]ί[α]ν [τραπέζων, was not less than 10 drachmae. The earlier portion is much mutilated. For the conclusion see 721. 14-5, note. About A.D. 13. 14 lines.

836. 13.5 x 12.8 cm. Loan of 32 artabae πυροῦ στερεῶν from Theoxenus to two Πέρταν [τῆς ἐπιγου[ῆς and a third person. Lines 6 sqq. ἀποδότωσαν δὲ οἱ δεδεικνυόμενοι Θεοτζε[ίρ] τῶν τράκωντα δώο ἀρτάβας τῶν πυρῶν ἐν μηλί Παινυ τοῦ ἐκκαιδεκάτου ἔτους ἐν 'Οξυφυγκ(τῶν) πόλει πυροῦ στερεῶν νέων καθαρὸν ἀδοίλου μέτρῳ τετραχωνίκῳ ἀγ' ἐπ[ο]ικ[υ]καταστῆσατε τοῖς ἱδίοις ἐκ[υ]μβάσαι κ.τ.λ. For
μέτρων ἄγορανομικῶν cf. 740. 17, note, and for the formula cf. the late Ptolemaic loans from Gebelén, e.g. P. Grenf. I. 23. First century B.C.; the sixteenth year refers to Neos Dionysus (B.C. 66-5) or Augustus (B.C. 15-4). Nearly complete, but broken at the beginning. 30 lines. The papyrus has been gummed on to two similar documents, of which parts of a few lines are preserved.

837. 18.6 x 15.5 cm. Will of Apollos daughter of Paësis, leaving her property at Kerkemounis jointly to Didymus son of Dio[genes], probably a son by her first marriage, and to the offspring of her present marriage with Apollos son of Ophelas, with provisions for the φερνή and παράφερνα of a daughter and for the guardianship of the children. Dated in the second year of Hadrian (A.D. 117-8). Cf. 489-95. Written across the fibres. 30 lines, of which only the beginnings are preserved.

838. 30.5 x 9.5 cm. Lease of land at the Ἡρακλέειον ἐποικών from Diogenes to two persons, with the signature of the lessor. The formula follows that of e.g. 499. The conclusion is τῆς ἐπινομῆς ὑστη τοῦ Διογένους. κυρία ἡ μισθωσις. Dated in the twenty-first year of Hadrian, Thoth (A.D. 136). Incomplete. 52 lines.

839. 27.5 x 17.1 cm. Letter from Eutychides to his mother, the earlier part describing an accident to a boat. Lines 6 sqq. ὡς ἐναυγησεν κατὰ Πτολεμαίδα καὶ ἦλθε μοι γυμνὸς κεκαυνυκώς. εὐθέως ἡγίρασα αὐτῶν στολήν. Α μαχαροφόρος is mentioned, apparently as the bearer of the letter. Early first century A.D. Incomplete. 26 lines.

APPENDIX I

Addenda and Corrigenda to Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part II and Fayum Towns and their Papyri.

For the literature connected with these volumes see the successive bibliographies of papyri by Wilcken in the Archiv, and by de Ricci in the Revue des études grecques. After an examination of the articles in question and a comparison with the papyri, we give here a list of those suggestions which both affect our transcriptions of the texts and are satisfactory. Proposed alterations which are unsuitable, or are based upon alternatives mentioned in our notes, or in the case of literary texts are confined to the supplements of lacunae, are generally ignored. Where the source of the correction is not indicated, it is our own.
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Part II. 211. 34. ξ[patw]v for ο[...].v (Weil) is possible.

214. Recto 7. The vestige of a letter before " is too slight to afford any clue. The same remark applies to the two letters after με in l. 15.

18. Possibly νο[...].ν (Ludwich).

Verso 11. Possibly ο[...].ο[...]. (Platt), but it is not certain that a letter is lost after ολα, and the following vestiges suit ε better than ο. Perhaps ιε[...].ιε[...]. (Bolling).

12. Τ[...].ο. the doubtful τ may be π, but neither ιε[...].ιε[...]. (Platt) nor ιε[...].ιε[...]. (Bolling) seem to suit.

13. μ... λον: the first letter is more like ν than μ.

14. l. οντ[...].οντ[...]. (Ludwich) at the end of the line.

215. i. 28. φθν should very likely be read in place of φθν, but there is not room for φθν οντ (Fraccaroli).

216. i. 2. λν is a misprint for λη.

218. The position in Col. ii conjecturally assigned by us to Fr. (e) may be considered certain. Line 26 is παν σι[...].παν (or, as Crönert suggests, επι[...].παν), 27 νερ της ολης, 28 Αρχελο[...].oς και Ζω[...].άρων (cf. our note ad loc.), 29 perhaps [νε τοις] περι ταφον (νε τοις Τινος). Fragment (b) probably joins Fr. (a) so that Fr. (a) i. 18 and Fr. (b) i form one line, i.e. Λουστρα το. Fr. (e) probably belongs to the bottom of Fr. (a) ii.

219. 11. λιθ[...].οις κι[...].ς (i.e. κειστ[...].ς (Platt) is possible.

17. For [ι...].ιων [τρως] (Wilamowitz) suggests ο[...].ο[...]. θ in place of o is possible, but the first letter is more like ε than o. The η of τρως is certain.

220. A newly-found fragment, apparently from the top of a column, contains the beginnings of two lines τυγχανε and ματ' γ'. Cf. 221 ad fin.

x. 16. The penultimate letter before αναι is β or κ.

xi. 20. ε[...].σει (Luo) is possible, but δε. τω[...].ς for the preceding letters is unsuitable.

221. i. 1. l. οτε for τέ (Ludwich).

2. τα[...].βαροντ τα (Ludwich) is not very suitable.

17. το...v before διαφορ (Ludwich) is possible.

21. Possibly ανι[...].φνει (Ludwich), but the doubtful letter is more like η or τ.

ii. 3. l. ε[...].κος (Allen).

9. l. τελευτ[...].το (Wilamowitz).

22. ii. 2. The traces of a letter before σελαν suit α or λ better than v. The papyrus has ε. ηυλ[...].νο, i. e. the first hand wrote δελον which was corrected to δελον (Diels).

3. l. Τιμας for γ Μπες (Diels).

6. l. πλαιο for επλαιο (Diels).

23-4. l. κε κ' [τον ελαθ[...].το (Ludwich).

25. πτωτ[...].ν (Ludwich) is possible.

26-7. l. γεγται (Ludwich).

iv. 18. The vestiges before αι are too faint to afford a clue.

vi. 11. φανται αν γνων (Ludwich) is possible.

vii. 5. παρ[...].ν Αμακρεων (Platt, Ludwich) cannot be read, but ουτως δε και Αμακρεων is possible.

15. l. ταμεν for τατε... ν.

ix. 1. l. σαστασ[...].[...].νας[ for σαν τατε... ] κα[...]. ]. πασ[.]

9. δε π[...].π[...].νς for δ επορειν[...].νς (Ludwich) is just possible, but the letter following π is more like φ than ε.

15. l. κρανα Μελανω[...].ν (Wilamowitz).

xii. 10. The vestiges on either side of γ are too slight to give a clue.

26. πνου might be read instead of των.
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xiv. 25. 9 at the end of the line is extremely doubtful. There are more probably two letters.

26. στενομε[σ]ί[α] γῆς (Ludwich) is possible.

xvi. 20-1. ε[π]τ[ι] υ[νον] (Ludwich) is possible, but the π is extremely doubtful.

xvii. 12. ε[ν] άφη (Ludwich) is possible.

Fr. (a) 5. αδη[ο]λής (Crönert) is possible.

The beginnings of 12 lines are contained on a new fragment which the recto (cf. 220) seems to show is from near the bottom of a column, while l. 9 ut asios (cf. II. xxii. 318-21) indicates that it belongs to the column lost before Col. xvi.

222. 17. οι(τως) Κρατης (Diels) can be read.


282. 2. Insert η after εδεκασθη.

287. iv. 8. 1. ἐκλεγομένη (Gradenwitz).

17. 1. τῷ ἀσκληπιαθή [ἄφοι]θεωκέναι (Grad.).

21. 1. τοῖς γὰρ ἀσκληπιαθήνου τῷ κόσμει (τέσσερις) [ἀφωκυριασθής] (Grad.).

26. 1. δ’ ἀναλογιμάτω διεγερθήσαται [μέ] (οί μ’ οί) (Grad.).

30. 1. τῆς δὲ μητρίδος οὐσίας (Grad.).

33. ἑπαταμενει[ν] (Grad.) is possible.

v. 7. οὐ is a mistake for δε (Grad.).

7-8. 1. καταλαβόμενοι αξιων ἠ’ ἐμε ἀνάπεμψον.

16. 1. ἀν[α]πομενυμεν αξιων (Blass).

34. 1. δι’ αὐτὸν σωματισμῶν (Grad.).

38. 1. δύναν [θ] άι (Grad.).

42. 1. μ[β] ήμεληθηκαί.

vi. 18. 1. οὕτως (Blass).

21. 1. ἀν’ έμοι δι’ ἄπλως.

24. 1. τί πάντοτε οὐσίας βούλθεισθαι σωματισθαι (Grad.).

25. 1. ἀπαλλαθήναι . . . (Grad.).

31. 1. τὸ . . . ποιθήναι έι οὐκ ἐξήν.

vii. 22. 1. ὑπὸ λαίτης (i.e. λιπής) for ἱππολάτης (Wilamowitz).


26-7. ἐνέγκαυτος is a mistake for ἐνέγκαυσα (Wilam.).

40. 1. μετέ ἀλλα for μετάλλα (Grad.).


27. 1. τὸν τοῦ. ε[γ] (referring to Trajan’s reign) can be read, as Stein suggested, for ε[γ], but cf. 712. 7, where a Sulpicius Similis is mentioned certainly long after Trajan’s time and perhaps in the reign of Commodus.
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255. 16. l. [ε]{υ}νόοις for [. . . ]τις.
265. 39. l. ἰδιεγμάτων.
269. ii. 2. l. [μ]άκρῳ for [Μ]άκρῳ (Wilam.).
270. 25. A line has dropped out of the text. l. καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἄρα ἐπί το αὐτό κατακόισας καὶ ἄνθρωπος ταῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατακοισώσας καὶ ἄνθρωπος τοῖς κατοικίαν κ.τ.λ. (Goodspeed).
273. 5. l. κατὰ †[Ρω]μαίων ἐξη ὑπὸ κ.τ.λ. .
8. The letters following οὐ might be read as τοῦ.
274. 22. l. ἐπικαταθάλας for ἐπικατακολούθεν (Wessely).
24–5. [ἐμθανεῖ]σεως (Wessely) is possible.
286. 19. l. ἀποδώσεων (i.e. ἀποδώσεων) for ἀποδώσεων (Wilam.).
287. 7. l. πάντα for πάντων (a).
289. 3. The abbreviation beginning with σ which recurs in this papyrus is probably σὸν(μ)πα(ρ); cf. 574.
298. 42. ἄ is a misprint for ὑ.

Fayûm Towns and their Papyri.

2. iii. 16. δ ἐλευ [τρ]αία for σε [. . . μ]α[.] [. . . ] α (Weil) is possible.
23. ἵστρῳ for [. . . ] τὸ (Weil) is possible.
32. l. ἀγγέλου for ἀγγῆν (Weil).
8. 10. [ἐ] is a misprint for [ἐρ].
10. This fragment has been identified by Plasberg and Ferrini as coming from Ulpian, Lib. xiv. (Dig. xxix. 1. 1). 3. l. proferri for professi. 6. l. er'ga for es.se. 10. l. milites festamenta. 11. I. facti'nt for enpast.
11. 22. l. τὸ[ν] καλὸν ἀγὼν (Wilcken).
20. introd. p. 117. 5. ψαρον (de Ricci) for ἁσος is possible. The edict is assigned by Dessau to Julian instead of Severus Alexander.
6. ει τι (Wilamowitz) can be read in place of επι.
8. εἰ before καὶ ταῦτα is corrected by Wilamowitz to εἰ.
15. εὔ ἀπαντῶν κρατεῖν | χρημάτων (Wilamowitz) is better than our εὔ ἀπαντῶν | χρηματικοῖς.

23. introd. I. Ταμαύκω(ς) for Ταμαν(ωδ) (Smyly); cf. the modern Tamiya.
23(a). 5–6. l. Καβασείτων . . . Μητρι(του).
27. 32. l. γραμμ(ι)κο(ν) for γραμμ(ι)κο(ν) (Wessely).
42(a). 15. l. γραμμ(ι)κο(ν) for γραμμ(ι)κο(ν); cf. P. Tebt. I. p. 28.
46. 3. l. περὶ for . . . γ(.).
48. 3. l. πρώγον(ος) 'steeplings' (Wilcken).
50. 5. l. δρóμου(ν) for Δώμου(αυτος) (Wilcken).
67–76. l. τετελ(εχθη) for τετελ(εχθαι) (Wilcken).
73. 1. l. ἀντεσαμβολὴ(ν) Παυλίσι τετελ(ο)ντίσμους (Wilcken). Similarly in 74. l. l. ἀντε- σαμβολ(ης).
96. I. A.D. 143 for A.D. 122.
110. I. l. Βελλύθου (Wilamowitz).
15. l. ποιουσω(ν) for λογισμο(ν) (Wilamowitz).
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112. 4. l. διομολογεῖς; cf. P. Amh. II. 91. 11 note.
116. 3–4. l. φαίνεις for φαίνει (Wilamowitz).
138. I. κρινέται = κρινέτε (Wilamowitz).
244 is probably written across the fibres of the recto, not on the verso.
284 is dated in the 10th year of Antoninus (A.D. 146).

APPENDIX II

A revised text of Part III, no. 405 (Irenaeus, Contra Haereses, iii. 9).

The seven fragments of an early Christian work published as 405 were identified by Dr. J. Armitage Robinson as belonging to the lost Greek original of Irenaeus' treatise Contra Haereses, which is extant only in a Latin translation, and when fitted together correspond to part of iii. 9. A provisional reconstruction was given by him in Athenæum, Oct. 24, 1903; cf. our note, ibid., Nov. 7, and that of Dr. Rendel Harris, ibid., Nov. 14. We now print a revised text of the whole. The chief interest of the discovery lies in the resulting correspondence between the readings of Irenaeus' quotation from Matt. iii. 16–7 in ll. 23–9 and those of the Codex Bezae. The Latin translation there has the ordinary reading Hic est (filius meus), whereas the original agrees with D in having (I. 28) sū e[ι] in place of o[ῦ]ν e[ι]ν, and a variant peculiar to D (ὡς for ὡς before περιστέρα) occurs in I. 25 (Lat. quasi). 'These two unsuspected coincidences between Irenaeus and D, of which the one is misrepresented, the other inevitably obscured by the Latin translator, indicate that the extent of the agreement between Irenaeus' quotations and the text of the Codex Bezae is even larger than what the imperfect evidence of the Latin translation has led critics to suppose' (Athen., Nov. 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i</th>
<th>Col. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. . .] . [·] . [·] . [·] . [·] . [·] . . . . . . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>[. . .] . λιβαρ[ον] δε οτι θυ ο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[στου] σου [ωμοσεν κι τω] Α[αυ]</td>
<td>[και γνιωστοσ [εν τη Ιουδαια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ειδ α]ληθειαν κα[ι] ουν μη αθε</td>
<td>20 [γενιομενος και εμφανης τοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[τη]π[σε] [α]πον εκ [καρ]πον της</td>
<td>μη έτουσιν [αυτον και επι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 καλιας σου θεσ[ομε][ει το]</td>
<td>του βαπτισμου φησι Μαθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[νου σου κα]πι[αλιν]. γνωστος</td>
<td>&gt; οσ. ανει[χθησαν οι ουρανοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[εν τη Ιουδαια ο θυ και εγενη]</td>
<td>&gt; και ειδεν το[ν πνα του θυ κατα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[θη εν ειρηνη το]πος αυτυ</td>
<td>25 &gt; βαινον ως π[εριστεραν και</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

List of Oxyrhynchus and Fayûm Papyri distributed.

We give here a list of the papyri published in Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Parts I–III, and Fayûm Towns and their Papyri, which have been presented to different museums and libraries. Those papyri which do not appear have for various reasons not yet been distributed and are still at Queen’s College, Oxford. Where ascertainable, we have added the present reference numbers in the catalogues of the several institutions to which the papyri now belong. The following abbreviations are employed:

Am. = America. The papyri under this heading have only recently been sent to America, and details of the distribution are not yet forthcoming.

B. M. = British Museum. The numbers refer to the catalogue of papyri.

Belfast = Belfast Museum.

Bod. = Bodleian Library, Oxford. The references are to the hand-list of MSS.

Bolton = Chadwick Museum, Bolton, Lancs.

Bradfield = Library of Bradfield College, Berks.

Bristol = Bristol Museum.
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10 [en Σίων εἰς οὐ] και ο ου [και ου των] προφητήριον αυτον
[και ου του] προφήτηριον και ου του
[ευαγγελίου.] παρθενον [και ου]
[νος και ο ου εκ] παρθενον [ου]

15 [. . . . . . .] ου και το [ας]
[τριων Ησαΐας μεν ου] προφητευον

> ερχόμενον εἰς αυτον και
> ιδου φωιην εκ των ουρανων
> λεγουσα αυ ου εις μου ο αγα
> πητος [ε]ς ου [ευδοκησα ου]

30 γαι τοτε ο χσ [κατεβη εις]
τον Ίρα αιλλος μεν ο χσ
αλλος δε ις αλλα ο λογος του
θυ ο σωτηρ παντων και κν

ριουσυ ουρανου και γης

13. επαγγελλόμενος would be expected (annuntiatus Lat.), but the letter before αγγ is more like ι or γ than π.

14-5. The Latin has et huius filius qui ex fructu ventris David, id est ex David virgine et Emmanuel, cuius et stellam &c. The papyrus version is much shorter.


31. The Latin has in Iesum, neque alius quidem Christus. The supposed υ of Ιρα is more like η, but it is impossible to read Ιρα, and for the omission of η in the earliest contractions of Ιραυς cf. e.g. 1.
Brussels = Musées Royaux, Brussels, Belgium.
Cairo = Museum of Antiquities, Cairo. The numbers are those of the inventory; cf. our
Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the Cairo Museum.
Camb. = Cambridge University Library. The numbers refer to the 'Additions.'
Chicago = Haskell Museum, University of Chicago, U.S.A. The papyri are all numbered
'Accession 33.'
Clifton = Library of Clifton College, Bristol.
Columbia = Library of Columbia University, New York, U.S.A.
Dublin = Library of Trinity College, Dublin.
Dundee = Library of University College, Dundee.
Edinburgh = Library of Edinburgh University.
Eton = Library of Eton College, Windsor.
Glasgow = Library of Glasgow University.
Graz = Library of Graz University, Austria.
Haileybury = Library of Haileybury College, Hertford.
Hamilton = Hamilton College, U.S.A.
Harrow = Library of Harrow School.
Harvard = Semitic Museum of Harvard University, Mass., U.S.A.
Holloway = Library of Holloway College, Egham.
Johns Hopkins = Library of Johns Hopkins University, Maryland, U.S.A.
Liverpool = Liverpool Free Public Museum.
Melbourne = Library of Melbourne University, Victoria.
Owen's Coll. = Museum of Owen's College, Manchester.
Pennsyl. = Museum of Science and Art, University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
Princeton = Library of Princeton University, N.J., U.S.A.
Repton = Library of Repton School, Burton-on-Trent.
Rugby = Library of Rugby School.
Smiths. = Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
St. Andrews = Library of St. Andrews University.
Toronto = Toronto University, Canada.
Vassar = Library of Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, U.S.A.
Vict. = Museum of Victoria University, Toronto, Canada.
Winchester = Library of Winchester College.
Yale = Library of Yale University, U.S.A.

### Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. 7</td>
<td>2746.</td>
<td>9027.</td>
<td>4028.</td>
<td>739.</td>
<td>2211.</td>
<td>132.</td>
<td>132.</td>
<td>0132.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>192.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Bod. Gr. th. e. 7 (P).
2. Pennsyl. 2746.
3. Chicago.
5. Bod. Gr. th. f. 9 (P).
7. B. M. 739.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>B. M. 747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>B. M. 748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>B. M. 749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pennsyl. 2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Harvard 2212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>B. M. 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Harrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Dublin Pap. E. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Dublin Pap. F. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>B. M. 751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>(3 copies) Camb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4933-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Camb. 4036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>B. M. 752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>B. M. 753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Dublin Pap. D. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Camb. 4037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. 61 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Cairo 10007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Princeton 0132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>692. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Pennsyl. 2751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Camb. 4038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>(2 copies). B. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Owen's Coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vassar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>B. M. 755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72(a)</td>
<td>Chicago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Owen's Coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Camb. 4039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Dublin Pap. D. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>B. M. 756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>B. M. 757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>B. M. 758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83(a)</td>
<td>Repton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>B. M. 759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>B. M. 760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Camb. 4040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Pennsyl. 2752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Cairo 10008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>B. M. 761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Holloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Harvard 2213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>B. M. 762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>B. M. 763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Holloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Camb. 4041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>B. M. 764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>B. M. 765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Cairo 10006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Pennsyl. 2753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Harvard 2214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Eton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Cairo 10011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Eton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Clifton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Camb. 4043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. 66 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Haileybury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>B. M. 768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Cairo 10014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Cairo 10062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Cairo 10085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Cairo 10084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Cairo 10121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Cairo 10082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Cairo 10072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Cairo 10043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Cairo 10133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Cairo 10056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Cairo 10053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Cairo 10018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Cairo 10103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Cairo 10034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Cairo 10100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Cairo 10049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Cairo 10057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Cairo 10096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>B. M. 769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>B. M. 770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Cairo 10071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Cairo 10066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Cairo 10076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Cairo 10074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Cairo 10075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Cairo 10045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Cairo 10051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Cairo 10004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Cairo 10048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Cairo 10044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Cairo 10102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Cairo 10030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Cairo 10035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Cairo 10042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Cairo 10033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159-63</td>
<td>Chicago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>B. M. 771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Camb. 4044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 47 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. 67 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Pennsyl. 2754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Vassar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Harvard 2215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Camb. 4045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Melbourne Pap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. 62 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>B. M. 772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Harvard 2216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Pennsyl. 2755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. 68 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Dublin Pap. D. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Dublin Pap. E. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. 69 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Melbourne Pap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. 63 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>B. M. 773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Camb. 4046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>B. M. 774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Pennsyl. 2756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>B. M. 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>B. M. 776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>B. M. 777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>B. M. 778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Harvard 2217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>B. M. 779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Camb. 4047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>B. M. 780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>B. M. 781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>B. M. 782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Harvard 2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Camb. 4048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>B. M. 1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>B. M. 1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>B. M. 1182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Camb. 4049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>B. M. 1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220-1</td>
<td>B. M. 1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>B. M. 1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. 8 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>B. M. 783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>B. M. 784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>B. M. 785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Bod. Gr. class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. 64 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>B. M. 786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Camb. 4050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>B. M. 787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Pennsyl. 2757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Camb. 4051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
236. B. M. 788.
237. Bod. Gr. class.
a. 8 (P).
239. Pennsyl. 2758.
240. B. M. 789.
242. 692. 241.
243. 281.
244. B. M. 790.
245. B. M. 791.
246. Pennsyl. 2759.
247. Camb. 4052.
248. Glasow.
249. Camb. 4053.
250. Yale.
251. 280.
252. Liverpool.
253. Graz.
254-7. Am.
255. Brussels.
256. Am.
257. Dublin Pap. D.
3.
258. B. M. 792.
259. 286.
261. Vict.
262. B. M. 1187.
263. 273.
264. Am.
265. Pennsyl. 2760.
266. B. M. 793.
267. Am.
268. Camb. 4055.
269. 267.
270. Bod. Gr. class.
d. 65 (P).
271. Bod. Gr. class.
e. 78 (P).
272. Columbia.
273. 268.
274. Columbia.
275. Am.
276. 286.
277. B. M. 1188.
278. B. M. 795.
279. Camb. 4056.
281. 325.
282. Yale.
283. Bristol.
284. Harvard 2219.
285. B. M. 796.
286. B. M. 797.
287. Am.
288. B. M. 798.
289. B. M. 799.
290. Pennsyl. 2761.
291. B. M. 800.
292. Camb. 4057.
293-5. Am.
295. 287.
296. Bradfield.
297-8. Am.
298. B. M. 801.
299. Bod. Gr. class.
g. 47 (P).
300. Bod. Gr. class.
g. 48 (P).
301. Camb. 4058.
302. Bod. Gr. class.
c. 48 (P).
303. Cairo 10003.
304. Cairo 10012.
306. Dublin Pap. 309.
308. Glasow.
310. Owen's Coll.
311. Camb. 4059.
312. Harvard 2220.
313. Bod. Gr. class.
d. 65 (P).
314. Bod. Gr. class.
e. 78 (P).
315. Columbia.
316. 273.
317. B. M. 802.
318. Johns Hopkins.
319. Princeton 0132.
320. 692. 320.
321. Bod. Gr. class.
d. 66 (P).
322. Bod. Gr. class.
c. 49 (P).
323. Pennsyl. 2762.
324. Bod. Gr. class.
e. 80 (P).
325. Bod. Gr. class.
d. 67 (P).
326. Bod. Gr. class.
e. 79 (P).
327. Pennsyl. 2763.
328. Harvard 2221.
329. Yale.
331. Johns Hopkins.
332. Princeton 0132.
333. Princeton 0132.
335. Camb. 4060.
337. Edinburgh.
338. Glasgow.
339. B. M. 803.
341. Owen's Coll.
342. Camb. 4061.
344. Pennsyl. 2764.
345. Columbia.
346. Melbourne Pap. 4.
347. Camb. 4062.
348. Pennsyl. 2765.
349. Pennsyl. 2766.
350. Camb. 4063.
351. Yale.
352. Columbia.
353. Johns Hopkins.
354. B. M. 804.
357. Princeton 0132.
358. 692. 357.
359. Columbia.
360. 287.
361. Bod. Gr. class.
e. 81 (P).
362. Harvard 2222.
363. Camb. 4065.
367. B. M. 805.
368. Pap.
369. Hamilton.
370. B. M. 806.
372. Vict.
373. Bod. Gr. class.
f. 70 (P).
374. B. M. 807.
375. Camb. 4066.
376. Edinburgh.
377. B. M. 808.
378. B. M. 809.
379. Bod. Gr. class.
e. 83 (P).
380. Camb. 4067.
381. B. M. 810.
382. B. M. 811.
383. Camb. 4068.
384. B. M. 812.
386. Bod. Gr. class.
f. 71 (P).
387. Bod. Gr. class.
e. 84 (P).
389. Bod. Gr. class.
e. 85 (P).
390. Bod. Gr. class.
d. 68 (P).
391. B. M. 813.
392. Am.
393. Yale.
394. Camb. 4069.
395. Am.
396. B. M. 814.
397. Bod. Gr. class.
d. 69 (P).
398. Bod. Gr. class.
c. 50 (P).
399. Columbia.
400. Bod. Gr. class.
d. 70 (P).
401-2. Am.
402. B. M. 1189.
444. B. M. 1190.
446-8. Am.
449. Brussels.
450. Graz.
452-3. Am.
453. Bod. Gr. class.
c. 54 (P).
455-6. Am.
457. Vict.
458-62. Am.
APPENDIX III

463. Bod. Gr. class. Am.


d. 73 (P).


Fayum Papyri.

1. Camb. 4070.
2. B. M. 1192. 5 (P).
3. B. M. 815.
4. B. M. 816.
5. Dr. W. C. Winslow.
6. Cairo 10764.
7. B. M. 817.
8. Toronto.
9. Am.
10. Bod. Lat. class.g. 5 (P).
11. Cairo 10765.
12. B. M. 818.
15. Graz.
16. B. M. 819.
17. Bod. Gr. class. c. 52 (P).
18. B. M. 1193.
19 (a). B. M. 1194.
18 (b). Brussels.
21. Cairo 10766.
22–3. Am.
23 (a). Bod. Gr. class. c. 53 (P).
24. Cairo 10869.
25. Yale.
27. Brussels.
28. Vassar.
29. Pennsyl. 2767.
30–1. Toronto.
32. Princeton 0132.
340. 32.
33. Johns Hopkins.
34. Cairo 10768.
35. Cairo 10769.
36. Cairo 10770.
37. Cairo 10235.
38. B. M. 820.
39. Cairo 1071.
40. Brussels.
41. Smiths. 217853.
42. Columbia.
43 (b). B. M. 1195.
45. B. M. 821.
44. B. M. 822.
45. B. M. 823.
40. Owen’s Coll.
47. Cairo 10732.
47 (a). Cairo 10773.
48. Cairo 10774.
49. Cairo 10775.
50. Cairo 10776.
51. Cairo 10777.
52. Cairo 10778.
52 (a). Cairo 10779.
53. Am.
54. Cairo 10780.
55. Vict.
56. Cairo 10781.
57. Cairo 10225.
58–60. Am.
61. Cairo 10782.
62. Cairo 10221.
63–5. Am.
64. Cairo 10231.
67. Vict.
68. B. M. 824 (a).
69. Cairo 10239.
70. Cairo 10240.
71. Pennsyl. 2768.
72. Graz.
73. Cairo 10236.
74. Cairo 10237.
75. Johns Hopkins.
76. Princeton 0132.
76 (a). B. M. 824 (b).
77. Am.
78. Smiths. 217856.
79. Cairo 10241.
80–1. Am.
82. Cairo 10783.
83. Cairo 10784.
84. Cairo 1024.
85. Cairo 10785.
86, 86 (a). Am.
87. B. M. 825.
88. Pennsyl. 2769.
89. B. M. 826.
90. Cairo 10786.
91. Cairo 10787.
92. Harvard 2223.
93. Brussels.
94. Am.
95. Cairo 10788.
96. Cairo 10789.
97. Cairo 10790.
98. Cairo 10791.
99. Cairo 10792.
100. Cairo 10793.
101. Smiths. 217851.
102. Cairo 10794.
103. Am.
104. Cairo 10795.
105. B. M. 1196.
106. Am.
107. Cairo 10796.
108. Cairo 10797.
109. Cairo 10798.
110. Am.
111. Vict.
112. Smiths. 217852.
113. Am.
114. Cairo 10799.
115. Am.
116. Graz.
117. Am.
118. Bristol.
121. Cairo 10800.
122. Cairo 10801.
123. Cairo 10802.
124. Cairo 10803.
125. Cairo 10804.
126. Cairo 10805.
127. Cairo 10243.
128. Cairo 10806.
129. Cairo 10807.
130. Cairo 10808.
131. Cairo 10809.
132. Rugby.
133. Cairo 10795.
134. Cairo 10810.
135. Columbia.
136. Cairo 10811.
137–8. Am.
139. Cairo 10812.
140. B. M.
141. Cairo 10217.
142. Cairo 10247.
143. Cairo 10242.
144. Cairo 10219.
145. Am.
146. Bolton.
147–50. Am.
151. B. M. 827.
152. Cairo 10220.
153. Graz.
154. Am.
155. Vict.
156. Am.
160. Cairo 10218.
161. Cairo 10234.
162. Cairo 10232.
163. Cairo 10233.
164. Columbia.
165. Johns Hopkins.
166. Princeton 0132.
340. 166.
167. B. M. 828 (a).
168. Harvard 2225.
169. B. M. 828 (b).
170. Toronto.
171. Glasgow.
172. B. M. 828 (c).
173. B. M. 828 (d).
174. Pennsyl. 2770.
175. Edinburgh.
176. Vassar.
177. Camb. 4071.
178. Camb. 4072.
179. B. M. 828 (e).
180. Yale.
181. B. M. 828 (f).
182. Owen's Coll.
183. Hamilton.
184. B. M. 828 (g).
185. B. M. 828 (h).
186. Melbourne Pap.
6.
187. B. M. 828 (i).
188. B. M. 828 (j).
189. St. Andrews.
190–5. Am.
196. Pennsyl. 2771.
197. Harvard 2226.
198. Cairo 10230.
199. Cairo 10227.
200. Cairo 10228.
201. Cairo 10245.
202. Cairo 10246.
203. Cairo 10226.
204. Cairo 10244.
205. Cairo 10222.
206. Cairo 10223.
207. Cairo 10229.
208. Brussels.
209. Cairo 10813.
210. Cairo 10814.
211. Yale.
212. Cairo 10815.
213. Cairo 10816.
214. Columbia.
215. Cairo 10817.
216. Princeton 0132.
340. 216.
220. Cairo 10818.
221. Cairo 10819.
222. Am.
223. Cairo 10820.
224. Cairo 10821.
225. Am.
226. Smiths. 217859.
227. Am.
228. Brussels.
229. Graz.
230. Am.
231. Cairo 10822.
232. B. M. 829.
234. B. M. 831.
235. B. M. 832.
236. B. M. 833.
237. Cairo 10823.
238. Cairo 10824.
239. Am.
240. Cairo 10825.
241. Am.
242. Cairo 10826.
243. Am.
244. Cairo 10827.
248. Liverpool.
249. Brussels.
250–1. Am.
252. Vict.
253. Am.
254. B. M. 1197.
259. B. M. 1198.
260. Graz.
261. Am.
262. Brussels.
263. Am.
264. Graz.
265. Am.
266. Vict.
269. Brussels.
270. Graz.
278. Cairo 10828.
279. Cairo 10829.
280. Cairo 10830.
281. Cairo 10831.
282. Cairo 10832.
283. Cairo 10833.
284. Cairo 10834.
285. B. M. 1199.
286. Cairo 10835.
287. Cairo 10836.
288. Cairo 10837.
289. Cairo 10838.
290. Cairo 10839.
294. Cairo 10840.
295. Smiths. 217855.
296. Am.
297. Brussels.
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INDICES

I. NEW LITERARY FRAGMENTS.

(a) Greek.

Excluding 658 and 669, which are classed with the non-literary documents.
INDICES

8, 20, 28; 659. 15; 660. 2, 9; 663. 24; 664. 5, 41, 44, 92; 666. 112, 117, 170; 667. 19, 23; 670. 11; 674. 3 (?); 678. 2; 684. 2, 11, 13, 17, 19.

ei 663. 20, 23, 30, 31; 664. 40; 666. 163; 672. 9; 678. 18, 41; 680. 9; 683. 6. ei 659. 51; 662.

29.

ei 655. 11; 662. 30; 664. 2. εισαγγελία 662. 8.

εισέρχεσθαι 655. 44, 45.

είτε 667. 3. 4, 5, 7.

εί 661. 28; 662. 24, 26, 36; 676. 12; 677. 2.

είκαστο 682. 4.

είκάτερος 663. 35.

είκοσι 663. 22.

εἷναν 661. 20; 664. 77.

έλεύθερος 662. 39.

'Ελεύθερος 663. 21, 38.

'Ελευθερος 654. 10.

'Ελληνικά 679. 1.

'Εμών 659. 80; 661. 21; 671. 17.

'Εμπροσθεν 654. 27.

'Εμφανισίς 655. 19.

'Εμφασις 663. 47.

είν 665. 11; 659. 27, 58, 61; 663. 45; 664. 9, 29, 44, 497; 665. 1; 667. 2, 4, 15, 28; 675. 16; 679. 2; 680. 10; 682. 3, 12; 683. 12.

'Εναρμόσεις 667. 1.

'Ενδείκτικα 655. 6.

'Ενδύματα 655. 11, 16.

'Ενεκεν 659. 66.

'Ενεργότερος 684. 5.

'Ενών 659. 65.

'Ενώπιον 684. 16.

'Ενώπιον 684. 8.

είτε 684. 16.

εί 661. 26.

είκόσι 663. 22.

είκοσί 667. 14.

εἰσέρχεσθαι 680. 4.

εἰστάζων 654. 32.

εἴδω 667. 5.

εἴσπερα 664. 131 (?).

εἴσωμα 666. 159; 664. 18.

εἰσί 664. 91.

εἰσέβαλε 663. 47.

εἰσαρχευον 663. 22; 664. 15.

εἰσακεφαλής 659. 75.

εἰσείδη 664. 2.

εἰσείμα 659. 65; 667. 2.

εἰσλάτραι 663. 18.

εἰσπράττων 654. 23.

εἰσπέρασα 659. 71.

εἴπε 655. 14; 659. 8, 12, 57; 661. 20; 663. 35; 665. 12; 667. 20, 22.

εἰσδοξείαν 664. 4.

εἰσδοξαί 664. 25.

εἰσκατέχει 663. 39.

εἰστιν 679. 6.

εἰσώγοναί 659. 25.

εἰσκατέστερον 683. 11.

εἰσαρχευον 659. 38.

εἰστράτευον 680. 13.

εἰσπράττον 664. 42.

εἰσοδέει 659. 44.

εἰσότερος 663. 30.

εἰσότεροι 659. 64.

εἰσβάλλει 661. 21.

εἴρηκα 661. 32.

εἴρηκας 659. 14.

εἴρηκας 659. 57; 673. 7.

εἴρηκας 659. 58; 673. 7.

εἴρηκας 659. 42.

εἴρηκας 659. 19.

εἴρηκας 659. 15.

εἴρηκας 670. 19, 24.

εἴρηκας 661. 24.

εἴρηκας 679. 8.

εἴρηκας 664. 14; 661. 28.

εἴρηκας 654. 14.

εἴρηκας 659. 31.

εἴρηκας 659. 48.

εἴρηκας 654. 7.

εἴρηκας 654. 31.

εἴρηκας 673. 9.

εἴρηκας 663. 7.

εἴρηκας 659. 3.
I. NEW LITERARY FRAGMENTS

κάρα 659. 10, 32.
cató 663. 16; 664. 101.
catagýnov 661. 27 (?).
cataleýntes 664. 15, 37; 41.
cataleýmènes 664. 6.
catárrhos 661. 5.
catáktasias 664. 24.
catékteis 675. 3.
κάτω 659. 36.
ké Parade 659. 8; 667. 3.
képíados 675. 12.
kélèseis 664. 14, 129; 678. 1.
képtov 676. 10.
κεραία (or ákrh;?) 655. 49.
κεράτη 662. 49.
κέρατο 683. 18.
Κλίκλει 680. 1.
Κλείδα 679. 2.
κλέπτη 671. 6 (?).
κλέπτη 671. 17.
κλοπή 659. 58.
kípast 660. 6.
κοινό 667. 22.
κοινοφά 667. 12.
κοινωνία 684. 21.
κοιμίζε 664. 98; 683. 19.
κόμμα 659. 33.
κούρσασα 680. 5.
koumpé 659. 60.
kómos 655. 26.
kótores 662. 54; 671. 18.
Κραστό 665. 13, 15.
κρατέω 664. 113; 681. 5.
Κρατύνω 683. 28.
κρισίασταν 655. 7.
κρή 659. 80.
κρίνει 659. 7; 683. 19.
κρίνο 655. 8.
κρόα 683. 31.
Κρόνια 659. 12.
κρυπτέω 655. 43; 659. 10; 663. 31.
κρυπτό 654. 30.
κτήμα 684. 118.
kúma 664. 14 (?).
kúmai 684. 16.
kúmgías 662. 43 (?).
kúmgía 664. 27.
Κύπρος 680. 10.

κύρίος 654. 2 (?); 833. 1.
Κύψελος 664. 111.
kýnov 666. 52 (?).
kíllèes 663. 61.
kímpaideú 663. 44.
Λακεδαímon 662. 33; 663. 21.
λαλέω 654. 1; 677. 6.
λομβάρνς 664. 1, 113, 116; 679. 9.
λαυðánó 659. 49.
λέγει 654. 3 et saep.; 655. 17, 21; 659. 47; 661. 22; 662. 24; 664. 103, 110; 666. 109; 667. 25; 671. 1.
λείπει 662. 31; 670. 3.
λεω̊νδη 662. 41, 55.
λέγων 661. 18.
λιπολέκτος 659. 16.
λόγο 654. 1, 4.
λογέρα 662. 39.
λογίω 659. 23.
λοιπόν 670. 6.
λυπέω 677. 3.
λυστελεύ 664. 93.
λώτιος 659. 34.
μαθητή 655. 18.
μακάριος 654. 40.
μάλα 663. 46; 664. 19, 43; 684. 13, μάλλα 664. 94; 684. 6. μάλλα 660. 4; 684. 12.
μαλακάς 659. 27.
μαλακός 659. 40 (ταράτσειν Ραπ.).
μανάβαν 666. 163.
μάνις 659. 5.
μαρτυρέω 664. 104.
μαρτύραι 660. 16.
μάρτυς 659. 51.
μάχαμα 666. 156.
μάχη 665. 8, 17.
μεγαλοφυία 664. 25.
μέγα 664. 108, 116; 680. 3; 684. 17.
μετά 664. 18.
μέλα 659. 10. Μέλαι p. 261.
μέλλει 660. 9 (?); 663. 33.
INDICES

676. 13.
682. 2, 11.
673. 5.
662. 25.
677. 7.
664. 100.
662. 42, 46.
669. 54, 70, 80; 662. 35; 671. 12; 681. 13. νεῦ 664. 106.
660. 15.
632. 26; 665. 2, 6, 9, 19.
659. 58.
662. 45, 46 (?).
677. 1.
669. 72.
664. 101.
664. 13.
665. 19.
665. 17; 664. 40.
663. 38.
660. 3.
659. 82.
662. 37.
663. 37.
667. 24.
663. 24; 664. 119.
667. 4.
673. 5 (?).
659. 14.
662. 162.
662. 56 (?); 675. 6.
665. 1.
662. 54.
662. 26.
683. 3.
684. 19.
659. 37.
667. 29.
662. 37; 664. 32; 670. 21 (?).
659. 27.
664. 37.
654. 30; 31; 659. 36.
666. 165; 676. 13; 678. 5 (?).
664. 89.
654. 12; 655. 9; 659. 16.
674. 7; 655. 22; 686. 54, 113.
654. 25; 684. 3; 671. 8.
665. 10.
684. 25; 684. 15.
664. 96.
664. 5.
664. 16, 33, 102, 120.
659. 19, 20.
654. 11, 12.
665. 48; 664. 93, 95.
665. 4; 660. 8, 662.
44, 50; 663. 6, 19, 20, 38; 664. 92, 110, 117;
666. 62, 157; 667. 22, 23; 670. 26; 682. 10.
664. 106.
684. 15. οὐτω 664. 91.
659. 28.
664. 28; 664. 20; 684. 10.
659. 30.
675. 1, 12.
664. 6.
681. 14.
665. 70; 662. 31; 664. 16; 666. 156; 670. 26; 671. 22.
670. 21.
659. 54; 676. 17; 684. 18 (?).
661. 9, 13.
659. 07.
659. 17.
662. 42, 46, 50.
665. 28.
670. 7.
664. 108.
664. 33.
665. 81; 663. 14, 15; 664. 34.
663. 12, 33; 664. 106.
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στρατόπεδον 679. 12.
σύ 654. 28, 29; 655. 21;
659. 71 (τίν); 661. 23
(τίν); 664. 104; 671. 22,
676. 9; 678. 4.
συγγείτων 662. 43.
συγγένεια 664. 115.
συγγενής 664. 40.
συμβαίνειν 666. 110; 667.
II.
συμφορά 664. 108.
σίν 660. 10.
συνακολουθεῖν 663. 41.
συναφή 667. 3, 11.
συνδιαστίζειν 664. 45.
σύνεντες 668. 28.
Συρακάσσαι 665. 4, 5, 8, 21.
σύστημα 667. 13, 26, 30.
σφάλλειν 659. 17.
σφάλος 676. 16.
σχεδόν 669. 73.
σχήμα 667. 23.
σῶμα 665. 15.
σώφρων 659. 66.

τάλαρος 663. 30.
τατεινών 664. 22.
τοράσσειν 665. 40 (I. μαλά-
σευν?); 684. 8.
Ταρτάρος 670. 5.
τάσσειν 669. 13.
τάφος 662. 28; 672. 7.
tēleí 659. 5.
tēleútop p. 261.
tές 670. 14. 18.
tέρπειν 674. 6.
tεχνή 670. 11 (?).
tηλικόδο 684. 23.
tεῖν 659. 92.
tείναι 666. 15 (?); 680. 7;
682. 11.
tίκτειν 670. 10.
tίμαν 659. 53; 672. 4.
tίμη 659. 6; 684. 20.
tίς 663. 8; 664. 38, 128;
666. 59; 667. 15; 684. 4.
tίς 664. 35; 665. 4, 6, 12,
13; 662. 24, 28; 664.
99, 110; 670. 1; 671. 1;
677. 6; 684. 8, 9, 10.

Τιμάρες p. 261.
toίνυν 664. 92.
tοῖος 654. 1.
tωάδα 664. 22.
tωπότος 664. 11.
tοκετός 662. 27.
tολμ[664. 64.
tοπαίος 667. 20.
tόπος 651. 24; 667. 15.
tραγύνειν 664. 38.
tρεῖθ 667. 12, 25.
tρέψειν 664. 34.
tρέχει 667. 2.
Τριφόλιον 651. 10.
τρίήτες 662. 31.
tρίς 663. 30.
tρισάσθη 662. 36.
tρυπτεῖν 660. 10.
τρυπτόθαλος 679. 3.
τρόπος 664. 20; 677. 5;
684. 5.
tυγχάνειν 661. 17; 664. 35;
666. 113; 677. 3; p. 261.
tυπαρένειν 664. 7.
tυραννεῖν 663. 14; 664. 4.

υίός 659. 30; 660. 9; 664.
120; 670. 10; 671. 2.
ιτατς 654. 15 et saec.; 655.
4 et saec.; 682. 4.
ιτάτος 659. 31.
ίππος 675. 9 (?).
ιππάρχειν 663. 18.
ιππάτος 687. 16.
ιππέρ 664. 127.
ιππεριβάλλειν 664. 26.
ιππερπαγώς 667. 7.
ιππερπολαιαν 667. 18.
ιππερίτις 679. 18.

ὑπό 654. 13; 659. 9, 34;
662. 22 25, 35; 664. 42,
94; 665. 20; 670. 24;
679. 3; 680. 14.
ὑπολαμβάνειν 664. 81, 102.
ὑπομένειν 663. 32.
ὑποστήριξειν 680. 12.
ὑστερόν 679. 4 (?).

φαινεσθαι 667. 9.

φάναι 664. 92, 97, 103, 110;
670. 8; 683. 4.
φανερός 654. 30.
φάσκειν 663. 44.
φάνη 666. 53 (?).
φάσεις 664. 96; 666. 158.
φέρειν 677. 8 (?).
φέργειν 663. 25; 664. 118;
666. 64.
φθάνοι 659. 8.
φθάνοις 661. 15.
φθαίνων 659. 11. 69.
φθάσμον 664. 17, 42.
φιλοταύρη 662. 35.
φίλος 664. 11; 670. 6, 15.
φιλτρός 664. 99. φιλτρατος
664. 98.
φιλοσοφίαν 666. 169.
φιλοσοφία 666. 166.
φιλοστέφανος 675. 1.
φράγμα 662. 24; 664. 111.
φράσας 669. 38; 662. 34.
φροκες 659. 46.
φρόνησις 666. 161.
φύσε 664. 101.
φωμος 663. 34.
φωτείνος 665. 25.

χαίλη 659. 60.
χαλασάνειν 664. 78 (?).
χαλυβ. 682. 52.
χάρις 659. 24.
χαριθμοί 662. 53.
χειμάρων 659. 37.
χήρ 659. 27; 682. 33.
χελώνες 663. 12.
χίλια 669. 65.
χίος 680. 4.
χορηγεῖν 666. 93.
χορηγία 666. 113.
χορός 659. 51.
χρήμα 659. 49.
χρήσας 684. 19. 23.
χρόνος 659. 14; 664. 10,
70 (?).
χρυσ. 680. 22.
χρύσεις 671. 16.
χρύσατερος 659. 21.
χρυσαυγάκις 667. 1.
χώσεθαι 670. 16.


(a) Latin (669).

Aulus 76, 112, 193.
aurem 15.
auxiliari 90.
Bacchanalia 40.
Baebius, Cn. Baeb. 67. M.
Baeb. 74.
basilica 57.
bellum 68, 89.
benigne 90.
Bithynia 110.
Boi 55.
Bononia 7.
Brutus 203, 216.
caedere 1, 126, 171, 208.
Caepio, Cn. Caepio 170.
Q. Servilius Caep. 176, 182, 195.
Campani 17.
canere 62.
capere 12, 127.
Capitolium 189.
captiva 14.
caput 16, 112.
carcer 204.
carmen 105, 189.
Carthaginenses 22, 83, 90.
Carthago 132, 134.
Cato 56, 114.
censor 56.
Censorinus 88.
censura 8.
centurio 15.
certamen 42.
Chaldaei 192.
Charidemus 98.
cerca 51 (?), 169.
circumscirberi 39.
clades 175.
Claudius, Appius Claudius
(a) 48, (b) 177. M. Claud.
Marcellus 58. Ti. Claud.
Asellus 182. P. Claud.
Pulcher 50.
clavus (clava?) 196.
Cnaeus 2, 66, 137, 170, 191.
cogere 32, 73.
comitium 208.
commodum 206.
competitor 9.
compositum (l. propositum?) 9.
conferre 47.
coniurium. See connubium.
connubium 17.
consul passim.
consultare 153.
consultare 181.
contra 189.
cor 115.
Corinthus 142.
Corinthus 135, 145.
Cornelius, C. Corn. 84. Cn.
Corn. 137. L. Corn. Scipio
27, 45. P. Corn. Scipio
see Scipio.
Cotta 210.
Crassus 59.
creber 134.
cremen 72.
cruelissime 132.
cruentus 15.
cum (conjunction) 210.
cum (preposition) 77, 186.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d (= duo?) 51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare 3, 6, 17, 166.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de 33, 179.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decedere 119.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decimus 178, 200, 203, 216.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decius (?) 89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deditio 91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deducere 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deformis 185.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desertor 207.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desiderare 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devincere 164, 185.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devovere 188.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dextra 166.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dicere 114.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dies 25, 180.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dimicare 125.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodotus 213.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diripere 138.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribuere 120, 169.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditalco 197.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donum 165.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duo 141, 177.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edere 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esse 5, 63, 122.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et 18, 21, 37, 38, 82, 103, 169.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evincere 177.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ex 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercitus 96, 126.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exorti 89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expirare 207.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabius, Q. Fabius 4. Q. Fabius Maximus 149, 171, 185.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facere 104, 186.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fecenia 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferre 116.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fides 95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filius 100, 101, 120, 141, 179.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fingere 72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flamen 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminia via 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminius 52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminius 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminius 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminius 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminius 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminus 203.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminus 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminus 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminus 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminus 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminus 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminus 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaminus 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manilius, Cn. Manil. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus 44. M. Claudius Marcell. 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Censorinus 88, 103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus 58, 74, 81, 82, 111, 114, 115, 150, 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus 58, 74, 81, 82, 111, 114, 115, 150, 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus 58, 74, 81, 82, 111, 114, 115, 150, 215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus 3, 4, 120, 128.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus 149, 171, 185.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Metellus, L. Metell. 167. Q.
Metell. 127, 153 (?), 160.
millia (siglum) 51.
minari 8.
Minucius 21.
Minurus 197.
mitere 121.
multa 205.
Mummius 145, 168.
munire 31.
Myrtilus 21.

ne 26, 177.
neé 115.
neque 202.
Nobilior 82.
nobilis 14.
nomen 211.
non 133, 180, 220.
Numantini 174, 212.

obicere 196.
Obsidere 217.
occidere 16, 123 (?), 164.
Occius 186.
occupare 102.
omnis 91, 207.
oppidum 169.
Ortiagon 14.
Pamphylia 13.
pater 73.
pati 15.
pax 3, 6, 186.
pecunia 34.
pellere 94.
pensare (?) 16.
per 20, 30, 73, 98, 102, 107, 120, 138, 194.
perdomare 31.
Pergameni (?) 111.
persolvere 35.
persuadere 45.
pes 115.
petere 8, 79, 156.
Petillius, L. Petill. 75. Q.
Petill. 25.
Petronius 150.

Piso 191.
planus. See primus.
plebs 27, 78, 183, 204, 206.
podagricus 112.
Poenus 97.
Pompeius 170, 174.
pontifex 4.
Popilius 191.
populus 117, 205, 206.
Porcia basilica 57.
pocere. See pensare.
post 46.
Post. 36.
poetas 142.
potiri 214.
preada 20.
preator 4, 135.
prex 205.
primus 43.
primus 217.
pro 206.
producere 99.
proelium 13, 18, 134.
profectio 183.
proficia 5.
propositum 9 (?), 163.
prospere 125.
Publius 3, 59, 59, 74, 84, 200, 219.
Pulcher 50.
pupillus 37.
Punicus 89.

-que 16, 165, 180, 214.
qu 5, 22, 26, 35, 38, 100, 104, 119, 155, 164.
Quirinalis 5.
Quintus 52.
Quintus 4, 25, 81, 149, 160, 170, 171, 186.
quo 4, 53, 84, 122.
quantum 113.
quot 78.
redire 93.
referre 40.
regnum 119.
relinquere 119.
remittere 165.
res 216.
respondere 114, 181.
Rethogenes 161.
reus 99.
revocare 26.
rex 6, 110.
Roma 33, 169.
Romanus 1, 93, 133, 135.
Rutilius 38.

sacrarium 127.
sagulum 165.
Salassus. See Sapiens.
Salinator 19.
Sapiens 176.
Sardinia 5.
Scantinius 115.
Scipio, L. Cornelius Scipio 27, 45. P. Corn. Scipio
Africanus 25. P. Corn.
Scordisci 175.
scriba 75.
se 101.
secentu 118.
Sergius 152.
Sertorius Caepio 176, 182, 195.
Sibylla 189.
signum 168.
Silanus 178.
singuli 209.
socius 107, and see occidere.
spectaculum 54.
Spurio 36.
statua 168.
stolidus 113.
stuprare 85.
supremum 116.
subigere 42, 136.
subsellium 123.
suffragium 194.
Sullani 218.
| suus 53, 55, 179, 180, 184. | Syria 157, 214. |
| tabella 194. | tabernaculum 61. |
| tabula 168. | tertius 89. |
| Tiberius 182. | Syria 157, 214. |
| Theoxena 70. | tabella 194. |
| Thessalia 126. | tabernaculum 61. |
| tollere 41. | tertius 89. |
| Torquatus 178. | transferre 35. |
| transire 217. | veneficium 51. |
| tribunus 27, 78, 183; 204, 206. | venire (veneo) 209. |
| Tryphon 213. | venire (venio) 91. |
| tutor 38. | verna 193. |
| Tyreius 164. | vexare 167. |
| ultimus 108, 118. | Villius 78. |
| urbs 192. | vir 16. |
| Uticensis 89. | virga 208. |
| uxor 140, 146. | Virethus 172, 185, 198, 201. |
| vastare 13, 83, 157, 212. | virtus 96. |
| vates 62. | vis 15. |
| | votivus 46. |
| | Vulsio 113. |

II. KINGS AND EMP EmPORS.

Ἀρσενάς (Philadelphus?) 807.

Ptolemy Alexander I.

Πτολ. [ὁ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος θεὸς] Φιλομήτωρ καὶ Βερεύκη 802. om. Βερεύκη 824.

Augustus.

Καίσαρ 711. 3, 6; 721. 4 et ssp.; 731. 2, 4, 15; 742. 16; 743. 17, 44; 744. 15; 826.

Tiberius.

Τιβέριος Καίσαρ Σεβαστός 746. 12.

Claudius.

Θεός Κλαύδιος 713. 15; 808.

Domitian.

Ἀυτοκρ. Καίσ. Δομιτιανός Σεβαστός Ρωμανός 722. 2.

Nerva.

Ἀυτοκρ. Νέρωνας Καίσ. Σεβαστός 713. 41, 44.

Hadrian.

Ἀυτοκρ. Καίσ. Τραянός 'Αδριανός Σεβ. 714. 28, 32; 715. 27, 32; 728. 2; 729. 34, 38; 730. 32.

Ἀδριανός Καίσ. ὁ κύριος 707. 19, 33; 714. 19, 24; 715. 8, 20; 730. 6.

Antoninus Pius.

Ἀυτοκρ. Καίσ. Τίτος Αλίας Ἀδριανός Ἀντωνίνος Σεβ. Εὐσεβής 723. 1; 724. 14; 728. 25; 729. 45; 732. 6. om. Τίτος 727. 29.

Τίτος Αλίας Ἀδριανός Ἀντωνίνος Καίσ. ὁ κύριος 729. 39.

Ἀντωνίνος Καίσ. ὁ κύριος 712. 13; 724. 5; 728. 17, 41; 732. 3; 733. 1; 800.
Marcus Aurelius and Verus.

Aurélios 'Antonínos kai Oikés o'i kýroii Σεβ. 734. 1.

Commodus.

Αὐτόκρ. Καίσ. Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Κόρμοδος 'Αντωνίνος Εὐσεβῆς Εὐτυχῆς Σεβ. 'Αρμ. Μηθ. Παρθ. Σαρμ. Γερμ. Μέγιστος Βρετ. 716. 23.

Aυτοκρ. Καίσ. Μάρκος Αύρηλιος Κόρμοδος 'Αντωνίνος Σεβ. 'Αρμ. Μηθ. Παρθ. Σαρμ. Γερμ. Μέγιστος 725. 57.

Pescennius Niger.

Γαύος Πεσκένιος Νήγερ Ίοίστος Σεβ. 719. 5, 28. Cf. 801.

Septimius Severus and Caracalla.

Aυτοκρ. Καίσ. Λαύκιος Σεπτίμιος Σουήρος Εὐσεβῆς Περτίναξ Σεβ. 'Αραβ. 'Αδυηθήν. Παρθ. Μέγιστος καὶ Αὐτοκρ. Καίσ. Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος 'Αντωνίνος Εὐσεβῆς Σεβ. 705. 1, 54.
Αυτοκρ. Σουήρος καὶ 'Αντωνίνος 705. 15, 65.
οἱ κύριοι Σεβ. 735. 10.
Αυτοκράτορες 705. 19, 70.

Philippus.

Philippus Augustus ii et Philippus Caesar cos. 720. 6.

Decius.

Αὐτοκρ. Καίσ. Γαύος Μέσσιος Κύντος Τραίανος Δέκιος Εὐσεβ. Εὐτυχ. Σεβ. 658. 18.

III. MONTHS AND DAYS.

(a) Months.

Διστρος (Τύμβ.) 723. 1.
Iulius 737. 1.
Kαισάριος (Μεσορή) 715. 33; 722. 3; 789; 793.
Peránioς (Χοίακ) 808.

(b) Days.

ἐπαγόμεναι ἡμέραι, ε 715. 33, 37; ἐ 722. 3; 43.
Iudas 737. 5 et saep.
Kalάνδαι 747. 2.

Kalendae Sextiliae 737. 21.
Nonae Iuliae 737. 1.
Σεβαστή (Caesarius, 6th intercalary day) 722. 3.
IV. PERSONAL NAMES.

'Απολλών son of Ophelas 837.
'Απολλών daughter of Paësis 837.
'Αρος planet 804.
'Αρέθανις father of Thonis also called Morus 725. 63.
'Αριστίως 876.
'Αρσάλος son of Hermon 808.
'Αρφίλη 'Αμμωνίππου 720. 8. Aurelia Ammonianon 720. 2.
'Αρφίλη Δολις daughter of Aurelius L . . . . thion 658. 15.
'Αρφίλης Διόσκορος son of Aurelius L . . . . thion 658. 13.
'Αρφίλης Λ . . . . θίων son of Theodorus 658. 3.
'Αρφίλης Πλουτάρχου 720. 9, 13. Aurelius Plutammon 720. 4.
'Αρφίλης Ωρίων ex-archidicastes 705. 7, 18, 58, 67.

Avidus, Gradius Av. 735. 16.
'Αχιλλάς son of Thonis 732. 3.
'Αχυλλάς son of Ammonius 722. 27, 35.
'Αχυλλάς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
'Αχωρίς 807.
'Αφροδίσια 744. 11.

Barichius 735. 19.
Coras, Γάλλιος B. epistrategus 726. 19.
Beleus 735. 12, 13.
Beroe 736. 71; 744. 2.
Braās 832.
Bivus father of Papontos 719. 10.

Chu[ 735. 29.
Claudius Valerius Firmus praefect 720. 1.
Claudius Sabinus 735. 14.
Comarinthus (?) father of Marrius 735. 3.
Cumesius (?) 735. 27.
IV. PERSONAL NAMES

Γάιος Μάρκιος Ἅπιων also called Diogenes 727. 6, 9, 27.
Γάιος Μάρκιος Ἀπολλάνταρος also called Julianus 727. 6, 9, 27.
Γάιος 'Ρούστιος 745. 11.
Γάιος Σέπτιος 'Ρούφιος 721. 1; 835.
Γάλεστος 715. 5.
Γάλεστος son of Polemon 715. 2.
Γείλαος Βάιάνος epistrategus 726. 19.
Γέμπλος 724. 2; 736. 12.
Γή 722. 6.
Γαργᾶς father of Polemon 715. 3, 12, 17.
Γαργᾶς son of Polemon 715. 2, 34.
Gradus Avidus 735. 16.

Δαμαριφων 706. 10, 11.
Δαμάς 743. 24, 40.
Δάμων 730. 9.
Δαμηρία 707. 8 et saep.
Δαμιρίου 835.
Δαμιρίου βεβλαφυλάξ 713. 2, 43.
Δαμιρίου deputa archidicales, son of Hercules 727. 4.
Δαμιριτρός 728. 3.
Δαδών 734; 756; 791.
Δαδών son of Ammonius or Apollonius 719.
2, 8, 11.
Δαδών son of Charit . . . 826.
Δαδών son of Diogenes (?) 837.
Δαγιός 719. 17.
Δαγιός 726. 7; 801; 838.
Δαγιός son of Amois 728. 3, 23, 29, 36.
Δαγιός father of Apollonius 726. 6.
Δαγιός βεβλαφυλάξ 713. 3.
Δαγιός, Ταῖος Μάρκιος Ἅπιων also called Diog.
727. 7, 10, 27.
Δαγιός father of Didymus 837.
Δαγιός πράκτωρ 733. 2.
Δαγιός son of Sarapion 740. 38.
Δαγιός son of Theon also called Dionysius 716. 17, 30.
Δαδώρως father of Amois also called Papontos 733. 3.
Δαδώρως father of Agathinus 713. 5, 7; 723. 2.
Δαδώρως son of Diodorus 713. 4, 21.
Δανυοῦσα daughter of Galesus 715. 5.
Δανυοῦσιος 718. 5, 12, 17; 790.
Δανυοῦσιος son of Apollonius 724. 4.
Δανυοῦσιος βεβλαφυλάξ 714. 3, 4.

Δανυόσιος father of Dionysius 728. 33.
Δανυόσιος son of Dionysius 728. 33.
Δανυόσιος son of Phanius 789.
Δανυόσιος also called Theon 716. 8, 31.
Δανυόσιος son of Theon also called Dionysius 716. 9, 13.
Δασκάρως 810.
Δασκάρως, Αἰρήλιος Δ. son of Aurelius L.. . . 716. 818. 13.
Δαράς father of Panechotes 716. 3.
Δαράς son of Heras 716. 4, 28.

Εἰρηνίων 712. 17.
Εἰρηνία 719. 2, 11.
Εἰρηνία daughter of Gorgias 715. 17.
Εἰρηνία 743. 22.
Εἰρηνία 743. 25.
Εἰρηνία son of 717. 6.
Εἰρηνία 811.
Εἰρηνίαος also called Philonicus, basilicegrameus 714. 2.
Εἰρηνίαος 746. 3.
Εἰρηνίαος father of Harpalus 808.
Εἰρηνίαος (?) 735. 29.
Εἰρηνίαος also called Sarapion, strategus 801.
Εἰρηνίετορ 741. 1.
Εἰρηνίον son of Theon also called Dionysius 719. 9, 12.
Εἰρηνίατιο also called Tanechotarioi, daughter of Diogenes 726. 7.
Εἰρηνίδης 839.
Εἰρηνίων 794.

Firmus, Claudius Valerius F. praefect 720. 1.

Zabdius 735. 13.
Zebidiaus 735. 23.
Ζεῖν 722. 6.
Ζηρ . . . 736. 4.
Ζώλος 715. 22.
Ζώλος father of Ptolemaeus 729. 37.

'Ἡλαδώρως father of Heliodorus 732. 1.
'Ἡλαδώρως son of Heliodorus 732. 1 et saep.
'Ἡλιός 722. 6.
'Ἡρα goddess 731. 6.
'Ἡραδίων 725. 1.
'Ἡραλ[ 800.
'Hrapalēson of Sarapion also called Leon 725. 3 et saep.
'Hrapalēson of Tryphon 722. 21.
'Hrapalēia 740. 42.
'Hrapalēidēs 706. 2, 10; 740. 42, 43; 795; 831.
'Hrapalēidēs basilicogrammateus 746. 1, 13.
'Hrapalēidēs son of Horion 719. 18.
'Hrapalēidēs father of Samus 716. 6, 30.
'Hrapalēidēs father of Sarapion also called Leon 725. 3.
'Hrapalēidēs father of Theon 723. 2.
'Hrapalēidēs father of Xenon 785.
'Hrap 740. 35.
'Hrap basilicogrammateus 715. 1, 35.
'Hrap father of Dorian 716. 5.
'Hrapalēs father of Sarapion 730. 1.
'Hrap 736. 99; 740. 17 (?).
Ou̇s 716. 5; 736. 68.
Ou̇s daughter of Theon also called Dionysius 716. 10, 14.
Ou̇s daughter of Diodorus 713. 22.
Ou̇chēs son of . . . etis and father of Patermouthis 712. 4.
Ou̇dōn ou̇s, Oudōn Θ. also called Polion 727. 17.
Ou̇dōn ou̇s father of Aurelius L . . . thion 658. 4.
Ou̇dōn ou̇s 836.
Ou̇dōn ou̇s poliarch 745. 4.
Ou̇w 740. 35 (?); 748. 1; 799.
Ou̇w also called Dionysius 716. 8, 31.
Ou̇w son of Heraclides 723. 2.
Ou̇mous god 606.
Ou̇stous ous, son of Horus 797.
Ou̇n ou̇s father of Achillas 732. 3.
Ou̇stous 713. 26.
Ou̇n 725. 7.
Ou̇n also called Morous, son of Harthonis 725. 63.
Ieβa 735. 18.
Ieβa ous of Macchana 735. 15.
Ieβa ous 816.
'Ωphai 744. 1, 16.
'Ωphai also called J 727. 7, 10, 28.
'Ippōδ( ) 715. 35.
I. p. m., archidicastes, son of Isidorus 727. 1.
'Ωphai 736. 32; 739. 1.
'Ωphai daughter of Calas 718. 10.
'Ωphai ous 816.
'Ωphai ous ex-exegetes, father of I. r. m. 727. 1.
'Ωphai ous father of Valerius 735. 4.
'Ωphai ous son of Heradion 725. 1, 15, 46.
Iulia Titia lex 720. 5, 14.
Iulia 735. 28.
Kakēlimos 736. 55.
Κάλα 713. 10.
Κάλας, 'Αχίλλευς also called C 719. 1.
Κέβολάς 806.
Klāros 734. 2.
Klāvēla Πολεμα 810.
Klēdēs, Τίτου Κ. Συνδής epistrategus 718. 1.
Klēwa 734. 4.
Kārdos 736. 4, 10.
Κίνωs son of Ptolemaeus 814.
Κομάρινοs father of Victor imperial steward 735. 6.
Lai̇s, Λυ̇ριλία Α. daughter of Aurelius L . . . . thion 658. 15.
Lai̇tos praefect 705. 40.
Laȯdike 736. 95.
Lapontas son of Pekuris 732. 1 et saep.
Lapseious son of . . . monax 831.
Laws, 'Xarapios also called L., son of Heraclides 725. 3, 61.
Lapontas son of Alexander 713. 5, 9.
Lapontas son of Diodorus 713. 4.
Α . . . . βαλύς, Αβρήμιος Α. son of Theodorus 658. 3.
Lēβi 728. 1, 28.
Lopchētios father of Anteros 817.
Lopchēr 812.
Loolias, 'Ανθέστιος Πρείμος also called L. 718. 2, 32.
Lolikos 812.
Lolikos father of Ptoallas 729. 35.
Lolikos praefect 706. 5.
Loulakios 822.
Macchana father of Ierraus 735. 15.
Malichus son of Sa] 735. 24.
Malichus father of Themes 735. 17.
IV. PERSONAL NAMES

Μαλαχώς ορίῳ 735. 5.
Μαγνυτέρνος, Πετράνως Μ. praefect 726. 17.
Μάκρος, Γάιος Μ. 'Απίων also called Diogenes 728. 6, 9, 27.
Μάρκος, Γάιος Μ. 'Απολλώνιος also called Julianus 727. 6, 9, 27.
Μαρκιανος son of Comarinus (?) 735. 3.
Μελας father of Miusis 719. 19.
Μένιππος 715. 24.
Μύθις son of Melas 719. 19.
Μούρις 1( ) father of Pathotes 740. 40.
Μούδις father of Papontos 719. 18.
Μορφίς also called Thinis, son of Harthonis 725. 63.

Πατροντός also called Amois, son of Diodorus 733. 3.
Παποντός son of Bithys 719. 10, 27, 34.
Παποντός son of Mouthis 719. 18.
Παπάλους 740. 20.
Πάπις 736. 85 (?).
Παντέρις son of Petsiris 808.
Πεδέρις father of Leontas 732. 1, 9.
Πέλις 811.
Πετηρίς 732. 32.
Πετήρις father of Pausiris 808.
Πετρωνος Μαγνυτέρνος praefect 726. 17.
Πλούταρχος 707. 14.
Πλάθος 742. 2.
Πολέμων 719. 6.
Πολέμων son of Gorgias 715. 4, 11.
Πολέμων son of Tryphon 721. 2, 9.
Ποντάρων son of Thanochis 712. 4 et seq.
Πρεμίς, Ἀδάντιος Π. also called Lollianus 718. 2, 32.
Πράμα 736. 17.
Ρεσοσίριος 735. 25.
Ρησολέα, Κλαύδιος Π. 810.
Ρητελειαζος 790.
Ρητελειαζος father of Kunos 814.
Ρητελειαζος strategus 803.
Ρητελειαζος son of Zoilus 729. 37.
Ρητολάς son of Lucas 729. 35.
Ρητιλίος, Οὐαλέριος Θεόδωρος also called P. 727. 17.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Romanus} & \ 735. 26. \\
\text{Ρουστίος, Γιάος 'P. 745. 11.} \\
\text{Ρουφός, Γιάος Σπίντος 'P. 721. 1 ; 835.} \\
\end{align*} \]

Sabinus, Claudius S. 735. 14.
Sadus 735. 2, 20.
Salmes 735. 32.
Σάμος son of Heraclides 716. 6, 30.
Σαρατές daughter of Leonides 713. 5, 8.
Σαρατές son of Ammonius 722. 8, 21, 37.
Σαρατίων 707. 13 ; 716. 15 ; 729. 5 et seq.; 806 ; 825.
Σαρατίων also called Asclepiades, gymnasiarch 716. 1.
Σαρατίων father of Diogenes 740. 38.
Σαρατίων also called Evangelius, strategus 801.
Σαρατίων son of Heraclides 723. 4.
V. GEOGRAPHICAL.

(a) COUNTRIES, NOMES, TOPARCHIES, CITIES.

Aegyptus 720. 1.

Sparta son of Herodes 730. 1.
Sparta also called Leon, son of Heraclides 725. 3, 61.

Sparta 722. 11; 795.
Socinias 736. 50.
Socinianos 736. 81.
Sociniano 799.

Sicpions, Tiios 271. i; 835.
Sicilicus, Sulpicio 736. praefect (?). 712. 22.
Sicilicus 716. 9.
Sicilicus (or -tov) 794.
Sicilicus son of Ilaus 708. 4.
Sulpicio Sicilicus praefect (?). 712. 22.
Stratios 736. 97.
Symmachus 831.
Symmachus 829.

Taepaigeia 738. 70.
Taepoinga 736. 6.

Taeonophoros daughter of Panesi . . 722. 22.
Taeonophoros 716. 4.
Taeonophoros 715. 12, 18; 733. 5.
Taeonophoros daughter of Caecilius 736. 55.
Taeonophoros 799.
Taurino 716. 11.
Taurino 809.
Tepo 832.
Themes 735. 21.
Themes son of Malichus 735. 17.
Tita, lex Iulia et Tita 720. 5, 14.
Tita lex Iulia et Tita 720. 5, 14.

Trajano 736. 56.

Tragobunos father of Heraclis 722. 21.
Tragobunos father of Polemon 721. 2.

Truphon 735. 27.
Truphon daughter of Theon 723. 2.

Aegyptus 730. 1.

Taeonophoros 712. i, 8.

Aegyptus 706. 1, 7.
Aegyptus 727. 11.

Ambros father of Dionysius 789.
Ambros 742. 1, 17.

V. GEOGRAPHICAL.

Alfandria 709. 9; 743. 24; 744. 3, 5;

Alfandria 709. 9; 743. 24; 744. 3, 5;

799. 'Alfandriwm pélos 705. 20, 68.

799. 'Alfandriwm pélos 705. 20, 68.

H pélos 727. 2.

'Antinois 705. 50 (?).
V. GEOGRAPHICAL

Metallitis p. 263.

*Ωμβοι 834.
'Oξυφογχίτα 705. 9, 60.
'Oξυφογχίτη (νομὸς) 705. 69; 707. 15; 710. 2; 719. 4, 11; 721. 3; 727. 13; 746. 13; 833.
'Oξυφογχίτων πόλεως 718. 4; 724. 1.
'Oξυφογχον πόλεως 707. 13; 713. 6, 13; 716. 7; 722. 4, 12; 723. 1; 725. 2; 726. 3, 8; 727. 9; 728. 5; 730. 2. 732. 1; 739; 808; 831; 836.
'Oξυφογχον (? 745. 6.

Πέραση τῆς ἐπεγονῆς 730. 4; 836. Πηλούσιον 709. 4. Πηλούσιων τοιοῦτοι 705. 37. Πύλωναι 839.

*Ρωμαῖοι 705. 31; p. 263.

Σεβροίτης 709. 5.

Ταυίτης 709. 5. 

τοπορχία, ἄνω 721. 9.

Θεοσεφόροι 721. 11; 808. μέση 734. 3. 

Νορμαίτης (not Oxyrh.) 712. 20.

χώρα, ἡ κάτω χ. 709. 8.

(b) VILLAGES, ἐποίκια, τύποι.

Εὐφεργέτης 814.

Ἡρακλείδου ἐποίκιον 838.

Θελβά 814.
Θεω[ 740. 35.
Θ. βάθει 794.
Θάλεις 695. introd.; 740. 35.
Θάσσις 721. 9; 728. 2, 4, 6.

'Ἰβίων Παχυνοῦσα (Heracleopol.) 715. 21.

*Ισων 'Α... 732. 2.

*Ισων Τρύφωνος 719. 10, 14.

Κερκεμούνι 748. 7; 837.

Κεραυνία 740. 40; 808.

Κύων (= Κυνών?) 739. 2.

Μαγδάλα 740. 43.

<Mermeōθ(α?)> 740. 16; 823.

Μοσχίς 784.

Μωσήμερευ (not Oxyrh.) 712. 20.

Νέκλα 742. 17.

Νεύσα 797.

Νέσσα 713. 24, 31.

'Oξυφογχον (Dat.? = 'Οξ. πόλις) 745. 6.

Παγκόλα 732. 5.

Πάλαίων 808.

Πατομία 740. 24.

Πεννώ 713. 26.

Πέτα 740. 20, 21, 37, 38; 835.

Πέττυ Ναολ( ) τύποι 734. 3.
Σενέπτα 730. 3, 39.
Σένους 718. 13.
Σενοκομή 740. 37, 38.
Σερόφισ 707. 20; 740. 18.
Σεφῶ 803.
Σιαρυ 810.

Σακλ ( ) 734. 3, 5.

Τακάνα 743. 29.
Τάκλα 695. introd.
Ταμαύς (Φαύμ) p. 263.
Τεπόυα 721. 9.
Τής 808.
Τούμις (Ηρακλεο.) 715. 6, 13, 14.
Τρίφωνος "Ισιον 719. 10, 14.

Φελεμαχι ( ) (Ηρακλεο.) 715. 24.

(c) κλήρος.

Δάμωνος 730. 9.
Εὔφρωνος Αλα 794.
Ζωίλος και Νομαρίνος 715. 22.
Θρασυμάχο γαρ αρτεμίνι 713. 26.

Μενίσκον και 'Αρτεμίδαρον 715. 24.
Ξένων 810.
Χαραζείνου 728. 6.

(d) άμφοδα.

'Ιππίων Παρεμβολής 786.

Νότον Αρόμου 788.
Νότον Κρητίδος 714. 11.

(e) BUILDINGS, &C.

'Αθριανή βιβλιοθήκη 719. 35.

Σαραπείου 736. 25; 832; 835.

(f) DEMA AND TRIBE.

Σωσικόσμος ο και Ἡλία (?) 712. 9.

VI. RELIGION.

(a) GODS.

Γῆ 722. 6.
Ζεύς 722. 6.

"Hρα 731. 6.

θεός 659. 8; 715. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θζηρις 806.
VII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS

(b) PRIESTS.

ἀρχιερατεύσας 718. 3.

Ierous θεόρησ 808. ier. καὶ ἀρχιδιακοσθί 719. 3; 727. 2.

(c) MISCELLANEOUS.

ἄστρα Ἡρας 731. 6.

θυσία 658. 2.

εἰράν (τότο) 707. introd.

ἐλαυν ( '"offering' ) 658. 1, 12; 784.

ἱερόν ( '"temple' ) 785.

Ἰστια 731. 5.

VII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS.

ἀγαρανθός 722. 4.

ἀιρέτης 783.

ἄρημος, πρώτων ἄρημῶν ἐπειεύς 735. 8.

ἀρχιδιακόστης 1 . . . ιερεύς καὶ ἀρχιδιακόστης 727. 2. Οὐσιτάλος ιερ. καὶ ἀρχιδιακόστης 727. 4.

(A.D. 154) 719. 3. Δημήτριος Ἰωάννης διάσω τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχιδιακοστίαν (A.D. 154) 727. 4.

βασιλικὸς γουμματεύς 746. A.D. 16.

βιβλίοφυλάξ 712. 1; 713. 3; 714. 1; 715. 1.

βοστός 734. 4.

gενομασαραχηχός 715. 1, 35.

γραμματέας 709. 13; 716. 35; 835. βασιλικὸς γρ. 716. 4.

γυμνασιάρχος 716. 1.

δεκάδαρχος 747. 1.

ἐλεγητεύσας 714. 6.

ἐλεγητής (of Alexandria) 727. 1, 5.

ἐπικρητής 714. 5; 38.

ἐπιστατεία φυλακτῶν 803.

ἐπιστάτης τῶν ἱσπάρχων 790.


ἐπιτηρήτης ξενικῶν πρακτορείας 712. 1, 8.

ἐφόδιος 710. 4.

ἐγγεμνιστής, Ἐλλης (C. A.D. 153) 800.


ἰεράν, οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ θυσίων 658. 1.

Ἰππαρχος 790.

ἵππαρχος 790.

ῴκομενος 735. 8.

κυκλοσμητευκός 724. 1.

κριτής 726. 20.

κωμογραμματέας 718. 13, 20, 26.

λυγρόφως 786.

μαχαιροφόρος 839.

οἰκοκόρως οἰκόκρας 735. 6.

ὅπιται 735. 5.

οἰκόκρας, οἰκοκόρως οὐκ. 735. 6.

πέδες 735. 12.

πεζός, οἱ Σαγγαμάρος πεζοί 831.

πολιτάρχης 745. 4.

πραγματεύτης 825.
VIII. WEIGHTS, MEASURES, AND COINS.

(a) Weights and Measures.

ναίβας 669. 11, 24.

ξίλων 669. 11, 20, 21, 28. ε. βασιλικὸν 669. 11, 19. ε. δημώσιον 669. 38.

δύσιον 669. 1, 2.

άργυρον 669. 28, 39.

παλαιοτής 669. 13, 16, 27, 31, 34.

πηχυς 669. 2 et sacep. π. δημώσιον 669. 34. π. ἐμμαθέως 669. 6, 10. π. εἰδομετρικὸς 669. 5. π. λινούφικος 669. 33. π. Νείλο-

μετρικὸς 669. 35. π. οἰκοπεδικὸς 669. 9. π. στερέον 669. 7. π. τεκτονικὸς 669. 35.

πλεύρων 669. 29.

πνεῦμα 669. 27, 32.

πυγῶν 669. 27, 34.

σπαθιμή 669. 27, 32.

στάδιον 669. 29.

σχοινίον 669. 1, 3, 18.

τετάρτη 795.

χοῦσκα 740. 18 et sacep.; 789.

χοῖν 736. 15; 739. 11; 819.
IX. TAXES

(δ) Coins.

άργυρου 706. 3; 712. 6, 15; 724. 6; 728. 9 et saep.; 729. 6, 13, 20, 40; 730. 12, 37; 731. 8, 9, 10, 12; 784; 788; 791; 808. άργυρις έπισημον 722. 19. άργυρις Σεβαστού νομίσματος 719. 21; 722. 25.

as 737. 2 et saep.

δραχμή 707. 8 et saep.; 712. 6, 14, 15, 21; 719. 21, 31; 722. 19, 25; 724. 6 et saep.; 725. 22 et saep.; 728. 9 et saep.; 729. 6 et saep.; 730. 12, 14, 37; 731. 8, 9, 11, 12; 732. 5 et saep.; 733. 4, 6; 736. 2 et saep.; 739. 2 et saep.; 742. 14; 745. 1; 748; 788; 791-2; 799; 803; 808; 817; 819.

δραχμαίου τόκου 712. 14; 728. 20.

ήμιοβέλιον 733. 4, 6; 736. 12 et saep.; 739. 8, 11.

μηδέ 728. 21.

δοκελιαίος 729. 10.

δοκέλες 731. 8, 11, 13; 736. 5 et saep.; 739. 7 et saep.

πεντώβολον 733. 4, 6; 736. 68 et saep.; 739. 6.

semi (½ as) 737. 11 et saep.

τάλαντον 710. 6-8; 722. 17, 26; 784; 806. τετράβολον 722. 20; 734. 5, 6; 736. 12 et saep.; 739. 4, 13.

τριάνταμιον 736. 8 et saep.; 739. 11, 16; 819.


IX. TAXES.

άργυρικά 733. 2; 734. 3.

γλυ( ) 734. 4.

γραμματικοί p. 263.

ἐπικεφάλαιον 832.

λυγραφία 714. 23; 733. 5.

ναύλον πορτίων 792.

ξενικά 712. 1, 8; 825.

οὖν τέλος 788.

πρακτικοί δαπάναι 712. 21.

προσμετρώμενα 708. 12.

στιχικά 798.

στιχολογικά 740. 22, 27.

στιχομετρικά 740. 23, 25.

σωνήθη 730. 13.

σο( ) 734. 4.

τέλος 712. 6; 788.

νίκη 733. 4, 6.

φορικά, Ἀρσινόης φορ. 807.

φόρος πόρθμεου 732. 4.
abire 720. 13.
ábróchos 740. 45; 810.
ágein 742. 7.
agérgygetos 705. 74.
áfroáteu 717. 3; 742. 12; 745. 2; 839.
áfroáuméion 713. 13.
áfroáumikos 836.
áfroáóds 722. 4.
áfroáóds 798.
áfwn 732. 12, 34; 723. 5; 726. 9.
áfwn 744. 4, 13.
áfwn (sía) 705. 50, 51.
ádelphí 715. 17; 744. 1; 745. 1.
ádelphíados 727. 16.
ádelphós 707. 34; 712. 5, 12; 713. 21, 30; 716. 17; 717. 6; 718. 8, 10; 719. 15; 725. 6; 746. 1; 791.
ádiakritás 715. 36.
ádikos 717. 10; 719. 23.
ádikos 729. 19; 836.
áei 668. 6; 719. 13.
araxiás 808.
arís 719. 15, 16.
av 807.
av' 719. 26; 728. 12; 729. 21, 31, 41, 43; 787; 800.
av' 716. 22; 729. 41.
av' 709. 12.
av' 788.
av' 725. 41.
ávama 669. 29, 41.
ávádo 730. 15.
ávádo 706. 9; 718. 10; 729. 14.
av' 707.
av' 725. 41.
ávama 669. 29, 41.
ávádo 730. 15.
ávádo 706. 9; 718. 10; 729. 14.
av' 707.
av' 725. 41.
ávama 669. 29, 41.
ávádo 730. 15.
ávádo 706. 9; 718. 10; 729. 14.
av' 707.
ávama 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
ávádo 740. 10; 729. 18.
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άξιων 658. 16; 705. 51, 60; 716. 19; 719. 32; 727. 29; 805. 826.
άξιος 705. 14, 64.
άταντα 718. 23, 29; 727. 18; 803.
άταντας 718. 14; 722. 28.
άτατικος 724. 12.
άτελευθερος 706. 2; 716. 6, 29.
άτελευθερούν 708. 8; 722. 18.
άτεραγια 729. 2, 8.
άτερπλήτους 713. 39.
άπερχεσαι 709. 4.
άπεγει 719. 22; 808.
άπελογή 719. 17, 19; 728. 7.
άπελος 719. 9.
άπογραφήν 713. 34; 715. 6, 36.
άπογραφή 715. 30; 719. 24; 808.
άπόδεχοντά 705. 59.
άποδοσίς 712. 16; 729. 17; 808.
άποδύσκεις 718. 12.
άποικος 719. 2, 9, 11.
άπολαμβάνεις 706. 3.
άπολλόνια 743. 23.
άποφημίαν 798.
άποστάτων 724. 13.
άποσταλμεν 742. 3; 744. 8.
άποστατηθή 745. 7.
άποστολή 738. 13.
άποστατορ 729. 31; 730. 12.
άποστιγμα 730. 26.
άποφαίνεις 706. 6.
άργων 724. 14; 725. 35, 40; 731. 12.
άργυρικά 733. 2; 734. 3.
άργυρίον. See Index VIII (a).
άργυροι 796.
άργυρικά 729. 24.
άργων 735. 8; 742. 8.
άργωτρίδας 722. 10; 723. 5.
άργωτας 738. 23, 28, 35.
άργος 741. 6.
άργωμα. See Index VIII (a).
άργοφιδέα 729. 31.
άργοφιδέας 741. 8; 832.
άργος (؟) 744. 9.
άργως 708. 5, 18.
άργος. See Index VIII (a).
άργός 738. 8.
άρις 738. 9 et saep.
γονέως 713. 7, 38.
γονή 729. 40.
γών 722. 24.
γράμμα 718. 32; 725. 64; 727. 28; 728. 34.
γραμματέως. See Index VII.
γραμματικός p. 263.
γράφειν 706. 3; 718. 31; 718. 24; 719. 6, 27; 724. 10; 725. 63; 728. 33; 729. 37; 743. 39; 746. 5; 787; 811.
γραφείον 736. 16; 808.
γυναίκαρχίαν 715. 1.
γυναίκαρχος 716. 1.
γυμνός 839.
γυναικίον 739. 18; 741. 9.
γυνή 736. 11, 88, 89.
γυργαθος (γυργαθίος) 741. 5.
δακτύλιον 795.
δάκτυλος 669. 14, 17, 26, 43.
δανείζω 705. 47; 808; 836.
δανείσιμος 799.
δαπανάν 705. 63.
δαπάνη 705. 79; 708. 12; 712. 6; 729. 28; 738. 98; 739. 3.
dare 720. 3, 6, 15.
δέησα 720. 10.
δέημα 708. 5, 18.
dει 718. 14, 18, 29; 727. 19, 20; 729. 4, 5, 16; 743. 8.
dέισθαι 718. 24.
dειτενίν 736. 93.
dειτίνων 738. 39; 738. 1, 4, 7.
dεισαγωγή 729. 22.
dεκαίρωρχος 747. 1.
dεκατα 741. 17.
dεξίος 722. 24.
dέσμη 742. 4, 13.
dή 705. 61.
δηλοίν 707. 21, 30; 708. 13; 714. 21; 716. 19; 725. 7, 11, 48; 740. 30; 800.
dημάσιος 669. 24; 707. 2, 15; 715. 37. (τῷ) δημ. 712. 6; 719. 28, 30; 725. 56; 729. 20; 793; 803. (τῷ) δημ. 707. 22; 718. 11 et sccp.; 729. 33; 730. 17; 740. 14; 810. δημ. βέμα (? ) 740. 29. δημ. μετέρων 740. 18, 20. δημ. εξύον 669. 38.
δημ. δικείλη 719. 23. δημ. πήχες 669. 34.
dημ. ρύμη 719. 17, 19. δημ. τράπεζα 721. 13; 835. δημ. χρηματισμός 712. 12.
dημοσιοί 719. 32.
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δημοσίωσις 719. 31.
διαγράφειν 707. 22; 721. 12; 733. 2; 734. 2; 800; 803.
διαθήκη 715. 19.
διαρέεις 718. 7, 10.
διαλογίζεται 709. 4.
διαλογισμός 709. 2; 726. 12.
διατήρειν 727. 24.
διατοκέν 743. 22.
διατωκέν 727. 20.
διάστασις 669. 37, 40.
διαστολή 719. 32; 743. 28; 793.
διστάσεως 718. 25.
διστείχων 668. 8.
δισταλον 669. 30.
δάφνος 705. 11, 22; 797; 833.
διαφεύγειν 715. 30.
διάφυλος 707. 23.
δεδακαλός 725. 10, 14, 43.
δεδώκα 716. 22; 719. 4, 30; 725. 18; 729. 10, 13, 17; 731. 7, 10; 740. 15 et alp.;
742. 11; 743. 26, 28, 32; 789.
δέιειν 727. 5.
διείρχεσθαι 712. 18; 714. 18; 729. 26; 789.
διεισία 707. 24.
διειστείχων 718. 31.
δίκαιος 717. 10; 746. 9; 787.
δικαστήριον 705. 38.
δίκη 728. 24.
διέλετον 717. 5, 12.
δίμωρος 716. 14, 20.
δίδ 727. 21; 828.
διοπλος 729. 20; 741. 3.
διώκτησαν 741. 2.
διότερος 719. 15.
δικτυ 718. 24.
dominus 720. 3, 6.
δόξη 724. 7.
δώσθη 714. 15; 722. 14; 723. 3.
δώσαν 714. 13; 716. 15; 724. 3.
δραχμή. See Index VIII (δ).
δραχμίας 712. 14; 728. 21.
δρόμος 717. 17; p. 263.
δύναται 726. 10; 727. 11; 742. 10; 743. 36; 744. 12.
δύση 725. 12.
δωδεκαδραχμός 714. 22.
δωδεκάμηνον 800.

c 720. 5, 14.
έαν 729. 18.
έαντερ 729. 4, 8.
έγγραπτός 707. 20.
έγγυησθε 707. 33.
έγκαλείν 728. 40.
έγκτησις 705. 61; 712. 1; 715. 1; 825.
έδαφος 723. 15.
έδελω 705. 43, 62.
έδρωμος 729. 7.
ένως 705. 37.
ένδο p. 263.
ένδεια 718. 32; 718. 12; 725. 64; 728. 34; 729. 37; 745. 6, 8.
ένδος 669. 20; 719. 24.
ένδος 718. 22.
έν, μᾶς ἀντὶ μᾶς 740. 17, 18.
εἰσάγειν 729. 5, 6.
εἰσβολή 736. 97.
εἰσίναι 721. 8; 725. 30; 729. 2, 14, 30.
εἰσόδος 705. 39; 719. 16.
εἰσπορεύεσθαι 717. 5, 7; 744. 4.
εἰσφέρειν 717. 12.
εἰσχράσθαι 717. 2.
ἐκατός 705. 35, 77; 711. 1; 725. 11; 727. 22; 728. 21; 729. 18, 29, 37.
ἐκάτερος 713. 31; 729. 19.
ἐκατοστή 708. 8, 9, 20.
ἐκδαίνειν 708. 7, 19; 729. 36.
ἐκδέλειν 744. 10.
ἐκδούν 717. 1.
ἐκδέχεσθαι 724. 12.
ἐκδιδάκτειν 725. 47.
ἐκδιδάσκαλος 725. 5; 835.
ἐκαίρος 729. 18.
ἐκρούειν 725. 37.
ἐκλογή 729. 41.
ἐκματισθὲν 727. 19.
ἐκτακτός 707. 4.
ἐκτίνειν 725. 55; 728. 19; 731. 12.
ἐκτίτισι 729. 21.
ἐκφύραμεν 743. 29.
ἐλαίων 738. 15; 739. 5, 11, 16, 21; 784.
ἐλάσσων 669. 44; 705. 46; 708. 7, 20; 729. 42.
ἐλεύθρος 705. 40; 722. 6.
ἐλευκροίν 716. 11.
ἐλευθέρωτε 722. 31; 723. 4.
ἐμί(ολικός?) 740. 18.
ἐμβάδευσεν p. 263.
ÍNDICES

émballeis 708. 9, 21; 717. 1, 15.
émbain 725. 55.
émou 707. introd.
émbaros 707. 10.
édeikónai 705. 32.
énèka 719. 31.
énchryásia 712. 3, 10, 16, 19.
énchryán 728. 44.
ená 713. 39.
énanustó 725. 17, 20, 23, 25, 52.
enastá 713. 40; 715. 7; 724. 4; 725. 28; 726. 16; 729. 14; 730. 4; 732. 2; 808; 826.
énai 705. 41.
énikyris 729. 34.
énia 729. 34.
enole 705. 71.
enox 715. 31.
enolikos 741. 1.
enós 724. 11, 13; 728. 15; 729. 20, 30.
enugráhoi 717. 16.
enópion 658. 9.
épaleithróv 722. 13, 17.
énaxia 707. 4, 5.
ézótevn 705. 71.
énxíma 705. 52; 722. 27; 724. 12; 725. 53; 727. 25; 729. 43.
ézónta 728. 15.
énaggeirai 714. 6.
énaggeiré 727. 1, 5.
enlí 725. 26; 729. 26.
enó 719. 16.
énnosia 708. 8; 719. 25.
isó 725. 36.
isóteknov 724. 6.
éngek, épagómena 817. See Index III (i).
énaxthón 705. 49.
enépikouméven 729. 29.
enakynke 725. 42.
enánukos 707. 6; 729. 18, 40.
enán 707. 7; 740. 30.
eni 713. 20; 718. 22; 727. 25.
enpérgas 718. 13.
en ló ató 713. 28; 716. 14; 729. 15.
enpédeallou 715. 13, 15.
enángkhy 730. 4.
enángrafhy 719. 28.
enángkhono 810.
enángkemai 705. 36.
enángkónoi 705. 60; 715. 29, 34; 716. 18, 28.
énepíddos 705. 59, 76.
enéesi 705. 42.
enékataploti p. 263.
enékthallai 832.
enékrató 718. 28.
enékrh 714. 5, 38.
enélaodów 744. 12.
enémelw 719. 7; 727. 3.
enémelidó 727. 15; 729. 22; 743. 43; 744. 6; 745. 10; 746. 9; 805.
enémmphskoi 791.
enéwke 705. 34.
enéwph 780. 11; 810; 838.
enéptima 743. 30.
enépí 722. 19.
enéskopoi 743. 43.
enéstas 724. 3; 725. 50.
enéstas 803.
enéstóthe 780.
enéstállw 719. 25.
enéstolh 744. 4.
enéstolidó 789.
enéstragones. See Index VII.
enéstás 725. 13.
enétéléw 719. 26; 726. 20; 727. 22-4; 729. 18.
enésterh 712. 1, 8.
enéster 725. 55; 729. 20.
enésterpev 727. 15.
enésterph 743. 32.
enésterhos 716. 7; 740. 42.
enepiko 707. 37; 729. 34; 838.
'Enta nomoi 709. 7.
enégyzsth 729. 19.
enégyzia 742. 11.
enégyzia 800.
enégyzia 789.
enégyzia 729. 29.
enéBonth 736. 92.
enéon 791.
enelka 715. 9; 743. 42; 805; 839.
enelka 744. 6, 13; 745. 7; 746. 5; 787.
enelka 706. 63; 712. 10; 714. 4; 718. 22; 719. 25; 725. 30; 726. 19; 729. 3, 4, 11, 26, 29.
enéth 668. 8; 705. 23, 24; 718. 21; 727. 18; 729. 3, 25, 44; 744. 3.
enéth 822.
enéto 707. 11; 725. 47, 62; 726. 22; 727. 26.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κατανάλων</td>
<td>713. 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταστορά</td>
<td>708. introd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταστάθεια</td>
<td>705. 78; 707. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταχωρίσεις</td>
<td>714. 37; 715. 36; 719. 38; 731. 14; 786; 826.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατάχων</td>
<td>712. 3; 713. 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατακόκκος</td>
<td>715. 23, 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταχώρισμεν</td>
<td>736.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κάτω</td>
<td>709. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κελεύειν</td>
<td>658. 10; 705. 51; 708. 13; 708. 6, 19; 715. 9; 721. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κέλλι</td>
<td>707. introd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κελάριον</td>
<td>741. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κερδίμοιον</td>
<td>729. 36; 745. 1; 784.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κέρδος</td>
<td>729. 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κέφαλαια</td>
<td>736. 77.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κεφαλαίον</td>
<td>808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κέρδος</td>
<td>736. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κίθαν (κεχίτων)</td>
<td>736. 99.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κίνδυνες</td>
<td>705. 73; 839.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κίνδυνος</td>
<td>708. 10, 22; 712. 19; 715. 7, 36; 730. 16; 804.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλάδων</td>
<td>796.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλείς</td>
<td>729. 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κληρονόμος</td>
<td>719. 16, 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλήρου</td>
<td>715. 22, 25; 721. 6; 728. 7; 730. 9; 794; 810. Cf. Index V (c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλήρου</td>
<td>833.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοινός</td>
<td>719. 15; 729. 32; 740. 43. κοινός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόλλητα</td>
<td>736. 91, 100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κομητέαρια</td>
<td>724. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κομητε ιον</td>
<td>708. 14; 730. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόνιον</td>
<td>739. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοπη</td>
<td>729. 3; 810.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοπταιμοσία</td>
<td>729. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόπτειν</td>
<td>729. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόπον</td>
<td>819.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοσμηματεύειν</td>
<td>724. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοτόλη</td>
<td>784.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόφωνος</td>
<td>738. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κράζειν</td>
<td>717. 1, 9, 11, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κράταστας</td>
<td>726. 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κραθή</td>
<td>708. 8, 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρατολογίεν</td>
<td>708. 6, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρατήριον</td>
<td>719. 8; 727. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρατήσ</td>
<td>726. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κτάσθαι</td>
<td>705. 70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κτήμα</td>
<td>707. 23, 25, 31; 729. 5 et saep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κτήνος</td>
<td>729. 16, 39-41, 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κτήτωρ</td>
<td>718. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυβερνήτης</td>
<td>717. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυριακός λόγος</td>
<td>800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυριεύειν</td>
<td>730. 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος (‘lord’)</td>
<td>728. 15; 744. 2. Cf. Index II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κύριος (‘valid’)</td>
<td>719. 26; 725. 56; 727. 26; 728. 25; 729. 14, 34; 730. 31; 731. 14; 838.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κώμη</td>
<td>705. 60, 69; and see Index V (δ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κωμογραμματεῖς</td>
<td>718. 13, 20, 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαμβάνειν</td>
<td>707. 26, 29; 724. 8, 9; 729. 17, 41; 743. 26; 744. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαμπρός</td>
<td>705. 19, 39, 68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λανθάνειν</td>
<td>705. 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λάξος</td>
<td>806.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαογραφέων</td>
<td>711. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαογραφία</td>
<td>714. 23; 733. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαογράφος</td>
<td>786.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγειν</td>
<td>706. 11; 707. 14; 717. 2; 744. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λειτουργεῖν</td>
<td>705. 79; 731. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λειτουργία</td>
<td>705. 72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λειτουργός</td>
<td>793.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lex Iulia et Titia</td>
<td>720. 5, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λήγειν</td>
<td>729. 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λήμμα</td>
<td>825.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λῆρος</td>
<td>729. 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λίθον</td>
<td>736. 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λυνόσ</td>
<td>669. 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λυχάς</td>
<td>669. 27, 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λύφ</td>
<td>719. 17, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λωγοστήροιον</td>
<td>709. 1, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>705. 30; 708. 13; 724. 10; 726. 36; 726. 14; 727. 23; 729. 13; 732. 5; 740. 30; 741. 1; 800; 825.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λοιπά</td>
<td>707. 24; 709. 8, 12; 713. 36; 716. 16; 724. 11; 725. 19; 729. 4 et saep.; 732. 13; 740. 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λύειν</td>
<td>715. 19; 745. 6; 808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγον</td>
<td>722. 30, 40; 784.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λυχνία</td>
<td>736. 91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαμίθα</td>
<td>812.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μα( )</td>
<td>736. 73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magister</td>
<td>737. 12 et saep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάθησις</td>
<td>724. 3; 725. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαθητής</td>
<td>725. 15, 21, 27, 48.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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μακροπρόφοτος 722. 7, 16, 24, 33.
μακαριοφόρος 839.
μέγας 705. 22.
μείζον 669. 44; 717. 9; 729. 43.
μελέχρως 722. 7, 9.
μερίδια 788.
μέσφασθαι 706. 12.
μεν οὖν 705. 36.
μέτέχεις 744. 5.
μερίζεις 713. 29.
μέρος 707. 7; 715. 15, 16; 716. 13-5, 20; 719. 14; 722. 13; 728. 8; 729. 19, 31;
740. 46, 47; 810.
μεσοτείνει 669. 45.
μίσος 722. 7 et saep.; 729. 28; 734. 3.
μεταβάλλεται 728. 13.
μετατάσσεται 705. 38; 712. 16; 719. 4.
μεταλλάσσεται 715. 10.
μεταφέρεται 728. 11.
μεταφορά 729. 34.
μετρίως 669. 6; 735. 7; 740. 24, 26, 35.
μέτρων. See Index VIII (a).
μέταπον 722. 8.
μέμβρα 725. 12; 729. 7, 9; 731. 3.
μέμοι 669. 6, 7.
μημοίος 725. 51.
μήτηρ 658. 4; 713. 5, 9, 23, 36; 715. 3, 12,
18; 716. 3, 5, 9, 10; 719. 2, 8, 10, 11;
722. 11, 22, 32; 723. 2; 726. 6; 728.
2, 3, 28; 733. 5; 736. 69; 740. 44.
μημαχή 729. 12, 23, 28.
μικρός 741. 4.
μίλιον 669. 30.
μυθός 724. 5; 725. 18 et saep.; 729. 12;
731. 8; 736. 6.
μυθών 707, 14, 18; 729. 3 et saep.; 730. 1
et saep.; 810.
μύθων 707. 17, 20, 24, 35; 729. 14, 20,
34, 41; 730. 21, 31, 39; 740. 34; 838.
μυθώτης 728. 8; 825.
μυθές 728. 21.
μυθόχος 719. 32.
μύθος 707. 22; 718. 11; 729. 8, 9.
μύθχος 729. 16, 39.
μύρος 736. 13, 84.
μναγύεις 839.
μναξίον 669. 11, 24.
μναλον 792.
πε 720. 12.

Νελωμετρικός 669. 36.
νεομηνία 725. 8.
νεός 707. 17; 718. 8; 729. 19; 836.
νεόφυτος 729. 8.
νόημα 719. 21; 722. 25.
νόμος, τῶν Αλεξάνδρων v. 706. 7. ἀστικοὶ v. 706.
9. τῆς ὑδάτος v. 785.
νομός, ἑπτά νομοὶ 709. 7.
νότιος 729. 9.
νότος 719. 14, 16, 18.
νῦν, τὰ νῦν 811.

ξεία 747. 1.
ξείκος 712. 1, 8; 825.
ξηρός 736. 82.
ξυλάμαν 729. 31; 730. 10;
ξυλοκοπών 706. 13.
ξυλολογεία 729. 33.
ξυλοτομία 729. 29.

ἡξελιάος 729. 10.
ἡξόλης. See Index VIII (b).
ἡγόμον 669. 1, 2.
ἡθον 714. 21; 716. 18.
oikía 712. 5, 20; 715. 15; 719. 15.
oikeγειή 714. 14; 723. 3.
oikodómein 707. 7.
oikodómos 739. 10, 12, 14.
oikos 735. 6.
oikopetíkos 669. 9.
oikoptidó 718. 9.
oikókiós 729. 36.
oiων 707. 3; 729. 16, 19, 24, 27; 745. 1, 2; 784; 788.
oiγων 718. 23.
oin 724. 8; 730. 14; 740. 18. ὅλως 743.
22; 744. 4.
οἶμιεν 714. 27; 715. 26.
oimos 705. 61; 725. 14. ὅμοιος 708. 8;
709. 6; 711. 2; 725. 23, 25, 31, 34;
729. 9; 736. 51, 71, 80; 740. 33.
oimológiav 718. 12; 725. 1; 726. 4; 785;
803; 808; 831; 833.
oimológhma 725. 57, 62.
oimología 726. 23; 731. 13.
oimostátiros 716. 16.
oinlásthe 740. 19, 22, 25.
oinókiós 741. 10.
ονομα 715. 10.
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παρακαλέων 744. 6.
παραλαμβάνων 717. 6; 729. 16, 23; 742. 2, 4; 785.
παραλήψις 798.
παραλληγορούμενος 711. 5.
παραμείνων 724. 13; 725. 43.
παραμοιή 731. 13.
παραπολλώναι 705. 73.
παραστέθεια 713. 1.
παράφορα 796. 837.
παραφυλακή 705. 72.
παραχωρέων 719. 12, 25.
παραχωρητικόν 719. 20.
παρείναι 711. 2; 727. 11, 25.
παρεμβολή 736. 33.
παρίξ 729. 33.
παρέχειν 717. 4; 725. 9, 42; 729. 4, 9, 19; 785.
παρη( ) 788.
παρείναι, παρεμβείνη 713. 26.
πατήρ 713. 20; 715. 11; 784.
πατρικός 716. 15.
πάτρων 706. 2, 10.
πατρί̂ος 715. 28.
πεδεσ 736. 72.
πεδίων 740. 37.
πεζος 724. 10; 831.
πεμπταίς 729. 11.
πεμπταίοις 729. 24.
πενταετής 725. 49.
πεντάβολον. See Index VIII (b).
περιβάλλων 707. 32.
περιδειπνόν 736. 37.
περίέχων 719. 31.
περιστάτω 705. 53; 743. 36.
περιστερά 729. 10; 736. 29, 79.
πήγας. See Index VIII (a).
πίαξεν 812.
πιθανόσχεν 719. 12; 740. 30; 784; 819.
πίστις 705. 32; 727. 21.
πλακάς 729. 28.
πλαστός 729. 30.
πλαστία 733. 3.
πλάνης 707. 26, 32.
πλάτος 669. 7, 8.
πλέθον 669. 29.
πλείν 726. 11.
πλείστα 742. 1; 744. 1; 746. 2.
πλείων 705. 30; 712. 18; 725. 39; 833.
πλήν 721. 7; 729. 23.
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πλάθος 707. 28.
πλοῦς 799; 805.
πληθύς 737. 11.
ποιεῖν 705. 77; 707. 29; 709. 3; 713. 11; 713. 10, 14; 722. 28, 36; 725. 13, 44; 726. 14; 727. 11; 729. 7, 24, 29, 37; 743. 40; 745. 8; 787; 811.
πόλεμος 705. 33.
πόλις (= Alexandria) 727. 2. (= Oxyrhynchus) 658. 2, 6; 705. 22, 39, 43; 714. 7; 732. 2; 736. 31. Cf. Index V (a).
pολιτικής 745. 4.
pορείας 792.
pόροι 732. 4.
pορίδις 732. 2.
pοριζέων 719. 2.
pορφύρα 739. 16.
πόσος 742. 4.
ποταμός 800.
ποτέ 745. 7.
pοτήριον 741. 17.
pοτείζων p. 263.
pοτσιμοῦ 728. 13, 24.
πούς 669. 27, 32, 38; 722. 16; 723. 5.
πράγμα 706. 4; 743. 19.
πραγματεία 803.
πραγματευτής 825.
πραγματικόν 746. 6.
πρακτορεία 712. 1, 8; 825.
πρακτορικός 712. 21.
πράκτωρ 733. 2; 734. 3.
πράξις 712. 11; 728. 22; 729. 21; 730. 27.
πράσινον 736. 28.
πράσινον 708. 10, 21; 718. 25; 822.
πράτης 718. 12.
pροϊόντα 718. 5, 17.
pροϊόντων 807.
pραγάφεων 718. 29; 715. 34, 727. 12; 728. 14; 732. 7, 10; 786.
pραγματεία 724. 12; 728. 18.
pροϊόντων 719. 9.
pροκείμενα 713. 33, 37; 715. 30; 724. 12; 725. 44, 51, 54, 56; 727. 22; 728. 32; 40; 729. 18, 37, 42; 732. 8, 11, 14; 736. 8; 740. 23, 25; 819.
pροκήρυξις 718. 20.
pροκήρυκες 707. 16.
pροκήρυκαί 714. 16.
pροκήρυγματά 784.
pροκήρυξθα 743. 33.

προσφέρεινε 725. 10.
pροσείκει 705. 31.
pροσέχεισθαι 787.
pροσμετρεῖν 708. 12.
pρόσωπος 705. 78.
pροσοπεῖλεν 730. 25.
pροστιθέμα 708. 12; 709. 12.
pροσφάγων 736. 46, 89; 739. 7, 10, 12, 14.
pροσφέρειν 755.
pροσφανεῖν 718. 15, 26, 28.
pρότερος 705. 48. πρότερον 715. 16.
pροφέρειν 746. 6.
pροφείρον 741. 14.
pροχρίστια 729. 13, 800.
pρόχρησις 729. 17.
pρωτοπραξία 713. 6.
pρῶτος, πρῶτοι ἀμφότεροι 735. 8.
pτέρψει 738. 10.
pτειχόν 809. 27, 34.
πυκνός 717. 16. πυκνότερον 805.
pυρός 708. 4 et saep.; 718. 15; 735. 9; 736. 8 et saep.; 740. 28, 31, 32, 40; 784; 789; 833; 836.
pωλίν 729. 43.
pωμάριν 707. 19, 26.
πος 744. 12; 745. 6.
quo 720. 12.
ῥαφίς 736. 75.
rβτρόπος 707. 13.
ῥόδα 736. 58.
rβόδων 729. 32.
rγάρ 720. 3.
rβήμα 719. 17, 19.
rβαςίνατι, ἐρώσατο 719. 5; 742. 15; 743. 44; 745. 10; 748. 11; 798; 805.
sανδίλαν 741. 10.
sεμίδαις 736. 82.
sημαίνειν 833.
sημειογράφειν 724. 2.
sημεία 724. 3.
sημείαν, σημειώματα 713. 43; 719. 6.
semis 737. 11 et saep.
sειδοτός 738. 9.
sετικός 718. 8; 798.
sετίνος 729. 44.
sετολογικός 740. 17, 22, 27.
sετολόγος. See Index VII.
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σεμιτικόν 740. 23, 25.
αυτόπυτρα 739. 4.
σῶς 708. 11, 22.
ακαφή 729. 28.
σκέπη 785.
σκοπέλιων 741. 19.
σόλων 741. 8.
σπείρων 729. 31.
σπένδει 688. 7, 11.
σπέρμα 740. 36; 833.
σπίδιμα 689. 27, 32.
σπονδύλου 730. 12.
σπονδύλειν 746. 8.
σπάδια 689. 29.
στεγάζειν 729. 23.
στερέος 689. 7; 836.
στράβος 730. 56, 57.
στήμα 739. 18.
στολή 839.
στοχάζεται 705. 75.
στηκτηγώς. See Index VII.

συ( ) 734. 4; 797.
συγγράφειν 707. 35; 729. 17.
συγγραφή 713. 12, 32, 38.
συγκαταχωρίζειν 719. 34.
συγγραμματικά 727. 21.
συγγραφεῖν 727. 9.
συγγράφησις 727. 14, 26.
συγκάμανος 661. introd.
συλλέγειν 743. 31.
συμβάλλει 717. 4.
συμμαχεῖν 705. 33.
συμψήφισμα 689. 44.
συμπλήρωσις 729. 42.
συμπληρώσης 743. 33.
σύμφωνα 707. 10; 729. 22.
σύμφωναι 719. 20; 724. 5; 728. 37; 729. 32.

συνάγων 705. 48; 708. 11, 22; 833.
συναγορασμὸς 761.
συναναγώσαν 718. 16, 19, 27.
συνεδρίειν 717. 8, 11.
συνεπεδώσαν 716. 28, 30.
συνεργεῖν 707. 14.
συνιστάναι 715. 35; 724. 2; 726. 12; 727. 12, 25; 787.
σύνταξις 729. 12.
συντιμάω 739. 42.
συντίμησις 729. 16, 17, 40-2.
συντυγχάνειν 743. 37.

συνοπτικῆ 705. 77.
σύντασσω 726. 21.
σόφαδρα 705. 71.
σόφωρι 741. 3.
σχοινί 689. 1, 3, 18.
σχοινισμὸς 787.
σῶζειν 705. 23.
σωτήρ 705. 7, 66.

ταλαντον. See Index VIII (δ).
ταμίον 705. 72, 73.
τά νῦν 811.
ταραχεῖα 736. 5.
tάσσειν 722. 20; 729. 17.
ταφή 736. 13, 84.
ταχύς 743. 21.
τέκνων 713. 19; 716. 8.
tευτονκίον 689. 35; 729. 12.
tέκτων 729. 12; 739. 15.
tελεύτων 707. 22, 24.
tέλειος 707. 31; 729. 39, 40.
tελευτάτων 713. 20.
tελευτή 718. 18.
tέλος 712. 6, 21; 724. 9; 788.
tελωνίν p. 263.
tελώνης 732. 2.
tέμενος 785.
tετάρτα 795.
tετράγωνος 689. 21.
tετραπετία 707. 21.
tετραχώνειος 836.
tετράτελον. See Index VIII (δ).
tέχνη 725. 8, 49.
tεχτορ 737. 3 et al. sacr.
tέθεναι 725. 61; 742. 5; 745. 2.
tέκτων 744. 9.
tμᾶν 705. 36.
tιμή 719. 20; 728. 38; 739. 3, 16, 21; 734; 798.
tισίνη 736. 51.
tόκος 705. 49; 712. 6, 14, 21; 728. 20; 799.
tοπαρχία 734. 3; 808. Cf. Index V (α).
tοπωγραμματεῖς 833.
tόπος 705. 73; 707. introd.; 715. 16; 721. 12; 734. 3; 742. 5; 833.
tοσοῦτος 717. 1.
tράπεζα, δημοσία τρ. 721. 13; 835. 'Ασκληπιά
πιάδου τρ. 806.
tρέφειν 725. 15, 45; 729. 40.
X. GENERAL INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN WORDS

τρίβων 661. introd.

τριμέτα 729. 4; 5, 10.

τριπλήγυς 741. 12.

τρισκαδεκάτῃ 714. 17.

τριώβολον. See Index VIII (b).

τριόστος 800.

τροφή 705. 78.

τροχός 707. 7, 27, 29; 729. 32.

τυρός 729. 10.

τύχη 715. 27.

ὑγεία 715. 29.

ὑμαίαν 743. 43; 745. 10; 746. 2; 805.

ὑγία 729. 23; p. 263.

ὑδρεμία p. 263.

ὑδραπάροχος 729. 13, 16.

ὑδραφαλκεῖον 729. 23.

ὑδραφαλκία 729. 7.

ὑδρός 738. 9.

ὑδυλός 741. 15.

ὑδυή 733. 4, 6.

ὑίός 658. 13; 705. 70; 724. 3; 727. 5.

ὑπαρξεὶς 707. 15.

ὑπάρχειν 712. 5; 716. 12; 719. 16; 719. 13; 722. 12; 723. 3; 727. 13; 728. 23; 729. 21; 730. 30.

ὑπερή白衣 712. 17.

ὑποαρχείθα 745. 4.

ὑποδεικνύον 743. 38.

ὑποδόχων 729. 28.

ὑπολείπεται 729. 6, 25.

ὑπολογεῖν 263.

ὑπολογίζειν 729. 13.

ὑπολογύς 729. 4.

ὑπόμημα 719. 4, 35.

ὑποσχετείαν 658. 16.

ὕστερον 718. 11.

ὑπογείαθαι 743. 42.

ὕψος 669. 8.

φάγρος p. 264.

φαίνει 708. 5, 18; 718. 30; 746. 8; 811; 826.

φαινόμεν 786. 4; 10, 77.

φαινόν 805.

φερνή 795; 837.

φελλάξρρός 705. 21, 69, 75.

φίλα 705. 32; 743. 21.

φίλος 706. 6; 724. 2; 742. 8, 9; 745. 9.

φόρτηρον 740. 19, 22, 25, 27.

φορμός 807.

φόρος 707. 3, 21, 24; 727. 18; 728. 31; 729. 32; 730. 12, 20, 23; 732. 4.

φροντίζειν 727. 15.

φροντισθῆ 727. 14.

φύλλατης 803.

φύλαξ 729. 11; 803.

φυλάσσειν 705. 47; 62; 729. 11; 804.

φωτὸν 729. 20, 22.

χαίρειν 705. 7, 20, 58, 68; 708. 2, 15; 716. 2; 719. 4, 12; 724. 2; 728. 17; 732. 4; 735. 7; 742. 1; 744. 1; 746. 2.

χαλκίος 736. 6, 100.

χαλκός 722. 26; 743. 23.

χαλκοῦς 717. 8, 10.

χάμη 705. 63. χάμη 743. 29; 804.

χήρ 669. 40.

χειριστής 734. 2.

χειρ( ) 799.

χειρογραφία 719. 33.

χειρόγραφον 706. 4, 5; 719. 9, 30, 33; 745. 2.

χειροαμβλέοις 729. 30.

χέρις 740. 46.

χέρι 739. 3.

χειλάρχος 708. 13.

χειράλεος 661. introd.

χιτών 725. 29–34; (κιθὼν) 736. 99.

χίοις 740. 18 et saep. ; 789.

χορήγειν 725. 20, 39, 50; 833.

χόρτος 705. 78; 728. 8, 38; 730. 10; 810.

χοῦς (‘mound’) 729. 6.

χοῦς (measure). See Index VIII (54).

χρεία 729. 4, 8, 17; 731. 7; 745. 6.

χρήμα 705. 52.

χρηματίζειν 710. 1; 727. 8; 728. 1.

χρηματισμός 712. 10; 719. 3; 835.

χρηματιστής 719. 7; 727. 3.

χρήσατα 745. 6.

χρήσιμος 705. 75.

χρύνος 707. 11; 712. 18; 714. 38; 718. 11; 719. 13; 724. 4, 9, 11, 13; 725. 9, 11, 38, 49; 728. 35; 729. 17 et saep. ; 732. 11; 786.

χρυσός 795.

χρυσοχοία 806.

χώμα 729. 7; 8, 9, 23; 740. 46 (?).

χώρα 709. 8; 795.

χωρίν 705. 40.
INDICES

χαρίον 705. 70.
χαρίς 719. 27; 724. 6; 725. 45; 729. 30,
31, 34.

ψεύδεσθαι 714. 31.
ψηφερά 741. 7.
ψιλός 707. introd.; 715. 16.

ἀκολουθεῖ 736. 92.
ἀνείπαντα 721. 3.
ἀνή 732. 2.
ἀφόν 784.
ἀφα 747. 3; 804.
ἀπογράφων 710. 3.
ἀστέ 729. 31; 730. 10; 743. 27.
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EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND.

GRAECO-ROMAN BRANCH.

THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND, which has conducted Archaeological research in Egypt continuously since 1883, in 1897 started a special department, called the Graeco-Roman Branch, for the discovery and publication of remains of classical antiquity and early Christianity in Egypt. It is hoped to complete in the next few years the systematic excavation of the site of Oxyrhynchus under the direction of Drs. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.

The Graeco-Roman Branch issues annual volumes, each of about 300 quarto pages, with facsimile plates of the more important papyri, under the editorship of Drs. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.

A subscription of One Guinea to the Branch entitles subscribers to the annual volume, and also to the annual Archaeological Report. A donation of £25 constitutes life membership. Subscriptions may be sent to the Honorary Treasurers—for England, Mr. H. A. Grueber; and for America, Mr. Gardiner M. Lane.
PUBLICATIONS OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND.

MEMOIRS OF THE FUND.


VIII. BUBASTIS. For 1889-90. By Edouard Naville. Fifty-four Plates and Plans. 25s.

IX. TWO HIEROGLYPHIC PAPYRI FROM TANIS. An Extra Volume. Containing:


II. THE GEOGRAPHICAL PAPYRUS (an Almanack). By W. M. Flinders Petrie. With Remarks by Professor Heinrich Brugsch. (Out of print.)


XIII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part I. For 1893-4. By Edouard Naville. Plates I-XXIV (three coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.

XIV. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part II. For 1894-5. By Edouard Naville. Plates XXV-LV (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.


XVII. DENDEREH. For 1897–8. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Thirty-eight Plates. 25s. (Extra Plates of Inscriptions. Forty Plates. 10s.)


XIX. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part IV. For 1899–1900. By Edouard Naville. Plates LXXXVII-CXVIII (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.

XX. DIOSPOLIS PARVA. An Extra Volume. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Forty-nine Plates. 25s. (Out of print.)

XXI. THE ROYAL TOMBS OF THE EARLIEST DYNASTIES, Part II. For 1900–1. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Sixty-three Plates. 25s. (Thirty-five extra Plates, 10s.)


ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Edited by F. Ll. Griffith.


GRAECO-ROMAN BRANCH.


ANNUAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS.

(Yearly Summaries by F. G. Kenyon, W. E. Clun, and the Officers of the Society, with Maps.)

Edited by F. Ll. Griffith.


For 1892–3. 2s. 6d.

1893–4. 2s. 6d.

1894–5. 2s. 6d. Containing Report (with Plans) of D. G. Hogarth's Excavations in Alexandria.

1895–6. 2s.

1896–7. 2s. 6d. With Articles on Oxyrhynchus and its Papyri by B. P. Grenfell, and a Thucydides Papyrus from Oxyrhynchus by A. S. Hunt.

1897–8. 2s. 6d. With Illustrated Article on Excavations at Hierakonpolis by W. M. Flinders Petrie.

1898–9. 2s. 6d. With Article on the Position of Lake Moeris by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.

1899–1900. 2s. 6d. With Article on Knossos in its Egyptian Relations by A. J. Evans.

1900–1. 2s. 6d.

1901–2. 2s. 6d.

1902–3. 2s. 6d.

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS.

ΑΟΓΙΑ ΗΗΧΟΥ: 'Sayings of Our Lord,' from an Early Greek Papyrus. By B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 2s. (with Collotypes) and 6d. nett.

NEW SAYINGS OF JESUS AND FRAGMENT OF A LOST GOSPEL, from Oxyrhynchus. By B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 1s. nett.

ATLAS OF ANCIENT EGYPT. With Letterpress and Index. (Second Edition.) 3s. 6d.

GUIDE TO TEMPLE OF DEIR EL BAHARI. With Plan. 6d.

COPTIC OSTRACA. By W. E. Crum. 10s. 6d. nett.

Slides from Fund Photographs

may be obtained through Messrs. Newton & Co., 3 Fleet Street, E.C.;

and Prints from Mr. R. C. Murray, 37 Dartmouth Park Hill, N.W.

OFFICES OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND:

37 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C., AND
8 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS., U.S.A.

AGENTS:

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co.,
PATERNOSTER HOUSE, CHARING CROSS ROAD, W.C.
BERNARD QUARITCH, 15 PICCADILLY, W.
ASHER & Co., 13 BEDFORD STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.
HENRY FROWDE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.